

A DEBATE on the ROMAN CATHOLIC RELIGION

Between ALEXANDER CAMPBELL, *Bethany, Va.*

AND THE

•Right Reverend JOHN B. PURCELL, *Bishop of Cincinnati*

Held in the Sycamore Street Meetinghouse, Cincinnati, from the 13th to the
21st of January, 1837. Taken down by reporters, and
revised by the parties.

“Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits: for many
false prophets have gone out into the world.”

“If he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as
the heathen and the publican.”—JESUS CHRIST.

NASHVILLE, TENN.
MCQUIDDY PRINTING COMPANY
1914

TO THE PUBLIC

The Publishers being well aware of the importance of obtaining a full and correct report of this discussion, have spared no pains nor expense to effect this object.

They employed two gentlemen well qualified as reporters.

From the joint notes of these, they furnished each of the parties with a copy of his part of the report for revision, with the express understanding, that nothing should be added or subtracted to make their speeches different from what they were when originally delivered.

After being put in type a proof sheet of all was sent to each, for his last corrections.

Believing that by this means the desideratum sought has been obtained, this work is now commended to an enquiring, intelligent, and reading community.

THE PUBLISHERS.

Cincinnati, February, 1837.

INTRODUCTION

To introduce the following report to the reader, we lay before him the correspondence of the parties, which immediately preceded the debate.

LETTER FROM MR. CAMPBELL.

CINCINNATI, JAN. 11th. 1837.

Bishop Purcell—Respected Sir:

At two o'clock this morning, after a tedious and perilous journey of ten days, I safely arrived in this city. The river having become innavigable in consequence of the ice, I was compelled to leave it and take to the woods, about two hundred miles above. By a zigzag course which carried me to Chillicothe and Columbus, sometimes on foot, sometimes on a sleigh, and finally by the mail stage, I accomplished a land tour of two hundred and forty miles, equal to the whole distance from Wheeling to Cincinnati.

After this my travel's history, I proceed to state, that it is with pleasure I received either from you or some of my friends, a copy of the Daily Gazette, on the 22d ult. intimating your fixed purpose of meeting me in a public discussion of my propositions, or of the points at issue between Roman Catholics and Protestants. This, together with your former declarations in favor of full and free discussion, is not only in good keeping with the spirit of the age, and the genius of our institutions, but fully indicative of a becoming confidence and sincerity in your own cause. This frank and manly course, permit me to add, greatly heightens my esteem for you.

Now, sir, that I am on the premises, I take the earliest opportunity of informing you of my arrival, and of requesting you to name the time and place in which it may be most convenient for you to meet me for the purpose of arranging the preliminaries. It has occurred to me, that it would be useful and commendable to have an authentic copy of our discussion, signed by our own hands, and published with our consent; and that it might have all the authority and credit which we could give it, it would be expedient to sell to some of the publishers in this city, the copyright, and let them employ a stenographer or stenographers to report faithfully the whole matter.

It will also secure for such a work a more extensive reading, and consequently a wider range of usefulness, and I have no doubt, be most acceptable to our feelings, and every way reputable, to devote the profits, or the proceeds of the copyright, to some benevolent institution, on which we may both agree; or in case of a difference on a fitting institution, that we select such an object to which we can most conscientiously assign all the profits of such publication.

In order to these ends, it will be necessary, that we timeously arrange all the

preliminaries, and as many persons are now in waiting. I trust it may be every way practicable, during the day, to come to a full understanding on the whole premises.

Very respectfully,
Your ob't. serv't.,
A. CAMPBELL.

BISHOP PURCELL'S REPLY.

CINCINNATI, 11th JANUARY, 1837.

Mr. Alexander Campbell—My Dear Sir:

I sincerely sympathize with you on the tediousness and perils of your journey, from Bethany to Cincinnati. This is truly a dreadful time to embark on our river, or to traverse our state. The sun's bright face I have not seen for several days; I hope when the forth-coming discussion is once finished, our minds, like his orb, will be less dimmed by the clouds, and radiate the light and vital warmth without which this world would be a desert waste.

If it meet your convenience, I shall be happy to meet you, at any time in the morning, or in the afternoon, at the Athenæum.

Your proposition respecting the sale of an authentic copy of the discussion to a publisher, and the proceeds, all expenses deducted, applied to the benefit of some charitable institution, or institutions, meets my hearty concurrence. And I propose that one-half the avails of sale be given to the "Cincinnati Orphan Asylum," and the other half to the "St. Peter's Female Orphan Asylum," corner of Third and Plum streets, Cincinnati.

With best wishes for your eternal welfare, and that of all those who sincerely seek for the truth as it is in Christ Jesus, I remain,

Very respectfully yours,
†JOHN B. PURCELL,
Bishop of Cincinnati.

The parties met in the Athenæum at 2 o'clock, P. M. of Jan 11th, when after some debate on the question, *Who shall be the respondent?* they finally agreed to the following

RULES OF DISCUSSION.

1. We agree that the copy-right of the discussion shall be sold to some book-seller, who shall have it taken down by a stenographer, and that all the avails of the copy-right shall be equally divided between two such public charities as Bishop Purcell and Mr. Campbell shall respectively designate.

2. That the discussion shall take place in the Sycamore-street meeting house; and it shall continue seven days, exclusive of Sunday, commencing to-day, (Friday, 13th) from half past 9 o'clock A. M. to half past 12, and from 3 to 5 P. M., each day.

3. Mr. Campbell shall open the discussion each session, and Bishop Purcell respond. During the morning session the first speech of each shall not exceed an hour, nor the second half an hour. In the afternoon each speaker shall occupy only half an hour.

4. This discussion shall be under the direction of a board of five moderators; of whom each party shall choose two, and these a fifth: any three of whom shall constitute a quorum.

5. The duties of the moderators shall be to preserve order in the assembly, and to keep the parties to the question.

†JOHN B. PURCELL,
A. CAMPBELL.

In order to meet, as far as possible, the arrangements entered into for conducting the contemplated debate for seven days, Mr. Campbell, according to agreement, sent to bishop Purcell, on Thursday morning, Jan. 12, the following statement of the

POINTS AT ISSUE.

1. The Roman Catholic Institution, sometimes called the "Holy, Apostolic, Catholic, Church," is not now, nor was she ever, catholic, apostolic, or holy; but is a *sect* in the fair import of that word, older than any other sect now existing, not the "Mother and Mistress of all Churches," but an apostasy from the only true, holy, apostolic, and catholic church of Christ.

2. Her notion of apostolic succession is without any foundation in the Bible, in reason, or in fact; an imposition of the most injurious consequences, built upon unscriptural and anti-scriptural traditions, resting wholly upon the opinions of interested and fallible men.

3. She is not uniform in her faith, or united in her members; but mutable and fallible, as any other sect of philosophy or religion—Jewish, Turkish, or Christian—a confederation of sects with a politico-ecclesiastic head.

4. She is the "Babylon" of John, the "Man of Sin" of Paul, and the Empire of the "Youngest Horn" of Daniel's Sea Monster.

5. Her notion of purgatory, indulgences, auricular confession, remission of sins, transubstantiation, supererogation, &c., essential elements of her system, are immoral in their tendency, and injurious to the well-being of society, religious and political.

6. Notwithstanding her pretensions to have given us the Bible, and faith in it, we are perfectly independent of her for our knowledge of that book, and its evidences of a divine original.

7. The Roman Catholic religion, if infallible and unsusceptible of reformation, as alleged, is essentially anti-American, being opposed to the genius of all free institutions, and positively subversive of them, opposing the general reading of the scriptures, and the diffusion of useful knowledge among the whole community, so essential to liberty and the permanency of good government.

A. CAMPBELL.

CINCINNATI, 12th January, 1837.

DEBATE
ON THE
ROMAN CATHOLIC RELIGION

REPORT.

The parties met according to appointment, on the 13th January, 1837. at the Sycamore Street Meeting House. at half past nine o'clock. A. M.

MODERATORS.

MESSRS. SAMUEL LEWIS, THOMAS J. BIGGS, WILLIAM DISNEY, JOHN ROGERS
AND J. W. PIATT.

WILLIAM DISNEY, CHAIRMAN.

Mr. Samuel Lewis, having called the meeting to order, read the rules of the debate, as agreed upon between the parties, and the propositions advanced by Mr. Campbell for discussion. He requested the audience to refrain from any audible signs of approbation or disapprobation, as it would interrupt the debate.

Mr. Campbell then opened the debate as follows :—

My Christian Friends and Fellow-Citizens—

I appear before you at this time, by the good providence of our Heavenly Father, in defence of the truth, and in explanation of the great redeeming, regenerating and ennobling principles of Protestantism, as opposed to the claims and pretensions of the Roman Catholic church. I come not here to advocate the particular tenets of any sect, but to defend the great cardinal principles of Protestantism.

Considerable pains appear to have been taken by the gentleman who is my opponent on this occasion, to impress upon the minds of the public the idea that he stands here in the attitude of a defender of Catholicism, and to represent me as its assailant. I am sorry to say that even some Protestants have contributed to give that color to this debate; for I saw in this morning's Gazette an article, in which I am represented as conducting a crusade against the Roman Catholics. Its editor appears to have his sympathies morbidly enlisted in their cause. He is very sympathetic indeed, in behalf of the Roman Catholic religion. Every agony the mother church feels is a pang

to him; for every groan she heaves he has a bottle full of tears ready to be poured out. I will not stop to enquire whether they are political or religious tears. I have to do with the worthy gentleman here, who has represented me as having volunteered to come forward with an attack upon the Catholic church.

I need scarcely inform that portion of my audience, who were present at the last meeting of the College of Teachers in this city, that so far from its being true that I made an attack in the first instance upon the Roman Catholic church, the gentleman did first assail the Protestants.

He says in the Gazette of the 19th of Dec. 1836, that I am a bold and wanton challenger; but a word of comment on this document will shew that it is quite the other way.

The issue was made in the first instance in the College of Teachers. You will recollect that when Dr. J. L. Wilson read an oration on the subject of universal education, the gentleman arose, and in that Protestant house, and before a Protestant assembly, directly and positively protested against allowing the book which Protestant claim to contain their religion, to be used in schools. He uttered a tirade against the Protestant modes of teaching, and against the Protestant influence upon the community. This was the origin of the dispute. Had it not been for the assertions made by the gentleman on that occasion, we should not have heard one word of a discussion.

It is true that the propositions just read may present me in the attitude of what he is pleased to call an assailant of the Roman church. But the question is—how has the controversy originated? And let me ask, how is it possible for the gentleman to prove that, because, a year ago, I made some answer to an attack on Protestantism from the state of Illinois, and called for some more reputable antagonist, that on this account he did not assail Protestantism, and that I am the assailant in this case? Does my having been plaintiff in that case made me necessarily plaintiff in every other case? Does my having told him that I stood prepared to discuss the question at large with any credible gentleman—[Here Mr. C. was interrupted by the moderators as not speaking to the point.] I submit to the decision of the moderators. I thought it due to myself, that the public should know precisely the attitude in which the gentleman and myself stand in this matter. I stand here as the defender of Protestantism, and

"PROP. I. The Roman Catholic Institution, sometimes called the 'Holy, Apostolic, Catholic, Church,' is not now, nor was she ever, catholic, apostolic, or holy: but is a *sect* in the fair import of that word, older than any other sect now existing, not the 'Mother and Mistress of all Churches,' but an apostasy from the only true, holy, apostolic, and catholic church of Christ."

As this is the place and time for logic rather than rhetoric; I will proceed to define the meaning of the important terms contained in this proposition. The subject is the Roman Catholic Institution. This institution, notwithstanding its large pretensions, I affirm, can be proved clearly to be a *sect*, in the true and proper import of the term. Though she call herself the mother and mistress of all churches, she is, strictly speaking, a sect, and *no more than a sect*. We now propose to adduce proof to sustain this part of the proposition.

In the first place, the very term *Roman Catholic* indicates that she is a sect, and not the ancient, universal and apostolic church, the mother and mistress of all churches. If she be the only universal or Catholic church, why prefix the epithet *Roman*? A *Roman Catholic* church is a contradiction. The word *Catholic* means universal—the word *Roman* means something local and particular. What sense or meaning is there in a particular universal church? It is awkward on another account. If she pretends to be considered the only true and universal church of Christ among all nations and in all times, why call herself *Roman*? To say the *Roman Catholic* church of America, is just as absurd as to say the *Philadelphia* church of Cincinnati, —the *London* church of Pittsburgh,—the church of France of the United States. The very terms that she chooses indicates that she cannot be the universal church.

It will not help the difficulty to call her the *Church of Rome*. These words indicate a sect and only a sect, as much as the words *Roman Catholic*. They signify strictly, only the particular congregations meeting in that place.

The Roman Catholic historians endeavor to reconcile this discrepancy of terms by saying that, though those particular congregations are meant, in their larger sense the terms are used to designate all those congregations, scattered throughout the world, who are in communion with the church of Rome. Thus testifies Du Pin—

"It is true, that at the present time, the name of the church of Rome, is given to the Catholic church, and that these two terms pass for synonymous.

"But in antiquity no more was intended by the name of the church of Rome, than the church of the city of Rome, and the popes (bishops) in their subscriptions or superscriptions, look simply to the quality of bishops of Rome. The Greek schismatics seem to be the first who gave the name of the church of Rome to all the churches of the west, whence the Latins made use of this to distinguish the churches which communicated with the church of Rome, from the

Greeks who were separated from her communion. From this came the custom to give the name of the church of Rome to the Catholic church. But the other churches did not from this lose their name or their authority."

I shall hereafter give the day and date of this separation, when she received this sectarian designation and became a sect, in the proper acceptation of that term. It may, perhaps, appear that it was not only unscriptural, but dishonorable; as opprobrious as ever were the terms Lutheran or Protestant.

But suppose we call her "Catholic" alone; and her advocates now endeavor to impress the idea that she is no longer to be called "Roman Catholic," but Catholic, this term equally proves her a sect; for in the New Testament and primitive antiquity there is no such designation. It is simply the church of Christ. It is one thing for us to choose a name for ourselves, and another to have one chosen for us by our enemies. Societies, like persons, are passive in receiving their names. It is with churches as it is with individuals; they may not wear the name they prefer. She wishes now to be called no longer Roman Catholic, but Catholic. She repudiates the appellation of Roman; and claims to be the only Catholic church that ever was, and is, and ever more shall be. But we cannot allow her to assume it; and we dare not, in truth, bestow it, for she is not catholic. But, as there is no church known in the New Testament by that name, could we so designate her, still she would be a sect.

But let me ask, what is the church of Rome of the nineteenth century, or rather, what is the present Roman Catholic institution? Permit me here to say, most emphatically, that I have not the slightest disposition to use terms of opprobrium in speaking of this church; or of the worthy gentleman who is opposed to me in this debate. I do not wish or intend to use the slightest expression which could be construed into an unfriendly tone of satire, irony or invective towards the respectable gentleman, or towards his church. I shall speak freely of her pretensions as to the only true church, &c., but I shall observe a scrupulous respect in all my language towards the present representatives of the Catholic church in the nineteenth century.

Are we then to understand her as the immutable, universal, ancient, primitive, apostolic church of Christ? Are we to understand this by the Roman Catholic church of the nineteenth century, with her popes, her cardinals, her patriarchs, primates, metropolitans, archbishops, archdeacons, monks, friars, nuns, &c. &c. teaching and preaching the use and worship of images, relics, penances, invocation of departed men and women, veneration for some being whom they call "the mother of God," teaching and preaching the doctrine of priestly absolu-

tion, auricular confession, purgatory, transubstantiation, extreme unction, &c. &c.

Is this the ancient, universal, holy apostolic church? Not one of these dogmas can be found in the bible.

They originated hundreds of years since, as I am prepared to show, from the evidence of Roman Catholic authors themselves. How then can we call it the ancient apostolic church? Not one of these offices nor dogmas is mentioned in the New Testament. Hear Du Pin on this point. In exposing the imposition, practised, by an effort, so late as the ninth century, to foist into the history of the church certain pretended decrees or writings of those called the first popes, Du Pin, an authentic Roman Catholic historian, proves these decrees and writings to be spurious, because in them there are numerous allusions to offices and customs not yet existing in the times referred to.

"The following proves them spurious. 1st. The second epistle of St. Clement directed to St. James, speaks of the *Ostiaarii* or doorkeepers, archdeacons and other ecclesiastical officers, that were not then introduced into the church."

2nd. "This letter mentions *sub*-deacons, an order not then established in the church." p. 584.

3d. "In the first Epistle attributed to St. *Sixtus*, he is called an 'archbishop,' a word not used in this time."

4th. "The second, attributed to the same pope, mentions consecrated vessels, and appeals to *Rome*, the grandeur of the church. It is there pretended that all bishops wait for the pope's decision, and are instructed by his letters: modes of speaking never used by the first bishops of Rome."

5th. "The epistle attributed to *Tetesphorus* calls him an archbishop, a name unknown in the first ages."

6th. "There is a decree in it, to enjoin three masses on our Savior's nativity, a custom not so ancient."

7th. "We find several passages in the letter attributed to *Anicetus*, which does not agree with the time of that pope: as, for instance, what is there laid down concerning the *ordinations of bishops, sacerdotal tonsure, archbishops and primates*, which were not instituted till long after: besides many things of the same nature." p. 585.

How, then, can we suppose that this church of the nineteenth century, with so many appendages, is the apostolic church—the only original, primitive, universal institution of Christ?

But she glories in the name of mother and mistress of all churches throughout the world. This astonishes me still more; for with the bible in his hand and history before him, who can stand up and say, that this church ever was the mother and mistress of all churches!

The most ancient catholic church was the Hebrew. She was the mother, though not the *mistress* of all churches; for the christian church has no reigning queen on earth, to lord it over her—as Paul says, on another occasion—"Jerusalem is the mother of us all."

If the gentleman admit Luke to be a faithful historian, he must not only place the Hebrew church first, but the Samaritan, Phenician, Syrian and Hellenist churches as older than the church in Rome. I say if we speak of churches, as respects antiquity, the Hebrew, Samaritan, Syrian and Phenician churches must be regarded as prior to her. The Acts of the Apostles close with Paul's first appearance in Rome.

But that the Roman Catholic institution may stand before you in bold relief as a sectarian establishment, I will give you a definition of her pretensions, from an authentic source, one of her own standards. The Douay catechism, in answer to the question—"What are the essential parts of the church?" teaches "A pope, or supreme head, bishops, pastors and laity." p. 20.

These, then, are the four constituent and essential elements of the Roman Catholic church. The first is the pope, or head. It will be confessed by all, that, of these, the most essential is the head. But should we take away any one of these, she loses her identity, and ceases to be what she assumes. My first effort then shall be to prove that, for hundreds of years after Christ, she was without such a head; the most indispensable of these elements; and consequently, this being essential to her existence, she was not from the beginning. Because no body can exist before its head. Now, if we can find a time when there was no pope, or supreme head, we find a time when there was no Roman Catholic party.

By referring to the scriptures, and to the early ecclesiastical records, we can easily settle this point. Let us begin with the New Testament, which all agree, is the only authenticated standard of faith and manners—the only inspired record of the christian doctrine. This is a cardinal point, and I am thankful that in this we all agree. What is not found there, wants the evident sanction of inspiration, and can never command the respect and homage of those who seek for divine authority in faith and morality.

I affirm then, that not one of the offices, I have enumerated, as belonging to the Roman Catholic church, was known in the days of the apostles, or is found in the New Testament. On the contrary, the very notion of a vicar of Christ, of a prince of the apostles, or of a universal head, and government in the Christian church is repugnant to the genius and spirit of the religion. We shall read a few passages of scripture, from the Roman version, to prove that the very idea of an earthly head is unscriptural and anti-scriptural. The version from which I am about to quote was printed in New York, and is certified to correspond exactly; with the Rhemish original, by a number

of gentlemen, of the first standing in society. If it differs from any other and more authentic copy, I will not rely upon it. I am willing to take whatever bible the gentleman may propose. I read from the twentieth of Matthew. "Jesus said to his disciples, You know that the princes of the Gentiles overrule them, and those that are the greater exercise power against them. It shall not be so among you, but whosoever will be the greater among you, let him be your minister!" Does this convey the idea of a prince among the apostles, a vicar of Christ, a lord over the people of God? Does it not rather say there shall not be any *lordship amongst you!* This command is express, that there shall not be a pope, a supreme lord of the christian church. Again, Matt. 23. 8, "Be not you called Rabbi, for one is your Master and all ye are brethren: and call none father (i. e. pope,) for one is your father, he that is in heaven. Neither be you called masters, for one is your master, Christ. He that is the greater of you shall be your servitor!" If the very question about a pope had been before the Messiah at this time, he could not have spoken more clearly. This expression indicates the most perfect equality of rank among the apostles and disciples of Christ, and positively forbids, in a religious sense, the assumption of the title of *father* or *pope*. The commandment which says "thou shalt not steal," is not more clearly laid down than the command "call no man father."

Now will the gentleman deny that "pope" (in Greek "pappas," in Latin, "papa") means "father?" and that the case clearly comes within the command. Jesus Christ says, "call no man pope;" yet they ordain a bishop and call him pope; and this pope claims the title of "universal father"—supreme head and governor of the church of Christ. He is sometimes called Lord God the pope.

This testimony of Christ will outweigh volumes. Put all the folios and authorities, which the gentleman may bring, on one side, and this text of Jesus Christ on the other, and the former, in comparison, will be found light as the chaff which is blown away by a breath.

Can any one, then, who fears God and believes in the Messiah, call the pope, or any human being "father," in the sense here intended. The Lord anticipated the future in all his precepts, and spoke with an eye to it as well as to the men of his own time. He had the pride and assumptions, of the Rabbis of Jerusalem, in his eye, who coveted renown, who loved such greetings in the market place, and received such compellations in the synagogues. Describing these men to his disciples, he cautions them against their example, and teaches them to regard each other as brethren. I hope the gentleman will pay particular attention to this point in his reply to these remarks.

The third testimony on which we rely will be found in Ephesians iv. 11. This passage sums up all the officers or gifts which Jesus gave the church after his ascension into heaven. "And" says Paul "he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors, and doctors" or teachers. In this enumeration, which contains the whole, there is no pope. The highest or first rank is given to apostles.

In every other enumeration found in the epistles, there is the same clear reference to the apostles as the *first* class. 1 Cor. xii. 28. But let Peter himself speak as to his rank. We see that in his own 1st Epistle, ch. 1, he calls himself *an* apostle, not *the* apostle of Jesus, not the *prince* of apostles, not the supreme head of the church. Peter had no idea of such headship and lordship.

Again in addressing the "seniors" or elders, chap. v. 1, he says, "I myself am a fellow senior." They were all co-elders, co-bishops, co-apostles, as respected each other; and as respected all other officers the apostles were *first*. The thought of a supreme head amongst them is not found in the New Testament; only as reprobated by our Savior.

I will not, at present, advance any more scriptural authority upon the point, but shall proceed to examine what foundation this element of the Roman church, has in ancient history. But I would here say distinctly, once for all, that I will not open a single document to prove any doctrine, tenet, or principle of Protestantism, other than this holy record of the prophets, and apostles, the holy men of God, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. On these I rely, and I affirm that these contain no authority for the assumption of the doctrine of a universal father, pope, or head of the church. There was no such person mentioned—no such idea cherished until hundreds of years after the death of the apostles.

I will read the following general remarks by this learned historian. The title page is as follows:—

A New History of Ecclesiastical Writers, containing an account of the authors of the several books of the Old and New Testaments; of the lives and writings of the primitive Fathers: an abridgment and catalogue of their works; their various editions, and censures, determining the genuine and spurious. Together with a judgment upon style and doctrine. Also a compendious history of the Councils; with Chronological Tables of the whole, written in French by Lewis El- lies Du Pin, doctor of the Sorbonne, and Regius Professor at Paris. 3 vols. Folio. The Third Edition corrected, Dublin, printed by and for George Grierson, at the *Two Bibles* in *Essex Street*, MDCCLXXIV.

I am happy to find, appended to the preface, the seals and signatures of men high in the church, which I cannot now stop to read.

From this work I will proceed to read some passages in proof of the proposition I have advanced, that there is not a vestige of evidence in favor of the cardinal idea, of the Roman Catholic religion, that there was a pope in the first ages of the church. At the close of the third century the highest advance yet made towards any supremacy in the church on the ground of metropolitan standing, is thus described by Du Pin.

"The bishops of great cities had their prerogatives in ordinations, and in councils; and as in civil affairs men generally had recourse to the civil metropolis, so likewise in ecclesiastical matters, they consulted with the bishop of the metropolitan city. The churches of the three principal cities of the world were looked upon as chief, and their bishops attributed great prerogatives to themselves. The church of Rome, founded by St. Peter and St. Paul, was considered as first, and its bishops as first amongst all the bishops of the world; yet they did not believe him to be infallible: and though they frequently consulted him, and his advice was of great consequence, yet they did not receive it blind-fold and implicitly, every bishop imagining himself to have a right to judge in ecclesiastical matters." p. 590.

Observe the bishops of the principal cities *attributed to themselves great prerogatives*. And Rome, the chief city, began to assume the chief prerogatives. But the general character of the clergy as detailed by this writer was not yet favorable to such assumption—for, says he,

"The clergy were not distinguished from others by any peculiar habits, but by the sanctity of their life and manners, they were removed from all kind of avarice, and carefully avoided every thing that seemed to carry the appearance of scandalous, filthy lucre. They administered the sacrament *gratis*, and believed it to be an abominable crime to give or receive any thing for a spiritual blessing. Titles were not then appropriated to them, but the people maintained them voluntarily at their own expense."

"The clergy were prohibited to meddle with any civil and secular affairs. They were ordained against their will and did not remove from one church to another out of a principle of interest or ambition. They were extremely chaste and regular. It was lawful for priests to keep the wives they married before they were ordained."

Nothing indeed like an ecclesiastical establishment was yet in existence: for says Du Pin, speaking of these times,

"After all, it must be confessed, that the discipline of the church has been so extremely different and so often altered, that it is almost impossible to say any thing positively concerning it." p. 590.

So stood the matter at the close of the third century.

But we have still more definite and positive testimony, in the great councils of the 4th and 5th centuries. Let us then examine the early

councils. The famous council of Nice which sat in 325, is the first general council that ever assembled; for although they call the consultations of the apostles—Acts 15., a council, yet in the enumeration of general councils, of which they establish eighteen, that of Nice is called the first.

At this council there were present 318 bishops. It was called by the Roman emperor in order to settle certain discords in what was then called the church. By the sixth canon of this first council it appears, according to Du Pin, that the idea of a pope, or supreme head, had not begun to be entertained. The sixth canon of the council of Nice is as follows.

“The 6th canon is famous for the several questions it has occasioned. The most natural sense that can be given to it, is this: ‘We ordain that the ancient custom shall be observed, which gives power to the bishop of Alexandria, over all the provinces of *Egypt*, *Libya*, and *Pantapolis*, because the bishop of *Rome* has the like jurisdiction over all the suburbicary regions (for this addition must be supplied out of *Rufinus*;) we would likewise have the rights and privileges of the church of *Antioch* and the other churches preserved; but these rights ought not to prejudice those of the metropolitans. If any one is ordained without the consent of the metropolitan, the council declares, that he is no bishop; but if any one is canonically chosen by the suffrage of almost all the bishops of the province, and if there are but one or two of a contrary opinion, the suffrage of the far greater number ought to carry it for the ordination of those particular persons. This canon being thus explained has no difficulty in it. It does not oppose the primacy of the church of Rome, but neither does it establish it.’

“In this sense it is, that it compares the church of *Rome* to the church of *Alexandria*, by considering them all as patriarchal churches. It continues also to the church of *Antioch* and all the other great churches, whatsoever rights they could have; but lest their authority should be prejudicial to the ordinary metropolitans, who were subject to their jurisdiction, the council confirms what had been ordained in the fourth canon concerning the authority of metropolitans in the ordination of bishops. This explication is easy and natural, and we have given many proofs of it in our Latin dissertation concerning the ancient discipline of the church.”

“This canon,” says Du Pin, who be it remembered was always anxious to find some authority for the pope’s supremacy, “DOES NOT ESTABLISH THE SUPREMACY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.” Willing as he was to have this primacy traced to the beginning of christianity, he is constrained to admit, that even the council of Nice does not establish it. Nay more—it is in truth against it; for it gives the Bishop of Alexandria like jurisdiction with the church of Rome; and also preserves to the church of Antioch its metropolitan dominion.

It would be too tedious to go into an exposition of the causes, why so much power was accumulated in the hands of four or five bishops. It originated in the divisions of the empire. In Roman jurisdiction, there were four great political dioceses (for *diocese* was then a polit.

ical term) and to these the church conformed. Hence the patriarchal sees of Rome, Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria. In process of time, Jerusalem was added, and these all became radiating centres of ecclesiastical power and patronage. The bishop of each diocese assumed a sort of primacy, in his own district; and as various interferences and rivalries in jurisdiction occurred, the council of Nice so far decided that the same power should be given to them all—that all primates should be co-ordinate. Hence Du Pin could not find in that council authority for the supreme primacy of Rome. In the canons of the second and third general councils there is no reference to these matters whatever.

I shall therefore proceed to the great council of Chalcedon, of pre-eminent authority, the greatest of the first four general councils.

From all the canons of the council relating to government, it is evident that they had not yet excogitated the idea of a supreme head. Says Du Pin,

“The 28th canon grants to the church of the city of *Constantinople*, which is called *New Rome*, the same privileges with old *Rome*, because this city is the second city in the world. It also adjudges to it, besides this, jurisdiction over the dioceses of *Pontus*, *Asia*, and *Thrace*, and over the churches which are out of the bounds of the emperor, and a right to ordain metropolitans in the provinces of these dioceses.” p. 678.

Thus this council, composed of 340 bishops, and assembling in the year of our Lord 451, gave the same power to the patriarch of Constantinople as to the patriarch of Rome, and makes the supremacy of the one equal to the supremacy of the other.

I have examined the proceedings of all the councils of the first six centuries, of which I find about 170, promulgating in all about 1400 canons. I have read and examined the twenty creeds of the fourth century with all their emendations down to the close of the sixth; and I affirm, without the fear of contradiction, that there is not in all these a single vestige of the existence of a pope or universal head of the church down to the time of Gregory the great, or John the Faster of Constantinople.

I shall now proceed to show from the same learned historian when this idea began to be divulged. And be it *emphatically observed* that the title of pope in its peculiar and exclusive sense was first assumed by the patriarch of Constantinople, and approved by the patriarch of Rome. Du Pin says in his life of Gregory, chap. 1, “He did often rigorously oppose the title of universal patriarch, which the patriarchs of Constantinople assumed to themselves.” Indeed he calls the title, “proud, blasphemous, anti-christian, diabolical,” and says, the bishops of Rome refused to take this title upon them “lest they

should seem to encroach upon the rights of other bishops." But the following document of remonstrance against the title shews what a novelty the idea of an universal head, father, or pope was even at Rome, A. D. 588:—

"St. Gregory does not only oppose this title in the patriarch of *Constantinople*, but maintains also, that it cannot agree to any other bishop, and that the bishop of *Rome* neither ought, nor can assume it. *John* the younger, patriarch of *Constantinople*, had taken upon him this title in a council held in 586, in the time of pope *Pelagius*, which obliged this pope to annul the Acts of this council. St. Gregory wrote of it also to this patriarch; but this made no impression on him, and *John* would not abandon this fine title, B. 4. Ep. 36. St. Gregory addressed himself to the emperor *Mauritius*, and exhorted him earnestly to employ his authority for redressing this abuse, and force him who assumed this title to quit it. He remonstrates to him in his letter, that although Jesus Christ had committed to St. *Peter* the care of all his churches, yet he was not called *universal apostle*. That the title of universal bishop is against the rules of the gospel, and the appointment of the canons: that there cannot be an universal bishop but the authority of all the other will be destroyed or diminished; that if the bishop of *Constantinople* were universal bishop, and it should happen that he should fall into heresy, it might be said that the universal church was fallen into destruction. That the council of *Chalcedon* had offered this title to *Leo*, but neither he nor his successors would accept it, lest by giving something peculiar to one bishop only, they should take away the rights which belong to all the bishops. That it belongs to the emperor to reduce by his authority him who despises the canons, and does injury to the universal church by assuming this singular name." B. 4. Ep. 32.

But at this time the patriarchs of Constantinople and Rome were contending for the supremacy, and while it appeared to Gregory that his rival of the east was likely to possess the title, he saw in it, every thing anti-christian and profane. When a new dynasty, however, ascended the throne and offered the title to a Roman bishop, it lost all its blasphemy and impiety, and we find the successor of Gregory can wear the title of universal patriarch when tendered him by Phocas, without the least scrupulosity.

It is then a fact worthy of much consideration in this discussion, that John bishop of Constantinople first assumed the title of universal head of the whole christian church, and that the bishop of Rome did in that case oppose it as anti-scriptural and anti-christian.

Concerning the reputation of Saint Gregory I need not be profuse. Of the Gregories he is deservedly called the Great. Renowned in history as one who stamped his own image on the Roman world for a period of five hundred years, yet he could not brook the idea of a pope, especially when about to be bestowed on his rival at Constantinople.

St. Gregory, be it remembered, says Du Pin, did not only oppose the title in the case of John the Faster, as proud, heretical, blasphemous, &c., but could not agree to its being assumed by any other bishop;

he affirmed that the bishops of Rome ought not, dare not, cannot assume this pompous and arrogant title.

Thus stood matters as respects a supreme head up to within 14 years of the close of the 6th century.—[Time expired.]

Eleven o'clock A. M.

BISHOP PURCELL rises --

I thought it likely, my respected and beloved fellow-citizens, that I should have to-day a difficult task before me. But I perceive that I shall have an easy one. I expected from the reputation of my antagonist as a debater, that he was going to argue so closely, and to press me so hard, that he would, to use a common expression, make minced meat of me, and not leave one bone of me unbroken. I thought that my creed, so ancient, so venerable, so holy, was to be torn into tatters and scattered to the four winds of heaven—I was mistaken!

The gentleman occupied ten minutes of his time in endeavoring to bias the judgment of his hearers in favor of the idea, that this controversy originated not with himself, but that I was the aggressor, in doing which he was called to order. I will not trespass more than two or three minutes on your patience in answering his preliminary observations.

I am willing to let that matter rest on its own merits. As to the question of assailant and defender in this controversy, the public have the data, and it is for them to judge. My worthy opponent began the present debate by representing himself as the staunch defender of Protestantism, endeavoring thereby to enlist the sympathies of Protestants in his favor. And what, I would presume to inquire, are his principles? What are his claims, his pretensions, or his right to appear before this assembly as the defender of Protestantism? We are all aware what sad pranks have been lately played off before high Heaven by men styling themselves Protestants, which all classes of Protestants unite in deprecating, which they all condemn. I know not whether there be not some Protestants here, who will not admit his gratuitous advocacy of their principles—who will not believe that the principles of Protestantism which he volunteers to defend will be fully or fairly represented by him. For one, I think the Episcopalians, a numerous and respectable class, will not consent to be represented by him; for he denies, if I am rightly informed, that there is properly any ministry in the Protestant church so called—that a divine call should precede the assumption of the sacred office. [Here the moderators interrupted, by requesting the speaker to confine himself to the question.]

Well we are so far even, [a laugh.] The gentleman, then, began

by the assertion that the term Roman Catholic was an incongruity. But I deny it to be an incongruity. Terms, as we all know, are used the more clearly to designate the idea or object which they represent. "Catholic" is the name of our church; and we only prefix the word Roman to signify that she is in communion with the see of Rome. We acknowledge there a primate of superior, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and in this communion do we abide.

He says the word Roman is incongruous; yet his own authority, Du Pin, says it was synonymous with Catholic. It was so understood formerly. And here I may observe that I deny the authority of Du Pin to be competent to the settlement of questions to be called up for decision in the course of the present controversy. Du Pin was a Pansenist, removed from his place of Regius Professor at the Sorbonne for his doctrinal errors, by Louis XIV. to whom Clement XI. addressed a brief on this occasion, commending his zeal for the truth. The claim of Rome was undisputed in the early ages, and it was only when her pre-eminence was contested that the term "Roman" was used before the word Catholic. Hence it was no incongruity, but a clearer designation of the see in whose communion were all the churches. He has stated an inaccuracy in saying that the word catholic was not found in the bible. Is not the epistle of St. James called catholic? And will he presume to say the word was not placed there in the very first age of Christianity?

The gentleman says he will use no words that may convey an opprobrious meaning. God forbid that I should set him the example. I shall debate this question with earnestness, but not with passion. As soon as the discussion closes, I can meet the gentleman without a single unkind or unfriendly feeling.

But in enumerating various doctrines of the Catholic church, I was shocked to hear him use the language "some being called the mother of God." Great God! didst thou not send into the world thy Son, Jesus Christ, to save perishing man, and didst thou not select one of all the daughters of Eve, to be the mother of that child of benediction, and was not Mary this holy one, to whose care was committed his infancy, and to whom he was subject? Was she not the chosen one of heaven, to whom its archangel was sent with the communication—"Hail, full of Grace," or as it is in the Protestant version—"thou that art highly favored—the Lord is with thee," and do we now hear her stigmatized in such language, and designated as "some being called the mother of God?"

The gentleman then contests the doctrine of a hierarchy in the church; and says what he asserts is proved by the scriptures. I

would ask—has he read the bible? Has he read the book of Leviticus? Does he not find there the example set of a distinction of orders in religious affairs? Did not the Lord speak to Moses, saying—“‘ Take Aaron with his sons, their vestments and the oil of unction,’ and he poured it on Aaron’s head—he put also the mitre on his head. And after he had offered his sons, he vested them with linen tunics and girded them with girdles,” &c. &c. “And Nadab and Abiu were consumed with fire for opposing them, and they died before the Lord.” Did not Moses lead? Did not Aaron assist? Were there not councilors appointed by the Lord, to divide the burden of their ministry? Did not king Josaphat send Zachariah and Nathaniel and Michael, and with them the Levites, Senneias, &c., to teach the people? Paralip. 17. 7. What is this but a distinction of orders and of authority in the Jewish dispensation?

He says there was no distinction of orders in the early christian church; and he refuted himself by appealing for a solution of the difficulty to St. Paul. Were there no orders, no hierarchy? What says St. Paul in 4th Ephesians? “And he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and other some pastors, and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; until we all meet unto the unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the age of the fullness of Christ.” We must here remark a gradation of authority in the church of God. For what? For the work of the ministry. There never has existed a social body without subordination, or distinction of rank. The church of Christ is a social body. It needs to be subjected to order, even more than a political body; and as if St. Paul anticipated the objection, which we have, not without surprise, heard this day urged, he expressly states the object of the institution of a hierarchy by him, who ascending on high gave gifts to men, to be the perfecting of the saints—the unity of faith. “Are all,” he asks, (what my friend would make them) “prophets? Are all pastors?”—He elsewhere asks, “How can they preach unless they be sent?” By whom? By an ecclesiastical superior. So much for the evidence of the Old Testament, and the New Testament. They both teach a head, a hierarchy and subordination among the people of God.

This takes me to the examination of the title, assumed by the Catholic church, of mother and mistress of all the churches. He says Jerusalem was the mother church at first—and then the Samaritan, and so on, I need not follow him. I will explain what we mean by the term. We call her mother because she guides, she cherishes us.

We call her mother, because we feel a filial reverence for her—just as an orphan calls her who protects her, educates her, and guides her wandering feet, by the same tender appellation. There is no blasphemy in this comparison. It is the Son of God that established the authority of that church? The name is its designation.

But the word 'mistress' is never used in speaking of the church, in the sense of lordship, or queenship. It is the way in which children address their teacher. They frequently use the expression, as we read in Cordery's Colloquies, "salve magister." Magistra here is addressed to her in her capacity of teacher, and such she is, and, as I shall prove, by the appointment and the express institution of Jesus Christ.

He next referred to the Doway catechism to show from the definition of the Catholic church, that she consisted of four elements, viz. the pope, bishops, pastors, and laity.

Now the catechism of this diocese defines the Catholic church to be the congregation of all the faithful, professing the same faith, receiving the same sacraments, and united under one visible head, the pope, or vicar of Jesus Christ, on earth.

It is defined to be the congregation of *all the faithful*. This is the definition which most authors give. It is that of the catechism from which my friend has quoted.

But let us adopt his definition, and I am prepared to show that the idea of a supreme head has its origin in the bible, and is supported by the earliest ecclesiastical authority. I must here take notice of the promise he gave to put his finger on the precise day and date when the church called the Roman Catholic church, ceased to be the church of Christ. He has left us as much in the dark as ever on this most important of all events. It is a point which has puzzled the world, and will for ever puzzle it, to fix that date. It will, I am sure, puzzle my friend. The whole world has never been able to state at what particular moment the Catholic church lost her prerogative and the favor of God—when she ceased to be in the true sense the *Catholic Church*. The reason of this is obvious. She has never forfeited her prerogative. But to the matter before us. It is opposed to scripture to assert that the church in apostolic days had no head. What did Christ say to Peter when he addressed him the mysterious question—"Lovest thou me more than these?" Peter says he does love him. Jesus gives him the order, "feed my lambs." A second time he asks the question, and receives the same reply. The third time he repeats the same question. Peter, troubled that his Lord should doubt his affection, replies, "Oh, Lord, thou knowest all things—thou knowest

that I love thee," and Jesus repeated the command—"feed my lambs"—"feed my sheep."

Thus Christ establishes the headship of the church in Peter, and him he makes his vice-gerent, or common pastor, to feed both lambs and sheep—both clergy and laity.

Mr. Campbell quarrels with the doctrine of the pope's headship because it carries a *power* and an *authority* with it: and he quotes the New Testament to prove no such power to have been exercised in the days of the apostles. I have disproved his argument upon this point already. Christ did institute a body of leaders, a ministry to guide his people, "that henceforth we be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about by every wind of doctrine, by the wickedness of men, by cunning craftiness, by which they lie in wait to deceive. But doing the truth in Christ, we may in all things grow up in him who is head, even Christ; from whom the whole body being compacted and fitly joined together, by what every part supplieth, according to the operation in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body, unto the edifying of itself in charity." Must not the body have a head, the house a foundation? He objects that we call the sovereign pontiff—Pope, or father, whereas Christ says, "call not any man Father." But is this prohibition of our Savior to be taken literally? Is there any guilt or impiety in calling a parent "Father?" Many of Christ's commands are similar. He commands us to call no man *good*: for God only is good. But do we not, in saluting a friend in common life, say "Good Sir," "my good friend?" &c. Is there any impiety in this? It is the using these terms in that sense in which they are *peculiar* to the divinity, which Christ forbids. And the pope when he corresponds with the bishops, does not assume these proud titles, but addresses them as an elder BROTHER. We do not call him "Lord God the Pope."

Mr. C. says, St. Paul did not *lord* it over the clergy. Neither does the pope. He is to govern the church *according to the canons*. He can make no articles of faith. He cannot, he does not act arbitrarily in proposing articles of belief unknown to Catholic antiquity. But neither will he suffer innovation. His language is like St. Paul's, "Were I or an angel from Heaven to preach to you any other gospel, than what has been preached, let him be Anathema!" This expressed the sense the great apostle entertained of his own responsibility, and the danger of novelty in religion. He would not suffer altar to be raised against altar, on the ground of private interpretation of the bible. He would not suffer the wolves of heresy and error to prowl

around the fold, and tear, and scatter the sheep entrusted to him by Jesus Christ.

It would be horrid blasphemy to apply to man the title Father, in the sense in which it is addressed to God. We never call the pope in any sense God. When the pope writes to the bishops, he begins by "*Dilecti Fratres,*" "BELOVED BRETHREN,"—a republican, and if you please democratic address. The bishops are all brethren under one common Father. The pope is accused of letting himself be worshipped. This is not so. But when the Pope comes before the altar he bows down like the humblest of his people. "I confess," says he, "to Almighty God, to the blessed Virgin Mary, the holy Apostles, and to all the Saints," the least of whom he therefore acknowledges to be greater than himself, "that I have sinned;" and this is what is called setting himself up to be a God! See how you have been deceived by the invidious representations you have had of the pope, and of our doctrine, my friends.

I assert again that the authority quoted by my friend, Mr. C., viz. Du Pin, is no authority. He was the rank enemy of the Roman see, a Jansenist, reprov'd and censured by the Catholic church. Mr. C. knows this, for I have read to him the documents that prove it, and he was confounded by them. It is neither good faith, nor good logic, to quote him as an authority against my argument. As for the signatures appended to the English translation, I care not for them; they may have been wrongfully placed there, or those certificates suborned. This makes nothing for the authority of the book, and no argument can be drawn from them. But, my friends, I am sure you discovered his discomfiture when he appealed to Du Pin. There was a stumbling block in his way, something he could not get over. Did you not notice how with the rapid speed of a rail-road car dashing suddenly on an obstruction, *he fled the track*, when he found to his astonishment that the testimony adduced by his author, was not unfavorable to the supremacy of St. Peter, and his successors! I will examine his writings to show that even in the third century, the bishops of Rome claimed this prerogative, and Du Pin tells you that this was acknowledged. He says there were three principal bishops. This is a great admission, and I am thankful for it. He says that even then, bishops came from inferior sees, and laid their conflicting claims before the see of Rome; and submitted to the chair of Peter, doubts in religious matters; and urged it to proclaim a solution of their difficulties; but he says, they did not believe the pope of Rome infallible. This is granting to the Catholics the whole mooted question. The question is clearly settled by this admission. Appeals

were lodged before the bishop of Rome, though he was not believed to be infallible. Neither is he now. No enlightened Catholic holds the pope's infallibility to be an article of faith. I do not; and none of my brethren, that I know of, do. The Catholic believes the pope, as a man, to be as liable to error, as almost any other man in the universe. Man is man, and no man is infallible, either in doctrine or morals. Many of the popes have sinned, and some of them have been bad men. I presume my worthy antagonist will take his brush in hand, and roll up his sleeves, and lay it on them hard and heavy; so will I; and whenever he uses a strong epithet against them, I will use a stronger. But let us return to the gentleman's authority, Du Pin. We come to the council of Nice, which was held A. D. 325, and where 318 bishops were assembled. This council was convoked by the first christian emperor Constantine the Great, at the suggestion, I might have more correctly said the instigation of Sylvester, bishop of Rome, and of course, with his consent. Osius, bishop of Cordova, and two legates, Vitus and Vincentius, presided in it, in the name of the Roman pontiff. The principal doctrine on which the council was assembled to decide, was the divinity of Jesus Christ denied by the Arians. From the manner of the convocation of the council, the circumstance of its having been presided over by the representatives of the pope, or bishop of Rome, the submission of the entire christian world to its decrees, and the authentic records of its transactions which have reached us, we have the most convincing evidences of the reverence which was even then entertained for the successor of St. Peter; and the best practical illustration of the wisdom that established his pre-eminence of rank among his brethren, to watch over the purity of doctrine, the soundness of morals, the uniformity of discipline, and the maintenance of union among the churches. What more direct and satisfactory testimony could we require of the supremacy of the see of Rome, than the distinct recognition of its authority by so venerable an assembly? And what if rival claims were advanced by other sees? This ambitious spirit is as old as Christianity, as ancient as the origin of the human race. The apostles, themselves, strove for the mastery. They contended which of them was the greater. But this rivalry only served, in the end, to establish more firmly the precedency of the claim of St. Peter. In answer to the pretensions of the bishop of Alexandria, the council says to him, "As the bishop of Rome has his primacy in Rome, so the bishop of Alexandria has his primacy in Alexandria." It says to him, "you have no cause to complain—if he has his authority, you have yours; in your respective sees, or churches, you have the chief control; but

it is his prerogative, as occupying the place of Peter, to watch over the welfare of all." "Neither," says Du Pin, "DOES IT DISPROVE THE PRIMACY OF ROME." The council offered a sedative to the pride of the bishop of Alexandria, or asserted his authority in his own see, but it does not disprove the primacy of Rome.

What more do you want than what God has caused to be thus recorded here?

The dissension first originated among the patriarchal sees. The council took cognizance of it, and decided according to the rules and usages of the apostolic and immediately subsequent ages. From this, whatever follows, it surely does not follow that there was no primacy in Rome.

He says that the bishop of Constantinople assumed to call himself the universal bishop, and that the emperor winked at it. What does this mean? Why that the crafty emperor, and the more subtle bishop intended to compel Rome to acknowledge Constantinople as her equal. This attempt of the emperor and the patriarch illustrates the point at issue, and clears it in fact of any difficulty. They knew that Rome was referred to on every occasion; and that her decision was final. They were jealous of her authority. The manner of this assumption of the bishop of Constantinople, and of the emperor winking at it, are in fact proofs of the supremacy of Rome. Now, thought the proud Greek, I will bring this haughty pontiff of Rome crouching to my feet, I will make him surrender all his authority, and we, the emperor and myself, will divide the earth between us. It was therefore that the bishop made this assumption, and that the emperor *winked* at it. It was in this unjust and intolerable sense of the term UNIVERSAL FATHER, that Gregory who deserves all the praise which has been given him, and more, objected to its assumption. It was thus that he reprobated the title of universal father.

If the bishop of Rome now claims to be called the first pastor in christendom, he pretends to be no lord of the consciences of his brethren, or dictator of the terms of salvation to the servants of God. He acknowledges with humility his own intrinsic nothingness, unless supported by God, and guided and guarded by him in the administration of his eminently responsible office.

He is a father because he breaks the mystic bread, and dispenses the spiritual nourishment of sound doctrine to the souls of the people of God. He is a father because to him we appeal in our doubts, and to him refer in every emergency, as to the vicar of Christ.

The term Universal Father was likewise worthy of the condemnation of Gregory, in the bad sense in which it was assumed by the pa-

triaroh of Constantinople, viz. that of lord and master of spiritual power and of the consciences of the brethren, so as not to need or ask the advice of the bishops. The pope never gives a decree without taking counsel from his constitutional advisers, availing himself of the light of present wisdom and past experience. He takes all human means to weigh the subject well and to come to a sound and scriptural conclusion. Discard the pope—sever from the communion of the church of Rome, and you lose all claim, or shadow of claim to a connexion with the apostles. Hear Waddington speaking of the Vaudois—

“In our journey back towards the apostolic times, these separatists conduct us as far as the beginning of the twelfth century; but when we would advance farther, we are intercepted by a broad region of darkness and uncertainty. A spark of hope is indeed suggested by the history of the Vaudois. Their origin is not ascertained by any authentic record, and being immemorial, it may have been coeval with the introduction of christianity.

“But since there is not one direct proof of their existence during that long space; since they have never been certainly discovered by the curiosity of any writer, nor detected by the inquisitorial eye of any orthodox bishop nor named by any pope, or council, or any church record, chronicle, or memorial, we are not justified in attaching any historical credit to their mere unsupported tradition. It is sufficient to prove, that they had an earlier existence than the twelfth century; but that they had then been perpetuated through eight or nine centuries, uncommemorated abroad, and without any national monument to attest their existence, is much more than we can venture, on such evidence, to assert. Here then the golden chain of our apostolic descent disappears; and though it may exist, buried in the darkness of those previous ages, and though some writers have seemed to discern a few detached links which they diligently exhibited, there is still much wanting to complete the continuity.” [Page 554 of the *History of the Church from the earliest ages*, by Rev. Geo. Waddington, A. M. fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Prebendary of Ferring, in the cathedral church of Chichester. New York edition, 1835.]

Well if Christ established a church on earth, that church must be *catholic*. “I believe in the holy catholic church,” is the language of the apostles and of councils, of Protestants as well as of Catholics. The *true* church must be catholic. What church then is catholic? The universe answers the question—Italy, France, Spain, Austria, Ireland, South America, Canada, five hundred churches lately erected in England, Calcutta, Ceylon, Oceania, all the islands of the Pacific and the Atlantic: even in every country where Protestantism is dominant, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, the testimony is given, and the words “I believe in the holy catholic church” are used by the members of the Roman Catholic church, who alone have a right to use them. Applied to any other church they are a misnomer. Protestants cannot employ such language. They are cut up into a thousand discordant and chaotic sects. As no other church but ours is *now* catholic, so no other but ours ever has been or will be catholic. “Chris-

tian is my name and Catholic my surname," said Paclan. With love and charity to all men the Roman Catholic church subsists throughout all time, teaches all truth, and gathers into her communion the children of every clime. What she lost in one region, she gained in another. The axe of persecution that lopped off some of her branches, made the vigorous trunk produce the more luxuriantly.

"Investigating," says Fletcher, "in those countries, where either christianity has once subsisted, or where it subsists at present—the *monuments* which they exhibit, and interrogating these (*monuments have voices, my brethren, that speak plainly,*)—it will be found that they all loudly attest the greatness and the antiquity of our religion. "*We are Catholics,*" the venerable ruins say, "*and the emblems even, which still adorn us, shew it.*" It is so, likewise, not only in the monuments, which were once, or are yet, sacred to religion, but in a great variety of other vestiges. The proofs of the ancient splendor of Catholicity are legible on almost every object, that has seen the tide of ages roll away,—on the palaces of princes,—on the castles of the great,—on the gates of cities,—on the asylums of charity,—on the tombs of the dead. They may be read in the constitutions and laws of kingdoms—in the foundations and rules of universities,—in the customs and peculiarities of the vulgar. * * * * *

It is indeed, possible that prejudice may object to those arguments, that "they are very general and indistinct,—proving, it is true, that in almost every nation, and in every age, there has existed a widely diffused religion,—a Catholic religion, but not proving that this religion, its principles and doctrines, were in every age the same—in every age, the identical religion, which the Catholic believes at present." It is the essence of the true religion to remain unchanged; and to have descended, and to descend always, down the stream of time, without corruption or alteration. If, therefore, I undertake distinctly to prove, that the Catholic religion of the present period is indeed, the true religion, then should I also distinctly prove that it has never undergone any alteration, and that it is the same, which, revealed originally to mankind, has, during the course of eighteen centuries, formed always the object of the veneration of the orthodox believer." vol. 2, p. 173.

"As it was the design of God, that the true church should be Catholic; so it was also his design, that the true church should always be distinguished by the honorable appellation of *Catholic*:—as it was the will of Jesus Christ, that the establishment which he formed, should extend through every nation, and subsist through every age; so also it was his will, that this establishment should be dignified by a name corresponding to these great characteristics. "I believe," the apostles commanded the faithful in every age to say, "*in the holy CATHOLIC Church,*" "*by this name CATHOLIC,*" says St. Austin, "*I am retained in the Catholic Church,*" "*my name,*" adds St. Paclan, "*is Christian; my surname CATHOLIC; and BY THIS SURNAME, I am distinguished from all the sects of heresy.*" Sermon on the catholicity of the church, page 195, vol. ii. Balt. edit. 1830.

It is certainly, my beloved friends, a very animating circumstance, to view the immensity and the long duration of our church; to see it stretching out its empire through every climate; consoling by its benefits, and enlightening by its doctrines, the remotest corners of the universe: to see it existing through the long lapse of so many ages, unmoved, while the strongest empires sink to ruin; and unshaken, while all things fall in decay around it. It is animating to remark it triumphant over all the powers of darkness, and the exertions of human malice,

combating often, it is true, with the storms of persecution and the artifices of heresy; yet combating, always, to come off with victory; riding through the tempest, and exalted by the very means which had been levelled at its depression. *Ibid.* page 198.

From this contemplation, my christian friends, we may derive the consoling assurance, that happen or befall what may, though the billows of persecution swell and the tide of error rage; every effort to destroy the church shall turn out fruitless. The church, these scenes assure you, is an edifice protected by the hand of the Almighty, a rock fixed on the basis of the divine power amid the sea of human life. The billows of persecution shall swell, the tide of error dash against it in vain. They will no more move it, although they may, indeed, sweep away many of its unguarded members, than the gentlest spray will move the firmest mountain that the ocean laves. I should be sorry to see the misfortune happen, yet could I behold the most furious tempest gathering without one feeling of anxiety for the stability of the church. As the Psalmist says. "*It should come to nothing, like the running water.*" (Ps. lvii.) It would prove but the preparation for fresh conquests. The security of the church amid storms, during the long interval of eighteen centuries, is alone sufficient assurance of its security, amid the fury of future tempest. *Ibidem*, page 198.

If it can be proved that the Catholic church had not these characteristics, we admit she is not the church of Christ. I shall go to trial on this point. If she has ever ceased to teach the whole doctrine of Christ, to diffuse over all nations, the true christian precepts, or if she has not had a larger body of professors, than any of the sects, that separated in every successive age from her communion, then will I yield the question. But it will try the ingenuity of the gentleman to prove any such thing, and still more, to show in that case, what church was catholic. This difficulty meets him at the very threshold. [Time expired.]

Three o'clock, P. M.

MR. CAMPBELL rises—

My learned and worthy opponent commenced his forenoon speech, saying that he found before him a more easy task than he had expected. Were it a question of rhetoric rather than of logic, I confess I should have more to fear. He has been more accustomed than I, to the *display* of that art. I am rather a matter of fact man, and logic more than rhetoric has occupied my attention.

I apprehend, however, before this discussion is ended he may find his task not quite so easy as he would seem to anticipate. And to me the good book has suggested a caution which I hope always to remember. It is happily couched in these words, "Let not him that buckleth on his armor boast as he that taketh it off."

But to examine his defense, so far as in it there is reference to my speech, has he not made in the very first effort an unfortunate admission? The name *Catholic* he admits is generic and the name Roman

specific,—and that the term *Roman* only indicated the church in which this catholic communion is to be enjoyed: that the universal church is found in the particular, the genus in the species. Thus we can have Greek catholic, English catholic, American catholic, as well as Roman catholic. These particular universals are susceptible of indefinite multiplication. And so the catholicity of Rome is specifically the same with that of England!!

His second admission is equally unfortunate. He did not seem to perceive that he argued for me rather than against me, on the word *father*. He said that it could not be understood literally. So said I. How then must it be used but religiously? Call no man your religious or ecclesiastic Father. He has then fully conceded all that I ask. It is then an absolute prohibition of the Roman Catholic notion of a supreme holy father. To designate any person pope is then a violation of Christ's command.

The gentleman has admitted, somewhat reluctantly however, that the Doway catechism is a standard work, and that the definition of the church is infallibly correct. My argument hitherto has been to shew that the supreme head called pope, being of the essential elements, nay the chief element of the Roman Catholic church, and not found either in the bible or ecclesiastic history for ages after the christian era, the church of Rome is a *sect* in the true import of that word, and not the mother and mistress of all churches, for she cannot be older than her head, unless a body can exist without and before its head, which is impossible. It is not the nature of that head, whether political or ecclesiastic or both, but the simple fact of its existence concerning which we enquire. The nature and claims of the head may hereafter be the subject of examination. That the Roman sect is divided into four parties, touching the supremacy—one affirming that the pope is the fountain of all power political and religious—another teaching that he has only ecclesiastic supremacy—a third party affirming that his ecclesiastic dominion is over all councils, persons and things spiritual, and a fourth party limiting his jurisdiction to a sort of executive presidency—is a proposition susceptible of ample proof, and of much importance, but we wish it to be very distinctly stated that the question now before us in the fact that a head, or universal father, pope or patriarch, is not found in the Roman empire, east or west, for six hundred years, and consequently that during that time that church did not exist, whose four essential elements, are a pope or supreme head, bishops, pastors and laity.

I am the more diffuse on this point because my learned opponent seems to mistake the question or to confound it with another of a dif-

ferent category. He seems to be squinting at infallibility, authority, order in the ministry, rather than looking in the face the simple question, *was there a pope in any church for the first six centuries?* Authority is not infallibility, nor is order, supremacy. I go for authority in the president of the United States, but who infers thence that I hold the president to be infallible! I go for order in the christian church, but what has this to do with the supremacy of the bishop of Rome? Why, I emphatically ask, does the bishop of Cincinnati confound the question of fact before us with that concerning the Levitical priesthood? I have not agitated such a question.

And what have my views of church order and government to do with the question before us? Why drag these matters into discussion? Did I not distinctly say that I came not here to defend the tenets of any party of Protestants, but the great principles of Protestantism? And what have my views of church order to do with the questions at issue! Of these however the gentleman is wholly misinformed. I am the advocate of order, of a christian ministry, of bishops and deacons in the church. Without order no society can exist, and therefore no reasonable man can object either to order or authority in the church. But again I ask what is this to the question in debate!

He gave us too a dissertation on the passage, "lovest thou me more than these." This is certainly gratuitous at this time. I am glad however the gentleman has delivered himself on this text. But this is not the question now. We are seeking for a head for the church, a papal head for the church in the first ages, while our friend is expounding scripture on other themes.

To the authority of Du Pin the gentleman seems to except. But on what authority does he object? His works are certified by the doctors of the Sorbonne and by the guardians of the Catholic press. Will he say that he is not an authentic historian? Du Pin was born and educated, lived and died and was buried in the Roman Catholic church. The gentleman proved, two or three months ago, that general La Fayette was a Roman Catholic because he was baptized in the church of Rome and buried in consecrated ground. Certainly then Du Pin was all this and more! It matters not whether he was a Jansenist or Jesuit. Both orders have been at different times in good and bad repute. Jansenists have sometimes been proscribed, and Jesuits have been suppressed. But the question is not, was he a good Catholic, but *was he an authentic historian?* For a good Catholic is one thing, and a good historian is another. I wish the gentleman to answer. (Bishop Purcell: I answer emphatically, he was not an authentic historian.)

Then this gentleman and the bishop of Bardstown are at variance. The latter gentleman, if I mistake not, admitted in a discussion published in the Catholic paper of that place, that Du Pin was an authentic historian. I have seen this work repeatedly quoted in discussions between Romanists and Protestants, and I do not recollect to have seen any thing advanced against his authenticity. Mr. Hughes of Philadelphia, but on different grounds than those stated by my opponent, did indeed object to him as a faithful witness in his controversy with Mr. Breckenridge. However while I wish it to go the public that bishop Purcell has objected to Du Pin, as an authentic historian, I will distinctly state that I rely upon him in this controversy only so far as he is sustained by other historians, and therefore I will only quote him in such matters as I know can be sustained from other sources. Other historians record the same fact, and many of the works which Du Pin quotes are not only extant but accessible.

The word *catholic* the gentleman has stated that it is of high antiquity and found at the head of some books of the New Testament. But how came it into the New Testament? Was it Robert Stephens of Paris that placed it there in the 16th century as a sort of general heading to certain epistles, or was it placed there by the apostles themselves?

Touching the council of Nice and whether Sylvester had any thing to do with its convocation, may hereafter be worthy of discussion; at present this is not before us. The *decree* of the council and its *convocation* are distinct things.

Of the texts relied on by me to dispose of the pretensions of supremacy, the gentleman has taken special exception to Ep. iv. 11., and would have different orders of ecclesiastic *powers*, rather than *gifts* for the edification of the church and the *fitting of saints for the work* of the ministry, to be contained in that passage. But the text says *gifts* and not *lordships*. Of these gifts vouchsafed by the ascended Savior the first was apostles. "He gave first apostles, secondarily prophets," and here again "he gave some apostles and some prophets." No supremacy is expressed of an individual. It is not ranks of authorities like civil or military functionaries, such as magistrates, aldermen, constables, &c., but gifts of light and knowledge and grace. the splendid gifts of the Holy Spirit; gifts of teaching, preaching, exhorting, and setting up the tabernacle or church. The apostles had all authority and all gifts themselves; but they needed assistants and a distribution of labor, and not an hierarchy, in laying the foundation and in fitting saints for the work of the christian ministry.

Having now touched all the relevant points in the Bishop's opening speech, I hasten to my argument.

On examination of the New Testament, the primitive fathers, the councils both provincial and general, down to the close of the 6th century, we do not find in the whole territory claimed by our opponents as yet, the idea or name of a supreme head, pope, or vicar of Christ.

My learned antagonist has not produced any such document, and doubtless he knows if there be any such authority now extant, and would produce it.

The strong expressions of *Saint* Gregory in opposition to the title shew what a singular novelty it was in Rome during "his pontificate," and his bold declaration not only of the arrogance and blasphemy of the title, but of its aspect to all the bishops, as annulling their equality, sufficiently prove that he rightly appreciated its true meaning and its hostility to the genius of that simplicity and humility which comported with the servants of Christ. So far then as we have examined the evidence on hand, the defence of the Bishop, the argument as now developed stands thus:—a pope, or universal patriarch, is the first essential element of the Roman Catholic sect. But there was no such personage in existence for 600 years after Christ, therefore there was no church of Rome, in the sense of the creed, during the first six centuries.

We are now prepared to narrate the circumstances which ushered into being the pope of Rome. Mauritius the emperor of the East died at the hand of Phocas a centurion of his own army. Mauritius favored the pretensions of the bishop of Constantinople, and turned a deaf ear to the importunities of Gregory on the subject of taking from bishop John the title of universal father, so painful to the pride and humility of the great Gregory. For the *saint* had written to the emperor on the arrogance of John, metropolitan of the great diocese of the east. Mauritius was supplanted and the throne usurped by Phocas. Gregory rejoiced at his death, and hailed the elevation of his murderer to the throne. Gregory consecrated him, in the church of St. John the Baptist at Constantinople, and Phocas, as a reward for his consecration and favorable regards, conferred upon the successor of Gregory, Boniface the third, the title of *universal patriarch* in the very sense in which it had been repudiated by Gregory. Thus in the year 606 two years after the death of the saint, the first pope was placed in the chair of the Galilean fisherman, if indeed Peter had ever sat in a chair in Rome.

Concerning the consecration of Phocas, Mr. Gibbon thus remarks:

"The senate and clergy obeyed his summons, and as soon as the patriarch was assured of his orthodox belief, he consecrated the successful usurper in the church of St. John the Baptist. On the third day, amidst the acclamations of a thoughtless people, Phocas made his public entry in a chariot drawn by four white horses: the revolt of the troops was rewarded by a lavish donation, and the new sovereign, after visiting the palace, beheld from his throne the games of the hippodrome." Gibbon's *Decline and Fall Rom. Emp.* vol. viii. p. 269.

But the infidel has good reason to laugh at the saint, where he records the exultation of Gregory at the death of Mauritius.

"As a subject and a christian it was the duty of Gregory to acquiesce in the established government: but the joyful applause with which he salutes the fortunes of the assassin, has sullied with indelible disgrace the character of the saint. The successor of the apostles might have inculcated with decent firmness the guilt of blood, and the necessity of repentance: he is content to celebrate the deliverance of the people and the fall of the oppressor: to rejoice that the piety and benignity of Phocas have been raised by Providence to the imperial throne: to pray that his hands may be strengthened against all his enemies; and to express a wish, perhaps a prophecy, that after a long and triumphant reign, he may be transferred from a temporal to an everlasting kingdom." *Id. ib.* p. 211.

It looks indeed as if Gregory had permitted the recollection of the conduct of Mauritius towards his rival to mingle with his exultations at the elevation of Phocas. When we recollect that Mauritius, his wife, four sons and three daughters were immolated at the shrine of the ambition of Phocas because he feared a rival, we are astonished that saint Gregory could have called heaven and earth to rejoice in his exaltation to the throne of the Cæsars. His words are:

"*Benignitatem vestræ pietatis ad imperiale fastigium pervenisse gaudemus. Latentur cœli et exultet terra, et de vestris benignis actibus universæ reipublicæ populus nunc usque vehementer afflictus hilarescat.*" &c. *Greg. I. xi. ep. 38, ind. vi.*

It is not so honorable to the successors of Boniface the third, that the title of pope in its supreme import, was conferred by so mean a wretch as Phocas the usurper and murderer, and rather as a reward for the temporizing and easy virtue of Gregory the first. Boniface, though in the catalogue of popes he stands the 66th in descent from Peter, was in truth the first pope of Rome in the sense which is placed in the Catechisms and standards of the present church of Rome.

As yet the power was only ecclesiastic. But power is naturally cumulative, and especially ecclesiastic. Let any person be imagined to wear at his girdle the keys of heaven, and the sword of spiritual power, let him have kings and princes bowing at his footstool, and we shall soon see him like Napoleon, stretching out his hand not only to grasp the gorgeous crown of ecclesiastic but of political power.

But to complete the story of the origin of the papal power we must add a few words on the assumptions of Saint Zachary, or Stephen the

Second. Pepin the father of Charlemagne was in the cabinet of Childeric the king of France in those days. His master was a feeble prince and he was an ambitious minister. He knew the power of the pope, and before he dared to seize the throne of his master he deemed it *politic* to consult the vicar of Christ. He placed himself before him in this casuistic style. "Sir," said he, "whether is he that has the name of prince without the power, or he who has the power without the name, the rightful sovereign of a nation?" The pope answered him according to his wish. He was then absolved from all self-crimination, he seized the crown of his master, and rewarded the pope with some temporal power:—certain states in Italy which by his son Charles the great were augmented, till he had the dominion of the ancient Heruli—the Ostrogoths and the Exarchate of Ravennah superadded to his spiritual jurisdiction. Then did he assume the triple crown and the two swords, and stood forth in full attire as filling all the prophetic characters of the supreme head of that politico-ecclesiastic corporation called the church of Rome.—[Time expired.]

Half past 3 o'clock, P. M. *max*

BISHOP PURCELL—

Fellow-citizens—My friend objects to my explanation of the term "Roman Catholic." He observes that it has turned out no explanation at all. His difficulty of apprehension on this particular point, is to me, however, perfectly intelligible. The very name of our church is a proof of its unity and universality; and this, as he dislikes it, he cannot, of course, understand. The word "catholic" in ancient days was used, as many other old and new words in Webster's dictionary, for more purposes than one. Its true and principal sense was easily ascertained in its application to the whole catholic church of Christ. It was also used to designate the authority of certain chief national churches, to distinguish them from inferior churches in the same districts, and to mark the superiority of archbishops and patriarchs over their brethren in the Episcopacy. The name of "Roman Catholic" shewed the bond of union which bound all these various churches in the profession of the faith of the chief see of the entire christian world. Hence it always brought to the believer's mind, in every clime, the church which was the head,—the great, primitive, senior church, the church of Rome; and as more people became converted to the faith, they were called by their different and distinct appellations, as English Roman Catholics—American Roman Catholics—French Roman Catholics, &c.

As to the prohibition from calling any man "*Father*," &c., I said it

was not meant literally, and this he seizes as an admission that it is a prohibition from calling "Father" in an ecclesiastical sense. This may be true or not, but it does not prohibit us from calling the head of our church "father" as one who cherishes, instructs, and otherwise acts the part of a father towards us; as he who adopts an orphan child is, in a figurative sense, his father, though not literally married to his mother. The gentleman cannot therefore understand me as admitting his argument in my previous explanation. But this is matter too insignificant to waste more time on it.

Mr. Campbell tells us the church had no head for 600 years. This is a strange representation! The church was then a headless body. I never heard of a body without a head, on which all the members depend for the vital influences. But was there indeed no head to the church? Was not Jesus Christ the head? and I say further that his servant on earth, his humble servant, was the pope. The language of Christ himself, "on this rock will I build my church," refers not to the divine head of the church in Heaven, but to the representative of his divine commission on earth. I affirm that what Christ thought necessary in the days of the apostles, is necessary now; and the more remote we are from that day, the more necessary does it become. Jesus Christ well knew that there must be scandals and errors; and he determined his church should not be left headless. We know this head exists and where it resides; but we are not slaves in the Catholic church. We acknowledge no mere human authority between us and God. We are as free and untrammled as any people under heaven. It is not the man, but the authority, we respect. The man may err, and if the pope claims a power not belonging to him, we soon remind him of his mistake. How this lesson has been taught to a few popes, the history of the church will show.

My friend now contradicts the statement he made to-day. He first argued that the introduction of patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, deacons, and so on, into the church, was of exotic growth—and, as if he had forgotten what he had previously denied, he turns round, and tells us, nearly in the same breath, that he goes for bishops and deacons and orders. So far then, Mr. Campbell is a good Catholic, and I congratulate him on this advance towards the truth. [Symptoms of applause in the audience, were here manifested, but were immediately checked by the moderators; and bishop Purcell besought them, once for all, to abstain from the least demonstration of the kind during the debate. It was improper in a discussion of this character, and the house being greatly crowded, much inconvenience would follow, and the debate could not go on.]

As to the authority he has produced here (Du Pin's Ecclesiastical history) I will remark that I consider Du Pin a learned man. I would even select him as a splendid illustration of the strength imparted to the human intellect by the Catholic intellectual discipline. He was truly a prodigy of learning and of precision of style. But there was a plague spot, a gangrene upon him, which must forever neutralize his authority as a Catholic. Before the gentleman pronounced his name we had a flourish of rhetoric, and a labored eulogy upon my tact in managing this controversy. For my part, I must say that I am quite a novice in these matters—I am not accustomed to debate. My friend has complimented me upon oratorical powers to which I lay no claim. If I have any advantage, I owe it not to practice but to the force of truth.

Du Pin, on whom my friend relies as Catholic authority, recognized by the church, was in constant correspondence with Wake, the archbishop of Canterbury. He tried every stratagem to bring about a re-union of the church of England, and the church of Rome. Leibnitz, and many a distinguished name, had previously labored in the same vocation. But Revd. Dr. Du Pin's motives were, unfortunately, suspicious. He proposed as the basis of the re-union, the abolition of auricular confession, of religious vows, of the Lenten fast and abstinence, of the pope's supremacy, and of the celibacy of the clergy. He was himself, like Cranmer, secretly married; and after his death, his pretended wife came publicly forward to assert her right to his goods and chattels. And this is Catholic authority!

It is said these papers were discovered in his study after his death. But he was censured by pope Clement XI. even during his life-time; and when, as I have stated, Louis XIV. removed him from among the Doctors of the Sorbonne, Clement approved the act.

If my friend can produce Roman Catholic authority, let him do so. But let him not produce one that approaches with a mask. The authority of Du Pin I have challenged on just grounds; but this has nothing to do with the views I have stated upon the great question we are discussing.

We are told that the commission spoken of in Ephesians, 4th chapter, "To some he gave apostles, &c.," confers, not powers, but simply gifts. This I deny. St. Paul tells us authority was given to the rulers of his church by Christ, not for their sakes but *that we may be no longer children tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine*. They were not, then, merely gifts, they were powers and authorities to regulate the church, and to rule the people of God. These commissions are the foundation of the church established on earth by Christ,

before he ascended on high. They were necessary, as the more solid parts of a temple are first laid, that the whole building may afterwards have strength, consistency, and symmetry. I deny that the church ever has been or could be without a foundation. The foundation is *at least* as necessary as the superstructure. Christ made Peter, therefore, the rock of his church, and was himself the corner stone whereon that rock rested, as did the whole edifice securely rest upon the rock.

Why has Mr. Campbell anticipated the subject of the third or fourth day of this discussion, and brought up the pope as the man of sin—the sea monster of Daniel—the youngest horn of the beast? &c. For aught I know, he may prove the pope to be the sea serpent—no doubt his powers of logic are adequate to the task. We shall see.

Again—the pope is not a tyrant, nor does he claim the title of Universal Father, in the sense in which Gregory rebuked John for claiming it. Mr. Campbell has solved the question beforehand, in stating the arrogant pretensions of the bishop of C. P. who pretended that all authority proceeded from him. I do not derive all my authority from the pope. The bishops of the United States consult together. They propose candidates for the vacant sees; and they send to Rome the names of three clergymen, marked according to their judgment, "Worthy, Worthier, Worthiest." The pope generally trusts to their wisdom, and acquiesces in their choice. It was thus that a certain testimony of my fitness to succeed the venerable Fenwick, as bishop of this diocese, was forwarded to Rome. The sovereign pontiff, Gregory XVI., ratified the selection of the prelacy of the United States, and expedited the brief, or letters, in virtue of which I was ordained a bishop; but my power to consecrate, to baptize, and to perform other episcopal functions, comes not from the pope; it comes like that of the apostles, directly from God.

There are other denominations, besides the Catholic, that contend for the necessity of apostolical succession of orders and missions, and these too are the objects of my friend's sarcasm. I select only two—the Episcopalians and the German Reformed.

In the last number of his Millennial Harbinger, in speaking of the Episcopalian bishop Otey of Tennessee, he asks, "why is bishop Otey silent? He either feels that his castle of Episcopalianism has been demolished by the editor of the Harbinger (Mr. Campbell) or he does not. If he feels that it has been overthrown, as an honest man he ought to acknowledge it. But if he still thinks that he is adorning 'the doctrine of God' by sustaining Episcopalianism, let him shew his strength to such as wish to read both sides of the question. It is an apostolic admonition to 'contend earnestly for the faith delivered

to the saints.' If he is sent of God, as he professes to be, as a faithful watchman on Zion's walls, he should not remain mute; but cry aloud, seeing his opinions have been *politely* assailed. Percontator."

Answer.—Many reasons might be *imagined* for bishop Otey's silence, but I will venture upon only one, viz: that like M. de La Motte (I presume the witty and pious bishop of Amiens) he is waiting for a *reply to his silence*. How, &c.

Again—Mr. Lancelot Bell, addressing the editor, Mr. Campbell (vid. Mil. Harbinger, p. 570,) says, "I accompanied bishop L. to Cavetown, where he addressed the citizens," &c. Two of the "called and sent" of the German Reformed church, considering, I suppose, their "craft in danger," came to the place, and I spoke against these things, contradicting, who were going—to express it in the language of some of the people, to "lick us up like salt," &c., &c.

Mr. Campbell, therefore, has changed his tone; he is now in favor of orders; and this change has apparently taken place within a few days.

I have proved that the headship of the church was no new thing in the beginning of the fourth century. Du Pin spoke of the decision of the council of Nice, respecting the contest between the bishops of Alexandria and of Rome, but said that this decision of the council did not disprove the primacy of Rome, so that this doctrine is at least as old as the year 318, when Sylvester of Rome presided by his legate Osius of Cordova at the council of Nice. This shows that the authority of Rome was then recognized. He spoke of the council of Chalcedon. I have here an authentic historian recognized by the Catholics, and one who tells sharp truths of individual Catholics, when he conceives them to be in the wrong. It is Barronius. In his Annals, year of Christ 451, of pope Leo, 12th, twenty-seventh of Valentine and 2nd of Marcian, he says that in this council the authority of the see of Peter was recognized. 360 bishops met in this council. Circumstances not permitting pope Leo to assist at it in person, he sent three legates, two bishops and a priest, to preside in his name. At the first session Paschasinus, bishop of Lillibeum, and one of the legates of the pope, preferred charges against Dioscorus, patriarch of Alexandria, for his uncanonical conduct in the conventicle of Ephesus.

Dioscorus, thus accused and convicted, was compelled to leave his seat and sit in an inferior place in the middle of the assembly. Subsequently a sentence of deposition was pronounced against him; and as his guilt was manifest, he left the assembly and appeared no more. The fathers of the council unanimously exclaimed that the doctrinal decisions of Leo were those of Peter himself—"Petrus per Leonem

locutus est"—Peter hath spoken by the mouth of Leo. (vid. Reeves, 1st vol. 263.) the fathers of the council directed to St. Leo a synodical letter, in which they acknowledge him for the interpreter of St. Peter, for their head and guide." (vid. Barronius, *ibid.*) Now here is the authority of the first general council of Nice, as quoted by Labbe. Greek bishops say:

COUNCILS.

"The Roman church has always had the *primacy*." (Labbe, t. 2. p. 41.)

The second general council and first of Constantinople says:

"Let the bishop of Constantinople have the first share of honor *after* the bishop of Rome." (Alexandria was entitled to the second rank.)

The third general council of Ephesus says:

"St. Peter, the prince and head of the apostles, the foundation of the Catholic church, received the keys of the kingdom from our Lord Jesus Christ, and the power of loosing and of binding sin was given to him, which to the present time, as it ever has done, subsists and exercises judgment in his successors."

The fourth general council of Chalcedon, writing to St. Leo, says:

"We therefore entreat you, to honor our judgment by your decrees: and as we have adhered to our head in good things, so let your supremacy supply what becometh (or is wrong) for thy children."

The council of Florence in which the Greek and Latin bishops were present, thus speaks:

"We define that the holy apostolic see and the Roman pontiff hold the primacy over the entire earth, and that he is the successor of the blessed Peter, the prince of the apostles, the true vicar of Christ, and the head of the whole church." &c. T. 13. p. 515.

The general council of Trent, speaks in the following terms:

"The sovereign pontiffs, in virtue of the supreme power delivered to them over the entire church, *had a right* to reserve the judgment of certain more grievous crimes to their own tribunal."

Melancthon holds the following language, as quoted by Bossuet in his history of the variations. L. 5, n. 24.

"Our people agree, that the ecclesiastical polity, in which are recognized superior bishops of many churches and the bishops of Rome superior to all bishops, is permitted. Thus there is no contest respecting the supremacy of the pope and the authority of bishops, and also the pope and the bishops could easily preserve this authority, for it is necessary for a church to have leaders to maintain order, to keep an eye upon those called to the ecclesiastical state, and upon the doctrine of the priests, and to exercise ecclesiastical judgment, so that if there were no bishops we would have to make them. The monarchy of the pope would also serve much to preserve amongst many nations the unity of doctrine: wherefore we could easily agree as to the supremacy of the pope if we could agree in every thing else."

Leibnitz, as quoted by De Starck, p. 22, speaks as follows:

"As God is the God of order, and as by divine appointment, the body of the only, apostolic, Catholic church can be maintained by a single, hierarchical and universal government, it follows, that there must be a supreme spiritual chief, who shall be confined within proper bounds, established by the same (divine) right, and invested with all the power and *dictatorial* authority necessary for the preservation of the church."

FATHERS.

St. Irenæus of Lyons, the disciple of St. Polycarp, who himself appears to have been consecrated by St. John the Evangelist, repeatedly urges this argument against his contemporary heretics. He says:

"We can count up those who were appointed bishops in the churches by the apostles and their successors down to us, none of whom taught this doctrine. But as it would be tedious to enumerate the succession of bishops in the different churches, we refer you to the tradition of that greatest, most ancient, and universally known church, founded at Rome by St. Peter and St. Paul, and which has been preserved there through the succession of its bishops, down to the present time."

Tertullian, who also flourished in the same century (year 150), argues in the same manner and challenges certain heretics in these terms:

"Let them produce the origin of their church; let them display the succession of their bishops, so that the first of them may appear to have been ordained by an *apostolic man*, who persevered in their communion."

St. Athanasius writes to St. Felix, the Roman Pontiff:

"For this purpose Christ placed you and your predecessors to guide the ark and to have the care of all the churches, that you may help us."

St. Cyprian, in his 55th Epistle, holds the following language:

"They dare to sail and carry letters to the chair of Peter and the principal church, whence sacerdotal unity proceeds."

St. Augustin, who wrote in the fifth century, mentions the following among other motives of credibility in favor of the Catholic religion:

"There are many other things which keep me in the bosom of the Catholic Church. The agreement of different peoples and nations keeps me there. The authority established by miracles, nourished by hope, increased by charity, and confirmed by antiquity, keeps me there. The succession of bishops in the see of St. Peter, the apostle (to whom our Lord after his resurrection, committed his sheep to be fed) down to the present bishop, keeps me there. Finally the very name of CATHOLIC which, among so many heresies, this church alone possesses, keeps me there."

St. Jerome in his 4th Epistle to pope Damasus says:

"I, following no leader but Christ, am in *communion* with your holiness, that is, with the chair of Peter. Whoever gathereth not with you scattereth. that is, whoever is not of Christ is of anti-Christ."

This is, in substance, the testimony of the bishops throughout the world, in every age to the present time.—[Time expired.]

Four o'clock. P. M.

'When did ist
Pope Exist'

MR. CAMPBELL rises—

On the subject of the emendation of the term Roman Catholic, by prefixing the word English, &c., I am willing that my friend should have all the advantage to be derived from that explanation. I am willing that he should appear before the public with that explanation, if he thinks it can help the matter. On the same principle he may say the Philadelphia Pittsburg church of Cincinnati. The church, I argued, had no mortal head for six hundred years. He certainly could not have understood me as denying that Christ was the head of *his* church! I admit that Christ is the immortal head of the church which is his body, and Christ is her only head. Christ's church requires a living and omnipresent head. She needs not two heads, for her head is the head of all principality and power. Can the pope be omnipresent, keeping order in all his dominions?

I was surprised at the gentleman's hypothesis, that if I argued that the church had no visible and human head for six hundred years, I then asserted that Christ was not the head of his church. I spoke not of Christ, but of the great hierarchy on earth, who claims to be the fountain of all power and authority in the church. Could he not understand me?

The gentleman says, that the Catholics are as free as others. I ask, have they the same liberty to read the Bible, to think and act for themselves, as have the Protestants? I am sorry that he seemed to take advantage of my acknowledging myself a friend to bishops and deacons in the church. In my enumeration of the different orders, in the present Roman church, I mentioned *Arch*-bishops and *Arch*-deacons; but he did not hear me say bishops and deacons. They were on purpose left out of that enumeration, that I might not fall into the errors which he has imagined for me.

I dispose of the gentleman's extract from the Millennial Harbinger and of his learned remarks upon them, by informing him that he has mistaken the writer: I am not the author of the article in question.

Still I must ask, why this evasion of the question in debate? Why seek to excite the odium theologicum, on account of some distorted

theory unjustly attributed to me—on subjects, too, wholly foreign to this debate! Are these the weapons by which my learned opponent is compelled to defend the “*mother and mistress of all churches*” from the charge of unscriptural, and unfounded assumptions? Let no one imagine, however, that I am at all opposed to order and government in the church. As far as concerns oversight, or the having of bishops to preside over the flock, I am an Episcopalian. I am for having presbyters or elders in every church. I do not believe in a church without presbyters or bishops. So far I am both a Presbyterian and an Episcopalian.

On the subject of the primacy of Rome, the gentleman quoted Baronius, and snarled at Du Pin. But it is too late for any bishop of Rome, or of England to stand up in this nineteenth century and tell us that Du Pin is not an authentic historian. My friend intimates that the certificates in the preface were suborned. What a charge on the learned and venerable author of this work!

[*Bishop Purcell here said, that those certificates being in the book proved nothing:—that they might have been put there by the printer.*]

I will now read these attestations and vouchers that you may judge how gratuitous are the objections and insinuations of the bishop.

THE APPROBATION OF THE DOCTORS OF THE SORBONNE.

“The whole world has openly declared the esteem which they think due to the *New History of Ecclesiastical Writers*, that we could not but be sensible of the complaisance shewn to us, since the judgment we had formed of it was followed, supported and authorized by that of the public.

* * * * *

“All those who have already read them, will here find what will recall to their memory many things they may have forgotten, and will see with pleasure, that our author has reduced their doctrines to certain principles, by which they show their solidity and coherence. Those who wish to read them will here meet with what will save them much time and trouble; and those that are engaged in that long and wearisome journey, will at least have the advantage of a faithful and experienced guide, who will lead them only through paths equally safe and known. Both the one and the other will meet with a piece of criticism which is always clear, prudent, and upright; distinguishes what is certain from that which is false or doubtful; never precipitates the judgment, nor lays down simple conjectures in place of demonstrative proofs; gives to every thing what it merits, purely on its own account; and the better to attend to reason, banishes all prejudices and looks at nothing in its search after truth, but truth itself; nor condemns, only where it cannot excuse.

* * * * *

“Given at Paris, August 18th, 1688.

BLAMPIGNON, Rector of St. Merriis.
HIDEUX, Rector of St. Innocents.”

APPROBATION OF THE ROYAL CENSOR.

"By the order of my lord Chancellor; I have read a book, entitled '*A History of the church and of Ecclesiastical Authors in the sixteenth century*,' by Monsieur Lewis Ellies Du Pin, Priest, Doctor of Divinity of the Faculty of Paris and Regius Professor of Philosophy: Containing the History of the Church and of ecclesiastical Authors, and from the year 1550, to the year 1600; in which I find nothing to hinder its being printed.

"Given this 18th day of *January*, 1703.

BLAMPIGNON, Curate of St. Merris."

APPROBATION OF THE DOCTORS OF DIVINITY OF THE FACULTY OF PARIS.

"We whose names are under written, Doctors of Divinity of the Faculty of Divinity of Paris, certify, that we have examined a book, entitled '*A History of the Church, and of ecclesiastical Authors, in the sixteenth century*;' by Monsieur Lewis Ellies Du Pin, Priest, Doctor of Divinity of the Faculty of Paris, and Regius Professor of Philosophy: and that we have found nothing therein contrary to the Catholic faith, or to good manners. In assurance whereof, we have set our hands this 20th day of *January*, 1703.

BLAMPIGNON, Curate of St. Merris.

HIDEUX, Curate of St. Innocents."

I put it now to the good sense of my audience, whether such testimonies are to be set aside, by saying that the printer may have forged or printed them on his own responsibility.

The divine warrant for the primacy of the pope is not the question on which the gentleman read from Barronius. There are two things in every history,—the statement of facts, and the comment on those facts. The opinion of the historian is like the opinion of the reader; but the facts stated are common property; and these are the proper materials of *his* work. Barronius does not, however, on the point in debate, state a *fact* contrary to Du Pin. There were, indeed, primacies at Alexandria, Antioch, Rome, Constantinople, Jerusalem. But the primacy of a metropolitan, and the doctrine of an universal primacy over all metropolitans at any one place, is a different matter. I could not understand in what sense he meant to be understood when he said Gregory could not go for primacy in "that sense." Was there a peculiar mysterious meaning attached to the claim or title which Gregory reprobated? It has not been proved that any contemporary understood it so. I affirm that there was not an intelligent Catholic of that day who understood the title of universal patriarch, in any other sense than that in which, it is understood among us now. The person first established in the primacy of Rome exercised a universal superintendency over the church exactly similar to that first claimed by the bishop of Constantinople.

My friend says, "the author from whom he read you states the fact of such a primacy early in the Roman Church." If we examine the

authority we shall see, it is nothing but the opinion of a fallible man; and that opinion contrary to all ancient history. I affirm that there is no ecclesiastical historian of authority, who attests the fact, which he is desirous to prove. It is one thing to state a fact, as a historian, and another to state an opinion or commentary on a fact. The question before us, is not the metropolitan primacy of Rome, or Antioch, or Alexandria; but the universal primacy of the whole church!

I admit, as to the council of Nice, what it was said Du Pin asserted, viz. "that the sixth canon does not deny the primacy of Rome." But Du Pin goes further,—(and why did not the gentleman read all that Du Pin asserts?) I read it all. I told the whole truth respecting it—the gentleman has told you but the half of it—Du Pin says "this canon does not preclude the idea;" but "*neither*," says he, "*does it establish it.*" I am for quoting the whole authority. Du Pin, as a Catholic, was endeavoring to find some authority for supporting the antiquity of the primacy of the see of Rome. He is examining the canons of the council carefully, and he says that though this canon does not preclude the primacy, "YET NEITHER DOES IT ESTABLISH IT." It afforded him nothing for or against it. And what other decree or council did establish it?! That is a secret the bishop will never reveal.

Let us now return to my argument. I left off at the year 750, and was in pursuit of the day, when the present church of Rome began. I hasten to establish it.

It would be both tedious and unnecessary to read, or narrate the quarrels between Nicholas of Rome and Photius of Constantinople, on the vital question who shall be the greatest? which greatly prepared the way for the grand schism. We have not time for this, as we are now, before we sit down, to give you the day and date of the separation of the Roman church from the Greek church, which must be regarded as the day of her separate existence, when she became what she now is, a *schism*, or *sect*.

There was a violent contest between the patriarch of Constantinople and the patriarch of Rome, or pope, if you please, (for I state *emphatically*, that the idea of a supreme head of the church had never been digested in the east, and though the eastern church may have submitted, or acquiesced for the time being, she never did consent to it). The promotion of the layman Photius, gifted and splendid as he was, to the primacy of Constantinople, greatly vexed his holiness of Rome. Indeed, from the time of Victor, bishop of Rome, A. D. 197, who assumed to exercise jurisdiction out of his proper diocese, in respect to the observance of Easter, there never was a cordial feeling of unity, or co-operation between the eastern and western portions of the church.

The arrogance of Victor, called for strong expressions of insubordination on the part of the Asiatic brethren, who claimed for themselves as much license to dictate to the western, as he had to the eastern church.

The "Catholic" body was not yet divided into two great masses. Photius had charge of the church of Constantinople. Nicholas of Rome was indignant that a layman should hold the high dignity of patriarch of the eastern church, however the emperor and the church might think. To make matters worse, they excommunicated each other, which laid the foundation of dissensions and bad feelings, which to this very day, never have been atoned. For the jealousies and rivalries of these two bishops never slumbered nor slept, till the church was divided into what have since been called the Greek and Latin churches. All historians, give substantially the same account of this matter. I will read an extract or two from Du Pin.

"Though the Latin and Greek churches were not in close communion with each other ever since the affair of *Photius*, yet they did not proceed to an open rupture till the time of pope *Leo IX.* and of *Michael Cerularius*, patriarch of *Constantinople*. This breach began by a letter which the latter wrote in the year 1053, in his own name, and in the name of *Leo* archbishop of *Aceridia* and of all *Bulgaria*, to *John* bishop of *Trani* in *Apulia*, that he might communicate it to the pope and to all the western church. In this letter they reproved the *Latins*. (1) Because they made use of unleavened bread in the celebration of the eucharist. (2) Because they fasted on *Saturdays* in *Lent*. (3) Because they eat the blood of beasts, and things strangled. (4) Because they did not sing *Alleluiah* in *Lent*," &c., &c. Vol. ii. p. 234.

The patriarch of Constantinople first anathematized *Leo IX.* ecclesiastically cursed him and his party, and this may have provoked severer measures against the Greeks than were at first contemplated by the Latins. It is, however, an important fact, that *the Greeks were the first excommunicators*.

The pope of Rome sent three legates to Constantinople, under pretence of healing the divisions and strifes existing, who had, secretly in their pockets, a bull of excommunication against the patriarch and his party. They were instructed to exhort him to *yield*; but if they found him incorrigible, they were to fulminate against him the dread anathema. After a fruitless attempt to bring over the patriarch by mild means, they entered the church of *St. Sophia*, at noon day, on the 16th of July, in the year 1054, and mounting the altar read aloud the bull of excommunication, before the people, and then departed, shaking off the dust of their feet against the patriarch, his city and people. The bull speaks on this wise:

"The Holy Apostolic see of Rome, which is the chief of the whole world, to which as to the head belongs in a more especial manner the care of all the

churches; has sent us to this royal city in the quality of its legates, for the welfare and peace of the church, that as it is written, we should go down and see whether the cries which pierce its ears from this great city be true or no.

“Let therefore the emperors, clergy, senate and people of this city of Constantinople know, that we have here found more good to excite our joy, than evil to raise our sorrow. For as to the supporters of the empire, and the principal citizens, the city is wholly christian and orthodox: but as for Michael, who took upon him the false title of patriarch, and his adherents, we have found that they have sown discord and heresy in the midst of this city * * * because they rebaptized, as did the Arians, those who had been baptized in the name of the blessed trinity, and particularly the Latins; because *with the Donatists they maintain that the Greek church is the only true church and that the sacrifices and baptism of none else are valid.*”

* * * * *

The Greek church, be it noted with all distinctness, did stand upon this point, that *she was the only true church; and that no ordinance, baptism or the eucharist, was at all valid, unless administered by her authority.*

I will read a little further:

“Michael having been advertised of these errors,” &c., &c., “refused to appear before, or to have any conference with us, and has likewise forbid our entrance into the churches to perform divine service therein forasmuch as he had formerly shut up the churches of the Latins, calling them *Azymitae*, persecuting and excommunicating them, all which reflected on the holy see, in contempt whereof he styled himself ŒCUMENICAL or UNIVERSAL PATRIARCH. Wherefore not being able any longer to tolerate such an unheard of abuse as was offered to the holy apostolical see, and looking upon it as a violation of the Catholic faith in several instances, &c., we do subscribe to the anathema which our most holy father the pope has denounced against Michael and his adherents, if they do not retract their errors,” &c. Id. ib. p. 236.

If then, there be any truth in history, from that day the present sect of the church of Rome began its existence.

It never was fully, or cordially conceded by the Greek church, that the pope was, or ought to be, the universal father; and it may be affirmed in all truth, that this was the real cause of the schism.

To recapitulate, thus far, in seeking for the papal head, so essential to the Roman church, we find it not in the New Testament, in the ancient fathers, in the canons of the first general councils, nor in the history of the church, till the commencement of the seventh century. On the authority of Barronius, it is said that Phocas gave the title to Boniface the 3rd in the year 606. We have also seen, that Pepin, another usurper, gave temporal estates and political dominion to the popes about the middle of the 8th century, and that on the 16th of July 1054 the Western or Roman half of the church, after having been first anathematized by the Eastern or Greek half, did solemnly separate itself from the communion of the Greek church by an anathema.

Hence, both the origin and the name of the church of Rome.—[Time expired.]

Half-past 4 o'clock, P. M.

BISHOP PURCELL rises—

My friend Mr. Campbell has fought a noble battle for me. I shall prove that presently. Gibbon was an infidel, and became so because his father would not allow him to embrace the Roman Catholic faith. He was a prodigy of mind, and his intellect was so precocious that even when only sixteen years old, he read, I think it was, Bossuet's Universal History, by which he was convinced of the truth of the Catholic religion. His father (sad proof of the restraints on liberty of conscience, as exemplified in Protestant communities) persecuted him for this, and sent him to Lausanne, in Switzerland, where, under the close surveillance of Pavillard a Calvinist minister, he was confined, debarred the reading of Catholic books, and fed on bread and water, till at last he yielded his creed for better fare. He thus became an infidel, and wrote against all religions. But a man who could thus shrink from duty to that faith which he believed true, because he was persecuted, was not fit to appreciate the beauty of the religion that had attracted him; nor the sublime testimony rendered to its divinity by its martyrs' blood. If he could thus prove recreant to the only one which he loved, no wonder he became opposed to all.

Such are the authorities against which I have to militate.

The gentleman told us that he would put his finger upon the precise day and date, as recorded in history, when the Roman church separated from the holy and ancient apostolic church, but he has not kept his word. I warrant that that pledge will never be redeemed. (Mr. Campbell here explained that he had fixed it at the 16th July, 1054.) If then the Catholic church ceased to be the true church in 1054, where was the church of Christ? Where was the true Catholic church, from which the *Roman* Catholic church separated? "Behold I am ALWAYS with you," says Christ, "and I will send you another Paraclete who will abide with you ALL DAYS." Matth. xxviii. 20.

If the true church was nowhere—if Christ had no witness on earth, his promises have failed; and Revelation is a solecism. A church, unless it be conspicuous, unless every enquirer can have access to it, is of no use as a witness of truth to mankind. If hid, how can it testify of the true doctrine of Christ to all nations? But mark the splendid testimony in favor of the purity and watchfulness of the Roman Catholic church, afforded by history. How did the schism of the Greek church begin? A layman Photius intruded and declared himself the head of the church. This single fact is a splendid argu-

ment of itself, to prove the necessity of a supreme head to watch over the church. To use a Scriptural phrase, he was like a faithful sentinel upon the walls of Zion, to sound the warning to the world, or, if you will, not to resemble "a dumb dog," but to bark at the approach of the thief, who came not in at the gate, but came by another way into the fold, and he did bark at him; and Photius and Michael Cerularius and other Greek intruders and errorists, not content with assuming a power not belonging to them, actually cursed and anathematized the pope of Rome, a proof perhaps of the amiable character the gentleman gives the enemies of order and of the pope, but a sufficient reason why the pope should exert all his authority in protecting the church from their usurpations.

But the three legates to whom the commission was entrusted, carried the bull of excommunication in their pockets, and they are made to appear very treacherous because they did not produce it at once, but tried by pacific measures to bring about a reconciliation. Is it in the gentleman's estimation, then, an evidence of treachery, to resort to persuasive means with an enemy, before appealing to the sword and involving one's country in war? Suppose the president of the United States sends a minister to a foreign country to obtain the settlement of a disputed question. Does that minister begin by declaring war, by forcing his proposal with a bayonet down the throats of the people to whom he is accredited? No, he tries every mild means first. The contrary course would be neither politic nor wise, neither humane nor in accordance with the rules of civilized society. The great and the peculiar character of the people of the United States, is neither to provoke nor to brook aggression. If her rights are violated, she endeavors to convince the violator of his injustice, to disabuse him of his error, to win him back to a sense of rectitude by persuasions and just remonstrance. If this falls, she resorts to arms, and though she loves peace she is prepared for war. In a word she is terribly peaceful. Now mark the course of the legates. They entreat Michael to reconsider his conduct, they urge every argument that zeal can suggest, but finding all their efforts fruitless, they afterwards act in pursuance of their instructions, with perfect ingenuousness and openness. Observe their procedure. They ascend the altar of the great church of St. Sophia, the seventh wonder of the world—at whose portals stood that large vase for the holy water, wherewith Greeks and Romans, commemorating the sprinkling of the blood of Christ, by which our consciences are purified from dead works to serve the living God, were accustomed alike to bless themselves; and on which were inscribed the Greek words "Νίπσον Ἀνψμηματα μη μοναι οψίν" "purify O

God, our transgressions, and not our countenance only." They went on the altar and in a formal speech explained to the assembled multitude what were the grounds of the anathema. The crime of Michael was that in defiance of the prohibitions both of the old and new law, he had made eunuchs priests. He was also accused of Arianism. Now the Arians deny the divinity of Christ—I have heard from some of our most respectable citizens, that Mr. Campbell also denies that cardinal dogma, but I do not vouch for the correctness of their assertion. (Mr. CAMPBELL here stated that he did not deny the divinity of Christ.)

It appears pretty plain from history that the people were for the legates and opposed to their own usurping archbishop. Why? "The legates flattered them." But how? So far from it their whole argument was directed *against* a man living amongst this very people, and *for* an individual far distant. It is natural to suppose that the people were prejudiced in favor of their own archbishop and against one who was a stranger to them. In short, were they not speaking against the primacy and the assumptions of the ecclesiastical dignitary of the very church in which they spoke, and of the very people to whom they spoke. Did they flatter the clergy? no; they strongly inveighed against the unscriptural and uncanonical ordination of the odious eunuchs, by whom the patriarch was surrounded. This was a fine illustration of the zeal for sound doctrine and discipline, displayed in every previous and subsequent age by the holy see. It was acting on the apostolic maxim—It is better to obey God than man—That duties are ours and consequences are God's.

"Oh Timothy, guard the deposit" (of faith), said St. Paul.

"Now the spirit manifestly saith, that in the last times, some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to spirits of error, speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their consciences seared with a red hot iron. These things proposing to the brethren thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ, nourished up in the words of the faith, and of the good doctrine, whereunto thou hast attained."—1st Ep. to Tim. ch. iv. v. 1. 2. 6.

Thus on this occasion did the pope.

My friend could not understand in what sense the patriarch of Constantinople claimed the title of universal bishop; and wanted to learn how his claim differed from the present understanding of the office. He has the answer in the history of facts. He has, or his authority Du Pin has for him, admitted that this Michael had said in effect that he was Lord God over all the earth; and that there was no authority without his sanction for any officer of the church to perform any of the ordinances of religion. Even the pope of Rome must crouch to

his feet before he could administer the eucharist or even baptize an infant. And the historian says that the document accusing the archbishop was read before the people of Constantinople—the very city where he reigned, where he was known, and where all the facts of the case were before them. What is the most natural supposition? Surely this; that if that document had not been true the people would have cried out against it;—they would not have assented to it. So that all this is a splendid triumph of the supremacy of the Roman see. But why refer to particular instances, when ecclesiastical history is full of appeals made to the bishop of Rome by all the other bishops of christendom, and all acquiescing in his decision as not only the decision of Peter, but of Christ himself. “The extraordinary commission given to Paul,” says Bossuet, “expired with him in Rome, and blending with the authority of Peter, to which it was subordinate, raised the Roman see to the height of authority and glory. This is the church which, taught by Peter and his successors, has never been infected with heresy. This power of binding and loosing from sin, was given first to Peter and then to the rest of the twelve apostles. For it was manifestly the design of Jesus Christ, to place first in one what he afterwards intended to confer on many, but the sequel impairs not the commandment, nor does the first lose his place. All receive the same power from the same source, but not all in the same degree, nor to the same extent, for Jesus Christ communicates himself as he pleases, and always in the manner best calculated to establish the unity of the church.” “Peter,” says St. Augustin, “who, in the honor of his primacy, represented the entire church, first and alone, receives the keys, which were next to be communicated to all the others.” The reason of this is assigned by St. Casarius of Arles, that the ecclesiastical authority, first established in a single bishop, and afterwards diffused among many, may be forever brought back to the principle of unity, and remain inseparably united in the same chair. This is the Roman chair, the chair of Peter so much celebrated by the Fathers, in which they vied with one another in extolling the principality of the apostolic chair, the principal principality, the source of unity, the mother church, the head (or centre) of the episcopacy, whence parts the ray of government, the chief, the only see which bindeth all in unity.”

In these words you hear Optatus, St. Augustin, St. Cyprian, St. Irenæus, St. Prosper, St. Avitus, Theodoret, the council of Chalcedon, Africa and Gaul, Greece and Asia, the east and the west united together. This is the doctrine of all the church; this is its unity and strength. Here all is strong because all is divine, all is united. And.

as each part is divine, the bond also is divine, and the union and arrangement such that each member acts with the force of the entire body. Hence whilst the ancient bishops said, they exercised authority in their respective churches as the vicars of Jesus Christ and successors of the apostles sent immediately by him, they also declared that they acted in the name of Peter in virtue of the authority given to all bishops in the person of Peter; so that the correspondence, the union and harmony of the entire body of the church are such that what one bishop does, in accordance with the spirit and rules of Catholic unity, all the church, all the Episcopacy, and the chief of the Episcopacy act in concert and accomplish with him.

My friend observes that the Greeks were always uneasy under the Roman popedom. I admit this to a great extent, but St. John, and Polycarp, and Ignatius and Irenæus (his name signifies Peace, or the peaceful) and Eusebius and Chrysostom and a hundred others were Greeks, and the most eloquent advocates, and the ablest supporters of the pre-eminence of the church of Rome above all other churches.

Here then is a cloud of witnesses who furnish an astonishing mass of testimony to the fact that in the early days, the Greek church as well as the Latin submitted willingly to the authority of St. Peter and his successors—the authority necessary to preserve order and peace and unity, &c., in the church of God on earth.

With regard to the controversy of the gentleman with Bishop Otey; there was a mooted point between Mr. Campbell and himself. I understood however that all the discussion was on Mr. Campbell's side.

(MR. CAMPBELL here explained that he had had a private discussion with Bishop Otey, and had afterwards written him seven letters upon the Episcopacy.)

BISHOP PURCELL. I really do not know what Mr. Campbell's tenets are, or what he believes. My brethren, I am fighting in the dark. I am obliged to answer on the spot charges and objections against my religion which I cannot anticipate, while I really know not what my antagonist's belief is, what qualifications, what marks of a divine call to the ministry he considers necessary, if indeed he believes in any peculiar separation of any man or set of men, for priestly functions.

Will my friend say definitely, before this assembly, if he believe in the necessity of such call or mission.

MR. CAMPBELL. I do.

BISHOP PURCELL. How is that calling made known, that mission given?

MR. CAMPBELL. By the word and providence of God.

BISHOP PURCELL. How can we ascertain that word and providence of God?

MR. CAMPBELL. By the voice of the people and the written word—*vox populi vox Dei.*”

BISHOP PURCELL. Suppose the people are displeased, for instance, with a Presbyterian pastor, have they the sole power to remove him?

MR. CAMPBELL. Yes.

BISHOP PURCELL. Suppose the ministry of a Presbyterian church are displeased with him, and the people of his church are pleased with him. May he then retain his station against the will of the ministry?

MR. CAMPBELL. If the people will have it so, it must be so. “*Vox populi, vox Dei!*”

BISHOP PURCELL. There, my brethren, you have heard him! Such declarations!

SATURDAY, JANUARY 14TH., *Half past 9 o'clock, A. M.*

MR. CAMPBELL rises—

I shall resume the subject where I closed yesterday evening, reserving my remarks on the last speech of my opponent till the conclusion of my present argument.

The gentleman read in the various reasons assigned for the bull of Nicholas, against the patriarch of Constantinople and his brethren, among others, the statement that the Greeks pretended to be the only true, catholic and apostolic church. It would not be difficult to prove from history that in point of seniority, the Greek church has a superior claim to the Roman. It is first in point of time, and claims a regular descent from the apostles. There is one strong argument in her favor which never has been met. To her belong the first seven councils. They were held in Grecian cities, called by Grecian emperors, and composed of Grecian bishops. They were wholly Grecian. The Roman church has no right to claim them. And if the doctrines proclaimed by these councils be true, they are the doctrines of the Greek church subsequently borrowed by the Romans.

As this is an important point, I will expatiate a little more fully upon it. I have taken the trouble to collect the following facts: at the *first* council of Nice there were 318 bishops: of these 315 were Greek and 3 Roman. This was the first general council, A. D. 325. At the first council of Constantinople, (the *second* general council of the church,) A. D. 381, there were 150 bishops; of these 149 were Greeks, and only 1 was Roman. At the *third* council held at Ephesus, A. D. 431, there were but 68 bishops present. Of these 67 were Greek, and one was Roman. At the *fourth* general council, which was the largest

and most authoritative of the first four, held at Chalcedon A. D. 451, against Eutyches, there were present 353 bishops, 350 of whom were Greeks, and only 3 Roman. At the second council of Constantinople (the *fifth* general council) there were present 164 bishops, 156 of whom were Greeks, and 6 Romans—held against Origen and others, A. D. 553. At the third council of Constantinople, (and the *sixth* general council,) there were 56 bishops present, 51 of whom were Greeks, and 5 Romans. This council met against the Monothelites A. D. 680. At the second council of Nice, (the *seventh* general council,) there were present 377 bishops, 370 of whom were Greeks, and 7 Romans. They met to restore images, A. D. 787. These were the *first seven* general councils of the church. I have been at the pains to make this collection of facts, to ascertain the merits of the controversy between the Greek and Roman sects, as respects the question to whom of right belong the doctrines of the ancient councils. I find that the whole number of bishops in these councils was 1486: only 26 of whom were Romans. Certainly the Greek church has the prior claim on our attention, and ought to be revered for her antiquity and authority, more than the schism which haughtily separated from her!

But, in addition to these councils having been called—not by the authority of the church of Rome: but by eastern emperors, and composed of eastern bishops; every great question discussed in the first four; and, indeed, I may add, in the last three councils, was of Grecian origin. They grew up in the Greek school—a school easily distinguished from the Latin, by the peculiar subtilty of its definitions—a school long accustomed to nice distinctions, and whose reasoners could split the thousandth part of an idea. Of this, their wars about *homousios* and *homoousios* are ample proof. There are no questions more purely abstract and metaphysical than many of those discussed in these seven great ecumenical councils.

Again, these councils were not only called by Greeks, composed of Greeks, and occupied about Greek questions; but were all assembled in Grecian cities.

If there be any virtue in councils to establish doctrines and the priority of churches, the Greek church must be considered the mother of the Roman, rather than her daughter. At all events, it is fully proved that the Roman Catholic church is a sect or schism, which is the burthen of the proposition before us. To strengthen this conviction, I proceed to comment on a standard definition of Catholicity.

I would now ask if there be any objection to the book which I hold in my hand, as a good Roman Catholic authority. I believe it to be the true standard of the Roman Catholic church. It is "*the doctrine of*

the council of Trent, as expressed in the creed of pope Pius the iv. But while the word "catholic" is in my eye, I am reminded that my friend has asserted, "that *catholic* is a scripture title of the church." I reply that it is not so used in the New Testament; and that it is only found as a general, running title to some epistles: that its antiquity is very doubtful, as it cannot be found in the body of the book; and, consequently, it has no authority. But now for the definition from the approved standard of the church:

Section IV. Under the head, "*That the church of Christ is CATHOLIC or UNIVERSAL,*" it is asked,

What do you understand by this?

Answer. "Not only that the church of Christ shall always be known by the name of Catholic, by which she is called in the creed; but that she shall also be truly Catholic or Universal by being the church of all ages and nations." p. 15.

We have been showing that the church of Christ was not originally known by the name *catholic*; that the Roman sect was not the church of the first six centuries; and, therefore, that the approved definition of the creed will not apply to this party. I have proved that she had no pope, or supreme head, for full six hundred years, and in corroboration of the argument, drawn from general councils, I have shown that the first seven were not hers, but peculiarly those of the Greek church; and that the Greek church is, in fact, the mother.

But there are yet other, and perhaps stronger arguments to show her *daughtership*. Some of my audience can appreciate the following: That the Hebrew is a more ancient language than the Greek, and the Greek than the Roman, needs not be stated but for a few. One proof of this fact is, that the Hebrew has given many words to the Greek, while the Greek has given none to the Hebrew. So the Greek has given many words to the Latin, while the Latin has given none to the Greek. Thus we prove the Roman church to have come out of the bosom of the Greek, from the fact, that all the leading ecclesiastical terms in the Roman church are Greek. For example: "*pope,*" "*patriarch,*" "*synod,*" "*ecclesiastic,*" "*schism,*" "*schismatic,*" "*heresy,*" "*heretic,*" "*heresiarch,*" "*catechumen,*" "*hierarchy,*" "*church,*" "*chrism,*" "*exorcism,*" "*akoluthi,*" "*diocese,*" "*presbytery,*" "*trinity,*" "*mystery,*" "*mystic,*" "*catholic,*" "*canon,*" &c., &c., &c. This as fully proves the seniority of the Greek church, as it does that of the Greek language over the Latin.

All ancient ecclesiastical historians, are also Greeks, such as Eusebius, Socrates Scholasticus, Evagrius Scholasticus, Sozomon, Theodoret. The most ancient and primitive fathers are also Greek. They were models to the Latins and imitated in their writings.

To recapitulate, we have now shown that the Greek church is more ancient than the Latin church; because the first seven general councils were all Greek, there being 1486 Grecian bishops and only 26 Roman bishops present, they were called by the Greek emperors, held in Greek cities, and employed about Greek questions. i Wx

The leading ecclesiastic terms of all the ancient offices, customs and controversies, are Greek: so are the early fathers and historians.

These considerations superadded to the facts and documents of yesterday, we think fully prove that the Roman church is not the church of all ages and of all nations—not the catholic and apostolic church, as the creed of Trent defines; but a *sect*, a branch or schism, from the Hebrew and Greek churches of the New Testament.

In proving the proposition before us my plan is to select one of the grand elements embraced in the standard definition of the church, and to show that such being essential to the church, the church could not exist without it. Now, I prefer the arithmetical mode of procedure in this discussion. First lay down the rule and work a single question, and then leave it to others to work as many as they please.

Thus I first laid down a definition of the Roman Catholic church from her own standards. From that it appeared that a pope or universal bishop is an *essential* element of her existence. I then showed that six hundred years had elapsed from the time of the apostles, before the doctrine or existence of a universal bishop was thought of, and that the office was not instituted till the year 606. But when I have proved this, I have worked only one question. Any one may take up the doctrine of transubstantiation, the worship of images, purgatory, (a doctrine more ancient however, than either the Greek or Roman church,) and every other peculiar doctrine of the Roman Catholic church, and prove that not one of them is to be found in the divine book, nor in the records of the church.

What, let me now ask, is the great point in my first proposition? To prove that the Roman Catholic church is not "the *mother* and *mistress*" of all churches; but a *sect*, in the full import of that word; and if that be not now proved, I know not what can be proved. I admit the subject is capable of much more extensive development; but we think is neither necessary nor expedient to be more diffuse.

Will the presiding moderator please read my first proposition?

[Here proposition No. 1 was read by the moderator.]

I say then she is not the *holy, apostolic, catholic* church, as she pretends to be; for in proving her to be a *sect*, I prove her to be *not catholic*, nor *apostolic*; because the true apostolic church cannot be called a *sect*. To prove her to be a *sect* is to prove her not Catholic, there-

fore, nor apostolic. What remains now? Even on the concession of my opponent, she is not the *Catholic* church; for he admits, that the Greek church differed from her only in a few non-essential matters. On that admission, if he admits that persons are saved in the Greek church, she must be a part of the church of Christ; for with him, there is no salvation out of the church.

In the next place my proposition says "she is not *holy*." I am impelled by a sense of duty, and not by any unkind feelings towards such of my fellow-citizens as belong to that community, to attempt to prove that the church of Rome is not holy. I would not heedlessly or needlessly offend against the feelings of an Italian, a Hindoo, or a Pagan, in his sincere devotions, how absurd soever they might be. Much less would I wound any one that professes the christian religion under any form; but in serving my contemporaries, in redeeming my pledge, it has become necessary to investigate the grand pretensions of this fraternity, that exclusively arrogates to itself the title of *holy*.

Not to expatiate at this time on the vices of the clergy and of the popes what the cardinals Barronius and Bellarmine have so fully noticed, and sometimes specially detailed, I shall take a single text from Bellarmine, De. Eccl. lib. 3, c. 7. which avows a doctrine that must forever make the Roman church *unholy*. It is expressed in these words:—

"Wicked men, infidels and reprobates remaining in the public profession of the Romish church are *true* members of the body of Christ."

How then can we admit that she is holy? Again: it must be admitted that the great mass of all those who die in the faith and profession of the Catholic doctrines are not strictly holy; for why then should they have to pass through the fires of purgatory?

But again; in her own Testament (if she have a Testament. The gentleman may, indeed tell us his church has no English Testament; for she never owned but the Vulgate. She never gave to her people, with approbation a French, or English, or any vernacular Testament. The Rhemish Testament is, however, published by the authority of a portion of the church; and from it we can find the doctrine of Bellarmine explicitly taught in the notes appended, by the same authority which gave the Testament)—*in her own Testament*, I repeat it, on John xv. 1. these Roman annotators say:—

"*Every branch in me, &c.*" Christ hath some branches in his body mystical that be fruitless: therefore, ill livers also may be members of Christ's church."

"*Ill livers*" (mark it) "may be members." This is repeatedly stated in various places, and as I understand, avowed by all that com-

munity, as the true doctrine of the church. "Ill *livers*," wicked men, infidels, reprobates, vicious characters, those guilty of crimes of every enormity and color, may then continue members of the Roman church, while they acknowledge the pope and the priesthood, and make profession of faith in the Catholic church; she therefore counts within her fold 150,000,000 of souls, as my opponent stated in this city in October last. All that happen to be born in Catholic countries, infidels, atheists, and all, are enrolled in her communion. Her gates are wide as the human race. It is all church and no world with her. The lusts of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life, are found in her communion.

The Roman Catholics in the United States are probably the best body of Catholics in the world. I mean those who are native citizens. But visit Old Spain or New Spain, Portugal, Italy, Austria, France, or Canada, where Catholicism is the established religion; and then ask whether holiness be a distinguishing attribute of the depraved and degraded millions who call themselves Roman Catholics? This with me is no very pleasant theme, and I will not extend my remarks on this point by unnecessary details. I have said enough to prove the *ellegata* in my first proposition, and to show that the church of Rome is a *sect* and not the holy, apostolic church of Christ, as she proudly and exclusively pretends. I am willing to submit these documents to the severest investigation; and if other arguments and facts are called for, I will only add, we have them at command.

My learned opponent seems to imagine that when I fix the birthday of the Roman Catholic church, on the 16th day of July 1054, I must admit that the church from which she *separated* was the true and uncorrupted church of Christ; but this is what logicians call a *non sequitur*. It does not follow. The gentleman seems to reason as if it were invariable that when one sect separates from another, the body from which it separates, must necessarily be the true church. This is not logical. A new sect may spring from the bosom of the worst sect on earth; but does this prove that the mother sect has piety, character, or authority? Neither does it follow that in the year 1054 the Greek church, though the mother or sister of the Roman, was the true church of Christ. When it becomes necessary, I may show that both the Greek and Roman schisms had long before 1054, been separate from the apostolic church.

Protestants have all conceded too much in every age and period of this controversy. Even now there is a morbid sensibility upon this subject among some, lest we should make Christ's church too inde-

pendent of the pope's church. "In reproaching the mother church," say they, "you reproach us, also."

In one of the periodicals of this morning it was intimated that the fates and fortunes of some Protestant party are involved in the pending controversy. Be not afraid of the insinuations of such political alarmists. I stand here as a Protestant, not as a Baptist, or Methodist, or Episcopalian; but to defend Protestantism. I am not afraid to meet any antagonist on these premises. In advocating the great cardinal principles of Protestantism, I feel that I stand upon a rock. There is nothing in hazard. I am sorry to see this sort of sensibility manifested. Can the truth suffer from discussion?

In the mean time I will proceed to the second proposition, which will much illustrate and confirm the argument already offered in proof of the first. These great points so embrace one another, and are so intimately allied, that none of them can be fully demonstrated without reference to the others.

"PROP. II. Her notion of Apostolic Succession is without any foundation in the Bible, in reason, or in fact; an imposition of the most injurious consequences, built upon unscriptural and anti-scriptural traditions, resting wholly upon the opinions of interested and fallible men."

Before I heard that the bishop intended to meet me in debate, I had resolved to deliver a series of lectures, on the whole pretensions of the Roman Church, in the following order: 1st her apostolicity, 2nd antiquity, 3rd infallibility, 4th supremacy, 5th catholicity, 6th unity, and 7th sanctity. These seven great topics, I intended to discuss at full length. Each involving the others, none of them is so isolated as to be susceptible of an independent and separate development. The very term *apostolicity* involves *antiquity*: hence, we find her pretending to trace her descent, by regular steps, back to Peter, who, she asserts, was the first bishop of Rome.

"Only those that can derive their lineage from the apostles are the heirs of the apostles; and consequently they alone can claim a right to the scriptures, to the administration of the sacraments, or any share in the pastoral ministry. It is their proper inheritance which they have received from the apostles, and the apostles from Christ. 'As my father hath sent me, even so I send you.'" John xx. 21. [Grounds of Cath. Doc. p. 17.]

This is the doctrine of the creed of pope Pius iv., and a more glaring assumption is not easily imagined. This church, however, delights in assumption. She assumes that Jesus Christ did establish a church of all nations, to be ruled by a sort of generalissimo, or universal head, who was to be his vicar on earth; by virtue of whose ecclesiastical power she assumes for him political power; for his logic is, that Jesus Christ's vicar must represent his master in all things, in

his political as well as his ecclesiastical power. And as Christ himself possesses all authority in heaven and on earth, she assumes that the pope his vicar ought to be the fountain of all power: that by him kings should reign, and princes decree justice. After having thus assumed, that Christ did establish such a kingdom and headship on earth, that he did constitute the office of a vicar for himself and of a prince of the apostles; in the second place, she assumes that this headship was given to Peter, that Christ gave the whole church and the apostles themselves in charge to Peter; that he gave him absolute control over the bishops, pastors and laity; and in the third place, to complete the climax of assumptions, she assumes that Christ established a successorship to Peter throughout all ages. On this triple assumption rests the colossal empire of the papacy.

Now, as to the nature of the apostolical office be it observed with brevity, that it was essentially incommunicable. Holy writ recognizes but three orders of apostles, and none of them had lineal successors. Jesus Christ, the apostle of God the Father, was the *first*. He is called in the New Testament, "*the Apostle* and high priest of the christian profession." It is not necessary to prove that he could have no successor. *Second*, the twelve apostles, who were apostles of Christ, as he was the apostle of God. In John xvii. he says, "As my *Father* made me his apostle, so I make you my apostles." These then being personal attendants on the Messiah, could have no successors. *Third*, apostles sent out by particular churches, on special errands. These are called in the New Testament *οι αποστολοι των εχχλησιων*. These, always sent on special errands, could have no successors.

If the qualifications of the apostolic office were understood, there could be no controversy on the question of successors. As laid down by Peter, Acts 1., it behooved them to have been companions of Christ from his baptism to his ascension, to be eye and ear witnesses of all that he did and said. In this essential requisite they could have no successors. Besides, if *one* should have a successor, why not *all*? While the college of apostles was necessary, we see that succession was fully carried out. Therefore, the chair of Judas the traitor demanded a successor as well as that of Peter. But yet we have not heard of any controversy about the successor of Judas!

Our first argument against the Catholic notion of succession is drawn from the nature of the apostolic office.

But did we concede that the apostolic office was communicable, and that Christ did appoint a president of the apostles, and place his chair in Rome, there is no document on earth, from which we can learn with any degree of certainty, that Peter was ever bishop in Rome. And yet

Catholics themselves, contend that it is essential to the cause of the succession and supremacy that Peter placed his see at Rome by Christ's commandment.

Bellarmino positively affirms:

"The right of succession in the popes of Rome is founded in this, that Peter, by Christ's appointment, placed his seat at Rome, and there remained till his death." Lib. II. c. 1.

This resolves the controversy into a single question of fact, viz., *Did Peter, by Christ's appointment, place his seat at Rome and there remain till death?* Barronius, however, says:

"It is not improbable that our Lord gave an express command that Peter should so fix his see at Rome, that the bishop of Rome should absolutely succeed him." [Id. Ib.

Only probable! But there is no such succession *in fact*. In the first place, there is no proof from scripture that Peter ever was at Rome, much less, bishop of Rome; and secondly, if he were an apostle, he could not be the bishop of any church. A king, a justice of the peace, the bishop of London, the vicar of Bray! It is, on these premises, impossible to prove this most fundamental question.

Various efforts have been made by the bishop of Cincinnati to excite Episcopalians and others on this question, as if they were likely to be involved in the same common ruin with my opponent's pretensions. There is no need for any alarm on this account. The office of pope and his succession, certainly, are not identical with that of Episcopalian bishops in England or America!

There is no body of men who have done more to elevate English literature and science, than the English clergy, none whose writings I have read with more pleasure than theirs, on all subjects pertaining to general literature, morality and religion. In some of them, indeed, we find weak as well as strong places, and a too great timidity in contending against the Romanists, lest they should endanger their right of Episcopacy. I incline to the opinion, that the pretensions of the church of Rome may be fully canvassed without at all jeopardizing the simple question of the divine right of Episcopacy. But if we attempt to bring a clean thing out of the unclean; or expect to find a divine warrant in the commission given to the apostles; or in the Roman Catholic traditions; we shall never find it to the day of eternity.

Successors must be successors in full, or they are not successors at all. To illustrate this—does not the existing president of the United States inherit all the power and authority of George Washington, by virtue of constitutional succession? Does he not possess the same power, in all its length and breadth, its height and depth, as did his

predecessor, from the first to the last? This is true of every constitutional office in the civilized world. All the power which any predecessor can have, belongs to every incumbent: so in the church, if it have constitution at all.

If the apostles have successors, they have successors in full. But the Roman Catholics themselves give up the controversy, by admitting that none of the bishops or popes inherit the power and functions bestowed upon the apostles by the commission.

I do not, indeed, found my argument for the divine right of bishops, or elders, and deacons, on the commission, which Jesus Christ gives to his apostles; and I am prepared for all the consequences of this admission. For by every rule of interpretation, I must apply every word of the commission to the apostles; because it addresses them only. But let none be alarmed at this declaration: nothing is jeopardized—rather, indeed, all is secured by it.

In the presence of the apostles alone, he pronounced these words: "All authority in heaven and on earth is given to me; go you therefore and convert all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all the things which I have commanded you; and lo, *I am with you always*, even to the conclusion of this state," or to the end of the age or world.

This commission created plenipotentiaries: it reared up ambassadors, and gave to the apostles the same power of erecting the church, which God gave to Moses for raising the tabernacle in the wilderness. They had all the authority of Christ to set up what orders they pleased. They created both bishops and deacons; and as they had a divine right to do so, so those created by them have a divine right to officiate in the duties of those offices. A true interpretation of the promise, "*I am with you*," will go far to confirm the declaration, that they neither had, nor could have successors in office. Of this, however, again—

Meanwhile, it may be objected that Paul was an apostle, and acted without this commission. He had, indeed, a special commission, and the qualifications of an apostle. He had *seen* and *heard* the Lord. For to this end the Lord appeared to him. But as respected time, he acknowledged he was born rather too late to be an apostle—he was "*born out of due time*." How, then, could any of them have successors at this day!

The gentleman mentioned some two persons in the Old Testament. They could have no successors in office, according to the argument on hand. It was absolutely impossible that Moses could have a successor. His office and commission were really from God, and strictly peculiar

to himself. He brought the Jews out of Egypt, and erected the tabernacle; this was his peculiar office, which, in its very nature, *expired when once its duties were fulfilled*. The commission of Joshua, in like manner, was also peculiar to himself, and could not possibly descend to a successor. When he led Israel across the Jordan, and divided the land by lot amongst them, his works and office naturally expired. So when the apostles preached the gospel, revealed the whole will of Jesus Christ, and erected his church and all its proper officers and duties, their work was done, and they, like Moses and Joshua, being officers extraordinary, could have no successors.—[Time expired.]

Half past 10 o'clock, A. M.

BISHOP PURCELL rises—

Here is, beloved friends, as plain and logical a case for argumentation, and as fair an opportunity afforded for refutation, as ever the annals of controversy exhibited. The first argument of my friend amounts to this, viz: That for reasons he has given, the Greek church has superior claims upon our attention to the Roman.

I have quoted councils, general and particular laws, usages, appeals, the authority of Greek and Latin fathers, that is to say, the most authentic testimony of the first ages, to show that with Rome was the primacy of all the churches. This, at once, upsets all that he has said.

He says the first seven councils were Greek; and that therefore the Greek church had the pre-eminence. But, I ask, who convoked those councils? Who approved them? Who sanctioned their canons, and gave throughout the entire church the force of law to their decisions? Who guarded them against errors, and set them right when they were going, or had gone astray? It was the pope. I have already said, that Sylvester, bishop of Rome, aware of the danger that menaced the faith in the east, convoked the great council of Nice—that the emperor Constantine, the ruler of the east and west, of Rome and of Constantinople, the man, consequently, upon whom as chief magistrate of the Roman empire it devolved, afforded the necessary facilities to the various bishops to come to the council. Again, who presided as legate of the pope? Osius of Cordova, in Spain, a western man, assisted, as is and has been customary, by two inferior ecclesiastics.

The jealous Greeks beheld all this, and surely they would not have permitted Rome thus to assume the supremacy, if her right to it had not been universally admitted since the days of her founder, St. Peter. Is it not the most splendid proof of the correctness of my argument? The strongest evidence that could be desired of the discomfiture of my adversary?

I thought to have seen a more powerful display of logic from the strong and disciplined mind of my friend Mr. C.; but I attributed the poverty of his argument to indisposition on his part, or to the weakness of his cause.

Well, another reason is stated, to prove the supremacy of the Greek church, viz.: that the questions discussed in these councils were of Greek origin. Is it then to be wondered at, that as almost every error in the old church originated in the East, it should be there corrected? that the remedy should be applied where the disease existed?

The Greeks were at all times a curious, inquisitive, restless people. The passion for disputation displayed in the schools of the philosophers was, as by contagion, communicated to many of the professors of christianity. But the manner in which it operated upon the one and the other was essentially different. With the philosopher such questions were objects of understanding only, subjects of speculation; whereon the ingenuity of a minute mind might employ or waste itself. But with the christian they were matters of truth and falsehood, of belief or disbelief, and he felt assured that his eternal interests would be influenced if not decided by his choice. As soon as the copious language of Greece was vaguely applied to the definition of spiritual things, and the explanation of heavenly mysteries, the field of contention seemed to be removed from earth to air, where the foot found nothing stable (nothing like the rock of Rome—new and striking proof of its necessity) to rest upon; where arguments were easily eluded, and where the space, in which to fly and rally, was infinite. Add to this the nature and genius of the disputants; *for the origin of these disputes may be traced without any exception to the restless imaginations of the East.* The violent temperament of the orientals, as it was highly adapted to the reception of religious impressions, and admitted them with fervor and earnestness, intermingled, so closely, passion with piety, as scarcely to conceive them separable. The natural ardor of their feelings was not abated by the natural subtilty of their understanding, which was sharpened in the schools of Egypt; and when this latter began to be occupied by inquiries in which the former were so deeply engaged, it was to be expected that many extravagances would follow. Vid. Waddington, p. 92.

Yet, because it was in the east that the heresies in the ancient day of the church commenced, and in the east the councils met to correct those heresies, the Greek church must therefore have been the mother church! Such is my friend's argument! and it is now plain, that a feebler, a more inconclusive, and a more irrational one, he could scarcely have advanced before this enlightened assembly. But what

is still more remarkable, did not these very councils, these Greek councils, establish by their own acts, and these of the most solemn and authentic character, the supremacy of the Roman see? Did they not solicit the pope's approbation of their decrees, and acknowledge that without his sanction their proceedings were void of effect?

He says that the emperor presided. I have already answered that the emperor did not preside. He distinctly acknowledged the spiritual to be independent of the temporal power, he alleged that he pretended to no right to preside. He knew that God never told the emperors, his predecessors, to preside over the deliberations of his church. The constitution of that church had been established three hundred years before Constantine became a proselyte to christianity. It is unheard of that a temporal monarch ever presided over the deliberations of the church, or ruled in ecclesiastical matters. At least we catholics submit to no such dictation—such a confusion of things divine and human—such an anomaly! I am sorry it is allowed in England. In that country even a woman may be, for a woman has been, the head of the church, as in the instance of queen Elizabeth; nay, a little child, as in the case of Edward. It is contrary to reason, to scripture, to human rights and divine ordinances, that such as *these* should presume in any situations, to give or withhold authority to the ministry, to preach the gospel of Christ, or to dispense the mysteries of God. It outrages every feeling of sanctity, it degrades, it villifies the priesthood, to see bishops and archbishops kneeling at the feet of women and boys, and praying them to grant a *license* to preach.

My friend has charged me with making professions of respect for Episcopalians and Episcopal methodists, &c., but do I suppress the truth, and do I fail to censure them where they too are wrong? My friend has gratuitously presented himself before this assembly as the champion of Protestantism; and I have shown that he is, if at all, but little less opposed than I am to the dominations I have named, on the vital point of orders and a called and sent ministry. He would amuse them with an equivocal defence of their principles to-day, and then present them with his own views in theology—with Campbellism, baptized Protestantism.—[Here the moderators called Bishop Purcell to order.]

My friend, learnedly, (and I give him credit for it,) showed how it came that there were so many errors and questionable doctrines in the Greek church. I have stated the causes, humanly speaking, of the errors. It is then, an undisputed fact, that they were more numerous in the Greek than in the Roman church; that the Roman church was comparatively free from them. But he has plainly misconceived the

inference to be drawn from the fact; and it is this: that as Rome was the primary see, the centre of unity, the mother and mistress of all the churches, God watched over her with peculiar care, and preserved her from the errors and heresies that proved infinitely more fatal than the pagan persecutions, to the churches of the east. While they were distracted, the Roman church was united in faith; while they were in danger of breaking to pieces the edifice of faith, she was consolidated, herself, and laboring to consolidate them under one creed. If any thing did prolong the gospel life in the east, it was the authority of Rome. By her was the doctrine of the Savior vindicated, and kept pure from the foul admixture, the contamination of heresy. By her were Arianism, Nestorianism, Eutychianism, Monotholism, and a hundred other novelties, the spurious progeny of dangerous opinions in the east, successively condemned.

And now, having disposed of the argument which appears in the van of the gentleman's remarks, I will go on with a question of fact, to which he has again referred, touching the word *Catholic*. He says that it is not found in the New Testament. Admitting that it is not in the body of the canon, which I did not contend for, yet it is prefixed to some of the epistles, and as old, if not older, as a word belonging to the household of faith, than they are. He said the word *Καθολικη* (*catholike*) was prefixed to the Epistle of James in the year 1549, by Robert Stephens, or Robert Etienne, by which name that famous French printer is better known—about 300 years ago. Yes, and I will show you that here again his learning is at fault, that to the 300 years must be added a thousand more, and then that the origin of the word is coeval with christianity. Before quoting the testimony of St. Gregory Nazianzen, a writer of the 4th century, I will observe, that seven of the epistles found in the Catholic or Protestant Testaments, are called catholic, or canonical, as not having been addressed to any particular church, or person, if we except the 2d and 3d of St. John, but to all the churches. Five of the epistles, viz., that of St. James, the 2d of St. Peter, the 2d and 3d of St. John, the epistle of St. Jude, as also the epistle of St. Paul to the Hebrews, and the Apocalypse, or book of Revelation of St. John, were doubted of, and not always and every where received in the three first ages, till the canon and catalogue of the books of scripture were determined by the authority of the Catholic church, the supreme judge of all controversies in matters of faith and religion, according to the appointment of our Savior, Christ, expressed in many places in the holy scriptures. These I have mentioned were certainly, for some time, doubted of; they are still doubted of by some of the late reformers. Luther, the great doctor of the ref-

ormation, is not ashamed to say, that this epistle of St. James, *is no better than straw, and unworthy an apostle*. Speaking of these epistles, then, Gregory Nazianzen, at that early period, uses the word Catholic, and designates them by that name:

“Καθολικῶν Ἐπιστολῶν
 “Τινές μὲν ἐπὶ λα φασιν, οἱ δὲ τρεῖς μόνας
 “Χρηναὶ δεχεσθαι τὴν Ἰαχωβῶ μίαν,
 “Μίαν δὲ Πητροῦ, τὴν τε Ἰωαννοῦ μίαν.”

Greg. Nazianzen, Carmen de Canon. Script.

In English—“Some say there are seven Catholic epistles, others that there are only three—one of James, one of Peter, and one of John.” So much for the fourth age. Does not my friend say his prayers? Does not every Protestant unite with every Catholic in saying, “I believe in the holy Catholic church,” as we are taught in the apostles’ creed? Speaking of this most ancient formula of faith, composed, as it is believed, by the apostles themselves, before they separated for the great work of preaching to all nations, that it may be for ever a bond of union and an abridgment of sound apostolic belief, Waddington says, p. 46, “The creed which was first adopted, *and that perhaps in the very earliest age*, by the church of Rome, was that which is now called the apostles’ creed; and it was the general opinion from the fourth century downwards, *that it was actually the production of those blessed persons assembled for that purpose*; our evidence is not sufficient to establish that fact, and some writers very confidently reject it. But there is reasonable ground for our assurance that the form of faith, which we will repeat and inculcate, was in use and power in the very early propagation of our religion.”* Now will the gentleman tell us that the word *Catholic*—was unknown to antiquity?

You will perceive, my friends, that until the very minute Mr. Campbell speaks, I know not what he is going to say. You will not wonder that following him, my discourse should be desultory and rambling. I am here under every disadvantage to which a speaker can be subject. Obligated to leave the beaten highway and follow him through the thickets into which, he finds it useful to plunge so frequently.

I have at this moment in my hand, a copy of the New Testament, a beautiful edition, published in Glasgow, a Presbyterian city, and also an edition of Robert Etienne. Behold (displaying them) the title “Catholic,” prefixed in both, to these epistles.

I have now established the fact that Catholic was the ancient name

*A note to Waddington on this subject, contains the following remark: “Ignatius, Justin, and Irenæus, make no mention of it, but they occasionally repeat some words, contained in it, which is held as a proof that they knew it by heart.”

of the church—that no other than the Roman Catholic was entitled to that name—that the Roman Catholic church is the *Catholic church of all ages*, that in all ages it has had a head. For we may call the pope by any name we please, the name is nothing. It is the station, and the incumbent thereof, that it is important to ascertain, and the noonday is not clearer than that both existed from the very origin of the christian religion in Rome.

He argues against the supremacy of Rome from the circumstance that all the ecclesiastical words are Greek.

This is not at all surprising. There was not a particle of the Scriptures originally written in Latin. Surely my friend must be hard pressed for want of argument, when he grasps at such a floating, improbable, airy one as that! Words are but the signs of ideas. But he affirms that all the epistles are written to Greek cities. Was then none of these epistles written to Rome? And was Rome a Greek city? Does not Paul surpass himself—does he not reason most deeply in that epistle? Does he not style the Romans the “Called of Jesus Christ; the beloved of God?” Does he not say, 1st ch. v. 3, “I give thanks to my God, through Jesus Christ, for you all, because your faith is spoken of in the whole world?” Is it not in that epistle that he confounds the Jews, by proving that the ceremonial works of the law avail them nothing towards salvation, and the Gentiles by shewing that their shameful excesses, notwithstanding the boasted lights of philosophy, involved them equally with the rejected Jews in the divine malediction? Does he not devote eleven chapters of this epistle to establish solidly the fundamental doctrines of the christian faith?

Finally, was not the church of Rome at least as ancient as the church of Corinth?

My friend spoke of transubstantiation, and purgatory. These will come in their proper place in the debate.

The conclusion of all his arguments is, that the Roman Catholic church is a sect. This, I may venture to say, he has failed to prove. Indeed he has done anything but prove it; for he has in fact strengthened my grounds of defence, for the more he has questioned my authorities and arguments, the more signally have I established them.

My friend is correct in saying that to prove the church not *Catholic*, is to prove her neither holy nor apostolic. Had he acted on this hint, and compressed his first three propositions into one, and condensation is all important in discussion, he would have greatly abridged his own labor, and saved this audience and myself much loss of time. I have proved that the Roman Catholic church is now the only church that as a church, (and not as a band of sailors or travellers without any

fixed habitation,) spread over the entire world; that she only has been so from the beginning, to the exclusion of every sect; that she alone now bears, that she alone has ever borne the name of Catholic; that no other denomination, no sect now has or ever had a right to it—and that, as she is Catholic, she is also holy, she is apostolic, she is divine, and consequently the only true church of Christ. By the same strictness of investigation and of reasoning, by the same splendid *evidence of facts*, I will prove that she alone is united in faith and government as the true church should be: for Christ prayed for his disciples the night before he suffered, “that they may be ONE, as thou Father in Heaven and I are one.” Now in what church shall we seek for this unity? We shall see that, later in the debate, for notwithstanding the admission of my friend, we must plod our weary round, debating these propositions as he has penned them. But the gentleman says, “the Roman Catholic church *assumes* every thing.” No, my brethren, it is not so. When she can so validly establish her claim, she does not, she has no occasion to *assume* any thing. She proves all things, and holds fast to them because they are good. In the first place we prove from scripture that Christ did establish an earthly head to his church, and that that head was the apostle Peter. If not, why did he say to Peter, “*Thou art Peter, (a rock,) and upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it?*” Again, he did give him a pre-eminence over the other apostles. If not, why did he say to him, Luke xxii. 32, “Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you (in the plural, that is, all the apostles) that he may sift you as wheat, but I have prayed for *thee* that *thy faith fail not*, and thou being converted, *confirm thy brethren?*” He told Peter that he would deny him—that he would fall—but he at the same time cheered him by the divine assurance that his fall should not be for ever, that he would arise from it, and that after his transitory humiliation, no longer presumptuously confiding in his own strength, but placing all his trust in God, he should not only securely stand himself before both Jews and Gentiles, but likewise strengthen and support his brethren. For this Christ prayed for Peter, and the *Father* who also loves the church, heard and he will ever hear that prayer. The faith of Peter hath never failed. When did he ever say this to the other apostles? Peter is named first, when the apostles are enumerated; he speaks first in the meeting of the apostles and brethren, and gives instructions to proceed to the choosing an apostle in the place of the Iscariot. He is the first to reproach the Jews with deicide, and at his preaching eight thousand are converted. He is sent by an angel from heaven, to the gentile Cornelius; is released from prison by an

angel; confirms the Samaritans with St. John; healeth Æneas at Lydda; raiseth Tabitha from death at Joppa; founds the first see among the gentiles at Antioch. He speaks first in the council at Jerusalem, "men, brethren, &c.," Acts xv., "and all the multitude among whom there had been previously, much disputing, held their peace." "Then after three years," says St. Paul, Gal. i. 13, "I went to Jerusalem to see Peter, and I tarried with him fifteen days." And ch. 2. v. 1., "Then after fourteen years I went up again to Jerusalem, *and I went up according to revelation, and conferred* with them the gospel which I preach among the gentiles, lest perhaps I should run, or had run in vain."

My friend says that this assumption is followed by injurious effects, religious and political, in consequence of the power wielded by a single individual. This directly impeaches the foreknowledge and sanctity of Christ. He established the power, and from its exercise within the just limits, which he has prescribed, I maintain that no consequences injurious either to religious or civil society can ever ensue. History attests, and I have quoted some striking instances from the records of the Greek church, that the power of the popes was CONSERVATIVE. Their influence has ever been most favorable to the best interests of society as well as of religion. They were the friends of peace, the patrons of learning, the umpires of angry princes and hostile nations on the one hand, while on the other they preserved pure and uncontaminated, the holy deposit of the truth and proscribed error. Confined to its proper sphere, the influence of the head of the church must needs be salutary; must, if God was wise, be beneficial and far above reproach. This power has been exerted for the welfare of society under every form of government, monarchical, aristocratical, mixed, and republican. It is the friend of all. It is irreconcilable with none, but of the temporal influence of the popes it will be time enough to speak in its proper place. I will now proceed to show that the want of an ecclesiastical superior, whom all are bound to obey, lets in a deluge of evils, and these irremediable, on every religious body that wants a head. Reason alone should attest this truth, without further illustration. The sheepfold over which there has been placed no shepherd, will soon be the prey of the wolf. The school in which no teacher presides, the society which recognizes no chief magistrate, will not fail to exhibit a scene of confusion, and must finally be dissolved. Let us appeal to experience. What has multiplied the (so called) christian sects to such an excess that neither the evil nor the remedy can be any longer endured in Protestant communions? It is the principle contended for by my opponent. It is this, as bishop Smith justly observes, more

prolific than the knife that divides the polypus, that daily multiplies divisions and produces new sects in christianity. Hear a late number of the Baptist Banner, speaking of this controversy. It says:—

“But to be serious, we cannot believe that any good will follow this debate. But too much excitement is attempted to be gotten up against the Roman Catholics—an excitement bordering on intolerance. Could we feel assured, either from his course in this instance or from a retrospect of his past life, that Mr. Campbell sought this discussion solely to vindicate truth and expose error, and not ostentatiously to exhibit his tact in debate and to reap a pecuniary harvest by a new publication, we might feel less distrust of consequences, and should have some faint hope that probably good would ensue; but credulous, nay, stupid must be the man, who in looking over the circumstances which have concurred in originating this debate, can suppose that any religious or commendable motive prompted him to throw the gauntlet and provoke the controversy. In looking over his past career, a love of truth and a desire to promote the peace and prosperity of Zion, have not been the prominent traits which have marked his character and rendered conspicuous his course. [Bishop P. was here called to order; Mr. Campbell also here observed, that as he had read the worst part of the article he might read the balance; and the point of order being examined, the board decided that he was in order.] We do not speak for other places, but in Kentucky he has caused more serious injury to the cause of religion, more disturbance, more wrangling, collision, and division in society, in a few years, than in our humble judgment, the Catholics can ever do. But we forbear. The debate will take place. The Campbellites will sip delicious wisdom from the lips of their leader. A new impulse will be given to their now drooping state. They will again wage his high claims to competency to reform religion and introduce the Millennium. And Mr. Campbell will have the proud satisfaction of rendering great good—to himself by the sale of another book! This will be about all that will result from this discussion.”

I knew not until yesterday that the Baptists were opposed to Mr. Campbell; but as necessarily as the stream flows from its source, do these disastrous effects which the Baptist Banner deprecates, flow from the system which acknowledges no head in religious matters, but allows every individual, qualified or disqualified, to give his own crude fancies for the revelation of heaven.

The Zion's Advocate of the 28th ult. and the Palladium of the 7th inst. give similar testimony against the radicalism of my friend. But I spare him the reading. You can now judge of the tree by its fruits; his are bitterness and confusion, those of the Catholics, admitting a supremacy in the church, are order, unity and peace. His rule necessarily creates enmities and endless altercations in the church; the Catholic rule cuts them up by the very roots, and not only arrests their growth, but renders their very existence impossible.

Mr. Campbell said that the Roman Catholic church was an apostasy from the true Church, and that this event, so important in the annals of the world, took place precisely on the 16th of July 1054, when she separated from the Greek church. It is a pity, as he intended to

be so particular, that he did not tell us whether it was *old style or new*.

But perceiving the terrible effect of this admission, upon his argument, he retraces his steps, and taking us all aback, he says that the Greek church was not after all the true church of Christ, and thus he has left us as much in the dark as ever. Remember I told him how much it had puzzled the world and would puzzle him to settle that point. I ask him again then, if the Roman Catholic church apostatized from the church of Christ at the period in question, and the Greek church, from which she separated, was as corrupt as herself, where was, at that time, the true church? God's covenant with her, Ezech. xxxvii. 62, was an everlasting covenant of peace, a covenant, like that of day and night, to last for all generations, Jre. xxxiii. 20, 21, always visible, Is. ii. 2. 3. Michers iv. 1. 2, spread far and near, and teaching many nations, Ps. xi. 8. Dan. xi. 35. 44. Malach. i. 11. The pillar and ground of truth, unailing; the gates of hell were never to prevail against her. If all these glorious prophecies were not fulfilled in the Roman Catholic church, in what other church were they fulfilled? When will my friend answer me?

Mr. C. observes that the Roman Catholic church or the see of Peter, assumes to be the representative of Christ in all his power, ecclesiastical and political, and that as Christ was supreme head over all the earth, temporal and spiritual, so was Peter, and so are his successors.

I have already shewn that this is no part or parcel of the Catholic doctrine. The pope's power is spiritual, his kingdom like that of Christ, is not of this world. He has not a solitary inch of ground over which to exercise temporal authority in any territory on earth, beyond the narrow limits of the papal states; and the authority with which he is there invested rather originated in the people's preference of the bishop's crosier to the kingly sceptre, than in any views he could himself, have cherished of worldly aggrandizement. Hear Gibbon, III. vol. p. 230., Phil. 1830: "The want of laws could only be supplied by the influence of religion, and their foreign and domestic counsels were moderated by the authority of the bishop. His alms, his sermons, his correspondence with the king and prelates of the west, his recent services, their gratitude, an oath, accustomed the Romans to consider him as the first magistrate. The christian humility of the popes was not offended by the name of *dominus* or lord, and their face and inscription is still apparent on the most ancient coins. Their temporal dominion is now confirmed by the reverence of a thousand years; and their noblest title is the free choice of a people, whom they had redeemed from slavery."

I had a great deal of other ground to go over on this point, but my time is limited; and I will now proceed to review one of the most dreadful charges ever made against a pope of Rome, and to show that it is totally without foundation.

If I understood Mr. C. aright, he asserted, that it was the pope Gregory consecrated Phocas the centurion king, in the church of St. John the Baptist in Constantinople, and that he did so, contrary to every law of God, or man, for the base, the iniquitous purchase of the title of pope.

(Mr. Campbell reasserted the charge.)

Now I aver that the charge is unfounded and false. I mean no disrespect to Mr. C. He would not intentionally deceive this assembly or wilfully sustain by calumny an otherwise hopeless cause. But leaving motives to their proper judge, I shall now prove to this audience that he has stated what is not true, and alleged odious charges against the pope which he cannot substantiate. On his own reputation for accuracy and his knowledge of history let the penalty for ever rest, of having been this day detected before so many of his fellow-citizens, egregiously at fault in both. Hormisdas king of Persia, indignant at the defeat of his general Varamus (see *Natalis Alex. sæc. sext. Art. v. p. 226.*) sends him a petticoat in derision. The war is renewed; Mauritius loses 12000 troops, taken prisoners by the Chagan; he refuses to release them by paying the humble pittance set as a price on the head of each by the vicar; they are butchered in cold blood; his people, shocked at his avarice and cruelty revolt—Mauritius abdicates—the people choose the centurion, Phocas, to reign over them in his stead; *the patriarch of Constantinople consecrates* Phocas king, in the church of St. John the Baptist, in C. P. The entire story is thus related by Gibbon

“The troops of Maurice might listen to the voice of a victorious leader, they disdained the admonitions of statesmen and sophists, and when they received an edict which deducted from their pay the price of their arms and clothing, they execrated the avarice of a prince insensible of the dangers and fatigues from which he had escaped: and every age must condemn the inhumanity or avarice of a prince, who by the trifling ransom of six thousand pieces of gold, might have prevented the massacre of 12,000 prisoners in the hands of the Chagan. In the first fervor of indignation, an order was signified to the army of the Danube, that they should spare the magazines of the province, and establish their winter-quarters in the hostile country of the Avars. The measure of their grievances was full; they pronounced Maurice unworthy to reign, expelled or slaughtered his faithful adherents, and, under the command of Phocas, a simple centurion, returned by hasty marches to the neighborhood of Constantinople.

“The rigid and parsimonious virtues of Maurice had long since alienated the

hearts of his subjects; and a vile plebeian, who represented his countenance and apparel, was seated on an ass, and pursued by the imprecations of the multitude.* The emperor suspected the popularity of Germanus with the soldiers and citizens; he feared, he threatened, but he delayed to strike; the patrician fled to the sanctuary of the church; the people rose in his defence, the walls were deserted by the guards, and the lawless city was abandoned to the flames and rapine of nocturnal tumult. In a small bark the unfortunate Maurice, with his wife and nine children, escaped to the Asiatic shore; but the violence of the wind compelled him to land at the church of St. Antonius, near Chalcedon, from whence he despatched Theodosius, his eldest son, to implore the gratitude and friendship of the Persian monarch. For himself, he refused to fly. His body was tortured with sciatric pains, his mind was enfeebled by superstition: he patiently awaited the event of the revolution, and addressed a fervent and public prayer to the Almighty, that the punishment of his sins might be inflicted in this world, rather than in a future life. After the abdication of Maurice, the two factions disputed the choice of an emperor; but the favorite of the blues, was rejected by the jealousy of their antagonists, and Germanus himself was hurried along by the crowds, who rushed to the palace of Hebdomen, seven miles from the city, to adore the majesty of Phocas, the centurion. A modest wish of resigning the purple to the rank and merit of Germanus was opposed by his resolution, more obstinate, and equally sincere: the senate and clergy obeyed this summons, and as soon as the *patriarch was assured of his orthodox belief, he consecrated the successful usurper in the church of St. John the Baptist.*" Gibbon; sixth Amer. Edit. of the Hist. of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. Page 184. Vol. III. A. D. 1830.

Thus it appears that Gregory did not act the part assigned him by my friend, and that this accusation turns out to be, like a thousand others, taken up at second hand, without examination or suspicion of falsehood or incorrectness, against the pope, a mere fabrication without a shadow of foundation in history! What will this enlightened audience now say? What apology is my friend prepared to make for having unconsciously led them into error? This case may illustrate many others that are similar, and I beg it may not be forgotten. Napoleon, Papin, &c., are parallels, the pontiff could not resist the will of an entire people; and it would only perpetuate lawless violence and disorder to contest a claim to the throne, to which no one was able to support his rival pretensions. The pope seeing that the people, who had the right, selected themselves a new ruler, like a true lover of peace and friend of established order, congratulated Phocas on his election, and used the language of scripture, be it observed, in his letter, because anarchy was at an end, and an orthodox and generous prince substituted on the throne of C. P. for a tyrant, a miser, and a

*In their clamors against Maurice, the people of Constantinople branded him with the name of Marcionite or Marcionist: a heresy, (says Theophylact, Lib. viii. c. 9.) *μετα τινος μωρας ευλαβειας ευηθης τε και χαταγελαστος.* Did they only cast out a vague reproach, or had the emperor really listened to some obscure teacher of those ancient Gnostics?

suspected Marcionite heretic. Mauritius may have died penitent, but he reigned without love for his subjects.

We were spoken to of the president of the U. S. He has the same power and authority as Washington had while the constitution of the country endures. And as long as the constitution of the church endures, the successors of Peter have the authority of Peter. If there was ever to come a time, when the true church was to fail, Jesus Christ was bound by his wisdom and love to foretell it. If it was his intention to forsake the church, and if the power and authorities of all the regularly constituted orders were to fail, he never should have given it the promise of perpetual endurance, and the precise period, and all the different circumstances of its defection should have been more clearly and emphatically revealed, than any other event in the scripture. It is needless to add that such defection is not foretold; but on the contrary it is repeatedly declared by the Son of God, that his church should stand forever, that his Holy Spirit should abide with it all days, that the gates of Hell should not prevail against it. What is the meaning of the words "the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it?" In the east, laws were enacted, justice administered, and the sages and people assembled for deliberation at the gates of the cities. Hence the expression denotes, wisdom, subtlety, malice. Again, when a city was invaded by a hostile army, the hottest fighting was around its gates. In them and around them, were all the energies of the conflicting hosts put forth—and on the issue of the battle was suspended a nation's weal or woe. Thus by the gates of Hell are clearly meant, all the craft and power of Hell, the malice of heresy and error, the force and violence of persecution. All these shall rage around the church in vain, for Christ is in the citadel, and his Holy Spirit is the sentinel that guards its outposts and defences from being overthrown by error. But he says that the apostles had *all* power given to them—grant it—but what was the nature of that power? what was its extent? It was a power to teach all nations. The weapon of their warfare was not carnal but spiritual; "for our wrestling," says St. Paul, Ephes. vi. 12., "is not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the world of this darkness, against the spirits of wickedness in the high places." "Behold," says Christ, "I send you as lambs in the midst of wolves. Carry not with you scrip nor staff, &c. Be not solicitous for the morrow, what you shall eat, or wherewithal you shall be clothed. Behold the lilies of the field, they sow not, neither do they spin—and yet your Heavenly Father clotheth them—careth for them—how much more ye, &c." By patience they were to run towards the fight proposed to them, and by patience they

triumphed over their persecutors. The pope, should occasion require, will show himself the faithful imitator of these heroic models. Were he stript to-morrow of all external, temporal power whatever, and a poor wanderer among the mountains of the moon in Abyssinia, he would have no less power, and would be, for aught I know, no less respected, than he is at present. His chief authority is, thank God, such as this world can neither give nor take away. It was given for the salvation of the people of God, and as long as there is a soul to be saved, a sheep to be brought back to the fold, or a spiritual conquest achieved for the glory of Christ, and the praise of his grace, so long shall that power survive; when all else decays, itself, amidst vicissitudes unchanged, shall flourish in immortal youth.

For our sakes, in this distant province of creation, and at this late age, as well as for those who saw the Word made flesh conversing among men, was this commission given and this authority conferred. Our souls were no less dear to Christ than were those of the first believers of glad tidings—and Cincinnati was the rival of Jerusalem in the Savior's love! With him there was no exception of persons—neither past nor future. He provided for every casualty which he foreknew should happen in the lapse of ages—he anticipated every favorable or adverse circumstance that should affect the condition of his church, and with divine wisdom he adapted its constitutions to the peculiar exigencies of every age and nation and individual believer, until we reach "the consummation of the world." He sent his apostles with power to ordain faithful men, who should in their turn be fit to teach others. This is the charge that St. Paul repeated to Titus, and thus has the succession of apostolic teachers been continued from nation to nation, and from age to age, the church gaining in one region of the earth what she has lost in another, renewing her youth like the eagles, increasing her members, and daily transmitting to the bright realms of heavenly glory innumerable multitudes of her children of every clime and tongue, and peculiarity of social government or manners.

The apostles exercised various functions—I admit it. But they substituted the deacons to wait on tables, and distribute the alms, so do their successors; Christ gave them powers adequate to every emergency.

It has been wrongly asserted, that Moses had no successor. Joshua was, in one important branch, his successor, for it devolved on him to lead the people into the land of promise, and without this consummation, the ministry of Moses would have been in vain; and there are Joshuas now whose office it is to lead the people to their spiritual Ca-

naam—and as God obeyed the voice of Joshua, in commanding the sun to stand still, so he now obeys the voice of his priests making supplication for his people. Here is an obvious analogy between the old and the new covenants. My friend argues that, because Moses had no successor, Peter could have none, and the apostles none; but it is clear that Moses had a successor. All that Moses accomplished would have been incomplete without a succession of ministry to carry on the work of God in favor of his people, Israel. This, Eusebius beautifully establishes, p. 46. So by the same analogy, it is necessary that the succession of an apostolic priesthood should be continued for the carrying on of the christian dispensation, and be transmitted down from generation of spiritual guides to generation, until they shall have conducted all the people of God to the true land of promise, where I trust we shall all meet, and cease to dispute, as we now do, like little children, at the imminent risk of neglecting the weightier points of the law. For myself, I am heartily sick of such interminable contention. Here would I stop and suffer the matter to end without another word, if the sad necessity was not imposed upon me of defending the impugned tenets of my church, and giving with my voice the testimony which, with the divine assistance, I should not hesitate to seal with my blood, to the truths of the Roman Catholic faith. From the discharge of this duty, no true believer, still more no minister of God, should shrink; and it is worthy of notice that, with all the love and humility of St. Paul, he should have warned his disciple Timothy, and still more the body of the faithful, against associating with "heretics." I never use this word, as it is now so harshly understood, to designate those who differ from me in religion; but I know not how any human being is to determine without the aid of a competent tribunal, who are heretics, and who are not; for we cannot look into the heart.

I am told that an English divine was accustomed humorously to define these terms in this way: "Orthodoxy is my doxy and heterodoxy is yours." But seriously, what being on earth can look into the secrets of the heart? Who was to determine when heresy occurred? That it existed in the early days of the church none can doubt. The apostles denounced it. They delivered its authors to Satan (of whom St. Paul says, are Hymeneus and Alexander whom I have delivered to Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme. 1st Tim. 1. 20.) The apostles did not suffer their disciples to make this discrimination for themselves, in defiance of the express word of God. They did not allow every man to assert the right of private judgment on scripture, which they taught was of no "private interpretation." 2 Peter, 1. 20. The very form "*understanding this first*" exceedingly strengthens the text.

Divisions will ever exist. They are, unfortunately, as *natural* to depraved man, as vice; and but little, if at all less fatal. "*There were also false prophets among the people,*" says St. Peter, 2d Ep. xi. 1, *even as there shall be among you lying teachers, who shall bring in sects of perdition,* and again v. 10 and 12, "*They fear not to bring in sects, blaspheming those things that they know not, promising their disciples liberty, whereas they themselves are the slaves of corruption.*" These are fountains without water, clouds tossed with whirlwinds, or as St. Jude says, v. 13, "raging waves of the sea, foaming out of their own confusion, wandering stars to whom the storm of darkness is reserved for ever." Who would trust his safety in a perilous voyage to an unskilful pilot? Who would risk the horrors of the deep without chart or compass? Has God abandoned his children so far as to leave them a prey to every innovator, every wolf in sheep's clothing? Is there no ark of safety for man, while the waters of error overspread the earth? Yes, my friends, there is. It is the church. That ark alone can save the world. "Whosoever," says St. John, 2d Ep. 9, 10, "revolteth and continueth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. If any man come to you and *bring* not this doctrine, receive him not into the house, nor say to him, 'God speed you.' For he that sayeth 'God speed you,' communicateth with his wicked works." This admission, we understand to be directed against false religions and false teachers. It does not forbid charity, which we owe to all men, and particularly the erring; for whom, we are taught it to be our duty to pray, that they may happily come to the knowledge of truth.

I confess that, for my part, I cannot practice this doctrine literally, nor refuse to salute one who differs from me in faith. I retain my own convictions and eschew his errors. The apostles did differently, and who will presume to say, they were not more enlightened than we? When St. John met Cerinthus (who denied the divinity of Christ) in the baths of Ephesus, he ran out saying that he was afraid the baths would fall upon him. And when his disciple St. Polycarp met Marcion, in the streets of Rome, he refused to salute him. "Do you not know me?" said Marcion. "I do know you," replied Polycarp, "to be the oldest son of the Devil." This shows the dread of religious innovators entertained by the apostles of Christ and by their disciples, the dangerous result of heresy.—[Time expired.]

Half-past 11 o'clock, A. M.

MR. CAMPBELL rises—

I am sorry that I cannot sympathize with the gentleman in his embarrassment, occasioned, as he alleges, in being obliged to respond promptly to objections to his doctrines, which, he says, he cannot an-

ticipate. So far as he is placed in the predicament of a respondent to my allegations, he has no one to blame but himself. When arranging the preliminaries as to the mode in which this discussion was to be conducted, the gentleman perseveringly insisted that I should lead the way, commencing every session; and that, whether the proposition were affirmative or negative, he must always respond. It was a *sine qua non* with him, that he should always have the last word. I would, as an apology for giving him such an advantage, inform my audience, that *on no other condition would he consent to meet me*. If, however, he sincerely dislikes the arrangement, I am willing to alter it, and change places with him to-morrow. The affirmative, should, in all right, and by universal usage, open, and the respondent follow, in debate.

I regard this discussion, my friends, as a very serious and important affair, involving in it the very best interests of the whole community. I do not appear here to speak for myself alone in behalf of Protestantism, or to you alone. I speak for my contemporaries, and for the great cause of truth; and I am glad for their sake that this debate is immediately to go to record. I must, therefore, give as connected a form as circumstances will permit to my argument. For this reason, I passed over some things in the speech of yesterday that I might finish my first argument this morning. I unfortunately, however, forgot to notice them before I commenced my second proposition.

I will now recapitulate.—

The question was asked me, yesterday evening, "Where was the true church before the time of the Greek schism?" I observed, this morning, in answer, that my having shown the Greek church to be the senior, or the original of the Roman, did not necessarily involve the idea *that the Greek church was at the time of separation the true Catholic church*. To this answer the gentleman has not replied; but yet reiterates the question. His assumption of a church of nations with a political head, having always existed, so confounds him that he cannot see a church without a pope, or a national establishment. I might ask, in reply, where was the church before the days of Constantine?

We can, however, show that from the earliest times there has existed a people whom no man can remember, that have earnestly and consistently contended for the true faith *once* delivered to the saints. If he requires me to put my finger on the page of history on which is described the commencement of the degeneracy of the Roman diocese from the true faith, I will turn back to about the year of our Lord 250. Then the controversy between Cornelius and Novatian, about the bishopric of Rome, embraced the points at issue, which separated the true

church from that which was then grievously contaminated with error and immorality. It was, indeed, a controversy about the purity of communion and discipline, rather than about articles of doctrine. And it is worthy of remark, that such was the principal issue made at that time, although the doctrine of christianity will not long continue pure in a degenerate community.

I have here, before me, Eusebius, the oldest of ecclesiastical historians, who informs us that Novatus and his party were called *Cathari* or *Puritans*. And, although he appears greatly incensed against Novatus and his party, he can record no evil against them except their "uncharitableness," in refusing to commune with those of immoral and doubtful character.

The gentleman has given you *his* definition of orthodoxy and herodoxy; *my* definition is—the *strong* party is the *orthodox*, and the *weak* party is the *heterodox*.

I hold in my hand one of the latest and best historians—Waddington. My learned opponent has already introduced him to your acquaintance. He is a Fellow of Trinity college, Cambridge, and Prebendary of Ferring, in the cathedral church of Chichester. The account he gives of these reformers is sustained by Jones and other ecclesiastical historians. I prefer Waddington for his brevity and perspicuity. He says:

"We may conclude with some notice of the sect of the Novatians who were stigmatized at the time both as schismatics and heretics; but who may perhaps be more properly considered as the earliest body of ecclesiastical reformers. They arose at Rome about the year 250, A. D., and subsisted until the fifth century throughout every part of Christendom. Novatian, a presbyter of Rome, was a man of great talents and learning, and of character so austere, that he was unwilling, under any circumstances of contrition, to re-admit those who had been once separated from the communion of the church. And this severity he would have extended not only to those who had fallen by deliberate transgression, but even to such as had made a forced compromise of their faith under the terrors of persecution. He considered the christian church as a society, where virtue and innocence reigned universally, and refused any longer to acknowledge as members of it, those who had once degenerated into unrighteousness. This endeavor to revive the spotless moral purity of the primitive faith was found inconsistent with the corruptions even of that early age: it was regarded with suspicion by the leading prelates, as a vain and visionary scheme; and those rigid principles which had characterized and sanctified the church in the first century, were abandoned to the profession of schismatic sectaries in the third."

This sounds a little like Protestantism. Our author proceeds:

"From a review of what has been written on this subject, some truths may be derived of considerable historical importance; the following are among them:—
1. In the midst of perpetual dissent and occasional controversy, a steady and distinguishable line, both in doctrine and practice, was maintained by the early church, and its efforts against those, whom it called heretics, were zealous and

persevering, and for the most part consistent. Its contests were fought with the 'sword of the spirit,' with the arms of reason and eloquence; and as they were always unattended by personal oppression, so were they most effectually successful—successful, not in establishing a nominal unity, nor silencing the expression of private opinion, but in maintaining the purity of the faith, in preserving the attachment of the great majority of the believers, and in consigning, either to immediate disrepute, or early neglect, all the unscriptural doctrines which were successively arrayed against it."

Other truths are here stated, as consequent from the premises. I will however for the satisfaction of my Episcopalian friends read what follows, in this connection on church government:

"There was yet no dissent on the subject of church government. It was universally and undisputably *Episcopal*; even the reformer Novatian, after his expulsion from the church, assumed the direction of his own rigid sect under the title of bishop; and if any dissatisfaction had existed as to the established method of directing the church, it would certainly have displayed itself on the occasion of a schism, which entirely respected matters of practice and discipline." *Hist. of the chh.*, p. 79.

These Puritans or reformers spread all over the world, and continued to oppose the pretensions of those who, from being the major party, claimed to be the Catholic or only church. They continued under the name of Novatians for more than two centuries; but finally were merged in the Donatists, who, indeed, are the same people under another name. These Donatists were a very large and prosperous community. We read of 279 Donatist bishops in one African council. Of these Donatists the same historian deposes:

"The Donatists have never been charged with the slightest show of truth with any error of doctrine, or any defect in church government or discipline, or any depravity of moral practice; they agreed in every respect with their adversaries, except one—they did not acknowledge as legitimate the ministry of the African church, but considered their own body to be the true, uncorrupted, universal church."

Mark it. The Donatists considered *their own body to be the true, uncorrupted, universal church!* "It is quite clear," our author proceeds:

"It is quite clear, that they pushed their schism to very great extremities, even to that of rejecting the communion of all, who were in communion with the church which they called false; but this was the extent of their spiritual offense, even from the assertions of their enemies." *Wad. Hist.*, p. 154.

The Donatists, in some two centuries, were amalgamated with the Paulicians. They, too, were called Puritans. Jones, who has been at the greatest pains to give their history, gives the following account of them:

"About the year 660, a new sect arose in the east, under the name of PAULICIANS, which is justly entitled to our attention.

"In Mananalis, an obscure town in the vicinity of Somosata, a person of the name of Constantine entertained at his house a deacon, who having been a prisoner among the Mahometans, was returning from Syria, whither he had been carried away captive. From this passing stranger Constantine received the precious gift of the New Testament in its original language, which even at this early period, was so concealed from the vulgar, that Peter Siculus, to whom we owe most of our information on the history of the Paulicians, tells us the first scruples of a Catholic, when he was advised to read the Bible was, "it is not lawful for us profane persons to read those sacred writings, but for the priests only." Indeed, the gross ignorance which pervaded Europe at that time, rendered the generality of the people incapable of reading that or any other book; but even those of the laity who could read, were dissuaded by their religious guides from meddling with the Bible. Constantine, however, made the best use of the deacon's present—he studied the New Testament with unwearied assiduity—and more particularly the writings of the apostle Paul from which he at length endeavored to deduce a system of doctrine and worship. 'He investigated the creed of primitive christianity,' says Gibbon, 'and whatever might be the success, a Protestant reader will applaud the spirit of the enquiry.' The knowledge to which Constantine himself was, under the divine blessing enabled to attain, he gladly communicated to others around him, and a christian church was collected. In a little time, several individuals arose among them qualified for the work of the ministry; and several other churches were collected throughout Armenia and Cappadocia. It appears from the whole of their history, to have been a leading object with Constantine and his brethren to restore as far as possible the profession of christianity to all its primitive simplicity." *Jones' Hist. Christian chh.*, p. 239.

Again:

"The Paulician teachers," says Gibbon, "were distinguished only by their scriptural names, by the modest title of their fellow pilgrims; by the austerity of their lives, their zeal and knowledge, and the credit of some extraordinary gift of the Holy Spirit. But they were incapable of desiring, or at least, of obtaining the wealth and honors of the Catholic prelacy. Such anti-christian pride they strongly censured."—*Id. ib.* p. 240.

I might read almost to the same effect from Waddington and Du Pin. True they are called *heretics* by those who call themselves Catholic and us heretics; but what does this prove?

Until the appearance of the Waldenses and Albigenses, these Protestants continued to oppose the church of nations in the east, and in the west, until at one time they claimed the title of Catholic. We read of hundreds of bishops attending the different councils in which they met to oppose the violent assaults of their enemies.

It is sometimes difficult to say which were the more numerous party, those in communion with the Cathari, or Puritans, sometimes called Novatians, sometimes Donatists, sometimes Paulicians, sometimes Waldenses; but always, in fact, Protestants.

The spirit of true religion seems to have fled from Rome from the first appearance of the Novatians. The first schism at Rome acknowledged and recorded by the Roman Catholic historians, is that which

occurred at the election of Cornelius over Novatus. Hence Novatus is called the first anti-pope. Du Pin and Barronius amply testify of the violence by which St. Peter's chair was often filled with a vicar after this schism. In the election of Damasus many were killed in the churches of Rome. One hundred and thirty four persons, beaten to death by clubs, were carried out of a single house at this election. Had the Holy Spirit any thing to do in thus filling the chair of St. Peter with a vicar of Christ? Is the church which permits such things and which has been sustained by such means, the true church of God? Is the person thus elected, the supreme head of Christ's church—the proper vicar of Christ?! May we not then say that the spirit of God on that day, had departed from Rome? And may we not add, from the documents before us, that if there be any truth in history, we have found a succession of witnesses for the ancient faith against Rome, from the days of the first schism till the present hour?

There is but another point in the speech of my opponent, to which I will now respond. I called on him to explain the difference between the claim of the title of pope, or universal father, (as St. Gregory opposed it,) and the same claim as now maintained by the head of the church. The name pope, indeed, has in modern times, much changed its meaning; for once it was applied to all bishops, and is now applied to every priest in the Greek church. But when has the title, "universal father," been changed? He alluded, in reply, to the schism between the Greek church and the Roman church. The Greek church, it seems, would not allow that the ordinances of religion without their sanction, were validly administered. Is not that the very plea of Rome at this hour? Does she not say, that the bishops and clergy of the English church are all *laymen*, because that church separated from the Roman church; and that all the authority she had from her has been since revoked by the authority that gave it? How often are we told that the pope has the power of resuming all authority given him—that he can create, and afterwards destroy? that whatever ecclesiastical power he gives, he can take away; and that therefore all heretics excommunicated and anathematized have no power left to perform the ordinances of religion? The ground upon which the gentleman stands as to his defence of the authority of the pope, is precisely the ground of Gregory's opposition to the title, as claimed by Boniface III., if I can understand his attempt to explain it.

But I must advert, before I sit down, to a single point on which I touched in my speech of this morning, viz. that of the councils. The gentleman asks, did not Sylvester the pope preside in the first general council by his legate? I affirm that he cannot show documents to

prove that fact.—Nay, let him show, if he can, that the first seven councils were called by the bishops of Rome, or that his legates were there to preside.

What would the gentleman prove by the fact, if it be a fact, that a Roman bishop presided over one of these councils? That, therefore, they were *Roman* councils? How would such logic pass with us with regard to the house of representatives? His argument runs thus: Mr. Henry Clay was once speaker of that house, Mr. Clay is from Kentucky, therefore the house of representatives were all *Kentuckians!* This would be exactly the pith of the logic we have heard.

My opponent admits the history of the first seven councils which I have given to be correct: but explains it by asserting that all the business was eastern. But *there were western heresies*, as well as eastern, and western business as well as eastern transacted in these councils. I therefore object to his exposition of that matter. It would have been impolitic on his exposition to call together eastern men to decide upon eastern heresies. They ought to have sent western men, who would have been more impartial judges. But he has not yet adduced one document, showing that these councils were called for such purposes, or that the east only was concerned in these questions.

On the prefix "*Catholic*" to the epistles, the gentleman did not hear me, or did not apprehend my meaning. The argument is not about its *antiquity* but its *authority!* He has not proved, and cannot prove that it was so prefixed in the first ages, nor that it was ever so applied by any inspired writer. Having brought no documents to prove this, his reasoning is wholly irrelevant.

But you have been treated, my friends, to a feast from the "*Baptist Banner*," one of the party ephemerals opposed to reformation. Unfortunately for the cause of religion, every age has produced a crop of these special pleaders for party tenets. Many such a banner was unfurled against Martin Luther, John Calvin, John Wesley and all reformers: for they were all heretics and controversialists. Indeed there never was a good man on earth who was not a controversialist. From the days of Abel and Noah till the present hour, the friends of truth have been heretical and controversial. But what has the Baptist Banner to do with the present points at issue? Is the gentleman so hard pressed as to form such alliances, to deliver himself or cause from ruin? I trust he will either keep, or be kept to the question in debate, and leave Protestants to settle their own controversies.—[Time expired.]

Twelve o'clock, M.

BISHOP PURCELL RISES---

I thought we should be placed under considerable obligations to my friend, for putting his finger upon the historic page that records the day and date of the apostasy of the Roman Catholic church from the true and holy Apostolic church, with so much precision. But now we are adjourned back nearly 1000 years, and yet nothing more definite than a "some time about the year 250!" Some time about! He does not tell us whether it was in one year, or another, that the church began to be corrupt. It was *some time about*, and so on. About this time, it seems, the Novatians separated from the church—well, Paul foresaw that such events would occur in the church's history—he foresaw that "ravenous wolves would enter the fold;" that dissensions would exist, at all successive periods, to the end of time—that every day new heretics would start up, who would deny the truth, introduce false doctrine, and trouble the people of God. The Novatians were one of these sects—and what did they teach? Why the most revolting and horrible doctrines; among others, the doctrine that a convert to christianity, who, in times of peril and temptation, nay *even when compelled by physical force*, should forsake his creed, could never be restored, no matter how sincerely penitent. Who that feels his frailty and knows that his heart in an evil hour might stray from duty, does not revolt at such a doctrine, that for one offence would cut him off forever! God dealt not so with Adam, nor Christ with Peter, when at the voice of a woman, and in an evil hour, even *his* strong heart failed him. He admitted him to mercy, received him back to his bosom, and made him the rock of his church.

But if all heretics are right, and this among the number—if the church was wrong in separating herself from these men—if it is her duty to say to the upholder of false doctrine "all hail," you are as free from error, as incorrupt and immaculate, as we are, come partake with us, we are of one communion; the rule should, according to the gentleman's logic, *work both ways*, and Rome has as good a right as any other to be called the church of Christ. On the other hand, if the Novatians were right, as he says they were, in excluding others, the church was right in excluding them. The speech of heretics, St. Paul tells us, 2d Tim. ii. 17, spreadeth like a cancer; he elsewhere says, that evil communication corrupts good manners; and the Pagans were not insensible to the wisdom of the distich—

"Principiis obsta; sero medicina paratur

"Cum mala per longas invaluere moras."

My friend must have forgotten his argument of this morning, when he said that the church of the living God should include none but the

pure and holy. If this be true, we must all give it up; for who is holy? Which of us can lay his hand upon his heart and say I AM WITHOUT sin? No, we are only holy in acknowledging our sinfulness and guilt in the sight of God, with humility and prayer. "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us! If we say we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to clear us from all iniquity." St. John, Ep. If such be the gentleman's requisitions, there can be no church of Christ in this erring world. There is none pure from defilement, says Job, and all are included as the objects of divine displeasure, from which only the blood of Christ, with faith, repentance and good works, can save us. If the gentleman insists on applying a test which would require absolute perfection to enable us to endure it, there is no such holiness, that I am aware of, exhibited in this probationary state. My friend may feel a proud consciousness that he is a happy instance of its existence, but for my part, I cannot, I should not think it safe to lay the flattering unction to my soul. I would advise no man to do so, while the great St. Paul commands us to work out our salvation with fear and trembling; and tells us, he chastised his own body, lest while he preached to others he himself "should become a reprobate." 1st Cor. ix. 27. It is our duty to acknowledge that we are frail and sinful mortals even like the rest of men. Establish a contrary rule, and pride digs one abyss after another beneath our feet, and there will not be left one virtuous feeling, one sound principle upon which we can take our stand to make a last appeal to heaven for mercy! When Christ empowered the church to throw her nets into the sea of human life, as the apostles did into the lake, she gathered in it fishes, both good and bad; when the nets are hauled ashore, the good fish will be selected and the bad thrown back into the sea. So will it be at the end of the world. The angels of God will come forth and select the elect from the reprobate—they will gather the wheat into the garner, but the tares they will burn with unquenchable fire. The Catholic church with a consciousness of man's true condition in this life, and a liberality which does her honor, and which, all agree, ought to belong to the fold of Christ, permits all to join in her religious festivals and exterior communion who profess the same faith, and are willing to submit to her decisions as her children.

But mark the distinction between the body and the soul of the church, all who profess the true faith, assist at the same religious exercises and obey the same pastors, belong to the body of the church and are therefore numbered among her children; but to faith and exterior

communion of which alone man can take cognizance, must be added hope and love and grace with God, that we may belong to the soul of the church. Of the latter the church does not undertake to decide. This she leaves to God who alone can see the heart. She, herself, judges not the inscrutable things of the spirit of a man, but contents herself with knowing and teaching that nothing can escape the piercing and all-seeing eye of God, who will render to every man according to his works, on that day when the hope of the hypocrite shall perish. Hence, as long as one of her members disqualifies not himself for the communion of the faithful by flagrant impiety, notorious depravity, or scandalous excess, she rejects him not; but like that charity of which St. Paul speaks, 1st Cor. xiii., "is patient, is kind, thinketh no evil, rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth with the truth, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things, with modesty admonishing men, if peradventure God may give them repentance."

The gentleman quoted from Waddington the history of the Novatians. He says, they continued, how long I know not, but *TILL!* (forget not the word,) *till* they merged in the sect of Donatists. The expressive word *till* is enough. There is no such fatal and terminating word in Catholic history. The Catholic church is universal, and not sectarian. It is perpetual in duration, and is not *merged* as one wave of error is merged in or obliterated by another. The gentleman asserts, that the Donatists did not differ from the Novatians. This is incorrect. The Donatists fell from schism into errors which the Novatians had never adopted. They employed the "*savage Circumcellions*," as the protestant historian Waddington calls them, to pillage churches, murder Catholics, and perpetuate other acts of barbarity unheard of among the meek followers of Jesus Christ. What, too, will my friend say to the uncontrollable propensity to suicide, which they were accused of encouraging and indulging with dreadful frequency? Not so the true church—she comes like Jesus Christ to call sinners to repentance, and heal the contrite of heart—she employs his own inviting, and attractive, accents of pity and compassion:—"Come to *me* all you that labor and are heavy burdened, and *I* will refresh you, not drive you to despair, to acts of self-destruction; and you shall find rest for your souls." Matthew xi, 28. A hard heart will fare badly in the end, says the scripture, and consequently every feeling of justice and humanity revolts at the idea that the Novatians could have been animated by the meek spirit of Jesus Christ, when they condemned to eternal exclusion from the church for a single, and that, frequently, a compulsory fault, as when an individual was condemned by brute force to offer incense to the idols, or the Donatists, who revolted against the

authority of the African bishops, and ravaged the countries where they prevailed with a lawless soldiery. Is this the meek church of him who came to preach deliverance to captives? Must we palliate these and a hundred similar excesses, to criminate a church which would, if her mild counsels were obeyed, have averted these evils from mankind? Is it candid, is it just, to blame her without cause and to withhold praise where it is due? The Roman Catholic church has never given the example of such cruelty. She on the contrary admits all sinners to repentance, she counts as belonging to her communion, all the children baptized in Protestant communions who die before they are capable of committing mortal sin, or who living in invincible ignorance that they have been bred up in error, keep the commandments of God, and love him, as far as their knowledge of his divine nature will permit. All these belong to the soul of the church; and are consequently among the most precious of her fold. Even among the unenlightened Indians if any there be that keep inviolably the natural law and serve their Creator according to the best lights which they possess, these she enrolls among her children, and teaches us to consider them as objects of God's special mercy, whom he will not, according to St. Thomas Aquinas, fail to illustrate with the light of divine truth. For this purpose the resources of his wisdom, are like that wisdom, infinite. Thus while the Catholic church watches with the most scrupulous fidelity over the purity of faith, in her has the beautiful saying of the psalmist been fulfilled, "Mercy and truth have met one another, justice and peace have kissed." Ps. lxxxiv. 11.

By what ingenuity can the gentleman flatter himself he will establish the claims of the discordant and evanescent sects of these early ages to the title of Catholics? Sisyphus-like, these sects which he is laboring so hard, so vainly, to roll up to the summit of that "mountain placed upon the top of mountains," spoken of by Is. ii. 2., and which is the aptest figure of the Catholic church, to which all nations flow, will fall upon him and crush him. He can never prove them Catholic in *time*, in *place*, or in doctrine. The Novatians did not slip into the Donatists, nor the Donatists into the Paulicians; there was no common bond of union, no identity of doctrine, among these heterogeneous sects. As it is the same sun which took its station in the heavens at the creation that now shines over us, so it is the same religion that was taught eighteen hundred years ago by Jesus Christ, that irradiates us at this very day with the light of truth; and not more difficult would it be to count all the vapors, mists and clouds, that passed athwart the bright luminary of day since he first gladdened the universe with his beams than to enumerate the numberless sects that

have cast their shadows on the light of Catholic holiness, and purity, and truth, since the origin of christianity. They have passed, or are fast passing away for ever, while she lasts on, and will last till the end of time. "I have seen the wicked," says the Psalmist, xxxvi. 35, "highly exalted, and lifted up like the cedars of Lebanon. And I passed, and lo! he was not, and his place was not to be found." This is a glorious indication of the stability of the Catholic church—of the truth of the power that sustains her. And as she signalized her triumph over all the false gods of Paganism, by establishing the church of All Saints, and of the God who made them saints, on the ruins of the greatest of idolatrous temples, so does she signalize her triumph over all sects and heresies, falsely professing to be christian, by the august pontiff who speaks to the eternal city and the Catholic world. From the inspiration of scripture, and of splendid facts, I pass to the inspiration of poetry, I care not whose, and close the words of my argument in the words of Byron:

"But thou of temples old, or altars new,
 Standest alone—with nothing like to thee
 Worthiest of God, the holy and the true!
 Since Zion's desolation, when that He
 Forsook his former city, what could be
 Of earthly structures in his honor pil'd
 Of a sublimer aspect? Majesty,
 Power, glory, strength, and beauty, all are aisl'd,
 In this eternal ark of worship undefil'd."
 * * * * *

My friend has dwelt eloquently upon riots in the church in particular seasons of excitement. But shall a society forfeit all claims to regard, because, in seasons of high excitement, differences of opinion proceed to violence? or a few bad people come to blows? It has happened, and may happen among all denominations, even the most peaceful sects, and every body of men; (instances were here specified.) A riot may take place at an election of president, and blood be shed; but does this affect the title of chief magistrate of this union? Is he to lose his office because blows were struck during the election? and if the pope could not always be elected peaceably, by reason of the disturbances created by men, was the succession to cease, and was there never to be a pope again, or a bishop, or any other pastor in the church? was Christ not God because Peter, the servant Malchus, shed blood for him? See the terrible effects of my friend's bad reasoning. The deist has availed himself of it, and denied the God of the Old Testament, because exterminating wars, as we there read, were waged at his command. We must make allowances for the passions and

DEBATE ON THE

weaknesses of human nature; but the aim of religion is to correct, to heal, if she cannot entirely remove them. When the pope was elected, in the case alluded to, he restored order. As Christ said to Peter, so said he to the mob excited by Novatian, "Put up again thy sword into its place, for all that take the sword shall perish with the sword." Matthew xxvi. 52.

The gentleman asked me to tell him in what objectionable sense the bishop of Constantinople claimed the title of Universal Father. It was in a sense never used before; he had no title to it; he assumed too much in claiming it. Again, it was he who pretended that no sacrament could be administered but by his authority. The Catholic church teaches that, however *illicitly* he may exercise it, no authority on earth can take even from a degraded priest the *power* of consecrating. Schismatical bishops, when duly ordained themselves, could ordain bishops, priests and inferior clergy. We admit the baptism of Methodists and Baptists by aspersion, or immersion, as I have already explained; and even the orders of the English Episcopal church are contested, on the ground of the very serious doubt whether the first of their bishops was, himself, consecrated by a bishop, or if so, by a valid formulary.

My friend was not at all accurate in stating the number of bishops present at some of the first councils. There were more present at them, as I can easily shew, than he has stated. He draws a parallel between the council of Nice and the house of representatives. I do not understand the force of his analogy. If that council belonged exclusively to the Greeks, why did they permit a Latin to preside? But it was to shew the world that they admitted the authority of Rome that Osius, the pope's legate, presided—and without his signature, and the pope's approbation, their acts would have had no force as rules of Catholic faith. What analogy is there between Henry Clay and Osius? Did they stand in the same relation to their respective assemblies? Did they ever dream that they would be placed in juxtaposition? If the speaker of the house, or the president of the senate, were to object to the passing of a law, would his veto avail anything? would not the majority rule?

My friend said, first, that *Catholic* was a new term; and next, when he found it impossible to prove that, insisted it was not used to designate the church, by inspired writers. I have abundantly disproved both of these assertions. The apostles were inspired writers, and it dates from their time; and they alone, according to the rule of St. Augustus, had the right to institute it. Besides, what are all the glorious prophecies of the universal diffusion of the church by Isaiah, &c.,

&c., but the evidence that it should be what its name imports? In fact, it was *Catholic* before *all* the New Testament was completed. And the apostles, aware of the doubts that error would originate on the authority of the church, gave a sure and unerring guide to every sincere believer, teaching him to say, next after the profession of his belief in God himself—not, I believe in the bible—it is not once mentioned—not in any sect—there were none heard of at that time—but “I believe in the holy Catholic church.”—[Time expired.]

Three o'clock, P. M.

MR. CAMPBELL rises—

I may have been mistaken in ascribing to the bishop of Rome what was done by the bishop of Constantinople, in reference to the personal consecration of the successor of Mauritius; but this does not affect the justice of my remark, or invalidate my reasoning: and I think my worthy friend apprehends this, inasmuch as the consecration was approved and sustained by Gregory. I read those documents at the same time, and may have confounded them, but we shall hear them again and see how much is either gained or lost by the admission.

“As a subject and a christian, it was the duty of Gregory to acquiesce in the established government, but the joyful applause with which he salutes the fortune of the assassin, has sullied with indelible disgrace the character of the saint. The successor of the apostles might have inculcated with decent firmness the guilt of blood, and the necessity of repentance: he is content to celebrate the deliverance of the people and the fall of the oppressor; to rejoice that the piety and benignity of Phocas have been raised by providence to the imperial throne; to pray that his hands may be strengthened against all his enemies; and to express a wish, perhaps a prophecy, that, after a long and triumphant reign, he may be transferred from a temporal to an everlasting kingdom.”*—*Gibbon Hist. Dec. and Fall Rom. Emp. vol. viii. p. 211.*

Now this, if I mistake not, amounts in substance to my affirmation. Gregory approved the usurpation, and sanctioned the induction into office of a man who had wrested the throne from the legitimate master, and who was both a murderer and a usurper.

I could wish that my opponent would select some of the great points of my argument in his replies, and form an issue with me. Were this piece of history blotted out of existence, what loss to the main argument? These are merely incidental and minor matters—illustrations

*Gregor. I. xi. epist. 38, indict. vi. Benignitatem vestræ pietatis ad imperiale fastigium pervenisse gaudemus, lætentur cœli et exultet terra, et de vestris benignis actibus universæ reipublicæ populus nunc usque vehementer afflictus hilarescat, &c. This base flattery, the topic of Protestant invective, is justly censured by the philosopher Bayle, (Dictionnaire Critique, Gregoire I. Not. H. tom. II. p. 597, 598.) Cardinal Barronius justifies the pope at the expense of the fallen emperor.

rather than proofs, and leave the great facts as they were. I must, however, briefly glance at some other little things before I resume my argument.

The gentleman's next remark was, "that Joshua was the successor of Moses." True it is, that every man is in one sense successor to some one who has preceded him. But Moses was, for a time, captain, prophet, priest, and king of Jeshurun. Joshua, however, merely commanded the people, and divided the land of Canaan among them. This did not Moses: Moses accomplished all that he was appointed to do. He needed no successor in the peculiar work assigned him. They were both extraordinary offices. Moses was a law-giver, and Joshua a savior. The law was given to the people by Moses: Joshua gave them an inheritance. Neither of them, in the nature of things, could have a successor in the same office, for its duties were all discharged.

I was pleased to hear the gentleman admit all that I said concerning the Novatians. They had one fault which we both allow—they were too severe in one branch of discipline—they could never receive those who had grievously fallen—no repentance would obtain re-admission if the penitent had very flagrantly sinned. The occasion was this: In the interim of the Pagan persecutions, many new converts were added to the churches. By and by, when the storm of persecution arose, they withdrew and fell away: but when a calm ensued, they sought to be restored to the church. The Novatians opposed their restoration; the other party contended for it. The Puritans got vexed with the frequent indulgences and backslidings of such professors; and this occasioned that extreme on their part, which drew down upon them many anathemas from the other party. They had other objections besides this against the opposing party; but this was sufficient for a division.

I was sorry to hear the gentleman excusing the church for embracing in its bosom men of every sort of wickedness. He spoke with great feeling and eloquence upon the subject of calling ourselves holy, &c. We admit that there is no man free from all pollution, whose heart is always and only pure. But what has this to do with the openly wicked and profane—reprobates of the deepest dye? Ought the church to open her doors as wide as the human race, and admit every human being without discrimination? Is there no medium? He quoted the parable of the tares and wheat. It is true, the Savior commanded to let the tares and wheat grow together till harvest: but the gentleman *assumed* that it was spoken of the *church*. I admit the doctrine, as applied to the world. "*The field is the world,*" not the church, said the Savior. Does this excuse us for tolerating reprobates *in the bosom*

of the church? "You are not of this world," says the Savior to his disciples—"My kingdom is not of this world," "Come out from among them, and separate yourselves, and I will receive you, says the Almighty Father. What concord has Christ with Belial, or he that believeth with an infidel?"

As to the "continuation of the Novatians *till* the Donatists, and the Dónatists *till* the Paulicians." &c., my friend emphasizes the word *till*, as if those witnesses for Christ had died away when some new sect arose. The fact is, that when some great leader arose, his name was imposed upon all that associated with him; and different leaders, in various parts of the world, moved great masses of professors, who were essentially the same people; and when they became acquainted with each other, they coalesced under one great profession, variously nicknamed by the opposite party. So are the Lutherans, Calvinists, Wesleyans, Cameronians, &c., of our own time.

Sorry was I to hear my liberal antagonist compare the Protestant sects to the psalmist's description of a prosperous wicked man—"I saw," says he, "the wicked great in power, spread himself like a green bay tree: he passed away; yea, he was not. I sought him, and he could not be found." I do not know how his Episcopalian friends will thank him for this compliment. I have no doubt in this he was sincere, for the Romanists often bewailed the long life of Elizabeth, because, under her reign, a new race of Protestants was born and educated, and alienated from the Roman hierarchy, who were proof against all the machinations of Rome. They hoped that the Protestant Episcopalians would, like the green bay tree of David, (emblem of the prosperous wicked,) have withered away, and been reabsorbed by the mother church; but for once the application failed, and the wicked Protestants have for three centuries grown and increased, in despite of all the policy and effort of Rome, and are now in expectation of seeing the same 37th psalm verified in the fates of Roman Catholicism.

Every sect and individual, as I said before, is passive in receiving a name. Sectarian names are generally given in the way of reproach; thus the disciples were first called christians at Antioch, most probably in derision; yet it was a very proper name. Call us what you please, however, it does not change nature or race. The disciples of Christ are the same race, call them Christians, Nazarenes, Galileans, Novatians, Donatists, Paulicians, Waldenses, Albigenses, Protestants, or what you please. A variety of designation affects not the fact which we allege; we can find an unbroken series of Protestants—a regular succession of those who protested against the corruptions of the Roman church, and endeavored to hold fast the faith once delivered to

the saints, from the first schism in the year 250, A. D., to the present day; and you may apply to them what description or designation you please.

The gentleman spoke of these sects as waves passing by while the true church remained like a wall, immovable and unchangeable. History refuses him her suffrage in this assumption: for it deposes that she has changed, in whole, or in part, her tenets and her discipline, no less than eighteen times in all—that is, once, at least for every general council. She is the mutable immutable church, contending for uniformity in faith and variety of discipline.

My opponent has quoted the apostles' creed. Du Pin, and a learned host prove that the apostles never wrote it. The doctrine contained in it, I admit is apostolic. And it is worthy of remark that like all old creeds, it states *facts*; whereas modern creeds are human expositions of *doctrines*. For my own part, I can adopt every article of that creed, *ex animo*; except, perhaps, I would change one expression, and say that "I believe in a Catholic church." I believe that there does exist such a thing as a truly Catholic church of Christ. But as for human creeds, I make no such platforms a bond of union among christians. We, like the Romanists, differ about church discipline among ourselves: but all the Protestant world believes this "apostles' creed," as it is called; and are as uniform in this faith as the "mother church" herself.

I was sorry to hear the election of the pope, the pretended vicar of Christ, as respects riots, and blows, and carnage, compared to that of the president of the United States, and to have the excesses complained of in Rome, excused on the ground, that sometimes we have mobs, and perhaps a fight on a presidential election. Is the presidential chair of such dignity and sanctity as that of the vicar of Christ?! And is a riot or murder no more incongruous in the one case than in the other? We opine, that he who holds that exalted station should come into it without blood. And yet in all these political elections, since the Protestant reformation, there is nothing to equal half the uproar, and tumult, and murder, that happened in filling the chair of St. Peter, at the conflict between Damasus and Ursinus, not to mention a second. Can it be compared to the election of the president so as to transfer to the one the language which is *pertinent* to the other? As, for example, "Take heed to the flock over which the HOLY SPIRIT has placed you!"

The gentleman is glad that his church is *so liberal* as to authorize every sort of baptism, even that performed by heretics, provided only the proper name be pronounced! This is certainly a modern excess

of liberality! If I am rightly informed, his predecessor, in this very charge, was not so liberal as he—in one case, at least, which occurred at Portsmouth in this state. There were two members of the Episcopal church, one of the parties the son of an Episcopalian minister, desirous of entering into matrimony. Bishop Fenwick desired to know of what party they were, and on learning that they were Episcopalian, refused to marry them, unless previously baptized by himself. There may be many other instances of the same sort, certainly, in former times there were many, and so far as they prove that the church is not immutable, are hopeful indications of the possibility of reform. But this is not the question before us. We are not discussing baptism, or the eucharist, or any of the “seven sacraments,” or any ordinance of the church. Will the gentleman inform us whether his church regards the administration of the eucharist, or any other of her seven sacraments valid, unless at the hand of those whom she authorizes to minister them? Let him not wave the question by a reference to a practice which he knows can be explained on other principles.

I shall not now stop to dispute about Sylvester and the council of Nice: but shall resume my general argument where I left off.

All agree that if primacy or supremacy reside in the church at all, it must reside *in some person*. If Jesus Christ intended to make Peter the prince of apostles, the vicar of Christ; the title will prove it clearly. If this headship, on the other hand, was not given to Peter; none can derive it from him by succession. Was Peter invested with this authority? If not, none can pretend to it as his successors. The whole question rests on this. My learned opponent cannot show that Peter ever had such an office. He affirms, indeed, that Peter was superior to the rest of the apostles: but does he show in what respect? How many kinds of superiority might there have been in his case? I will answer for him and say that there are, at least, *four*. 1st. of age, 2nd. of talents, 3d. of character, and 4th. of office. These are clearly marked in holy writ, and fixed in society. Admit then that Peter is head of the list; can he decide which of these four has placed him first? The bishop *asserts* that he was first in *office*. But how can he take this for granted, when there are three other ways in which Peter might be at the head? Is this the reasoning that logic or Catholicism sanctions or requires?

I would request the gentleman to tell us, how he knows which of these four sorts of superiority to ascribe to Peter? He assumes one, and is bold in asserting the Catholic doctrine of a supreme head of the church on this assumption. Peter may have been the oldest, or the first called of all the apostles: or his character or talents may have given him a decided superiority; why then assume one, to the exclu-

sion of the others? The greatest empires have been built on the most bold assumptions. But never was there a more baseless monarchy in the annals of time than that of papal Rome. I wish my opponent would for once assume, or take up some one of these grand points, on which his church rests, and not waste his time in fighting about shadows or peccadillos. Let him come at once to the great principles of the debate. I challenge him to show cause, why he assumes for Peter a supremacy of office, rather than of age, of talent, or of character; any one of which is much more feasible and probable than that which he has begged.—[Time expired.]

Half past 3 o'clock, P. M.

BISHOP PURCELL rises—

I was far from charging Mr. C. with a wilful dereliction of the truth, when he stated, what he now confesses to be untrue, that Gregory crowned Phocas. The imputed motive was very base, but he now sees that it was not the pope's. I attribute this extraordinary mistake, on the part of my friend, to the fact of his having been too apt to believe that every thing written against Catholics must be true, and to his memory's not having been lately refreshed in his early readings. But it is due to the public that he should apologize for having, through want of care on a matter of so much importance, fallen into so very serious a mistake in what was calculated so deeply to injure the truth. He should first have inquired whether all he said was true. I repeat, then, that Gregory did not crown Phocas at all, much less for the express purpose of eliciting from the gratitude of the sovereign an acknowledgment of his "papal supremacy," for this recognition was as old as Christianity. Order was restored to Constantinople. He then sent him words of compliment on his accession. It is contrary to the rules of sound argument to presume that Gregory approved of the circumstances which led to the change of dynasty. Napoleon grasped the Iron crown of Italy, from the altar and put it on his brow, for he acknowledged no Donor thereof but the sword. So would Phocas, very probably have done with the crown of C., whatever Gregory might have thought of the act. Moreover, Phocas did not hurl Mauritius from the throne. Mauritius abdicated, and the people, not the bishop of C. P. made Phocas king, in the place of Mauritius, a miser, and a tyrant; and Gregory rejoiced, not at the disturbances but at the restoration of order. My friend now treats these matters as light, and incidental. It was he himself who made them principals, by the manner in which he introduced them. He was arguing a knotty point, the manner in which Rome came to "assume" her high prerogative over the church. The plain, scriptural truth, that she came to it by divine appointment

was before his eyes, but he would not see it. Is it to be wondered at that he saw in history what was not there! I will say no more on the subject of Joshua. Eusebius confirms, p. 46, what I have said. The object of the ministry of the old or of the new law, of the coming of Christ, of the shedding of his blood, and all the institutions of his religion, was not the setting up of a tabernacle in the wilderness, or the crossing of the Jordan, or the surveying of a piece of land and dividing it among a few tribes, but the SALVATION OF MANKIND, without any exception, or distinction of age, or clime; and this great work of regeneration and redemption is just as important now, and will continue so while there are IMMORTAL SOULS to be enlightened and saved, as it was in the days of the apostles. Their office must remain, and their successors are charged with it. The bishops and their assistant brethren watch over the safety of the fold, and the sovereign pontiff sees that they and their flocks persevere in unity. He watches over all.

Mr. C. persists in saying that the Novatians, Donatists, Paulicians, &c., &c., agreed in doctrine, and may be considered as the Catholic church. I have already refuted this theory, but here is Protestant testimony again to destroy it, and I hope we shall not waste any more time on it, for it is too absurd. "No heretic," says Waddington, p. 154, "was as likely as the Donatist to lay claim to the name Catholic; yet even a Donatist, while he maintained that the true spirit and purity were alone perpetuated in his own communion, would scarcely have affirmed that that was *bona fide* the universal church, *which did not extend beyond the shores of Africa, and which had not the majority even there.*" Speaking of the sects in Dauphine and other errorists condemned at Arras in 1025, the same author says, (p. 554,) "It is proper to mention what these opinions really were, which were condemned at Arras, lest it should be supposed that they were at variance only with the Roman Catholic church, and strictly in accordance with apostolic truth." "It was asserted that the sacrament of baptism was useless and of no efficacy to salvation, (what does Mr. C. think of this?) that the sacrament of the Lord's supper was equally unnecessary.—It appears that the objections of the heretics on this point went beyond the mere denial of the change of substance—that the sacred orders of the ministry were not of divine institution—that penance was altogether inefficacious—that marriage in general was contrary to the evangelical and apostolical laws—that saint-worship is to be confined to the apostles and martyrs, &c., &c., so mixed and various is the substance of those opinions to which learned writers on this subject appeal with so much satisfaction." Again, "They were all tainted more or less deeply by the poison of Manichæism: and since it is our object to establish a connection with the primitive church, we

shall scarcely attain it through those whose fundamental principle was unequivocally rejected by that church, as irrational and impious." 555.

Mosheim says, 1st vol. p. 328, "Among the sects that troubled the Latin church, this century, (the 12th) the principal place is due to the Cathari, or Catharists, whom we have had already occasion to mention. This numerous faction, leaving their first residence, which was in Bulgaria, *spread themselves* throughout almost all the European provinces, where they occasioned *much* tumult and disorder. Their religion resembled the doctrine of the Manicheans and Gnostics, on which account they commonly received the denomination of the former, though they differed in many respects from the genuine primitive Manicheans. They all indeed, agreed in the following points of doctrine, viz., that matter was the source of all evil; that the creator of this world was a being distinct from the supreme deity; that Christ was neither clothed with a real body, nor could be properly said to have been born, or to have seen death; that human bodies were the production of the evil principle, and were extinguished without the prospect of a new life. They treated with the utmost contempt all the books of the Old Testament, but expressed a high degree of veneration for the New." Speaking of the Waldenses, p. 332, Mosheim says, "They committed the government of the church to bishops, presbyters and deacons, but they deemed it absolutely necessary that all these orders should resemble exactly the apostles of the divine Savior, and be like them *illiterate*, &c., &c. The laity were divided into two classes, one of which contained the *perfect* and the other the *imperfect* christians." Of another sect, the Pasaginians, Mosheim says, p. 333, "They circumcised their followers, and held that the law of Moses, in every thing but sacrifice, was obligatory upon Christians." What the same Protestant historian says of the brethren of the free spirit is too horrid. It is the foulest of the many foul pages he has stained with the history of sects. "They maintained that the believer could not sin, let his conduct be ever so horrible and atrocious." The celebrated Ziska, not a Roman Catholic inquisitor, but the austere general of the Hussites, another sect of Protestants, falling upon this miserable sect in 1421, "put some to the sword and condemned the rest to the flames." Mosheim, 428. "A sect of fanatics called *Caputiati*, infested Moravia and Burgundy, the diocese of Auxerre, and several other parts of France, *in all which places they excited much disturbance among the people*. They declared publicly that their purpose was, to level all distinctions, to abrogate magistracy, to remove all subordination among mankind, and to restore that primitive liberty, that natural equality, which were the inestimable privileges of the first mortals." Mosheim, p. 333. Luther repeatedly declared that he stood

alone, that all antiquity was against him. Here are startling facts and no less startling admissions by sound Protestants. Will my friend insult this enlightened assembly by making up a monster-church, a very chimera, of all these sects, and give modern Protestants all the honors present and prospective of being the *tail of the beast*? I would counsel *him* not to dream of doing so, and *them* to look out for more reputable religious ancestors.

But the Roman Catholic church has changed at least in discipline. Grant it. And what of that? Is it not the very nature of discipline that it must be modified by times, places, peculiarities of nations and other circumstances, in order to be adapted to the wants of man in all the varieties of his being? Truth is unsusceptible of change. Like God it is always the same. But the form of the dress of the clergy, the color of the wine to be used at mass, days of fasting and abstinence, and of public meetings for prayer and certain unessential rites in the administration of the sacraments, may be changed. The constitution of the church should possess this element of good government. She has the power to make these changes, and she has made them as the wants of her children seemed to require. But the doctrine is invariable. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but, of it, not an iota shall change.

As to the deaths occasioned in the election of a pope, I ask again, what has that to do with the constitutionality of the office? The pope did not slay those people. According to the gentleman's theory, the president of this union would have to answer for the blood, if any, spilled at his election. I am astonished that such arguments should be repeated. I can say with certainty of my venerable predecessor that he **would** not have pursued the course, he did, if the story be true, if he **had** had reason to believe the individuals had never been baptized—and if any two or more young people will come to me, who have been rightly baptized in Protestant communions, I warrant them, if there be no other obstacles, they shall be quickly bound together in the indissoluble bonds of matrimony.

I am perfectly willing to revert to the point of the supremacy of St. Peter and the continuance of his high authority in his successors, for it is a cardinal doctrine. It solves a thousand lesser points of difficulty; and I am happy to argue it again from the New Testament, from church history, from reason. I have already quoted scripture for the dogma of the supremacy of Peter—"upon this rock I will build my church." My friend does not like to approach that rock,—He takes care to keep shy of it. I also quoted "feed my lambs,—feed my sheep"—"To thee I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven,"—"Blessed art thou, Simon,"—and "when thou art anointed confirm

thy brethren," &c. All these texts, and more, did I quote, and the gentleman has had my authority before him. I shall now strengthen my quotation from the fathers, adducing overwhelming facts to prove that Peter was bishop of Rome and that the bishops of that see have EVER been regarded in the Catholic church as his successors. Many of my hearers may suppose that this matter is buried in the night of time—that history is either silent, or not sufficiently clear upon it. But when they hear the splendid testimonies I am going to adduce, they will change their minds on this subject, and confess that, from time immemorial, in the very earliest ages, the church was precisely the same, in its faith, its sacraments, its hierarchy, its clergy, &c., &c., that *the Catholic* church is at the present day. (Here Bishop Purcell held up the map of the succession of popes from the first, Peter himself, down to the present pontiff, Gregory XVI.; the names of all the most eminent men in the church; the date of the establishment of the gospel in the various countries of the world, the origin and authors of the various heresies and schisms, their condemnation by general councils, or synods, &c., &c.) let any other exhibit such an array!

Christ Jesus said to his apostles "go, teach *all* nations." They went! they preached every where, and the world believed! before their death they ordained others whose names are here faithfully recorded. Here is the ecclesiastical history of Eusebius, and according to the pun upon his name (you see by us) you will see by him what a flood of light irradiates this subject. Eusebius wrote in the 4th century, and to remove all suspicion I bring before you the translation of his history by a Protestant minister, C. F. Cruse, A. M., Assistant Professor of the university of Pennsylvania, 2d. edition, revised and corrected by the author. [The reading was interrupted by the half hour's expiring.*]

Four o'clock, P. M.

MR. CAMPBELL rises—

Is the original Greek of Irenæus extant? [The bishop intimates, "No."] Of what authority, then, is the version from which he reads? I have never read in Irenæus nor seen quoted from him a warrant for the assumption that Peter was ever bishop of Rome! But of this again—

After raising such a dust as the gentleman has about Phocas and Gregory, it has become necessary for me to re-state my argument.

Gregory the great wrote to Mauritius, requesting him to induce John, bishop of Constantinople, to give up his claim to the title of universal father. Mauritius would not do it. Gregory the great, is sup-

*The extract referred to will be found in a subsequent speech.

posed by all antiquity to have harbored a grudge, or bad feeling towards Mauritius, because of this; and therefore his exultation at his death, and his easy recognition of the pretensions of his murderer, which acquiescence, on his part, secured the compliance of Phocas with the wishes of Gregory, and secured to his successors the title of universal patriarch, or pope—

[Bishop PURCELL here observed, that Phocas was not the murderer of Mauritius.]

Very well, I have the authority of Gibbon for my assertion—not for saying that he killed him by his own hands: but by his authority, as he lays to Phocas the blood of Mauritius and his seven children, on the principle, *qui facit per alterum, facit per se*. He does himself what he does by an other. The said Phocas did afterwards, Barronius being a faithful witness, give the title of universal bishop to Boniface, Gregory's successor, and who can infer any thing else from all the circumstances, than I have done!

I thought the gentleman was about to produce authority to prove that Sylvester did call the council of Nice. This, I again assert he cannot do. If he think he can, let him attempt it, and we will show he cannot. We, however, do assert on the authority of Eusebius, and all ancient history, that Constantine the great did call the council of Nice; and we affirm on equal authority, that the pope's legate did *not* preside in that council. Whether Hosios did is problematical. It is inferred from the fact of his being present: but there is no historic authority for it. But all this is very subordinate and of little value. The whole question rests upon the inquiry, *What office had Peter?* What was his ecclesiastical power and patronage? Was Peter the prince of the apostles? Was he made the vicar of Christ? Ay, this is the question! It requires explicit—nay, positive scripture authority—where is it?

The gentleman offers several passages to this point. I shall examine the prominent texts, and begin with the 16th chapter of Matthew.—I read from Griesbach's Greek Testament. In this chapter, Christ asks his disciples the question, "Who do men say that I am?" and afterwards asks them, "But who say ye that I am?" and Peter answered: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God;" "and Jesus answered and said unto him, blessed are you, Simon Barjona, for flesh and blood has not revealed it to you, but my Father, who is in heaven: and I say also to you, that *you are Peter*, and upon *this rock* I will build my congregation and the gates of hades shall not prevail against it." Matth. xvi. 13-18.

"Upon this rock:" was Peter this rock? The words sound much alike, (*Petros* and *Petra*). Let us examine the passage. One of the

internal evidences of the truth of the apostolic writings is, that each writer has something peculiar to himself. So has every speaker and teacher, that has appeared amongst men. Jesus Christ himself had his peculiar characteristics. One of his peculiarities most clearly marked by the four evangelists is, that he consecrated every scene and circumstance and topic of conversation to religion or morality. A few examples, out of many that might be given, must suffice. When standing by the sea of Galilee, he says to the fishermen, who were casting their nets into the sea: "follow me, and I will make you *fishers of men*." At the well of Samaria, he says to a Samaritan woman, from whom he asked a drink—"Whoever shall drink of this water shall thirst again; but whoever drinks of the water that I shall give him, shall never thirst: but it shall be in him a well of water springing up to eternal life." While with his disciples in the temple, and seeing the sheep going up to be sacrificed, he says: "My sheep hear my voice, and they follow me;" and he speaks of himself as the true shepherd, who lays down his life for his sheep. His disciples having forgotten to take bread, when embarking on the lake, and when talking about it, he took occasion to say: "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees." When on Mount Olivet, among the vines and olives, he says, "I am the true vine, and my Father is the vine-dresser." And when looking at the temple, he says: "Destroy this temple, and I will build it in three days."—So in the passagè before us. He asks his disciples an all important question, in reply to which, one of them who happens to be named *Peter*, utters the great truth, upon which he is to found his church forever: "THOU ART THE CHRIST, (THE MESSIAH), THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD." Jesus turns to him and says: "Thou art *stone*, and upon *this rock* (on this great truth which flesh and blood has not revealed to thee), I will build my church."

Εἰ σὺ Πέτρος καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ—"*ei su Petros, kai epi taute te petra*"—"You are Peter and upon this *petra*," strikes the ear of a Grecian as "thou art *stone* and upon this *rock*," strikes the ear of an English man; and as we have seen is a part of the Savior's peculiarity.

The construction of language requires that the word "*this*" should refer to something antecedent different from *thou*, or you. They are different in *person* and in *case*. But not only does the Savior's peculiar characteristics, and the change of person from "*thou*" the personal, to *this* the demonstrative, fix the sense: but other considerations of great moment, forbid any other interpretation. For let me ask, why did Jesus propound the question to his apostles—why did he elicit from them so great a truth, if in the solemn declaration which immediately follows, he meant to pass by that truth and allude to Peter alone? This would be a solecism unprecedented—a case unparalleled.

The whole authority of the christian religion and all its excellency is embraced in the radical ideas which had been for the first time pronounced by the lips of man. There are, indeed, but three cardinal ideas in all christian doctrine: for there can be but three cardinal ideas about any being. Two of these are distinctly embodied in Peter's confession of faith. The whole three are, 1st the person, 2nd the office, and 3rd the character of Christ. Beyond these—*person, office and character*, what conception can mortals have of our Redeemer? Peter mouthed of these, the two which gave value to the third --The *person* and the *mission* of Jesus. He was the first mortal who, distinctly and intelligibly avowed the faith, in the person and mission of Jesus the Nazarene, upon which the empire of the ransomed race shall stand forever. This is the good confession spoken by Jesus himself at the hazard of his life, before Pontius Pilate, of which Paul speaks in terms of the highest admiration.

This great truth deservedly stands forward under the bold metaphor of the Rock. But still more creditable to this truth,—not “flesh and blood,” but the Heavenly Father first uttered it from Heaven. On the banks of the Jordan, when Jesus had honored his Father in his baptism, his Father honored him; and was it not worthy to be honored by proclaiming it from the opening sky, “*This is my Son, the beloved in whom I delight,*” while the descending Dove marked him out? A Pagan poet said,

“Never introduce a God unless upon an occasion worthy of him;”*

And who feels not the propriety of such an introduction here; for when first spoken, no angel in heaven, nor man on earth, could introduce the Messiah, in his proper person, but his own Father. Now, because Peter was the first to utter it, Jesus says to him: “I will give to you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever you shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.”

What a controversy there has been about these keys! Jesus gave them to Peter alone—not to him, his heirs, and successors forever! I was denoted as heterodox a few years since, because I alleged that the opening of the reign or kingdom of heaven, by Peter to Jews and Gentiles, was the true exposition of the keys. But I am glad to see this view promulged now from various reputable sources, even from Trinity College, Dublin. Peter opened the kingdom of heaven on the day of Pentecost, and by divulging a secret never told to that day, viz., “Let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God has made that Jesus, whom you crucified, both Lord and Christ.” This an-

*Nec Deus intersit nisi dignus vindice nodus--Inciderit.—Hor.

nunciation of the coronation, or *Christing*, that is *anointing* of Jesus king and governor of the universe, was a new revelation made on the Pentecostian morn by Peter. He declared remission on that day to 3000 souls, and introduced them into the kingdom of the *Messiah*. Again, when it pleased God to visit the Gentiles in the family of Cornelius, a Roman centurion; an angel sent from heaven, commanded him to send for Peter to Joppa to come and tell him and his relations "*words* by which himself and his friends might be saved." He did so. He sent, and Peter came. Why thus call upon Peter? Because Christ's gifts are without repentance. He had given him the keys. He therefore must open the two-leaved gate, and introduce both Jews and Gentiles into the kingdom. This being once done, needs not to be repeated. The gates of heaven have not since been locked. There is no more use for the keys. Peter has them yet. He took them to heaven with him. He did not will them to any heir or successor. The popes are fighting for shadows. Heaven never trusted such gentry with the keys. They might take into their heads to lock the heretics out. I thank God that he gave them to Peter, that Peter opened the gates of the kingdom of heaven to us all, and that as the popes cannot shut them, we do not need them a second time. Peter will guard them, till he who has the key of David, who opens and none can shut, will appear a second time. Thus we dispose rationally, and I think scripturally, of this grand text.

The next text upon which confidence is placed by my opponent, is where Christ says to Peter, "Feed my sheep, feed my lambs." Language has no meaning but from the context. Every word serves to fix the meaning of its contextual associates. We must read the 21st chapter of John's Testimony, from the beginning, if we would correctly understand this passage. The facts are: Peter and some of his brethren had returned to Galilee, disconcerted and overwhelmed with the events of the day. They felt themselves destitute, forsaken, and in need. While their master was with them he provided for them in some way. He could say, when I sent you without scrip or staff or money, did you lack any thing? They answered, no. But he was gone, and they knew not what to do. In this distress, Peter says, "I am going a-fishing," and the rest accompany him: but they toiled all night and caught nothing. In the morning they see the Savior walking on the shore; they know him not. He says to them, "Children, have you any meat?" They answer, "no." He tells them to cast on the other side of the bark. They do so and take a large number of fish. Peter, when he knew it was the Lord, girt his fisherman's garment around him, leaped into the lake, and swam ashore.

They dine together, and after they had eaten to satiety, Jesus says to Peter, "*Do you love me more than these?*"

My construction of these words is, "Do you love me more than these fish, or these victuals?" He then says to Peter, "Feed my lambs:" and the fact before him and all the circumstances say, *I will feed you.*

The bishop's construction is, "Do you love me more than these disciples love me?" But how could Peter answer such a question? Was he omniscient to know how much his companions loved his master? In that case he would have said, "Lord, I love thee, but I do not know how much my brethren love thee; they also love thee, but I know not whether I love thee more than they do." But suppose he could have known, then I ask, was it comely to ask so invidious a question? Would not they have felt themselves disparaged, if Peter had said, "Yes, Lord, I love thee more than all my fellow-apostles love thee!!!"

Peter had erred. He had become discontented—had forgotten his duty to his master, and had betaken himself to his former occupation of fishing, and induced the rest to join him. Christ asks him solemnly, "Do you love me more than these fish, these boats, nets, apparatus, or these victuals, this worldly employment? If so, cease to spend your time in providing food for yourself; but feed my sheep and lambs, and I will provide for you." Besides, he having caught nothing till the Master appeared, was a very striking lesson, which I presume Peter never forgot. I confess, I think the gentleman's interpretation of *sheep* as bishops, and *lambs* as laity, most singularly arbitrary and fantastic, and needs not a grave reply. So we dispose of the second grand text on which the church of Rome has leaned with so much confidence for so many ages.

My learned opponent has not yet afforded us evidence for his assumption of official supremacy for Peter. These texts reach not the case. They do not institute a new office bestowed on Peter, but are tokens of esteem, for reasons personal. Every privilege he received was on account of some personal pre-eminence, not because of an office which he held. The canon law has decreed that a personal privilege doth follow the person and is extinguished with the person. Now as all the honors vouchsafed Peter were in consequence of his promptness, courage, penitence, zeal, &c., they never can become the reasons of an hereditary office. His supremacy, or rather superiority, or primacy, most naturally arose from his being one of the first, if not *the first* convert—the oldest of Christ's disciples; because he was prompt, decided, courageous, zealous, ardent, and above all, he was a married man, had a wife and family. And although this fact might not comport with his being the fountain of penal authority, it obtained

him an honor above John the bachelor, and all the bachelors of that age!!

Once more on this subject—let me ask, who made a more voluntary surrender of himself to his master—who more promptly forsook all that he had, than he—who, when his Lord asked, will ye also leave me, with more ardor said: “Lord, to whom shall we go but to thee? for thou hast the words of eternal life?” Who more courageously, in the time of peril, drew his sword to defend his Master? who, when the Savior foretold his own sufferings and indignities, more affectionately and devotedly exclaimed, in the warmth of his heart, “Lord, it shall not be so done unto thee!”

It is true that this ardor of disposition, this promptness, this decision of character, sometimes betray their possessor into errors; yet who will not say, give me the man of energy and decision, and ardor of character? John was meek as a dove; he was innocent and amiable as a lamb, and the Lord loved him; but those bold and stern, and manly virtues he wanted, which gave so much interest to the character of Peter; and so admirably fitted him to stand forward and foremost, amongst his colleagues and fellow-apostles.—[Time expired.]

Half-past 4 o'clock, P. M.

BISHOP PURCELL rises—

Do you love me more than these fish!! My brethren, if the subject were not too serious, I should call my friend's construction a fish story!

Jesus Christ said to Peter, “lovest thou me more than these?” *plus his*—what, if fish? (*Ιχθυας*) *plus quam hos*. There is an end to all that argument.

MR. CAMPBELL. That is the Latin version. Let us have the Greek.

BISHOP PURCELL. The Greek is not more plain, nor will it prove your interpretation less revolting, less contrary to the obvious and more common interpretation of the text. Sad conclusion this, which my learned opponent reserved as his main reliance, for the last hour of the day! And is it thus that he proves the church of Rome to be neither catholic, apostolic, nor holy, but an apostasy from the only true, holy and apostolic church of Christ? He is heartily welcome to the proselytes this argument may gain to his tottering cause. Let learned Protestants now claim their champion's services in the difficult task of interpreting the scripture—or let them, as I have prophesied they would do, repudiate *his* advocacy.

The change of name from Simon to Peter, shows that Christ chose him to be, beyond the other apostles, a *rock*, or more firm, more constant, more immovable than they—and that forever—in the confession of his divinity, his real presence with his church and all the other

truths he had vouchsafed to reveal to the world. A rock does not melt.—The winds may beat and the rains may fall, but the house built upon a rock will stand, not for a few years, but forever. And as the rock, in the physical order loses not its nature, so neither do the promises of Christ lose their efficacy. "Thou art Peter, (or a rock) and on this rock, I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Matthew xvi. 18.

A professor of Andover College has published a volume, I think it is entitled "Elements of Sacred Criticism." I have examined this work, but my memory retains not the author's name,—perhaps some of the learned gentlemen present may aid it by the suggestion—however, he substantiates my interpretation, or rather that of all ages, by incontrovertible argument. And I confess the American College has, in this instance, a decided superiority, both in sound criticism and orthodoxy, over the "dumb sister," as the English and Scotch universities have invidiously, or facetiously, named Trinity College, Dublin.

There is one plausible difficulty, against the testimony of Peter's having fixed his residence at Rome, which the gentleman has overlooked, viz., that Paul does not mention Peter in his epistle to the Romans. To explain this, it is only necessary to observe, Paul wrote A. D. 57, in the reign of Claudius, when Peter was absent from Rome; and this the illustrious convert of Damascus knew. But why waste time on a subject undisputed for fifteen hundred years? Pearson, Grotius, Usher, Hammond, Blondel, Scaliger, Casaubon, Dumoulin, Petit, Basnage, all agree that Peter transferred his see to Rome and there suffered martyrdom.

And here another objection is overruled; he said there had been contests among the apostles, who should be greatest. He said that if Peter had confessed that he loved him most, a greater controversy would have arisen. But there was good cause to the contrary. Andrew saw him first—John reposed on his bosom, &c.—for many reasons, these disputes may have arisen—surely such objections after so great a mass of testimony deserved not serious attention.

I have long ago seen, in a little work written in Philadelphia, the remarks of my friend about the Savior's saying he was a vine, when among the vines, on mount Olivet, &c., &c. This is not therefore original or new.

I now take up a connected argument on the apostolicity of the church, for I wish this matter to go before the public in its peculiar strength. I look upon it as the most powerful argument that can be advanced in favor of the Catholic church. I read from Fletcher. His style is good.

“ Christ Jesus had called the apostles ‘ *fishers of men,*’ he had told them to ‘ *go and preach the gospel to every creature,*’ assuring them, at the same time, that ‘ *all power was given to him in heaven, and on earth,*’ and that ‘ *himself would be always with them.*’ Animated by this commission, and these assurances, and fired too with the love of God, and an ardent charity for men, these heroic victims of benevolence, did ‘ *go forth and preach.*’ They preached; and although the world with all its passions, prejudices and superstitions was leagued against them;—although its doctrines, which they preached, were repugnant to all the bad propensities of the heart, and exceeded far the measure of the human understanding; yet did an immense portion of the public, of the corrupted and the vicious, of the learned and the enlightened, hear them, and believe. They preached; and the love of vice was converted into zeal for innocence; prejudice, into the desire of truth; superstition, into the warmth of piety. Vice itself was exalted into the heroism of sanctity; and every defilement done away, which corruption had introduced into the sanctuary of the heart. They preached; and Satan, like a thunderbolt, was hurled from his throne; his temples razed; his altars overturned; and idolatry, abashed and trembling, fled from those scenes, which it had so long disgraced by its follies, and infected by its abominations. They preached; and the Universe was changed! The spectacle which they exhibited was new; the spectacle of exalted virtue and consummate wisdom. Men beheld the virtue, and it edified them: they listened to the wisdom, and it convinced them. In this manner did the first apostles of Jesus Christ completely realize the figure of the ‘ *fishers of men,*’ completely verify the assurance which their divine Master had given them, that ‘ *himself would be always with them,*’ completely illustrate that passage of St. Paul, in which he says, ‘ *God employs the weak to confound the strong, and the foolish to confute the wise.*’ It is this call and mission of the apostles, which are the sources of the call and mission of their successors; and it is the successes that attended the preaching of the apostles, that are the proof, not only of the divinity of their mission, but of the mission of those who have replaced, and shall yet replace them till the end of time. In religion, as every thing was originally *apostolical*, so every thing to merit veneration, must continue *apostolical*. According to the definition and import of apostolicity, it is necessary that the church which was founded by the apostles, and the mission also which was imparted to the apostles, should, without destruction, or interruption, have been perpetuated to the age we live in, firm amid revolutions, unchanged amid changes.

I have said, that to ascertain in the Catholic church this stability of duration, a more positive proof cannot be adduced, than the spectacle of its pastors (who compose a large portion of its members, and whose functions are the most important duties of religion) regularly in each age, succeeding to each other, and transmitting to each, the mission which originally had been inherited from the hands of the apostles. The only difficulty here, is by the light of evidence to establish these important facts. Well, my brethren, and this is what, without any difficulty, the Catholic exults to do. To do it we need only to consult the records of history; those records which the Protestant himself considers authentic. The light of history is a testimony, which, beyond the power of reasonable doubt, attests the regular and perennial succession of the Catholic ministry.

The apostles, whom Christ had sent, *as his Father had sent him;* and with whom, likewise, he had promised *to remain all days to the end of the world;* in consequence of the above commission and assurance, chose for themselves co-operators and successors in their sacred ministry:—*co-operators*, in order to assist them in the government of the churches which their zeal had planted;—*successors*, to whom, on occasion of their departure from this scene of their

labors, they might resign the burden of their functions, and the honor of their sees. Now, fortunately for the cause of religion, we have in the annals of history, and in the writings of the learned, the accounts very carefully preserved, of the resignations, which the apostles made of their functions and sees to their successors; and of the resignations also which their successors' successors made, during a series of ages, to the pastors, who, in long order, have till the present age, continually replaced each other. Among these accounts, that which of all others is the most interesting, and which religion has preserved with the nicest care, is the history of the continuation until to-day, of the apostolic powers which Christ Jesus conferred upon the prince of the apostles, St. Peter. We have, thanks to that Providence, which watches over the church, and which marks its paths with beams of light, we have the proof of this continuation so luminously attested, so evident, that not hostility can contest, nor incredulity doubt it. Important testimony! itself a bright feature in the divinity of the church; a testimony, which, proving *immediately* the apostolicity of the mission of its supreme pastors, proves also *immediately*, yet directly, the apostolicity of the mission of all its other pastors. For, if you consult the rolls of history, you will find that with our supreme pastors, the Catholic pastors of every age, and of every nation, were always united in communion; acknowledging their supereminence, and revering their jurisdiction; considering them as the great source, after Christ, of spiritual power, and the centre of spiritual unity.

There have been several distinguished writers, who, incapable of misrepresentation, and possessing the means of knowing the history of the successors of St. Peter, and the order of their succession, have carefully handed down to us, each to his own time, the lists of these illustrious men. The first of these I believe, who is known to have preserved the important catalogue, is St. Irenæus.

After Tertullian, the next who continues the catalogue of St. Peter's successors, is St. Optatus. He brings it down to the time of Siricius; that is, to the year three hundred and eighty-four. '*In this one chair,*' says the saint, *speaking of the see of Rome, 'sat Peter first, to him succeeded Linus, to him Clement, &c. . . . To Liberius succeeded Damasus; to Damasus, Siricius, the present pontiff, with whom we and all the world hold communion. And now,' he adds, addressing himself exultingly to the Donatist, 'and now, do you give an account of the origin of your sees, you, that pretend to call yourselves the Catholic church.'* (Contra Parmen.)

St. Austin is another writer, who had attended to the succession, and has preserved for us, the list of St. Peter's successors; deriving from the long order of their continuance, the same conclusions as did Irenæus, Tertullian, and Optatus. The list which the Saint has communicated reaches down to his own time, to the pontificate of Innocent the first, in the year four hundred and two, and in its earlier eras it exactly corresponded with the list which I have alluded to already. '*Come,*' says he to the Donatists, '*come, brethren, if it be that you wish to be ingrafted on the vine. I weep to see you as you are; lopped off from its sacred stock. Count up the pontiffs in the chair of Peter, and in that order see which succeeded which. This is that Rock, over which, the proud gates of hell cannot prevail.'*

Hence, without the necessity of producing further testimonies, it follows, if men will not contest the authority, or call in question the veracity of some of the fairest characters, that the christian world reveres: it follows that from the time of St. Peter to the time of Innocent, in the fifth century, there existed in the see of Rome, an uninterrupted chain of pastors, and a continuation of an apostolic mission. The continuation of that same apostolic mission which Christ

Jesus had imparted to St. Peter. Only he, can doubt this, whose incredulity doubts of every thing.

And has the chain of Roman pastors,—for this is now the only point which we must investigate,—been continued and extended from the time of Innocent the first, to the present day; an interval, it is true, extremely long, and filled up with storms, and changes, and revolutions and great events? Yes, the chain has been continued and extended all this whole length of period; from Innocent, who consoled the great Chrysostom, under the persecution of an ambitious princess, to Pius the seventh, who himself is the heroic victim of the persecution of a relentless victor. Indeed, the fact is so obvious, it is not even contested. It is conceded by the men, who are interested to deny it. To be assured of it, you need only to consult the political annals of any considerable state, or to appeal in our historians to the mere tablets of chronology. You will find that all give to our Roman pontiffs the same line and length of succession, which I here assign them. Their conduct has been always prominent; their influence always conspicuous. Few were the great events and transactions, in which, either from a principle of piety, or sometimes of ambition, they did not bear a part.

Yes, but if prompted by curiosity, you will give yourselves the trouble to consult the annals of the church, there you will trace, more distinctly still, the evidence of the truth, which I am now establishing. There attending to the occurrences of each epoch, you will observe, the helm which had been confided to the trust of Peter, is with the greatest regularity transferred from hand to hand; and with pious care, confided to the trust of each successor. You may mark the name, and read the character of each individual, who directed it, the date of the day when it was committed to his guidance: and the hour, almost, when he resigned. In short, admitting the accuracy of the lists which have been preserved by Irenæus, Tertullian, &c., you trace in the annals of the church, a clear, plain, and incontestible evidence of a line of Roman pontiffs, the successors of St. Peter, during the long course of above eighteen hundred years.

If the ancient fathers, in their times, and at the distance only of a few years, so triumphantly produced the list of these holy men, evincing by it the divinity of the church, and the apostolicity of the mission of its pastors, and by it confuting the novelty and claims of heresy; if Tertullian, impressed with the force of this argument, victoriously called out to the hosts of innovators, "*shew us any thing like this. Unfold and shew us the origin of your churches; show us the list of your bishops, in regular order from the days of the apostles, succeeding to each other;*" if he could say to them, "*Who are you? Whence is your origin, derived? What have you to do in my estate? I am the possessor. My possession is ancient. I am the heir of the apostles:*" if he could say all this; and from this, after scarcely the lapse of two centuries and the succession of hardly a dozen pontiffs, demonstrate the apostolicity of the church: with how much more reason and with how much more effect, might I, or any other Catholic, demonstrate its apostolicity at present, at present when the continuance of Peter's successors forms a chain, of above eighteen hundred years, and their number fills up a list of above two hundred and fifty pontiffs? Oh! were only a Tertullian now, or an Austin, standing in the same situation in which I am placed before you, addressing you from this seat of truth and pressing the same argument, which I do to day, upon your attention; and pressing it recommended by the circumstances which I have just referred to, how the thoughts would grow, and the words burn, with which they would convey the exultation of these feelings to you! How the cause of truth would triumph in their eloquence! With what redoubled enthusiasm would they exclaim, "*let heresy shew any thing like this!*" In reality, if the argument which these great men have employed to

prove the apostolicity of the church, proved aught in their times, is certainly proves the same, and a great deal more, at present.

To the thoughtful and the philosophic mind, there is much, I have already observed, to admire in the stability of the church amid the fluctuation of human things. It is the same in regard to the long continuance of the successors of St. Peter. Wisdom and reason, when they consider it, are struck with wonder; and piety discovers in it the visible effect of an Almighty superintendance. The institutions of men soon perish. The modifications of human policy do not long retain their forms. Nothing human is permanent. To contemplate, therefore, an order of pontiffs reaching the whole length of eighteen centuries unchanged, whilst every thing else was changing; uninterrupted, whilst all other institutions were perishing,—is a spectacle at once striking, awful, and impressive; calculated to inspire the protestant himself, if not with the conviction of its divinity, at least with a conviction of its wisdom; with a respect for its strength; with a veneration for its antiquity. Let only reason cast a look into the annals of time, or recall to its recollection the events and revolutions, which during the lapse of eighteen centuries, have taken place on the theatre of life. During that interval in every kingdom of the civilized world, every government has changed its form; every dynasty resigned its power; every empire sunk to ruin. Rome itself, during it, has experienced in particular, all the vicissitudes of human instability: has been ruled alternately by Consuls, Emperors, Kings and Exarchs: has been taken, plundered, sacked and reduced almost to a heap of ashes. In short, during it, every thing that is human and political,—the work of the power and ambition, of the wisdom and art of men, has either perished or undergone a variety of alterations—Kingdoms, states, cities, monuments, laws, opinions, customs, heresies. Nought but the succession of our pontiffs, and the institutions of our holy religion, have remained unaltered. These alone, amid the general revolution, amid the storms of war; the ravages of passion; the conflicts of heresy, subsist undecayed and undecaying. They even subsist in spite of all those evils: though assailed by the violence of persecution; though combated by the machinations of passion; though attacked by the artifices of error; though assaulted by the combined efforts of vice, Satan and the world. Surely prejudice itself will own it,—a succession of Pastors thus perpetuated for eighteen centuries, and perpetuated amid such obstacles, is not the effect of chance, nor of earthly policy; not the creation of ambition, nor the offspring of worldly wisdom. The only method of accounting rationally for it, is to allow, that it is the result of a divine institution; and the consequence of that assurance given by our great Redeemer to his apostles, that he *would be with them all days, to the end of the world*:—or in other words, that it is the result and the proof of an *apostolic mission*.

“From the evidences of the apostolicity of the church of Rome, is inferred the evidence of the apostolicity of the various other Catholic churches, which are disposed throughout the universe. In reality, they are all of them the parts of one whole; the branches of one tree; the streams of one fountain; the rays of one sun. They all form only *one communion*, whose centre and head is the church of Rome. Of these churches, some were established by the apostles themselves, and their immediate successors;—some and a very considerable part, by the successors of St. Peter, the Roman pontiff, who in each age have with pious zeal, deputed missionaries to preach the gospel in almost every region of the globe. But in every age, and in every region, the churches that were thus planted, were only considered as apostolical, or as portions of the true church, from the evidence of their union with the church of Rome. It is the remark of St. Jerome; *that no bishop was ever acknowledged to be a lawful bishop, except in as much, as he was united in communion with the chair of St. Peter.*”

And why may I not adduce as another evidence of the apostolic mission of our pastors, the venerable subsistence of a multitude of other churches, which, without having lasted from the age, which saw the apostles live, have still lasted from the ages that are not long subsequent to it? This is the case with several churches in Spain, Italy, France, &c. In Spain, the churches of Toledo, Cordova, &c.; in Italy, those of Milan, Naples, &c.; in France, those of Lyons, Tours, &c., have subsisted from the early ages of christian fervor: from those ages which are often denominated apostolical, down to the present period of degeneracy. Their annals, more accurately preserved than the annals of civil governments, exhibit to our astonished, but gratified reason, a line of pastors during this whole length of ages—unbroken and uninterrupted—uninjured by the violence of persecutions, as well as unimpaired by the sunshine of prosperity; a line of pastors that in canonical succession have till the present day, replaced each other. These are monuments of stability, compared with which profane history has nothing similar; Protestantism nothing analogous. These two attest the apostolicity of the mission of our pastors; and the apostolicity consequently of our church. And now once more, let it be recollected, in relation to all these churches, that their founders, and the successors of their founders, were in communion with the see of Rome:—the former deputed perhaps immediately by it; the latter exulting always in their union with it as the best proof of the apostolicity of their own delegation."

[The above quotation was read in parts, in two different speeches; but it has been thought proper to insert it entire, here.]

I close here. To-morrow is the sabbath of our God. Let us devote the remainder of the day to the preparation of our souls for its holy duties.

MONDAY, JANUARY 16TH, *Half-past 9 o'clock. A. M.*

MR. CAMPBELL rises---

It is a trite and true observation, that the material universe is resolvable into a very few elementary principles. And not a few of our wisest philosophers suppose that the time may yet come, in the progress of chemical science, when material nature will be resolved into some two, or three rudimentary elements. The sciences, too, mental and moral, are all resolvable into a few great cardinal principles.

The papal empire itself depends also upon a few points, indeed, upon one great point, and that relates to the office upon which the whole superstructure rests. The most fundamental question is not whether the apostle Peter was invested with the office of pope, or vicar of Christ; but rather *whether there ever was such an office at all.* On this question we have not proceeded in the most logical manner. I have been compelled to approach it at different times, and by different avenues. My opponent has not adverted to the rules of this discussion. I am compelled to lead, and he to follow. He can only lawfully reply to such matter as I introduce. But instead of replying to my arguments, already offered, he read you some dissertations upon suc-

cession to an office, not yet canvassed and established. This reading of foreign discussions instead of replying to me is contrary to our rules and most illogical. I hope we shall have no more of it. What was read on Saturday afternoon on the question of succession is clearly irrelevant. Before we contend about succession, the question is, What is to be succeeded to? We have had seven presidents, and the succession is indisputable; yet the office depends not upon the seven incumbents, nor upon their rightful succession; but upon what is written in the constitution—upon the positive and express institution of the office.

If it is not found in the constitution, succession is of no virtue: however unbroken and orderly it may be, the present incumbent has no power. The grand question then is, *Is there in the constitution of the Christian church, in the New Covenant, or last Testament, a chair of primacy, or superintendency?* This is the logical and the cardinal question. On this single point rest all the fortunes of the papacy in an enlightened community. I wish all to perceive it, and I will present it in different forms. The first question is, *Has Jesus Christ appointed the office of pope?* The second, *Who was the first officer?* Third, *Was there a succession ordained?* and fourth, *Has that succession been preserved uncorrupt to the present day?* In this way our reason, or common sense, or logic arranges the matter; and in this way only can it be rationally and scripturally decided. With all men of sense, the controversy will hang on this point. A failure here is ruin to the cause. If this point cannot be proved, it is as useless to contest others, as it would be to finish a house that is built upon the ice. Strike off the head and the body perishes. Yet this capital point rests upon an inference!

How would an American like to be told that the office of president depended upon an inference? that there was no provision for it in the constitution—that it was inferred from twenty clauses, scattered here and there in as many sections? Could it be possible, that the greatest office in this nation—the very head of this government, should rest on the construction of these clauses; that there is no chapter in the constitution, expressly creating the office? Yet, this is precisely the case with the pope. The gentleman does not claim for him a positive grant in the New Testament. He must acknowledge that there is no such office distinctly asserted—that it depends on the reasonings of fallible men to ferret it out. Here I must expose the nakedness of the land and sweep from the arena the dust of tradition, which blinds the eye of implicit believers.

It is said by the Romanists that a belief in the supremacy of the

pope is essential to salvation. Boniface VIII. decrees in his canon law in the words following:

“Moreover we declare, and say, and define, and pronounce to every human creature, that it is altogether necessary to salvation to be subject to the Roman pontiff.”

It appears, if not pedantic, at least awkward to read Latin to an English audience. However, my learned opponent, so often sets me the example, that he will allow me to quote this important decree:

“Subesse Romano Pontifici, omnis humanae creaturae declaramus, dicimus, definimus, et promunciamus omnino esse necessitate salutis.”

It is then solemnly decreed that a belief in, and submission to, the Roman pontiff is essential to salvation. Ought not, then, his authority to be as clearly pointed out in the Bible as the mission of Jesus Christ? for the person and mission and sacrifice of Christ are to us useless, without faith in the pope. Again, of what use is the Bible, without this belief; and especially, if so important a matter is so obscurely expressed in it as to rest upon a mere inference? Does the person and office of Christ depend on a mere inference? Is it not asserted and re-asserted, a hundred times by the voices of all the prophets and apostles of both Testaments? In the Jewish economy, the high Priest was on earth: but in our economy he is in Heaven. There was truth in the type, and there must be truth in the anti-type. Yet every thing concerning that priesthood was positively and expressly ordained. The office, the officer, the succession, and the means of keeping the blood pure. For, No man dare “take that office upon himself, but he that was called of God, as was Aaron.” Aaron then was distinctly called to be a high priest. Now we argue that if we had a high priest on earth under our high Priest in heaven, and if salvation hang upon obedience to him: it ought to be as clear as that of Aaron.

But in reference to the Old Testament priesthood, we find every thing distinctly and unequivocally stated, Exodus xxviii. 1.: “Take Aaron and his sons from among the children of Israel, that he and they may minister to me in the priest’s office.” Again, xl. 13.: “And thou shalt sanctify Aaron and his sons, that he may minister to me in the priest’s office; and their anointing shall surely be an everlasting priesthood throughout their generations.” How often in the books of the law, and in the subsequent history of the Jews, as it is in 1 Chron. 23d and 24th chapters, do we find the unequivocal institution and records of this priesthood!

But it is not only in a distinct and unequivocal call and consecration, but in the subsequent care evinced in sustaining this appoint-

ment, that we see the necessity of such a positive and express covenant and understanding. The rebellion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, and the destruction, by a miraculous interposition, of themselves and of their company, together with two hundred and fifty princes of Israel, for seeking to invade the office, is another solemn attestation of the divine erection of this office, and the certain call of Aaron's family.

Again: The appointment of God to select an almond rod for each tribe, and to inscribe the name of each of the twelve families upon those rods, every tribe's name upon a separate rod, and the miraculous budding and blossoming and almond-bearing of Aaron's rod, in the course of a single night, was another settlement of this matter, so special, supernatural, and divine, as to put it to rest forever. Here we ought to read in full the 16th and 17th chapters of Numbers; but we have only time to refer to them. Thus by a positive call, and two splendid and awfully glorious miracles, was the office of the high priesthood established in Israel.

And may we not ask, that if as Boniface has defined, and all Roman Catholics believe, "*that there is no salvation, but in the admission of the divine call of the popes of Rome;*" ought not the institution of a new order to be as clearly pointed out, and sustained in the new law, as it was in the old?!

But my opponent has to concede that there is no such positive or express institution of St. Peter's chair, nor of his call and consecration, nor any law of succession whatever in the New Testament; and that it rests wholly upon inference. Now, if no man can take this honor upon himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron, where is the office and the authority of the popes of Rome?! There is for it no such call. Or will my friend say that mere inference or assumption is a proper foundation for such a call and office?

On Saturday evening I began the examination of the premises from which is *inferred* this high and responsible office; and so far, I think, proved that he cannot even find a good logical inference for it. In Matthew xvi. we found no support to the idea that the church of Jesus Christ was to be built upon the flesh and blood and bones of Peter; neither upon his person nor office. We saw that every rule of grammar—that the construction of language forbade such a transition as was necessary to the hypothesis. To have addressed Peter in the second and third persons as both present and absent, in the same breath, is wholly unprecedented. To have spoken of him, and to him at one time, in one period, and on a matter so cardinal as making him the foundation of his church, is not to be admitted on the authority of mere assumption, without a single case parallel in all holy writ to lay along side of it.

The case in no rational point of view will endure such violence. Jesus asked for a *confession*, Peter gave it. The conversation turned upon that confession, and not upon Peter. The comment ought to have been upon the text, and not upon him that gave it. It was upon the text and not upon the preacher.

We Protestants say that the church is founded on the thing confessed. Christ himself is, indeed, the rock; but figuratively the truth which represents him. I was struck with astonishment when I heard my worthy opponent say, that Peter was the rock, and Christ only a stone in this spiritual temple!

[BISHOP PURCELL here explained, "that he had said that Christ was the corner stone which was to strengthen and give consistency to the foundation; and Peter the rock which was to strengthen and give consistency to the superstructure."] Mr. CAMPBELL proceeded:

Christ the corner *stone!* and Peter the rock!! Does this help the matter?

What says 1 Cor. iii.: "Other foundation can no man lay than what is already laid,"—very Peter!! No, indeed; but Jesus Christ himself is the corner stone, the rock, the foundation? Then Peter is but a *stone*, as his name imports. But there were eleven other stones of equal value: for, says the Holy Spirit, the church is built upon the foundation of the *apostles*—all of the apostles; and of the prophets too! When, then, all these stones are at the foundation, and Christ the chief corner, where is the room for Peter the rock?

But, we have other expressions that illustrate Matthew xvi. Looking at the temple one day, Jesus said to those before him, "Destroy *this* temple and I will build it again in three days." Were the persons he addressed in the second person and the *temple* the same thing? Here, then, are the persons addressed, the subject of conversation, and himself—*you*, (the addressed,) and the temple, (himself.) So have we Peter, the confession, and Christ the builder of the church, in the passage before us. They understood by his question that he spoke of his body; but his body was not himself: neither was the confession of Peter, Christ himself; nor Peter's person, the rock of ages. Surely the papal rock is not as our rock; our enemies themselves being judges.

But *petros* and *petra* sound alike, and therefore, though of different gender, case, and person, they must be identical! Of the person and case we have said enough, (for my friend has not attempted to refute it.) Of the differences in gender, he will tell us, that it was written in Syriac, and that the word signifying stone in that language is of no gender. This is gratuitous. He can produce no copy of Matthew in Syriac; the only authentic copy we have is that before me. It is the Greek version of Matthew: "*Thou*" is in the second person, and "*this*"

is in the third. *Petros* is masculine and *Petra* is feminine. It is impossible for language to do more to prevent mistake; and he that would attempt to explain away these three—gender, person and case, is not subject to the laws of language, neither *indeed* can be.

It is commonly observed that Peter seems not to have been any better qualified after than before the confession, to be the foundation of the church: for he is reprov'd for his worldly notions of the Messiah and his kingdom, in these words; "*Get thee behind me, adversary; for thou relishest not the things of God; but the things of men.*" The word *satanas* signifies adversary. Jesus calls him not *ho satanas*, Satan; but simply opponent. Stand aside thou who opposest me in this matter: Thou dost not understand these divine things.

There is another of the bishop's texts to which, out of courtesy, I must allude: "Peter, when thou art converted, confirm your brethren." The meaning of which is,—Peter, as you have experienced the bitterness of repentance, you can hereafter comfort and strengthen your penitent brethren. My learned opponent interprets it thus: Peter, when you are converted, *you shall be my vicar and prince of the apostles!*

John xxi., "Lovest thou me *more than these,*" is again before us. The bishop will have *these* to refer to the apostles. My audience will remember that when I read the Greek of the passage, he quoted Latin (*plus quam hos,*) as if to correct the Greek by deciding that *these* was *masculine* and not *neuter*, the very point in debate—that when he was challenged to sustain his Latin comment by the original, he immediately after taking up the Greek Testament laid it down.

It will elucidate this passage to read the whole in the original, verse 13th.

Ἐρχεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ λαμβάνει τὸν ἄρτον, καὶ δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τὸ ὑψάριον ὁμοίως. In reference to which Jesus says, Σίμων Ἰωῆα, ἀγαπᾷς με πλεον τούτων; The grammatical antecedent to *τούτων* must be *τὸν ἄρτον* and *τὸ ὑψάριον*, which makes it *neuter*. Now, I ask, on what grammatical authority does the Vulgate convert these into the masculine? Ought a translator to judge for his readers, or ought he to give the same latitude of inquiry to his readers which the original gives to him? The latter, certainly. So decides the highest tribunal in the commonwealth of letters. And neither my opponent nor his Latin nor Greek supplements, nor interpolations, have any right to make that masculine, which the original makes at least doubtful, himself being judge: and according to my judgment, on the laws of language, certainly, *neuter*.

On what precarious, inferential and illogical grounds rest the proud aspirations of the pope of Rome! He out-rivals the proudest mon-

archs of the east. He that styles himself "brother to the sun and moon," and "disposer of Asiatic crowns," is modest compared with the vicar, who claims dominion over angels and saints in heaven—over all the spirits in the wide domains of purgatory; who styles himself, or permits others to address him as a *God* on earth—as "his holiness, Lord God the Pope," as holding the keys of heaven and hell, and the two swords of ecclesiastical and political justice; and all this mighty empire resting upon the words, "*petra*," "*strengthen thy brethren*," "*lovest thou me more than these*," "*feed my sheep and lambs*," &c. Was there ever so proud a superstructure reared upon so many and so baseless assumptions?!

The gentleman quoted yet another verse from the Vulgate; 1 Pet. v. 3, "*Be not lords over the clergy*." Hence he infers, the apostle Peter had the *clergy* under him. But the apostle says, "not as lords over the clergy," there then, was a plurality of *lords*,—not one supreme head! Although this passage was quoted at an early period of the discussion, by my opponent, I reserved my remarks upon it till now. It reads in the original and the common version, "not as lords over the heritage, lot, or people of the Lord." *Κληρος*, the word here translated *clergy*, occurs twelve times in the New Testament, and in nine of these it is translated *lot*. In Acts xxvi. 18, and in Col. i. 12, it is translated *inheritance*, and in the passage before us, it may be either *lot*, *heritage*, or *inheritance*: but *clergy* is most whimsical and arbitrary. As well might the Vulgate have said to Simon Magus, "thou hast neither part nor clergy in this matter:" or, in Col. i. 12.. "he has fitted us to partake in the clergy of the saints." In both cases the word is the same in the original. These shew by what a stretch of power and arbitrary dominion over words, these critics would bring the clergy or christian ministry under the bishop of Rome. So fades from the face of reason the whole evidence from the Bible, in favor of the grand office without which the papacy is as mere a figment of fancy as the visions of the prophet of Islamism!

Having found the office of vicar, or general superintendent of the whole church, the universal episcopate of Rome, without express or positive precept or institution, and without even inferential probability; I proceed in the third place to show still farther, that it is *anti-scriptural*, not only in theory, but in the facts recorded.

I have said that the first church was the Hebrew. It was catholic and apostolic: for all the twelve apostles were in it. This cannot be said of any other society that ever existed. The whole college of the twelve apostles had their seat in Jerusalem. The Samaritan daughter of Jerusalem was the first fruits out of Judea. Philip, one of the apostles' evangelists, carried the word of the Lord to Samaria.

They had believed, repented, and been baptized. News is brought to Jerusalem. The cardinals all meet.—The twelve apostles are in session. But where is Peter's chair? The prince of the apostles, the vicar of Christ, had not yet learned his duty, and his brethren had not yet learned to call him pope. The fact is, they made a legate of him. They sent two legates to Jerusalem. And who do you think were the two first apostolic legates? They, indeed sent pope Peter and his brother John! Thus it is clear that the notion of Peter's universal episcopacy, and princship of the apostles was not yet conceived. This fact speaks a volume against the pretended successors of Peter.

But—again, and still more humiliating to his successors, when Peter had introduced the Gentiles into the church, the brethren of the circumcision rose up *en masse* against him, not regarding him as having the least supreme authority in the case. "How," do you ask, "did Peter receive the complaints from all quarters for his daring to innovate, by mere authority on all the holy brethren? Did he say, I am Christ's vicar—chief of the apostles,—the supreme head of the church—I hold the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and do you demand of me, why I should act thus?!" Never thus, spoke Peter. He did not assume any thing: but tells the matter over, and shows how God had opened the door of faith to the Gentiles; "and what was I," he reasons, "that I should withstand God?" Ought I to have stood up and said to the Gentiles, you shall not enter the kingdom of the Messiah, nor be enrolled amongst the children of God?—In the 11th chapter of the Acts of the apostles, we have a full exposition of the groundless pretension of his successors, in the details of this case from the lips of the apostle himself. A third instance of the entire absence of all such vicars in the primitive church, appears in the "council held at Jerusalem." So the bishop's party designates it, and for the sake of argument, let it be a *council*.

It was not called by Peter the pope, nor was it a council of the whole world; but of two or three churches. Well, they met. Who was president? Neither the pope nor his legates. Peter is not in the chair; but on the floor. He spoke first, as he was always accustomed to do; but did he dictate the course to be pursued? No. Had he the honor of drafting or submitting the decrees? He did not. He arose and spoke to the assembly, and told what God had done by him among the Gentiles. Paul and Barnabas, also on the floor, then stated what the Lord had done by them among the Gentiles, and when they had done, James arose to present his views. "*My sentence is,*" says he, "that we ought to write so and so to the Gentiles." In his views they all acquiesced. They do not say in this letter, "it seemed good to Peter!" No, "it seemed good to *us*." Indeed, if any was pope in

this assembly, it was James: not Peter. All the popes of Rome as successors of Peter, are therefore not only unscriptural; but anti-scriptural.

Again, and stronger still. In Gal. 1st chap. we are told of a certain controversy between Paul and Peter,—not about faith, nor morality; but about expediency. Paul never would have related this matter: but in self-defence. There were some in Galatia that regarded him as a sub-apostle, not equal to those who had been companions of the Lord during his public ministry. In self-defence, he affirms that, in conversations with the *pillars*, as some called Peter and James and John—three of the oldest apostles—he did not receive a new idea. So far from being dependent on Peter, or inferior to him, he was the only apostle in those days with whom Paul had the slightest dissension: “for,” says he, “after Peter came down to *Antioch* I withstood him to the face, for he was to be blamed: for before certain persons came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles; but when they were come, he withdrew and separated from them, fearing the Jews. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him, insomuch that Barnabas was carried away with their dissimulation. Seeing that they walked not uprightly, I said to Peter in the presence of them all: “Why do you compel the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?” Thus Paul reproved the head of the church, his father, pope Peter, in the presence of all the brethren for a sort of temporizing expediency in its practical details, squinting at dissimulation. All these facts show how contrary to the doctrine and facts of the sacred writings are the assumptions of popery.

A word or two from the last will and testament of the apostle Peter. Being far advanced in years, he writes two letters containing his last advice to the brethren. In the first he associates himself with the elders of the Jewish church, and claims no other eminence than that of *fellow elder*, and as such exhorts them to feed the flock of God willingly. In the second letter, he wills, that the brethren addressed, “should, after his decease, be mindful of the commandment of us, the *apostles* of the Lord and Savior.” Thus, with his last words, he disclaims every attribute of official supremacy. He is known only in the New Testament, as *an apostle*, either from his own words simply, or those of Paul, or from any other circumstance, which in the history of the church is recorded from Pentecost to the end of the New Testament. I shall leave other scriptures for the calls of my opponent, and the occasion.

I now proceed to show that as there is no foundation in scripture, so there is none in fact, nor in reason, for the papal supremacy. I have shown, that it wants *positive* proof—that it is built on inference—that this inference is not found in the *premises*—and that other scrip-

tural facts and documents preclude the possibility of such an inference.

We have emphatically stated, that the first point is to establish the office. If there is no office, there can be no officer. But my friend the bishop's system is still more at fault, for if he could prove (what he never will) that there was such an office; still he has to prove that Peter was the first officer.—That Peter was that officer is as cardinal a point to his system, as that the papal office had been set up by Jesus Christ. The Scriptures are perfectly *mute* on that point! What says church history? It is only *inferred* that Peter ever *was in Rome*? It is only *probable*. Barronius only says it is probable he had a see there: he does not moot that question. *There is not a single word in all antiquity which positively asserts that Peter was ever bishop of Rome, or was ever in Rome.* The gentleman quoted Irenæus. Can he quote the original? I affirm that it does not exist: and even the copy from which he read was not found for centuries after Irenæus wrote. But admit it to be genuine. I affirm that Irenæus *no where asserts, that Peter was bishop of Rome.* If neither he nor his contemporaries assert it, what is the authority of Grotius, or Casaubon, or Usher or such modern authors?! It proves nothing. The assertion of my present opponent is worth as much as that of any man who has lived for a thousand years, to prove an event which happened a thousand years before he was born.

The bishop and his friend the editor of the Catholic paper and at least fifteen hundred citizens heard me lecture when last in the city; and yet, so faithless is tradition, that I have seen it stated in a print of this city—in a Roman Catholic Telegraph, too, that I had asserted as a proposition to be proved, "*that Charles Carroll, of Carrollton was not a Roman Catholic!*"—words that never fell from my lips or pen. If then tradition cannot be kept here for a single week, in this day of light and knowledge, and good faith, how can you respect and believe traditions descending through ages of darkness and superstition?—why bring up men from the remote corners of the earth, who lived more than a century after the time in question, to tell us their *hearsays* or the rumors of past ages.

I have affirmed, that there is no document to prove that Peter was ever bishop of Rome. My friend disputes this point; we are then at issue, and this is a vital point. Let him then meet me upon it, and decide the controversy. Irenæus says not, that either Peter or Paul was bishop of Rome; but, "over that church that was planted by Peter and Paul sat Linus." True, the inference is, that Peter and Paul must have been at Rome; if not, how believe that the church was planted by them? But the church at Rome *never was planted by them.* The

faith of the Romans was known through all the earth when Paul wrote his letter to them, and at that time he had never been in that city. The proposition is therefore not true; and Irenæus, if he wrote so, wrote on erroneous tradition, and is not worthy of credit. Admit, for argument sake, that we take the testimony of the fathers on the succession, which are we to believe? They tell us stories irreconcilably different. The gentleman triumphantly held up a map, as if there were some hidden virtue in it, and said he could speak upon it till doomsday. I have also a map here, which will prove that his map can prove nothing without a tongue in it; and if holding up this map before you could convince you, I should soon carry the point. Bellarmine admits, that the fathers contradict each other on the succession of the first popes. A phalanx of authors can be adduced to prove that the fathers are not unanimous upon any one point of importance, on that or any other dogma of the papacy.

Divine authority cannot exist, but in the holy oracles: against any other pretended infallible standard, all men should protest. The fathers agreed in bearing testimony to the scriptures, as far as they individually knew them; but their unanimous consent on any thing else has not yet been found.

Justin Martyr, for example, proves my interpretation of the 16th ch. Matthew, on the *rock*. He is one of the primitive fathers. He gives substantially the same views of that whole passage as I have adduced here. Now it is impossible for my opponent to find a unanimous consent of the fathers with him, as I have Justin Martyr, of the second century, and many others, with me. My standing argument, on the consent of the fathers, is this:

I find many of the fathers unequivocally agreeing with me. These, therefore, must express the unanimous consent, if there be any; for it cannot be unanimous without them. Now, if there be no unanimous consent, the Romanists build upon a false foundation; and if there be, they build on a false foundation; for we have that consent, not they.

But this unanimous consent fails in the succession. Admitting that Peter was first bishop of Rome, no living man can tell whether Linus or Clement was the second bishop of Rome. The ancients do not agree upon that point. Tertullian makes Clement second bishop, and others make Linus. I have a chart, in Eusebius, which differs from his own history in various points. I have other charts and indexes that place the bishops of Rome in a different order. Eusebius does not place Peter first; nor do any of the fathers. He places Linus first, then Clitus, then Clement. Another tells us, that Peter was first, then Linus, then Clement. A fourth, perhaps, on the authority of the last, places Peter first and Clement second.—[Time expired.]

Half-past 10 o'clock, A. M.

BISHOP PURCELL rises—

It is well, beloved friends, to keep our eyes upon the polar star, when once we have embarked upon the sea of controversy. The polar star of this question, is the attempted disproof, by my learned friend, of the Roman Catholic claim, to be the holy, apostolic, catholic church. He was pledged to show her to be an apostasy from the only true church. Has he proved this? Is there one intelligent man in this assembly prepared to answer this question in the affirmative? I asked, from what church was she an apostasy? He told us that she had apostatized in the year 1054. But he has not yet told us what or where was the one true, holy and apostolic church from which she seceded. There was a good reason for it, no other catholic church existed at the epoch indicated, but ours, the Roman Catholic. We were then taken to the year 250, or some time thereabout. These were indefinite words; and I ask again what and where was the true church from which she apostatized in 250? Has he informed you? we were referred to the Novatians—and a Protestant church historian, Mosheim, tells us—

[Mr. CAMPBELL here called Bishop PURCELL to order as not speaking to the point; the moderators decided that he was in order and he proceeded.] The gentleman cannot confuse me by these interruptions. My eye is on the star. I say, that Mosheim, a Protestant ecclesiastical historian, tells us that the Novatians embraced essential errors. I have quoted from that historian, for this sect and all other prominent sects, to the beginning of the 16th century. They taught some doctrines which Catholics, and some, which Protestants hold. They taught some errors which Catholics and Protestants agree to reject—they taught disorganizing doctrines, which armed the civil power both Catholic and Protestant against them—and these doctrines, Catholics and Protestant mutually abhor. They were not then united, pure, or apostolic. They were not the church of Christ. The question then reverts upon us—which was the church of Christ, from which the Roman Catholic church separated in the 3d century?

I now come at once to the last speech of the gentleman.—I have already agreed that this controversy is resolvable into two or three grand principles—and by the discussion of these we may succeed in ascertaining their ulterior consequences. If true that Christ has established a head of the Church on earth, it follows that we must recognize that head. So far we are right. If Peter was made that head, we are right. If Peter was to have successors, we are right. If that succession was to last to the end of time, we are right, for we hold

these propositions to be irrefragable. If on the contrary, these propositions could be satisfactorily proved to be untrue, the Catholics would be wrong.

I have proved the first of these, viz., that Peter was made the head of the church, by Christ, from scripture. And what has my friend discovered to weaken the force of the numerous and strong texts I have adduced,—the rock, the keys, the feeding of the lambs, and of the sheep whom the lambs are wont to follow, the prayer of Christ that Peter's faith should never fail, the charge given him by Christ to confirm his brethren, his confession of the divinity of Christ before the other apostles, and the BLESSEDNESS pronounced on him for that confession by Christ, the deference shewn him—the poor, illiterate fisherman, by Paul, imbued with the sublimest lessons of the Law at the feet of Gamaliel, &c., &c.? Why he says: "Peter, lovest thou me more than these fish?"

My friends, I know not how to treat this interpretation seriously. But since the gentleman is so curious an interpreter, let us see if the text will bear him out. After the miracle of the draught of fishes, the apostles, at Christ's invitation, proceeded to some distance from their nets and barks, for the purpose of dining. It is natural to suppose they selected, for dinner, no more of the fish they had taken, than they would probably eat. Can my friend say that after they had dined there were any of the cooked fish remaining? There might have been some bones left on the table; but would Christ point to these fish bones, and say, Peter, lovest thou more than *these*? What a question for Christ to ask his leading disciple! Surely such an interpretation is absurd. But what is the voice of antiquity? My friend says that Justin bears him out in his interpretation. Will my friend point out the passage in that father's works? Will he say that it is the principal sense, the sense that father approves? I pledge myself he will not pretend to do so while refutation is near. Now if scripture is so very clear, and this meaning as obvious as Mr. C. supposes, is it not strange that this light should beam upon us to-day for the first time? The gentleman charges me with having dared to change the gender of the word signifying *these*, from neuter to masculine. Does he not know that the word *τῶν* is both masculine and neuter? It is generally applied to persons, though I do not deny that it may be applied to things. The Greek therefore leaves us as much in the dark as ever.

We find a parallel passage in the new Testament. "He that loveth father and mother *more than me* is not worthy of me." Matth. x. 37. Here the words are *ὑπὲρ ἐμὲ* (more than me). *ἐμὲ* is in the accusative case—*τῶν* is in the genitive case. But, my friends, this has nothing to do with the question at issue; it does not make for or against my

argument, whether we adopt the natural, or the gross interpretation. Christ said to Peter, "*lovest thou me.*" He demands an assurance of his faithful attachment. Peter three times replies in the affirmative, and thrice the command is repeated to him, "feed my lambs," "feed my sheep." The argument is entirely independent of either construction referred to. Hence I maintain that Peter was established, head of the church by Jesus Christ. The "rock," the "keys," the prayer, the prophecy of the place and manner of Peter's death, which we read in the same chapter, all prove it.

The gentleman says that a doctrine should be so clear, that it could not possibly be contested. This is really too soft for a man of Mr. C.'s strong mind. What is there so clear that it *could not possibly be contested*. Does not the universe tell us clearly as Genesis, that God created the heavens and the earth, and is not that contested? What doctrine more clearly revealed in the bible, or more important than the divinity of Christ? and is not that contested? and by one of the most learned societies of christians in the United States, I mean the Unitarians. They read the bible and they think it impiety and blasphemy to call Jesus Christ God!

It was essential in the Jewish institution that there should be a high priest. If the old institution was a type of the new, where is the anti-type? And if the headship of the high priest of the Jews derogated not from the authority of God the Father, who was pleased to be their special ruler, neither does the headship of the pope derogate from the supreme authority of God the Son, Jesus Christ, who acquired the church by his blood and established Peter its visible head on earth, to exercise the office during his natural life, and by his successors for ever.

My friend flies from scripture to tradition, and from a father of the early age to a modern historian. I will pledge myself to this enlightened assembly that the supremacy of Peter and of Peter's successors in the Roman see can be abundantly attested by an appeal to tradition; and I may here observe that Barronius has been misrepresented. He does not say it is not improbable that Peter fixed his see at Rome—of this he knew there was no doubt; but that it was not improbable he fixed his see there by the express *command* of Christ, which is, the intelligent hearer will perceive, quite a different proposition. Peter acted as the other apostles did, under the guidance of inspiration, in the choice of the scene of his pastoral toils; but Barronius thinks it not improbable that Christ *expressly* commanded him to select Rome for his—There he could "TEACH ALL NATIONS." Mr. C. asserts that for a thousand years there is, not a voice heard to attest this fact. My friends, not one voice, but five hundred attest it. There is one loud

chorus of testimony among the fathers and historians, giving almost universal consent to the doctrine. Some obscure individuals may have doubted, or denied it in late years. They are but motes on the surface of the overwhelming stream of testimony. Again my friend went back to the bible. He read of the high priest—but he cannot open the bible without seeing his own refutation written there—almost the first words that struck my ears were, the *dresses* and *anointing* of the priests. Where are such things done among Protestants? Do they not make void the scriptures? Anointing the clergy and the sick,—commanded by the bible—rejected by Protestants—superseded by the fashions of the day! Again: Aaron was separated that he should bless and sanctify—and yet if the pope bless or sanctify, he is an impious assumer of what belongs to God alone!!

The case of Korah, Dathan and Abiram was mentioned. God really appears to me to exert from the adversaries of his church the most striking proof of her authority, vindicated in the Type, from the sacrilegious contradictions of the schismatics of the old law. The ground opened and swallowed them up! So have all the sects, that in the early ages opposed the church, perished. The grave has hidden their guilt from the earth, too happy if they bear not its penalty in the world that expands beyond the grave! Again 250 priests perished for opposing the ordinance of God! the ecclesiastical guide he had appointed!

My friend asks, if the headship of Peter and his successors were as certainly divine as the high priesthood of the old law, would it not have been established by proof as plain? Why, he emphatically demanded, cannot the Roman pontiff, like Aaron, shew his authority by an equally convincing miracle? My friends, I take the gentleman at his word. He that has eyes to see let him see. Has not God wrought a similar miracle—I will fearlessly say—a far more splendid miracle, to attest the pre-eminence of the see of Peter? Has not the night of Mohomedanism and infidelity thrown its sable pall over the once flourishing churches of Africa and Asia? Has not the bright light of the gospel become extinct in the most celebrated of the sees founded by the other apostles—Crete, Corinth, Ephesus, Antioch, Alexandria, Philippi, Jerusalem? Where is the hymn of praise to Christ intoned, the voice of pure confession heard, the TABERNACLE OF THE TESTIMONY seen in any of these famous churches, where St. Paul had formed such a multitude of adorers in spirit and in truth? which he visited with so much solicitude, prayed for with so much fervor, and loved with so much tenderness. Returning to visit these churches, not on the following day as Moses did the rods of the twelve tribes, but after eighteen hundred years, we see that the rod of Aaron, the church formed

by the high priest appointed by Jesus Christ in the New Law, has budded and blossomed, and produced fruit of which all the nations have participated, while the churches formed by the other postles have been stricken with a melancholy sterility, and have utterly withered! The murmuring of the children of Israel against Moses and Aaron ceased when they beheld the prodigy related in the book of Numbers; is it too much to expect that we will be less insensible to an equally authentic declaration in favor of the church and pontiff, the special objects of the divine protection and care?

When Pius VI. died at Valence, in France, it was said that quick lime was thrown on his corpse, that no vestige of it might remain, and infidelity boasted that christianity was buried in the same grave with its pontiff. But a successor was soon beheld to ascend into the chair of Peter—alas! he too, is doomed to suffer contumely for the name of Jesus. He is seized with violence, by a ruthless soldiery, and carried off from Rome, an exile and a prisoner, to Fontainebleau. The doom of his persecutor is written: he is precipitated from the giddy heights of his ambition, and the meek, but invincible heir of Peter's sacred power, contrary to all human foresight, is reinstated by a Protestant government, by 30,000 Protestant bayonets, in the peaceful exercise of his duties, as the chief pastor of the Catholic world. England, with all thy faults I love thee still. You are Protestants, but you can be just. Rome, changeless amid change; Rome, free among the dead, unaffected by earthly revolutions, by earthly conquests unsubdued, why have the nations raged, and the people devised vain things against thee? The Lord is thy protector still. He hath wonderfully sustained thee, amidst all the vicissitudes of human institutions. "He that dwelleth in heaven," to use the language of the Psalmist, "hath laughed at them that stood up against thee, and the Lord *shall* deride them." My friend would call it "*morbid*" in England, to sympathise with the Catholics, as he has called your generous sympathies for your persecuted fellow-citizens; but it is not morbid, it is magnanimous, it is just to confess an error, to adjure an unfounded prejudice, and to side with the wrongfully oppressed.

I quoted scripture to prove that Christ was the corner stone, on which the whole building securely rests—and that Peter is the *rock* of the foundation, deriving whatever strength it has thus exhibited from Christ. There is no contradiction in this. I am compelled to follow the zigzag course of my friend. The reader of the printed controversy will be at no loss to bring together the diverging rays of evidence and to find my answers to objections, where they may be, apparently out of place.

There is no distinction of persons in Syriac. In Greek it is once

πητρος, and again πητρα—but this change of gender is merely to avoid a repetition of the same word in the same sentence. This is reason sufficient, to account for the difference. I give my friend thanks for proving that Peter was not Satan. It is the correct reading, and therefore, I agree with his interpretations of the text; when Christ says to Peter, “get thee behind me, Satan,” that is you, who differ from me on this particular subject. This text has been much abused.

Again: Peter did think, that he loved Jesus more than the rest, and Christ knew that he did. Do you remember, my friends, the scene which took place shortly before the Savior suffered? When he told his apostles, with a holy melancholy on his sacred heart, that one of them would betray him—that the shepherd should be stricken, and the sheep dispersed? Ah! is there not something in the noble-hearted enthusiasm of Peter, which is at once the cause of his offence and its palliation? “Although all shall be scandalized in thee, yet not I.” This proves an impulsiveness, an ardor, and a strength of attachment to the person of Christ, which Peter, too confidently it may be, but yet sincerely, believed to be greater than the other disciples felt for their divine master.

Jesus knew this, but he warns him not to be presumptuous. “Amen, I say to thee, to-day, even in this night, before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice,” Mark xiv. 30. From this, and other texts, Peter’s ardor, and the Savior’s knowledge of his confidence in his own steadfastness are perfectly plain. Why, then, deny them both?

I quoted the vulgate, not through ignorance of Greek, on which I have shewn as much knowledge as my friend; but not to boast of a little learning on the words, *Πλειον τουλων*. The Greek, the Latin, and the English, as verbal criticism is necessary to elucidate the meaning of the text, are by a singular coincidence, in this case, equally ambiguous. How can an unlettered Protestant understand the text?

The popes do not claim to be lords, spiritual, and temporal. But very few of them exercised any temporal power beyond the limits of their own principality, where they rule, as Gibbon told you, by the voice of a free people whom they have redeemed from slavery. Their throne is established in the affections of their people, who, with reason, prefer their pontiff’s mild sway to kingly usurpation—the crosier, to the sceptre. The popes have never taken the title of kings of Rome.

I can shew from Waddington and Southey, both Protestant historians of the church, that through centuries of darkness and doubt and civil commotion, while the Turk was ravaging the southern regions of Europe and the northern hordes were pouring down in swarms from their ice-bound regions, desolating the blooming fields, and destroying all that was useful and beautiful of the works of civilization, the pope

was the only savior of Europe, from their barbarian ravages. He gave to science and to letters the only refuge which could then have availed them—the refuge of an altar—and the now calumniated monks who reproduced in more auspicious times, the intellectual ray. They handed us the works of the sages, and heroes, the poets, historians and orators of Greece and Rome across the isthmus of the “dark ages” so called. They preserved for us a better gift—the Bible.

Benefits conferred by the church.—“Yet should we be very unjust to the Roman Catholic church, if we should allow it to be supposed, that she opened no receptacles, for the nurture of true excellence; that in her general institutions, especially in her earlier age, she has overlooked the moral necessities of man—the truth is far otherwise. We have repeatedly observed, how commonly, in seasons of barbarism, religion was employed in supplying the defects of civil government and diffusing consolation and security. The *Truce of God* mitigated the fury of private warfare, by limiting the hours of vengeance, and interposing a space for the operation of justice and humanity. The name of the church was associated with peace; and it was a prouder position, than when she trampled on the necks of kings, (what she never did by the bye as I shall prove.) The emancipation of the Serfs was another cause, equally sacred, in which her exertions were repeatedly employed. In her interference in the concerns of monarchs and nations, she frequently appeared as the advocate of the weak, and the adversary of arbitrary power. Even the much abused law of Asylum served through a long period, as a check on baronical oppression, rather than an encouragement to crime.

The duty of charity, during the better ages of the church, was by no means neglected by the secular clergy, while it was the practice and office of the monastic establishments. And even the discipline, so strictly inculcated by the earlier prelates, however arbitrary in its exercise, and pernicious in its *abuse*, was not unprofitable in arresting the first steps, and restraining the earliest dispositions to sin. Confession and penance, and the awful censures of the church, when dispensed with discretion, must have been potent instruments for the improvement of uncivilized society.” Waddington’s Church Hist. page 546, New York edit. 1835.

We now come to the word *Κληρος* (cleros,) which the gentleman says means *lot* and not *clergy*. *Lot* does mean the whole people of God—clergy and laity. Now if the apostle could not lord it over the whole people, he could not lord it over the clergy. The pope does not lord it over the consciences of either clergy or laity—he believes as they do.

The apostles sent Peter and John to Samaria. Peter and John probably offered themselves for the early mission—Peter, to whom God had given superior power—and John, who had leaned on the bosom of Jesus at supper—both pre-eminent apostles, to confirm the people of Samaria.

No man can read the New Testament attentively without seeing, at almost every page, the evidence of Peter’s divinely appointed and acknowledged primacy; or the history of the church, without every where discovering the primacy of his successors. Not one council has

been received that the pope did not approve. His approbation is in the last resort, the only certain test of a council's orthodoxy.

Peter spoke first in the council at Jerusalem. Peter was justly reprimanded by Paul. The very fact of Paul mentioning his boldness on this occasion, confirms the fact of Peter's supremacy. So did Irenæus remonstrate with pope Victor in the controversy of the Quarto-decimans—about the time of observing the Easter—and the pope's sentiments prevailed—although Irenæus' dissuasive did good. So did the controversy about re-baptization terminate between St. Cyprian and the popes Cornelius and Stephen. The popes' decision was every where received.

Now Paul himself did the same for which he blamed Peter. He knew and prized the freedom with which Christ had made him free, yet he says, "If meat scandalize my brother, I will not eat it forever."

He vainly persists in saying there is no good ground for asserting that Peter was ever in Rome, after all the proof I have adduced. Here is Robinson's *Calmet*, a Protestant dictionary of the Bible, a standard work in Protestant libraries. *Calmet* was a *Roman Catholic*. He was a prodigy of learning and ancient literature—and Robinson, a Protestant divine, thought he could not furnish a better gift to the public than this book.

"If the reader wishes to see the evidence from antiquity, on which Peter's having been at Rome rests, he will find it fully set forth by Lardner, who concludes his inquiry as follows: This is the general, uncontradicted, disinterested testimony of ancient writers in the several parts of the world, Greeks, Latins, Syrians. As our Lord's prediction concerning the death of Peter, is recorded in one of the four Gospels, it is very likely that christians would observe the accomplishment of it, which must have been in some place. And about this place, there is no difference among christian writers of ancient times. Never any other place was named besides Rome; nor did any other city, ever glory in the martyrdom of Peter. It is not for our honor, nor for our interests, either as christians or Protestants, to deny the truth of events ascertained by early and well attested tradition. If any make an ill use (as *he* calls it) of such facts, we are not accountable for it. We are not, from a dread of such abuses, to overthrow the credit of all history, the consequence of which would be fatal." Robinson's *Calmet*, p. 741.

The gentleman has said that not one voice has attested the fact of the succession of the Roman see for a thousand years. I have quoted Eusebius, a Greek father of the fourth century, translated by a Protestant minister, a splendid work. Here is a list of 29 bishops who sat in the chair of St. Peter, all of whom he names in the body of the work; also the succession in the churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, Rome, Laodicea, &c.

OF ST. PETER.

(Simon Magus) "entering the city of Rome, by the co-operation of that malignant spirit which had fixed its seat there, his attempts were soon so far successful, as to be honored as a god, with the erection of a statue by the inhabitants of that city. This, however, did not continue long; for immediately under the reign of Claudius, *by the benign and gracious providence of God, Peter, that powerful and great apostle, who, by his courage took the lead of all the rest, was conducted to Rome against this pest of mankind.* He, like a noble commander of God, fortified with divine armor, bore the precious merchandise of the revealed light from the East to those in the West, announcing the light itself, and salutary doctrine of the soul, the proclamation of the kingdom of God."—Book II. chap. 14, page 64.

OF LINUS.

"After the martyrdom of Paul and Peter, Linus was the first that received the episcopate at Rome."—Book III. chap. 2, page 82.

ANACLETUS.

"After Vespasian had reigned about ten years, he was succeeded by his son Titus; in the second year of whose reign, Linus, bishop of the church of Rome, who had held the office about twelve years, transferred it to Anacletus."—Chap. 13, page 100.

CLEMENT.

"In the twelfth year of the same reign, (Domitian's,) after Anacletus had been bishop of Rome twelve years, he was succeeded by Clement."—Chap. 15, page 100.

EUARESTUS.

"In the third year of the above mentioned reign (Trajan's,) Clement, bishop of Rome, committed the episcopal charge to Euarestus."—Chap. 34, page 120.

ALEXANDER.

"About the twelfth year of the reign of Trajan, after Euarestus had completed the eighth year as bishop of Rome, he was succeeded in the episcopal office by Alexander."—Book IV. chap. 1, page 128.

XYSTUS.

"But in the year of the same (Adrian's) reign, Alexander, bishop of Rome, died, having completed the tenth year of his ministrations. Xystus was his successor."—Chap. 4, page 130.

TELESPHORUS AND HYGINUS.

"In the first year of this (Antonine's) reign, and in the eleventh year of his episcopate, Telesphorus departed this life, and was succeeded in the charge of the Roman church by Hyginus."—Chap. 10, page 127.

PIUS.

"But Hyginus dying after the fourth year of his office, Pius received the episcopate."—Chap. 11, page 138.

ANICETUS.

"And Pius dying at Rome in the fifteenth year of his episcopate, the church there was governed by Anicetus."—*ibid.* page 138.

SOTER.

"It was in the eighth year of the above mentioned reign, viz. that of Verus, that Anicetus, who held the episcopate of Rome for eleven years, was succeeded by Soter."—Chap. 19, page 156.

ELEUTHERUS.

"Soter, bishop of Rome, died after having held the episcopate eight years. He was succeeded by Eleutherus, the twelfth in order from the apostles."—Book V. Prelim. page 168.

VICTOR.

"In the tenth year of the reign of Commodus, Eleutherus, who had held the episcopate for thirteen years, was succeeded by Victor."—Chap. 22, page 206.

ZEPHYRINUS.

"But after this author (Victor,) had superintended the church, Zephyrinus was appointed his successor about the ninth year of the reign of Severus."—Chap. 28, page 214.

CALLISTHUS AND URBANUS.

"In the first year of the later (Antonine's reign,) Zephyrinus the bishop of Rome, departed this life, after having charge of the church eighteen years. He was succeeded in the episcopate by Callistus, who survived him five years, and left the church to Urbanus."—Chap. 21, page 242.

PONTIANUS.

"Whilst this was the state of things, Urban, who had been bishop of Rome eight years, was succeeded by Pontianus."—Chap. 23, page 243.

ANTEROS AND FABIANUS.

"Gordian succeeded Maximus in the sovereignty of Rome, when Pontianus, who had held the episcopate six years, was succeeded by Anteros in the church of Rome; he also is succeeded by Fabianus."—Chap. 29, page 248.

CORNELIUS.

"Decius . . . raised a persecution against the church, in which Fabianus suffered martyrdom, and was succeeded as bishop of Rome by Cornelius."—Chap. 30, page 254.

LUCIUS AND STEPHEN.

"After Cornelius had held the episcopal office at Rome about three years, he was succeeded by Lucius, but the latter did not hold the office quite eight months, when dying he transferred it to Stephen."—Book VII. chap. 2, page 271.

STEPHEN AND XYSTUS II.

"But after Stephen had held the episcopal office two years, he was succeeded by Xystus."—Chap. 5, page 273.

DIONYSIUS.

"Xystus had been bishop of Rome eleven years, when he was succeeded by Dionysius."—Chap. 27, page 302.

FELIX.

"Dionysius, who had been bishop of Rome for nine years, was succeeded by Felix."—Chap. 30, page 308.

EUTYCHIANUS, CALUS, AND MARCELLINUS.

"At this time Felix, having held the episcopate at Rome five years, was succeeded by Eutychianus, and he did not hold the office quite ten months, when he left his place to be occupied by Calus of our own day. Calus, also, presided about fifteen years, when he was succeeded by Marcellinus."--Chap. 32, page 310.

MILTIADES.

"Constantine Augustus, to Miltiades bishop of Rome."--Book X., chap. 5, page 429.

I need only refer to what I have read from this authentic historian for splendid and indisputable proof. Here is the succession equally plain in all the churches, but *longest in Rome*. Thence it has been faithfully noticed, and regularly perpetuated in an uninterrupted chain of pontiffs down to the present chief pastor, auspiciously presiding over all the church.

Now, my friend, in the name of God what is to become of this controversy, when testimony like this is overlooked? And to close the testimony of Eusebius who has embodied that of the preceding ages, so as to leave no doubt, that the same identical doctrines, the present organization, orders and sacraments of the Catholic church were those of the first ages of Christianity, and heresy too the same then that it now is. I crave your attention for one of the most instructive chapters that could possibly be read on a subject of such absorbing interest to the Christian.

Of Novatus, his manners and habits, and his heresy.

About this time appeared Novatus (Novatian) a presbyter of the church of Rome, and a man elevated with haughtiness against these (that had fallen), as if there was no room for them to hope salvation, not even, if they performed every thing for a genuine and pure confession. He thus became the leader of the peculiar heresy of those who, in the pomp of their imagination, called themselves Cathari. A very large council being held on account of this, at which sixty indeed of the bishops, but a still greater number of presbyters and deacons were present; the pastors of the remaining provinces, according to their places, deliberated separately what should be done: this decree was passed by all: "That Novatus, indeed, and those who so arrogantly united with him, and those that had determined to adopt the uncharitable and most inhuman opinion of the man, these they considered among those that were alienated from the church; but that brethren who had incurred any calamity, should be treated and healed with the remedies of repentance."

There are also epistles of Cornelius, bishop of Rome, addressed to Fabius, bishop of Antioch, which show the transactions of the council of Rome, as also, the opinions of all those in Italy and Africa, and the regions there. Others there are also written in the Roman tongue, from Cyprian, and the bishops with him in Africa. In these, it is shewn that they also agree in the necessity of relieving those who had fallen under severe temptations, and also in the propriety of excommunicating the author of the heresy, and all that were of his party. To these is attached also an epistle from Cornelius on the decrees of the council,

besides others on the deeds of Novatus, from which we may add extracts, that those who read the present work may know the circumstances respecting him. What kind of a character Novatus was, Cornelius informs Fabius, writing as follows: "But that you may know, says he, how this singular man, who formerly aspired to the episcopate, and secretly concealed within himself this precipitate ambition, making use of those confessors that adhered to him from the beginning as a cloak for his own folly, I will proceed to relate: Maximus, a presbyter of our church, and Urbanus, twice obtained the highest reputation for their confessions. Sidonius also, and Celerinus, a man who, by the mercy of God, bore every kind of torture in the most heroic manner, and, by the firmness of his own faith strengthens the weakness of the flesh, completely worsted the adversary. These men, therefore, as they knew him, and had well sounded his artifice and duplicity, as also his prejudice and falsehoods, his dissocial and savage character, returned to the holy church, and announced all his devices and wickedness, which he had for a long time dissembled within himself, and this too in the presence of many bishops; and the same also, in the presence of many presbyters, and a great number of laymen, at the same time lamenting and sorrowing that they had been seduced, and had abandoned the church for a short time, through the agency of that artful and malicious beast." After a little, he further says: We have seen, beloved brother, within a short time, an extraordinary conversion and change in him. For this most illustrious man, and he who affirmed with the most dreadful oaths, that he never aspired to the episcopate, has suddenly appeared a bishop, as thrown among us by some machine. For this dogmatist, this (pretended) champion of ecclesiastical discipline, when he attempted to seize and usurp the episcopate not given him from above, selected two desperate characters as his associates, to send them to some small, and that the smallest, part of Italy, and from thence, by some fictitious plea, to impose upon three bishops there, men altogether ignorant and simple, affirming and declaring, that it was necessary for them to come to Rome in all haste, that all the dissensions which had there arisen might be removed through their mediation, in conjunction with the other bishops. When these men had come, being as before observed, but simple and plain in discerning the artifices and villainy of the wicked, and when shut up with men of the same stamp with himself, at the tenth hour, when heated with wine and surfeiting, they forced them by a kind of shadowy and empty imposition of hands, to confer the episcopate upon him, and which, though by no means suited to him, he claims by fraud and treachery. One of these, not long after, returned to his church, mourning and confessing his error, with whom also we communed as a layman, as all the people present interceded for him, and we sent successors to the other bishops, ordering them in the place where they were. This assenter of the gospel then did not know that there should be but one bishop in a catholic church.* (εις καθολικη εκκλησια).

*The word catholic, in its Greek etymology, means universal, as we have sometimes explained it in this translation. It is applied to the Christian, as a universal church, partly to distinguish it from the ancient church of the Jews, which was limited, partial, and particular in its duration, subjects and country. The Christian is also called a universal or catholic church, because it must in regard to doctrine hold *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*. In this latter view, which it should be well observed is the original application, it is synonymous with *orthodox*. This is evident, from the fact that our author applies it to different churches in other parts of his history. And in the present instance the expression is general, *a catholic church*. It is in a sense allied to this also, that we are, no doubt, to understand the title of our general, (*catholic*) epistles, in the New Testament. They are *catholic*, because as consonant to the doctrines of the church in all respects, they have been also universally received. In this sense, the term is also synonymous with *canonical*.

In which, however, he well knew, (for how could he be ignorant?) that there were forty-six presbyters, seven deacons, seven sub-deacons, forty-two acoluthi (clerks,) exorcists, readers, and janitors, in all fifty-two; widows, with the afflicted and needy, more than fifteen-hundred; all which the goodness and love of God doth support and nourish. But neither this great number, so necessary in the church, nor those that by the providence of God were wealthy and opulent, together with the innumerable multitude of the people, were able to recall him and turn him from such a desperate and presumptuous course." And again, after these, he subjoins the following: "Now let us also tell by what means and conduct he had the assurance to claim the episcopate. Whether, indeed, it was because he was engaged in the church from the beginning, and endured many conflicts for her, and encountered many and great dangers in the cause of true religion? None of all this. To him, indeed, the author and instigator of his faith was Satan, who entered into and dwelt in him a long time. Who, aided by the exorcists, when attacked with an obstinate disease, and being supposed at the point of death, was baptized by aspersion, in the bed on which he lay; if, indeed, it be proper to say that one like him did receive baptism. But neither when he recovered from disease, did he partake of other things, which the rules of the church prescribed as a duty, nor was he sealed (in confirmation) by the bishop. But as he did not obtain this, how could he obtain the Holy Spirit?" And again, soon after, he says: "He denied he was a presbyter, through cowardice and the love of life, in the time of persecution. For when requested and exhorted by the deacons, that he should go forth from his retreat, in which he had imprisoned himself, and should come to the relief of the brethren, as far as was proper and in the power of a presbyter to assist brethren requiring relief, he was so far from yielding to any exhortation of the deacons, that he went away offended and left them. For he said that he wished to be a presbyter no longer, for he was an admirer of a different philosophy." After this, he adds another deed, the worst of all the man's absurdities, thus: "For having made the oblation, and distributed a part to each one, whilst giving this, he compels the unhappy men to swear instead of blessing; holding the hands of the one receiving, with both his own, and not letting them go until he had sworn in these words, for I shall repeat the very words: 'Swear to me, by the body and blood of our Savior, Jesus Christ, that you will never desert me, nor turn to Cornelius.' And the unhappy man is then not suffered to taste until he had first cursed himself; and instead of saying Amen, after he had taken the bread, he says, 'I will no longer return to Cornelius.'" And, after other matters, he again proceeds, as follows: "Now, you must know, that he is stripped and abandoned, the brethren leaving him every day and returning to the church. He was also excommunicated by Moses, that blessed witness who but lately endured a glorious and wonderful martyrdom, and who, whilst yet among the living, seeing the audacity and the folly of the man, excluded him from the communion, together with the five presbyters that had cut themselves off from the church." At the close of the epistle, he gives a list of the bishops who had come to Rome, and had discarded the incorrigible disposition of Novatus; at the same time adding the names, together with the churches governed by each. He also mentioned those that were not present at Rome, but who, by letter, assented to the decision of the former, adding also the names and the particular cities whence each one had written. Such is the account written by Cornelius to Fabius bishop of Antioch.—From pages 263-4-5-6-7 of Eusebius' Eccles. Hist. transl. by Rev. C. F. Crusé, Book vi. chap. 43.—[Time expired.]

Half-past 11, A. M.

MR. CAMPBELL rises--

I have some respect, my friends, not only to the audience who hear, but to those who may read this discussion; and, therefore, I wish my argument to be as continuous and unbroken as possible. I could, indeed, wish that my ingenious and eloquent opponent would reply to my speeches in regular sequence, and thus give more of system and tenacity to our debate. Before I trace his zigzag course, I wish to add to my last speech a few kindred considerations. While it behoves him to prove that Peter was first bishop of Rome, I am gratuitously in display of my resources, as the advocate of Protestantism, rather spontaneously proving a negative, or showing that Peter never was bishop of Rome. Two considerations may be added to my remarks on this head: 1st. The special commission, which he had to the Jews as Paul had to the Gentiles, precludes the idea of his here devoting himself to any portion of the Gentile world. The "ministry of the circumcision" was committed to him, and therefore not the Roman capital; but rather the Syrian capital or Jerusalem should have been the place of his location. 2d. His commission, as apostle, precludes the idea of his being stationed as *bishop* at any one place. You cannot place Peter as bishop of Rome, any more than you can make the president of the United States mayor of Cincinnati. The duties of these officers are not more incompatible than the duties of an apostle and a resident bishop. What are the duties of the bishop's chair? Are they not to watch over a particular diocese? What does the apostles' commission say? "Go ye into *all the world*, and announce the glad tidings to the whole creation." It would be as easy to prove that the bishop of London may be vicar of Bray, or curate of St. Ives, as that Peter was, or could be, bishop of Rome. These two considerations deserve the attention of my friend, and I hope that he will not pass them too in silence.

That every important office, essential to the government of any community, must have a place clearly specific in the constitution is scarcely necessary to prove; yet, as my opponent seems to slur over this matter, I shall read a sentence or two of the Constitution of the United States, to show that in the estimation of its framers, it was necessary to have a distinct assertion of the office and power of the president.

ART. II. SECT. 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of four years, and, together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term as follows:

SECT. 2. "Each state shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of senators and representatives to which the state may be entitled in the congress; but no senator or representative, or person holding any office of trust or profit under the United States, shall be appointed an elector." *The American's Guide*, p. 20.

Now the head of the christian church was, at least, as wise as the convention which framed this instrument, foreseeing all the difficulties of the church in all time, and as he was determined to make all things plain, and certainly he was as capable as they to reveal and express his own will, had he resolved to build his church on the shoulder of St. Peter, he would have unequivocally expressed it. He would have defined the office, appointed the first officer, and legislated the mode of election. The practice of electing popes in the church of Rome is a candid acknowledgment that there is no law in the case: for they have had very different modes at different periods of their history. What would we Americans say, if every few years a new mode should be adopted, without regard to the constitution? Would they submit to such a chief magistrate?

The gentleman proceeded to read and reiterate his remarks on two passages of scripture, often before us: he objects to my criticism on the last chapter of John. His last remarks enable me to give it a more thorough exposition. He says my construction "requires the *accusative* for *these*." I say, with more of the philosophy of language, his construction requires the nominative. The question would have been plainly this: "Do you love me more than these love me?" *Πλεῖον*, it is true, always requires the genitive; but the whole construction of the sentence would have been changed, if *these* were to be the nominative to the verb here understood. My construction is critically correct as the sentence now reads, but it will not bear his construction. But there is yet another great assumption in the quotation of this passage on which I have not yet emphasized. He says, "*feed my sheep*" means, feed my *pastors*, and "*feed my lambs*" means, feed my *flock*. Mark the *assumption*, that sheep signifies *pastors*, and lambs the people! Where does he find authority for this? If "*sheep*" any where else signified "*clergy*," and "*lambs*" laity, there would be some plausibility in it; but with the absence of such usage it is supremely whimsical and arbitrary; and yet the point of this passage rests upon the assumption of sheep for clergy. So far he presses it into his service, for that *bishops* are to feed the flock is not disputed, but that one of them is before the others is the question in debate.

The gentleman, on Saturday, called my interpretation of this passage a fish story; this mode of treating so holy an institution, so solemn a matter, is not in the true dignity of the subject, nor of the occasion; nor is it very respectful to the great personage on whose words we comment; but the audience have not met it with a laugh, and therefore I presume they felt the incongruity. In the same style are the morning's remarks on the *bones*, &c., but the bishop might remember there was more in the premises than the spoils of a single

meal; there were many fish and all the apparatus before them, but no one would interpret the words of the question in that style on any other occasion. It was sustenance in general, and not a particular meal, concerning which the Savior spoke.

The gentleman suggests that, in the 1st chap. of John, Christ in his first interview with Peter changes his name to Cephas; and he assumes "that it was that he might afterwards make him the rock of his church!" It was a very common thing in the history of the patriarches and Jews to change names. Thus we find from the beginning of their history, various instances of this: "Sarai" is changed into *Sarah*; "Abram" into *Abraham*; "Jacob" into *Israel*. Two of the apostles were called "Boanerges," *sons of Thunder*; but that did not convert them into thunder; neither did the name Cephas convert Peter into a stone. If I were to give a reason for the addition to Peter's name, (but it was neither change nor addition, rightly considered,) I would say that it was most probably occasioned by the fact, that Daniel spoke of the kingdom of the Messiah under the figure of *a stone* cut out of the mountain. With an eye probably to this kingdom of the stone, (as Peter was the first convert,) his name is improved by being translated into Syriac; for after all, it is rather a translation of *Petros* than an addition to it! He was, however, the beginning of this new spiritual edifice, and a foundation stone; but only one among many.

This kingdom of the stone, it is foretold by Daniel, was to commence in the days of the Cæsars: but it was to become the kingdom of the mountain. It was, indeed, to become a great mountain, and fill the whole earth. This building is composed of a succession of foundations, provided only that all the popes are successors of Peter, in virtue of his being the rock. To have this whole building at the foundation, or to be always laying new foundations in every election of a pope, is rather a singular idea, which grows out of the extravagance of the Romish assumption.

The bishop observes that a headless trunk is worth nothing, and would seem to think that our argument on that subject leaves the church without a head. Has the church no other head than the pope? Of whatever church the pope is head, that church is the body of the pope: And is it Christ's body too? The Romanists are the body of the bishop's church—cut the head off that body, or annul the pope's assumption and you destroy its organization. The gentleman rightly appreciates my argument: he feels that it makes the church of Rome a headless trunk: but the mistake is in supposing that this annihilation of the pretension annuls the church of Christ. Jesus Christ is independent of the pope. *He* is head; and the saints of all ages are the component parts of his spiritual, his *mystical* body.

The gentleman's allusion to the High Priest was peculiarly unfortunate. There never was but one high priest at a time: one in heaven and one on earth is without a single hint or allusion in the Bible. We cannot now descant upon such an incongruity.

The word *ἱερεύς* (Hierus) *priest*, occurs not once in the New Testament, in reference to christian bishops, or deacons. It is only found once, and that in the apocalyptic style, in all the christian scriptures: for the idea of any one officiating on the earth as a sacrificing priest, or that christian bishops have aught of a priestly character is anti-christian. But Christ is the anti-type of Aaron. The order of Aaron is extinct. The order of Melchisedec is the model of the Christian High Priesthood. Christ is called of God as was Aaron: but he is called to officiate after the order of Melchisedec. The doctrine of Protestants is, that their High Priest made one great sacrifice for sin on earth: and that he offered it in the heavens; and that by one offering of himself, he *has* perfected the sanctified. "Brethren, consider the high priest of our profession, Jesus Christ." He ever lives and ever intercedes, and is able to save to the uttermost all that come by him to God. We, therefore, need no high priest on earth.

The gentleman has told us too often of his love for America, and his love for England. If he repeats these declarations so often, we shall begin to think he loves too much in word, and too little in fact. He tells you of 30,000 English bayonets employed in defence of the papacy. And what of this? England is the cradle of all political freedom. Our notions of free government were all promulged in English books, and taught in English schools before they were imported here. We have, indeed, practised upon the science of free government more than our mother country. But as in America, we tolerate all religions: so in the British empire in every country where she has territory or subjects, supports and protects all. England tolerates everything. She supports Catholicism in Canada, Episcopacy in England, Presbyterianism in Scotland, and Paganism in the East Indies. Is she not too free and tolerant for my opponent, and for many Protestants?! She takes no part against any religion. The popular doctrine in England at this moment is, that Church and State ought not to be amalgamated, or consociated under the same earthly head. Indeed, she is disposed to follow her American children very far in this doctrine.

The bishop seems to apply to Peter what was common to all the apostles, "Whatsoever you shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." I remark upon this passage, that when the Messiah gave the keys to Peter to open the kingdom of heaven to Jews and Gentiles, he did not appropriate to him the sole and exclusive power of binding

and loosing: this power he bestowed on all the apostles. For after Peter opened the kingdom, they all introduced citizens into it, as well as he; and had the same official power; for as John says, chap. 20: he addressed them all—"As my Father hath sent me, so do I send you; whose soever sins you remit they are remitted to them, and whose soever sins you retain they are retained!"—This was spoken, in substance, repeatedly to them all. It is therefore asserting too much, to say that Peter alone was gifted with this power. He only used it first. They always exercised it in its true intent and meaning. I shall be glad to resume again the regular order.

We have heard much about the bishops of Rome and how they can be traced back even to Peter, &c., &c. I wish my learned opponent would confine himself to the proposition in debate, and permit me to go through with this argument, for succession. Then I will show of how much value are the traditionary enumerations found in Eusebius, from whose authors I can make out two or three successions.

The gentleman brings up the erudition of the 4th century. I would as soon call on people in this room for testimony that the battle of Bunker's hill, or Blenheim was so and so fought—not one of whom lived at that time; as on persons living in one century to prove what happened in centuries before they were born. In the fourth century there is one writer testifies to the succession. What a decisive proof! Is there any testimony for the first *two hundred years* affirming this succession? I affirm that there is not. All the tradition on earth fails just in this radical and essential point!

Again: tradition is wholly silent on the election of the first popes. No one pretends to tell how Peter and Linus and Clement were invested with the office. Tradition is even in the hands of Catholics ashamed to depose any thing upon this point. We all know how to dispose of tradition three hundred years too late, in other matters; and I think to the matter of fact people of this generation, it must appear preposterous to prove an event by those who lived one, two, and three hundred years after.

Irenæus was introduced as a witness of Peter's having been bishop of Rome: but Irenæus does not say so on his own responsibility: for he lived at the close of the second century. With him it was only *hear-say*. Again, his testimony of the church of Rome, having been *planted* by Paul and Peter is certainly false; and his saying that Polycarp was appointed bishop of Smyrna *by the apostles*, greatly weakens his traditionary statements concerning the Roman see: for Polycarp must have been ordained in the year 97, as he died in the year 147, having been 50 years bishop of Smyrna. Consequently it was impossible he could have been ordained by the apostles: but of this again.

While my opponent speaks so fluently of early fathers, and of the short interval of two or three hundred years from Christ, he seems to forget how long a hundred years is, and how few know much about the events that happened a hundred years ago. Even now, in this age of books and printing, and steam presses, and steam-boats, and railroads, and general reading, how few of us could accurately, from memory relate the history of the American Revolution! And yet the gentleman talks about the opportunities of a person to ascertain these historic facts, one or two hundred years after they occurred, from tradition too, in an age when all these facilities which we enjoy were unknown. Is not this tradition a very loose and uncertain witness?— [Time expired.]

Twelve o'clock, M.

BISHOP PURCELL RISES—

Irenæus lived in the second century. He was a disciple of Polycarp, who was a disciple of John the evangelist. Irenæus, was bishop of Lyons in France. The chain of testimony consists of three links, John the evangelist, Polycarp of Smyrna, Irenæus of Lyons. John told Polycarp what Jesus did—Polycarp told Irenæus what John had told him, and Irenæus bears testimony here. This edition was published by a Protestant divine, named Nich: Gallaisus. It is dedicated to Grindal, bishop of London; and as I do not like to advance any thing merely on Catholic testimony, I prefer the Protestant to the Catholic edition of this father's works. Irenæus distinctly says: "Since it would be very long to enumerate in this volume the succession of bishops in all churches, by appealing to the tradition of a church the GREATEST AND MOST ANCIENT AND KNOWN TO ALL, which was founded and established at Rome, by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul; a tradition which she has from the apostles, and the faith which she announces to men, and which comes down to us through the succession of bishops, we confound all those who in any way, either through evil self complacency or vain glory, or blindness and perversity gather otherwise than is meet. For with this church, on account of her more powerful principality, IT IS NECESSARY THAT EVERY CHURCH AGREE, that is the faithful who are on all sides, in which church, the tradition of the apostles has been preserved by the faithful who are on all sides." Iren. lib. III. chap. 3, (adversus hæreses.)

Eusebius, has preserved for us a letter, written by the martyrs who suffered in Gaul, in the 19th year of Antonius Verus, and who were charged by the Pagans, as they say in their address to their fellow-citizens in Phrygia, "with feasts of Thyestes, (*who ate part of his own son,*) and the incests of Œdipus," and such crimes as are neither

lawful for us to speak nor to think, and such indeed, as we do not believe were committed." In this document the martyrs commend Irenæus, then a presbyter of the church of Lyons, to pope Eleutherus, whom Irenæus appealed to on the subject of the Quarto-deciman controversy. I have this letter here in Greek. It may perhaps have more authority if I read the original.

Thus do we perceive that Eleutherus was styled "father and bishop of Rome," by these illustrious confessors of Jesus Christ, and his favor invoked in behalf of their brother.

In book III. chap. 3, (the title of this chapter is, of the apostolic tradition, or the succession of bishops in the churches from the apostles.) "These blessed apostles (Peter and Paul) founding and instituting the church, delivered the care of administering it to Linus, of whom Paul makes mention in his epistle to Timothy. To him succeeded Anacletus, after whom Clement obtains the episcopacy, in the third place from the apostles, who had seen and conferred with the apostles, who had heard their preaching sounding in his ears, and had with his own eyes beheld their traditions. Nor was he the only one—there were many more yet living who had been taught by the apostles. Under this Clement, when no inconsiderable discussion occurred among the brethren at Corinth, the church of Rome addressed to them most forcible letters, gathering them together in peace, *repairing their faith, and announcing to them the traditions they had recently received from the apostles.* To Clement succeeded Euaristus, and to Euaristus, Alexander; next was Sextus, sixth from the apostles, and after him Telesphorus, who also endured a most glorious martyrdom; then Hyginus, afterwards Pius, and after him again Anicetus. But when Soter had succeeded Anicetus, now in the twelfth place from the apostles, Eleutherus hath the episcopate." There is then the fullest manifestation that one and the same vivifying faith has been handed down in the church and preserved to the present day. I would fain read the rest of this admirable chapter, but enough—here is the volume to which all who are anxious for more proof are invited to refer.

Tertullian, a little later says, confounding the heresies of his day—"let them produce the origin of their churches, let them display the succession of their bishops, so that the first may appear to have been ordained by an apostolic man, who persevered in their communion." Lib. de præscrip. He then enumerates the pontiffs from St. Peter, to his own time in the Roman see, and concludes by the memorable words, "Let heretics exhibit anything like this." The evidence of Eusebius is also before you. On this subject I have one remark to make, which no one in this assembly who sincerely desires to know the truth, and of such a trust, the number is not small, will bear with

indifference. This is, that in the letter of Cornelius, bishop of Rome, to Fabius, bishop of Antioch concerning Novatus, which is given in full by Eusebius, and is a faithful exhibition of the doctrines of the whole church at that early period, there is not a single doctrine or usage mentioned, which is not taught and observed in the Catholic church in this very city, at this very hour. Is not this an admirable proof of the apostolicity of our church? The supremacy of the pope in the supplying of vacant sees, the sacraments of the holy eucharist, baptism, confirmation, orders, a hierarchy, bishops, priests, deacons, subdeacons, acolytes, exorcists, readers, porters, or janitors; asylums for the needy and afflicted—one bishop in a Catholic church; the right of excommunication, acquiescence of other bishops, personally testified or by letter, in the judgment of the bishop of Rome, &c., &c., &c. In the same letter we see heretics pictured to the life, the errors and evil practices of some modern sectarians described and strongly reprobated, viz: the forcing of communicants to take an oath never to quit a church they have joined. This I know to have occurred in Maryland, and I presume it is not uncommon.

Three o'clock, P. M.

MR. CAMPBELL rises—

The last half hour of the gentleman was spent in culling antiquity to find some collateral evidence in attempting to defend the great point of the succession of pontiffs; and with what success you have all seen. His sensibility on the present occasion is truly gratifying. His conduct here shows that he perceives it to be vital, supremely essential to his system to make Peter bishop of Rome, and to fix the first twenty-nine links in the apostolic chain. But the barrenness of ancient history cannot be remedied in the nineteenth century. He brought forward one fragment of antiquity on the subject; and it is the only fragment on which Eusebius himself relies. In truth that fragment, the Latin version of Irenæus, is the only fragment of antiquity now extant, or extant in the time of Constantine, from which any thing can be gleaned on this subject. And he never once says *that either Paul or Peter separately or jointly were bishops of the church of Rome!*

And here again I cannot suppress my astonishment at the choice of the Romanists:—Why they did not make *Paul* rather than Peter bishop of Rome. In the first place he was a bachelor; and that is now a most cardinal point: again, he informs us that “he had the care of all the churches.” He says, moreover, that he is not behind the chief of the apostles. This is rather disrespectful of pope Peter! It could be so easily proved, too, that he was once at Rome (though a prisoner for two full years.) Now, if he did not plant the church of Rome; he cer-

tainly watered it. He labored more abundantly than all the other apostles. Is it not then ten fold more probable that Paul rather than Peter was bishop of Rome? But probability will not do in the case. We must have the strongest evidence: we must have contemporary testimony: we cannot prove a fact by witnesses who did not see it. We require the evidence of sense. We should not believe the records of Christ's actions, even, unless we received them from eye and ear witnesses. To illustrate the difficulties that environ my ingenious opponent, I will suppose a case like the one he has to manage. Suppose that in the year one thousand, a tradition had been current that a certain bridge over the river Tiber had been built in the time of the apostles, and that Peter laid the corner stone of the Roman abutment. Some incredulous persons began then to doubt of the matter, and called upon those who affirmed that Peter laid that stone to prove it. They go to work. They found very many believing it in the 10th century: fewer in the 9th, fewer in the 8th, fewer in the 7th, till within 200 years of the time, they find only one person that affirms faith in it, and with him it is an unwritten tradition. All record ceases. There is a perfect chasm of 200 years without a single witness. How shall they throw a bridge over this chasm? Where is tradition during this period? Is there not one voice? NOT ONE. But they say it is *only two hundred years!* But according to all the laws of mind and society, these two hundred years should have the most witnesses: for, the nearer we approach any true event, the more numerous are the vouchers of its reality and authenticity. Therefore the total failure of testimony during that period is fatal to the credibility of the tradition. But they say, it was traditionary for two hundred years: but who can prove the tradition? It is as hard to prove this tradition as the fact! To prove the existence of it first, and then the authenticity of it afterwards, is only rising from the positive to the superlative difficulty. We can as easily build a house in the air eighteen stories high, leaving out the two basement stories, as prove the truth of an event 1800 years old, finding a chasm of 200 years in which there is not one word about it. The church of Rome believes many miracles of her own on mere tradition. There is a legend in Ireland to this day, commonly believed, that St. Patrick 1200 years ago literally sailed from that country to Scotland on a mill stone. Now, if we trace this back we shall find the evidence diminishes with every century until you come within two or three centuries of the time assigned. Then it comes to a solitary individual, who heard some one say, that he heard another one say, that such a one *dreamed so!*

I think it would be well to advert more pointedly to that law of mind, that the testimony of a fact is always best and strongest be-

cause of the number and opportunity of the witnesses *at the time, or near the time* it actually existed. For example, at this day, there are many biographies of Washington and narratives of the revolutionary war; some four or five hundred years hence there will be but one or two. This is the established order of things. Genuine evidence diminishes as we descend from, and increases as we ascend up to the events, or facts recorded. All history is proof of this. It is a law of evidence, and a law of the human mind. Therefore, had Peter been bishop of Rome, we would, as we advanced upwards have found much more evidence of it than in the third and fourth centuries. But on the subject of tradition, I will gratify my audience with a few remarks from Du Pin: certainly he had no temptation to weaken its authority.

" Criticism is a kind of torch, that lights and conducts us, in the obscure tracts of antiquity, by making us able to distinguish truth from falsehood, history from fable, and antiquity from novelty. 'Tis by this means, that in our times we have disengaged ourselves from an infinite number of very common errors into which our fathers fell for want of examining things by the rules of true criticism. For 'tis a surprising thing to consider how many spurious books we find in antiquity; nay, even in the first ages of the church. Several reasons induced men to impose books upon the world, under other men's names.

The first and most general, is, the malice of heretics; who, to give the greater reputation to their heresies, composed several books, which they attributed to persons of great reputation; in which they studiously spread their own errors, that so they might find a better reception, under the protection of these celebrated names. And thus the first heretics devised false gospels, false acts and false epistles of the apostles, and their disciples: and thus those that came after them published several spurious books, as if they had been written by orthodox authors, that so they might insensibly convey their errors into the minds of their readers, without their perceiving the cheat.

The second reason that inclined people to favor books under other men's names, is directly contrary to the first; being occasioned by the indiscreet piety of some persons, who thought they did the church considerable service in forging ecclesiastical or profane monuments in favor of religion and the truth. And this idea prevailed with some ancient christians to forge some testimonies in behalf of the christian religion, under the name of the *Sibyls*, *Mercurius Trismegistus*, and divers others: and likewise induced the Catholics to compose some books, that they might refute the heretics of their own times with the greatest ease. And lastly: the same motion carried the Catholics so far, as to *invent false histories, false miracles, and false lives of the saints, to keep up the piety of the faithful.*

* * * * *

The third reason of the forgery of some books, keeps a middle way between those we have already mentioned; for there have been some persons in the world, that have been guilty of this imposture, without any other design, than to divert themselves at the expense of their readers, and to try how nearly they could imitate the style of other men. Hence it is, that some authors have composed treatises under *St. Cyprian's*, *St. Ambrose's* and *St. Austin's* names— * * * * * desiring rather (as the Abbot of Billi says,) to appear abroad, and be esteemed under other men's names than to continue despised, and be buried in darkness,

by writing in their own. And these are the reasons that may have occasioned the forgery of books; malice, indiscreet pety and the humors of men.

But besides these reasons that have advanced this trade of forgery; there are several others that have occasioned the setting authors' names to several books, which they never writ.

'Tis very ill done to conclude that such a book is spurious, because it pinches us, and afterwards to search for reasons why it may be thought so." [*Preface*, p. 6, 7.

We select only one of all these judicious and weighty remarks, from one of the most learned of Roman Catholics, viz., "*that the Catholics themselves have INVENTED FALSE HISTORIES, FALSE MIRACLES, AND FALSE LIVES OF THE SAINTS,*" to promote pety in their own members, from which I emphatically ask the question: *What is an article of faith worth which is founded alone upon the traditions of that church?* I will only add, these are the words of Du Pin, a learned and authentic ecclesiastical historian, whose work is published by the authority of the learned doctors of the Sorbonne.

I have, let me now add, strong suspicions of the authenticity of that passage of Irenæus. The Greek original in the first place is lost: and in the second place the Latin translation was not found for some hundreds of years afterwards. In the third place, two things asserted by Irenæus are not true: 1st, that Peter and Paul founded the Roman church; whereas it has been shown by Paul's letter to the Romans, not to have been the case. 2d. This same Irenæus says, that Polycarp was ordained by the apostles, when according to Polycarp himself, he was not ordained till the year 97, when all the apostles were dead save John, and there is no document to prove that even John lived till that time. Thus dispose we of *Roman traditions*.

The gentleman first introduced this authority which I have in my hand—an Episcopalian doctor—one of the most learned authors of the present day, George Waddington—"History of the Church, 1834." This author enumerates the bishops of Rome; but listen to his own candid testimony. In his chronological table of eminent men, and of the principal councils, he says:

"The succession of the earlier Bishops of Rome and the duration of their government, are involved in inexplicable confusion."

But I have here before me the *Romanorum Pontificum Index*—a chronological index of the Roman pontiffs, prefixed to Eusebius. I have compared it for the first two centuries with Eusebius and some of the primitive fathers on whose authority it partially rests, and I can say with confidence there is no faith can be reposed in it. I find the authorities on which its assertions rest sometimes obscure, frequently contradictory, and often at variance with other facts which they assert; involving the credibility of the whole story of the successions from

different chairs. There are the following traditions to be collected from Eusebius and his fathers for only the first five links of this chain:

1st. Lineage.	2nd. Lineage.	3rd. Lineage.	4th. Lineage.
1. Peter.	1. Linus.	1. Peter.	1. Peter.
2. Linus.	2. Anacletus.	2. Anacletus.	2. Clement.
3. Cletus.	3. Clement.	3. Clement.	3. Linus.
4. Clement.	4. Sixtus.	4. Alexander.	4. Cletus.
5. Anacletus.	5. Alexander.	5. Evaristus.	5. Alexander.

I might argue this subject for hours and hours, but it is not worth it. I do not like to imitate my opponent in dilating upon matters, which, whether true or false, do not affect the points at issue the weight of a feather. But the display we have now made of the beginning of succession, according to various traditions and statements, is susceptible of immediate proof, and shows how vacant and dubious these oral and hearsay traditions are. Is not Waddington justified in saying "*this matter is involved in inexplicable confusion?*" and well it is that saving faith depends not upon such testimony!

I have said the Romanists have never been uniform in electing their popes. I can show some six or seven different modes of filling the chair of Peter, equally approved by the church of different ages. The chair has often been filled by bribery, by force, by the bayonet, and by all sorts of violence. It has been filled by men and boys, and by all sorts of characters. But of this more fully at another time.

The gentleman remarked, on Saturday, that the pope is not infallible. The question was not about the *man*, but the *pope*. I take him at his word, and will now prove, that neither the present pope nor his predecessors are successors of Peter; because Peter was infallible, both in doctrine and in discipline. How, then, can these fallible gentry—these fallible popes—be successors to Peter, in the capacity of officers, when they have not *the grace* of office,—my opponent himself being judge?

I shall now attempt continuously to show, that if even Peter had been placed by a positive precept in the office of vicar and head of the church, all the official grace of such an appointment has failed by the various schisms in the Roman see. The chain has been broken; for Roman Catholics themselves admit, at least, *twenty-two* schisms; some count *twenty-six*. Protestants can find *twenty-nine*. I have already shown that the *hook* and the first *link* must be better secured, if not welded; for Peter the hook and first link has not yet been fastened to the right place; and some of the first links are so entangled that Eusebius, the pope, and G. Waddington, cannot strengthen them. And to quote the words of *A. Pope*, not *the pope*, if one link be missing,

“*Tenth or ten thousandth breaks the chain alike.*”

Ah me! I am jostled out of my course again! The mention of Eusebius reminds me that the bishop has quoted him against the Novatians, &c. But what avails the testimony of Eusebius as a *sectary*? It is quoting a Jansenist against a Jesuit—a Calvinist against an Arminian—a Romanist against a Protestant. Eusebius speaks as a *historian*, and he speaks as a *sectary*; sometimes *Arian*, perhaps, sometimes *Trinitarian*; but certainly opposed to Novatus and his party. It is very hard for a warm partizan, in any case, to state his opponent's views fairly. I have never yet heard any one oppose Calvinism, or Arminianism, just precisely as it was. There is some little difference or other in the most equitable hands, which the opposite party would not have stated just so; and we know how often the merits of controversy rests upon these minute matters. Novatus and Cornelius were both elected bishops of Rome, and a controversy arose on their respective claims. In the course of controversy, we learn, that it turned on these two points:

“That Cornelius admitted those who had been guilty of Idolatry to communion, and Novatus taught that the church neither could nor ought to admit those to the communion that had apostatized.” *Du Pin*. Vol. I. p. 135.

Novatus was the rival of his friend Cornelius, and he regards him as an anti-pope; he is, indeed, called anti-pope 1st. And, at this day, we cannot tell whether Novatus or Cornelius was the successor of Peter. So the first schism commenced, and we look for the faithful witnesses against Roman assumption from that hour amongst the Remonstrants—call them the Novatians, Puritans, or Protestants.

The second schism we shall notice is that between Liberius and Felix, A. D. 367.

“Constantius being enraged against St. Athanasius, as supposing him the cause of that enmity which his brother Constans had against him, Liberius as to this answered wisely, you ought not, sir, to make use of bishops to revenge your quarrels: for the hands of ecclesiastics ought not to be employed, but only to bless and to sanctify. At last Constantius threatened him with banishment; ‘I have already,’ says he, ‘bid adieu to my brethren at Rome, for the ecclesiastical laws are to be preferred before my living there.’ Three days time were given him to consider of it, and because he did not change his opinion in that time he was banished two days after to Berea a city of Thrace. The emperor, the empress, and the eunuch Eusebius, offered him money to bear the expenses of his journey, but he refused it, and went away cheerfully to the place of his banishment. The clergy of Rome having lost their head, took an oath to choose nobody in the room of Liberius as long as he was alive; but Constantius, by the management of Epietetus bishop of Centumcellar in Italy, procured one *Felix* a deacon to be ordained bishop, who was himself also one of them that had sworn not to choose a bishop in the room of Liberius. * * * But Liberius, who had given proof of so great constancy in time of peace, could not long endure the

tediousness of banishment; for before he had been two years in it, he suffered himself to be over-persuaded by Demophilus bishop of that city, of which he was banished, and did not only subscribe the condemnation of St. Athanasius; but he also consented to an heretical confession of faith."—*Du Pin*, Vol. I. p. 190.

Now, if we take Liberius for the true pope, we must take an *Arian* head; for it must be acknowledged that he subscribed the heretical and Arian creed; and, perhaps, at this time the majority of the Roman Catholic church were Arians; but that is not the present inquiry.

We shall now read an account of the third schism:

DAMASUS, BISHOP OF ROME.

"After the death of pope *Liberius*, which happened in the year 369, the see of Rome being vacant for some time, by reason of the caballing of those that pretended to fill it, Damasus at last was chosen by the greater part of the clergy and people, and ordained by the bishops. But on the other side, *Ursinus*, or rather *Ursicinus*, who was his competitor for the popedom, got himself ordained by some other bishops in the church of *Sicinus*. This contest caused a great division in the city of Rome, and stirred up so great a sedition there as could hardly be appeased. The two parties came from words to blows, and many christians were killed in the churches of Rome upon this quarrel. The governor of Rome called *Prætextus*, being desiring to allay the heat of this contention, sent *Ursicinus* into banishment by the emperor's order: but his banishment did not perfectly appease the quarrel; for the partizans of *Ursicinus* assembled still in the churches of which they were possessed, without ever communicating with Damasus; and even when the emperor had ordered that their churches should be taken from them, they still kept up their assemblies without the city, so that it was necessary at last to drive them quite out of Rome. And yet all this did not hinder *Ursicinus* from having his secret associates in Italy and at Rome. The bishop of *Puteoli* called *Florentius*, and the bishop of *Parma* were most zealous for his interests. They were condemned in a council held at Rome in the year 372, and afterwards banished by the authority of the emperor. However they found means to return into their own country, and stirred up new troubles there. They got pope *Damasus* to be accused by one *Isaac*, a Jew. This accusation was examined in a council of bishops held at Rome, in the year 378, which declared *Damasus* innocent of the crime that was laid to his charge. This council wrote a letter to the emperor *Gratian*, praying him to take some order for the peace of the church of Rome. The emperor wrote to them, that *Ursicinus* was detained at *Cologne*, that he had given order to banish *Isaac* into a corner of Spain, and to force the bishops of *Puteoli* and *Parma*, out of their country. This did not hinder *Ursicinus* from returning into Italy in the year 381, where he stirred up new tumults, and endeavored to pre-engage the emperor: but the bishops of *Italy* being assembled in a council at *Aquileia*, in the year 381, wrote so smartly to him, that he banished *Ursicinus* forever, and left *Damasus* in peaceable possession of the see of Rome, in which he continued until the year 384." *Du Pin*, Vol. I. p. 226, 227.—[Time expired.]

Half-past 3 o'clock, P. M.

BISHOP PURCELL rises--

In the 2nd. century lived Tertullian—a priest in Africa. He showed how clear was the chain of tradition—he says distinctly that Peter was

bishop of Rome. I am going to quote another splendid passage from his testimony. But first let me ask, how could a massive, an enormous volume like this (holding it up) of which the zeal of the early Christians, has made so many copies; and a portion of which, the admirable apologetic, or defence of our Christian ancestors, was addressed to the Pagan Emperors, have been vitiated? It was spread over the whole world—it was read with avidity by Christians and heathens. It is authentic history and based on testimony far more credible than we possess of the genuineness of Homer, or Horace, or Tacitus, or Cicero. We could not believe any fact of history, not even our title to our houses and other goods and chattels, without admitting it. How else but by such records, do we know with certainty of events of which our senses have not taken cognizance, of which we have no personal knowledge, that a few years ago we fought a hard battle with England and gained our independence? That our general was named Washington, and that he was aided by La Fayette? Comparatively recent as these events be, they are matters of tradition! and tradition is but another name for history. Admit my learned opponent's principle, and the world will be turned topsy-turvy. We cannot be sure of anything. I now cite Tertullian; and mark, I pray you, the clearness and force of his reasoning in the following syllogism, for apostolical succession:

Tertullian de præscriptione adversus hæreticos. lib. p. 394: "If the Lord Jesus Christ sent his apostles to preach, no other preachers are to be received than those whom he commissioned: for no one knows the Father but the Son, and they to whom the Son hath revealed him, nor is the Son seen to have revealed him to any others than the apostles, whom he sent to preach what he revealed to them. Now what they preached, that is to say, what Christ revealed to them, I will here lay down as a principle (*hic præscribam*) cannot be otherwise proved than by the same churches which the apostles, themselves, founded, by preaching to them, themselves, both by word of mouth, as they say, and, afterwards, by their epistles. If this be so, it is therefore plain that all the doctrine which agrees with these apostolic churches, the *matrixes and originals* (or exemplars) of faith, is to be reputed true, as undoubtedly, holding that which the churches received from the apostles, the apostles from Christ, and Christ from God: but that all other doctrine is to be prejudged false, as teaching contrarily to the churches and to the apostles, to Christ and to God. All, therefore, that remains now to be done is to demonstrate that the doctrine we preach, as already explained, has been handed down to us from the apostles, and thus convict all other doctrines of falsehood. . . . They, (the heretics) object that Peter was reprehended by Paul. But let those who make this allegation shew that Paul preached a different gospel from what Peter preached and the other apostles. If Peter was reprehended for withdrawing, through human respect, from intercourse with the Gentiles, with whom he previously associated, this was a fault of conduct (*conversationalis*) not of preaching. He did not, on this account, preach a different God from the Creator, a different Christ from the son of Mary, a different hope from that of the resurrection—and, (to refute these heretics,) I will answer as it were for Peter, that Paul, himself, said that he made himself, all things to

all men, a Jew to the Jews, and no Jew to those who were no Jews, that he may gain all. So that Paul reprehended, under certain circumstances, in Peter, what he, himself, under certain circumstances, did."

But I might read the whole book of prescriptions by Tertullian against heretics.

The fish story again—here is Henry's exposition of the Bible. The principal meaning, in his view, is that which I have given.

Could Paul, my friends, claim to be the chief of the apostles? He had probably done more than any man then living against Christianity, until prostrated by anger and mercy, on the road to Damascus. "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" changed him from a wolf to a lamb, from a persecutor to an apostle.

Eusebius informs us that Paul of Samosata, was deposed by a council in consequence of the heresy introduced by him at Antioch, of which a detailed account had been rendered by the council to Dionysius, bishop of Rome. Paul being unwilling to leave the building of the church, "an appeal was made to the emperor Aurelian, who decided most equitably on the business, ordering the building to be given up to those whom the christian bishops of Rome and Italy should write." Another Pagan, Ammianus Marcellonus, giving an account of the persecution raised by the emperor Constantius against the famous patriarch of Alexandria St Athanasius, tells us that this emperor strove hard to procure the condemnation of Athanasius by Liberius, on account of the supreme authority enjoyed by the bishops of the Roman see. "Even from the mouths of babes and sucklings," says the Scriptures, "hath God made perfect praise." I may observe, that he has extorted testimony from Pagan kings and historians, to prove the authority of the bishop of Rome throughout the Christian world.

My friend has introduced the subject of unity, in connection with tradition. We shall argue that, if he pleases, from the Bible; but in the mean time let us hear Cyprian, a bishop of Carthage, in Africa, on this subject, in the 3d. century. I am bold to say, you have never heard argument stronger, illustration more apposite, or language more beautiful, than what this father employs.

Cyprian. *de Unitate Ecclesiæ Catholicæ*, p. 181, and *De Simplici Præs.* The primacy is given to Peter that the church and the chair of Christ may be shewn to be one. And all the apostles and shepherds, but there is seen but one flock, fed by all the apostles with unanimous consent; can he who holdeth not this unity, believe he holds the faith? Can he who resists and opposes the church, who forsakes the chair of Peter, on which the church was founded, flatter himself that he is in the church, while the apostle Paul teaches the same thing and shews the sacrament of unity, saying, "ONE BODY AND ONE SPIRIT, ONE HOPE OF YOUR VOCATION, ONE LORD, ONE FAITH, ONE BAPTISM, ONE GOD." Let no man deceive the brotherhood by a lie; let no man, by perfidious prevarications corrupt

the truth of faith! The episcopacy is one, each separate part being consolidated in one. The church too is one, with luxuriant fertility extending her branches throughout. As there are many rays of light, but no more than one sun, many branches, but only one trunk, held fast in the earth by its tenacious root, many streams gushing from one fountain, but all blended in their source. Sever a ray from the sun, the unity of light suffers no division; break a branch from the tree, the broken branch will bud no more, cut off a stream from the source, the severed stream will dry up. So likewise the church, irradiated with the light of the Lord, diffuses her rays throughout the universe. The light, however, which is every where diffused is one, nor is the unity of the body separated. She spreads her copious streams, but there is one head, one origin, one blessed mother with a numerous progeny. We are her offspring, we are nourished with her milk, we are animated with her spirit. He can no longer have God for his father, who has not the church for his mother. If any one out of the ark of Noe could escape, so likewise he that is out of the church may escape. The Lord says, I and the Father are one: again, it is written of the Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost: "and these three are one," and can any one imagine that the unity which proceeds from divine strength, and which is maintained by divine sacraments can be torn asunder in the church, and destroyed by the opposition of discordant hearts?"

I will now go over the ground, my friend travelled this morning. He said we allowed that we had two high priests on earth. I protest against the gentleman's saying for me what I have not said. One high Priest we have in heaven, God. He has a vicar on earth, the pope. But that vicar wields no authority but from God.

I have, again, been reprehended for endeavoring to gain friends by expressing a liking for the English people, the Irish, and the Americans. But, my friends, have I done them more than justice! Have I swerved from the truth? Have I not said that the English had a thousand faults?—[Time expired.]

Four o'clock, P. M.

MR. CAMPBELL rises—

We have had a learned discussion on the unity of the church. We can sit and patiently hear my opponent while he fills up his time by reading the views of the saints on unity or any thing else he may deem edifying. But as this is not the business now before us, we shall be glad he would choose some other time for it. On this subject we have no controversy at the present time: and that the church should be one, and that she is one virtually and in fact, we doubt not. All that has been read by my opponent on this subject is wholly a free will offering, instead of that argument which the occasion demands. *

Was Peter ever bishop of Rome? That indeed was a question: but is it a standing question? How often will my opponent recur to it without proving it? He says, in deed, that Irenæus says that he was: but I say, not a line can be shown from Irenæus nor any other writer of the first two centuries affirming in so many words *that Peter was*

bishop of Rome! Let him then refute me at once, by producing the passages. He might have heard so. He has produced Tertullian as a commentator or a retailer of traditions. That you may know something of Tertullian as a theorist, and commentator, I will read you by way of offset a sample or two, simply to show how much these opinions are worth. He speaks very advantageously of custom and tradition, and relates several remarkable examples of ceremonies which he pretends to be derived from tradition.

"To begin," says he, "with baptism, when we are ready to enter into the water, and even before we make our protestations before the bishop, and in the church, that we renounce the devil, all his pomps and ministers: afterward, we are plunged in the water three times, and they make us answer to some things which are not precisely set down in the gospel; after that they make us taste milk and honey, and we bathe ourselves every day, during that whole week. We receive the sacrament of the eucharist, instituted by Jesus Christ, when we eat, and in the morning assemblies we do not receive it but from the hands of those that preside there. We offer yearly oblations for the dead in honor of the martyrs. We believe that it is not lawful to fast on a Sunday and to pray to God kneeling. From *Easter to Whitsuntide* we enjoy the same privilege. We take great care not to suffer any part of the wine and consecrated bread to fall to the ground. We often sign ourselves with the sign of the cross. *If you demand a law for these practices taken from scripture, we cannot find one there; but we must answer, that 'tis tradition that has established them, custom has authorized them, and faith has made them to be observed.*" Tertull. De Corona Militis.

When Tertullian asserts a *fact*, I believe: but when he relates a dream, a guess, an opinion, or reports a tradition, I listen to him as to the speculations of a contemporary. You shall have it both in Latin and English.

"Age jam qui voles curiositatem melius exercere in negotio salutis tuæ, percurrere ecclesias apostolicas, apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ apostolorum suis locis præsententur, apud quas ipsæ authenticæ literæ recitantur, sonates vocem, et representantes faciem uniuscujusque. Proxima est tibi Achaia? Habes Corinthum. Si non longe es a Macedonia, habes Phillippos, habes Thessalonicenses. Si potes in Asiam tendere, habes Ephesum. Si autem Italæ adjaces, habes Romam, unde nobis quoque auctoritas præta est."

"Come now, you who are desirous more fully to devote yourselves to the great affair of your salvation, hasten to the *apostolic churches*. Still do the very chairs of the apostles yet stand in their own places: still are their *authentic letters* recited, which sound forth their very tones, and which faithfully exhibit their very countenances. If you are in Achaia, you have Corinth: if in Macedonia, you have Phillippi and Thessalonica. If you journey into Asia, you have Ephesus. If Italy be your residence, you have Rome." &c.

On this precious excerpt I will only remark that it fully proves,

1. That the *authentic copies* or autographs of the apostolic epistles were extant in the time of Tertullian, in those churches to which they were addressed.—

2. That the superiority of these churches named above others, so

for as *salvation* was concerned, was, that they had these authentic epistles carefully preserved and read.—

3. That as respected authority in the grand affair of salvation, in the judgment of Tertullian, Corinth, Philippi, Thessalonica, Ephesus and Rome were equal.—Pardon the digression. The extract is worth a volume in prostrating the arrogant pretensions of Rome.

One word on the text, as commented on by Matthew Henry. I have had his work in my library for twenty five years. He is a highly esteemed *practical* commentator: but is not ranked among *critics*. But yet he decides nothing for my opponent. He admits that it may be either the one or the other explanation. But mind me. The Roman Catholic doctrine requires the explanation “lovest thou me more than these love me;” because it was on account of a supremacy of love over all the apostles, that it claims for Peter the supremacy. But Henry admits that Christ may have alluded to the nets and boats and occupation of Peter; while he refers to or says, “do you love me more than your companions.” The Messiah never, indeed, had any jealousy of that sort. His comment on John xxi. 15, reads:

“Lovest thou me more than these?” Better than James or John thy intimate friends, or Andrew, thy own brother and companion? Those do not love Christ aright, that do not love him better than the best friend in the world, and make it appear, whenever they stand in competition, or *more than these things*, these boats and nets! Those only love Christ indeed, that love him better than all the delights of sense and all the occupations and profits of this world. *Lovest thou me more than these?* If so, leave them to employ thyself wholly in feeding my flock.” *Henry's Commentary*.

But I would like to read what this commentator says about *the rock*.

Matthew xvi. 18: “And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter; and upon this rock, I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.”

Peter's confession contains that fundamental truth, respecting the person and offices of Christ, upon which, as on a rock, he would build his church. Nor could the powers of death or the entrance into the eternal world, destroy the hope of those who should build on it. Nothing can be more absurd than to suppose that Christ meant that the *person* of Peter was *the rock*, on which the church should be builded; except it be the wild notion that the bishops of Rome have since substituted in his place! Their rock is not as our rock, our enemies themselves being judges. Without doubt, Christ himself the rock—and tried foundation of the church, and woe be to him who attempts to lay any other. *Th.*

If then, Matthew Henry is good authority on one point he is good on the other.

Bishop Otey of Tennessee has been unceremoniously dragged into this controversy. He is a gentleman for whom I entertain a very high regard: and while we differ on some questions, concerning diocesan episcopacy, we perfectly agree on the import of *ἱερός* (*Hierus*) a priest, as applied to christians. He has no idea, more than myself, of a chris-

tian *hierus*, or priest offering sacrifices for sins on earth. He has not answered, indeed, seven letters addressed to him by myself on bishop Onderdonk's tract on diocesan episcopacy: but yet it is not too late. We expect one of these bishops to reply to them.

The Roman Catholics alone contend that priests, by which they mean an order of clergy, can offer sacrifice for sins. Nay, indeed, Mr. Hughes in his controversy with Mr. Breckenridge, says, "To offer sacrifice is the chief official business of the priests." p. 288. Hence, we learn that even in this enlightened land and 19th century, there are persons amongst us claiming the power of making sin offerings and expiating and forgiving sins!!

We now resume the history of schisms in the succession:

We last read you the contentions and havoc of human life on the succession of Damasus. The emperor at that time decided the controversy by banishing Ursinus, and on the decision of that emperor now rests the faith and salvation of the Roman church—themselves being judges. And yet, my learned opponent, in some of his speeches affects to tell you that emperors have nothing to do,—no right to interfere in councils, or with church officers; and here, and on numerous occasions, we find them filling Peter's chair, making vicars of Christ, and heads for his church!!

We cannot rehearse all the schisms, and shall therefore give only a specimen. We take another instance of an imperial pope—one of an emperor's creation.

"After the death of pope Zozimus, the church of Rome was divided about the election of his successor. The archdeacon Eulalius, who aspired to the bishopric of Rome, shut himself up in the church of the Lateran, with part of the people, some priests, and some deacons, and made them choose him in Zozimus' room. On the other side a great number of priests, several bishops, and part of the people, being assembled in the church of Theodora, elected Boniface. Both were ordained; Eulalius was ordained by some bishops, among whom was the bishop of Ostia, who used to ordain the bishop of Rome. Boniface was likewise ordained by a great number of bishops, and went to take possession of St. Peter's church.

Symmachus, governor of Rome, having tried in vain to make them agree, writ to the emperor Honorius about it. In his letter of the 29th of December, 418, he speaks in Eulalius' behalf, and judges Boniface to be in the wrong. The emperor believing his relation, sent him word immediately that he should expel Boniface and uphold Eulalius. The governor having received this order, sent for Boniface to acquaint him with it, but he would not come to him, so that the governor sent to him to signify the emperor's order, and kept him from returning into the city. The bishops, priests, and the people that sided with Boniface, wrote immediately to the emperor to entreat him that he would order both Eulalius and Boniface to go to court, that their cause might there be judged. To satisfy them, the emperor sent to Symmachus an order of 30th of January, 419, signifying that he should enjoin Boniface and Eulalius to be at Ravenna about the 6th of February. Honorius convened some bishops thither to judge of their cause; and that they might not be suspected of favoring any one side. he com-

manded that none of those who had ordained either of them, should be a judge in the case. The bishops that were chosen to judge this cause being divided, the emperor put off the judgment till *May*, and forbade *Eulalius* and *Boniface* to go to *Rome*; and sent thither *Achillius*, bishop of *Spoletto* to perform the Episcopal functions during the *Easter* holidays; in which time he prepared a numerous synod, and invited the bishops both of *Africa* and *Gaul*; but *Eulalius* could not endure that delay, and spoiled his business by his impatience: for whether he distrusted his right, or whether he was of a restless temper, he returned to *Rome* the 16th of *March*, and would have staid there notwithstanding the emperor's orders, which obliged *Symmachus* to use violence to drive him out of *Rome*; and the emperor having been informed of his disobedience, waited for no other judgment, but caused *Boniface* to be put in possession in the beginning of *April*, 419."—*Du Pin*, vol. i. p. 417.

The Holy Spirit, then, by the emperor *Honorius*—an *Arian*, too, (if I recollect right,) establishes a vicar for Christ in the person of *Boniface* I. What, says bishop *Purcell*, have emperors to do with Christ's church?! Once, then they had a great deal to do with it; and where is infallibility now?

Next comes pope *Symmachus*. Again the church's head is the fruit of bloodshed and war.

"After the death of pope *Anastasius*, which happened at the end of the year 498, there was a fierce contention in the church of *Rome* between *Laurentius* and *Symmachus*, which of them two was duly promoted to that see. *Symmachus* who was deacon, was chosen, and ordained by the far greater number; but *Festus* a *Roman* Senator, who had promised the Emperor *Anastasius*, that his edict of agreement with the bishop of *Rome* should be signed, procured *Laurentius* to be chosen and ordained. This schism divided the church and the city of *Rome*, and the most eminent both of the clergy and the senate took part with one of these two bishops: but at length both parties agreed to wait upon King *Theodoric* at *Ravenna* for his decision in the case, which was this, That he should continue bishop of *Rome*, who had been first chosen, and should be found to have the far greater number of voices for him. *Symmachus* had the advantage of *Laurentius* on both these accounts, and so was confirmed in the possession of the holy see, and he ordained *Laurentius* bishop of *Nocera*, if we may believe *Anastasius*. At the beginning of the next year he called a council, wherein he made a canon against the ways of soliciting nuns' voices, which were then used for obtaining the papal dignity: but those who opposed the ordination of *Symmachus*, seeing him possessed of the holy see against their mind, used all their endeavours to turn him out of it, for which end they charged him with many crimes, they stirred up a part of the people and senate against him, and caused a petition to be presented to king *Theodoric*, that he would appoint a delegate to hear the cause. He named *Peter* bishop of *Altinus*, who deposed the pope from the government of his diocese, and deprived him of the possessions of the church. This division was the cause of so great disorders in *Rome*, that from words they came many times to blows, and every day produced fighting and murders: many ecclesiastics were beaten to death, virgins were robbed and driven away from their habitation, many lay-men were wounded or killed, insomuch that not only the church, but also the city of *Rome* suffered very much by this schism.

King *Theodoric* being desirous to put an end to these disorders, called a council; wherein the bishop being possessed with a good opinion of *Pope Symmachus*,

would not enter upon the examination of the particulars alleged against him, but only declared him innocent before his accusers, of the crimes that were laid to his charge: and they prevailed so far by their importunity, that the king was satisfied with this sentence, and both the people and the senate who had been very much irritated against *Symmachus*, were pacified, and acknowledged him for pope. Yet some of the discontented party still remained, who drew up a writing against the synod and spread their calumnies, forged against *Symmachus*, as far as the east. The emperor *Anastasius* objected them to him, which obliged *Symmachus* to write a letter to him for his own vindication; but notwithstanding these efforts of his enemies, he continued in possession of the holy see until the year 514 wherein he died." Du Pin. Vol. I. p. 527.

If we cannot find Christ's church some where out of the Roman church at this time, we shall have a hard task to find her there!

Again, we shall read a few words concerning Boniface II.

"*Bonifacc*, the second of that name, the first pope of the nation of the *Goths*, was promoted to the holy see, under the reign of king *Alaricus* on the 14th day of October, in the year 529. At the same time one part of the clergy chose *Dioscorus*, who was formerly one of the deputies sent into the east by *Hormisdas*. Boniface was ordained in the church of *Julius*, and *Dioscorus* in that of *Constantine*. But this last died the 12th day of November. Boniface seeing himself left in sole possession used his utmost endeavors to bring over those who had been of the other party: he threatened them with an anathema, and forced them to subscribe. He called together the clergy, and condemned the memory of *Dioscorus*, accusing him of simony. He proceeded yet further, and, as if it were not enough for him to be secured of the holy see for himself, he would also appoint himself a successor, and having called a synod, he engaged the bishops and clergy by oath, and under their hands, that they should choose and ordain in his room the deacon *Vigilius* after his death. This being against the canons, he himself acknowledged publicly his fault, and burned the writing which he extorted from them." Du Pin. Vol. I. p. 542.

What an excellent head, truly, for the church of Christ!

We shall next see, that other *women* besides queen *Elizabeth*, whom my opponent denounces for being head of the English church, had something to do in pope manufacturing.—Pope *Silverius* and pope *Vigilius* come next:

"The deacon *Vigilius* remained at *Constantinople* after the death of *Agapetus*, who had for a long time aspired to the bishopric, and made use of this occasion to get himself promoted to it. He promised the empress, that if she would make him pope he would receive *Theodosius*, *Authimus*, and *Severus* into his communion, and that he would approve their doctrine. The empress not only promised to make him pope, but also offered him money if he would do what she desired. *Vigilius* having given the empress all the assurances that she could wish, departed with a secret order addressed to *Bellisarius* to make him successful in his design. *Vigilius* being come into Italy, found all things well prepared for him, the siege of *Rome* was raised when he arrived there, but during the siege *Silverius* was suspected to hold correspondence with the *Goths*, and so he was rendered odious for refusing expressly to accept the empress's proposals of receiving *Authimus*. Thus *Vigilius* having delivered to *Bellisarius* the order which he brought, and having promised him two hundred pieces of gold over and above the seven hun-

dred which he was to give him, found no great difficulty to persuade him to drive away Silverius."

* * * * *

"This was put in execution, he was delivered to the guards of Vigilius, and he was banished into the Isles of Pontienna and Panctataria, which were over against the mount Cirrellus, where he died of a famine in great misery, if we may believe Liberatus. Procopius, in his secret history, seems to insinuate, that he was killed by one named Eugenius, a man devoted to Antonina—the wife of Bellisarius: but what Procopius says, may be understood not of the death of Silverius, but rather of his accusation or apprehension."

* * * * *

"Although Vigilius was promoted to the see of Rome, by a way altogether unjust, yet he continued in the possession of it after the death of Silverius, and was acknowledged for a lawful pope, without proceeding to a new election, or even confirming that which had been made. The conduct which he had observed during this pontificate answered well enough to its unhappy beginning. He had at first approved the doctrines of Authimus, and that of the Acephali, to satisfy the empress: but the fear of being turned out by the people of Rome, whom he hated, made him quickly recall this approbation; yet he did not, by this, gain the hearts of the Romans. They could not endure an usurper, who having been the cause of the death of their lawful bishop, would abuse them also. They accused him also, of having killed his secretary with a blow of his fist, and of having whipped his sister's son till he died. The empress who was not satisfied with him because he had gone back from his word, sent Authimus to Rome with an order to bring him into Greece, and at his departure the people gave him all sorts of imprecations." *Ib. Vol. I. page 552.*

We shall only at this time give the details of another column of the history of the popes in the work before us. It speaks for itself—tells how all the evil passions of human nature co-operated in the election and creation of Christ's vicars.

Under head—"An account of the popes, and of the church of Rome, from the time of Sylvester II. to Gregory VII. After his death there was a schism in the church of Rome, between *Benedict VIII.* son to *Gregory* the count of *Frescati*, who was first elected by his father's interest; and one *Gregory*, who was elected by some *Romans*, who outed *Benedict*. He fled to *Henry*, king of Germany, who immediately raised forces, and marched into Italy to re-establish him. As soon as the king arrived, Gregory fled for it, and Benedict was received without any opposition. He conferred the imperial crown on that prince, and on queen *Chunegonda* his wife. Benedict died in the year 1034, and some authors say, that after his death he appeared mounted on a black horse, and that he showed the place where he had deposited a treasure, that so it might be distributed to the poor, and that by these alms, and the prayers of St. Odilo, he was delivered from the torments of the other life. We have only one Bull of his, in favor of the Abby of Cluny."

"The count of *Frescati*, that the popedom might be still in his family, caused his other son to be elected in the room of Benedict VIII. though he was not then in orders. He was ordained and called *John*, which, according to us, is the *eighth* of that name, but according to others the *twentieth*. 'Tis said, that some time after this pope being sensible that his election was vicious and simoniacal, he withdrew into a monastery there to suffer penance, and that he forbare per-

forming any part of his function, till such time as he was chosen again by the clergy."

"John XVIII. dying Novr. 7, in the year 1033, Alberi count of Frescati, caused his son to be seated on St. Peter's chair. He was nephew to the two last popes the count's brothers, and was not above eighteen years of age at the most. He changed his name of Thophylact into that of Benedict IX.

Peter Darnien, speaks of him as a man that lived very disorderly, and was very unworthy of that dignity to which he had been advanced by the tyranny of his father. However, he enjoyed the popedom very quietly for ten years together; but at last the Romans, weary of his abominable irregularities, ousted him, and put up in his place, the bishop of St. Sabina, who took upon him the name of Sylvester III. He enjoyed his dignity but three months; for though Benedict voluntarily resigned the popedom, yet he returned to Rome, and with the assistance of Frescati's party, drove out his competitor, and re-assumed the papal chair. But being altogether incapable of governing it, and having nothing more in his thoughts than the gratifying of his brutal appetite, he made a bargain about the popedom with John Gracian, archbishop of the church of Rome, and made it over to him for a sum of money, reserving to himself the revenues due from England to the holy see. This Gracian took upon him the name of Gregory VI. In the meantime, king Henry, who had succeeded his father, Conrad, in the year 1039, being incensed against Benedict, who had sent the imperial crown to the king of Hungary, after he had defeated that prince, resolved to march into Italy to put an end to that schism. After he came thither he caused these three popes to be deposed in several synods as usurpers, simonists, and criminals. Benedict fled for it; Gregory VI. was apprehended and afterwards banished; and Sylvester III. was sent back to his bishopric of St. Sabina. He caused Suidger, bishop of Hamberg, to be elected in their stead, who took upon him the name of Clement II. and was acknowledged as lawful pope by all the world. He crowned Henry emperor, and as he was waiting upon him home to Germany, died beyond the Alps, October 7, in the year 1047, nine months after his election. Immediately upon this, Benedict IX. returns to Rome, and a third time remounts the papal chair, which he held for eight months, notwithstanding the emperor had sent from Germany Poppo, bishop of Bresse, who was consecrated pope under the title of Damasus II., but he did not long enjoy that dignity, for he died of poison, as is supposed, at Palestrina, three and twenty days after his coronation."

"It is no wonder that these popes have not left us the least monument of their pastoral vigilance, either in councils or by letters, since all their care and aim was how to gratify their ambition and the rest of their passions, without watching over the flock of Jesus Christ." *Du Pin, vol. ii. p. 206.*

Observe, a single count has the controlling power of some three popes during this administration; and may be said to have the church under his special management! Comment on such a narrative is unnecessary.—[Time expired.]

Half-past 4 o'clock, P. M.

BISHOP PURCELL rises—

I should prefer replying to the last part of my friend's argument at once, but order requires that I should follow him through all his points.

We were told the "old Irish story" of St. Patrick sailing on a mill-

stone. Well, the Irish have always been remarkable for telling a good story; but this is told for them, and it is not even witty, much less has it any bearing on the argument. There is not, I presume, one educated Catholic in the world who believes a tale so ridiculous. For my own part, I had never even heard it before; but I have heard of a life of St. Patrick and St. Bridget, written by some young Protestant wag who gathered together all the absurd stories he could find and gave them this name. My friend must have felt the want of better arguments when he introduced such a silly tale, at this debate, for the purpose of weakening the authority of the most sacred documents. I will not call this profane, but I must say, that, in my opinion, it is indecorous.

I have been charged with exciting the laughter of this audience, at the expense of my friend; this is not my fault; what alternative but ridicule for the story we have just heard? It was thus that Elias mocked the false priests of Baal, by saying, "Cry louder on your god—peradventure he sleepeth and must be awaked." 3d. Kings 15, 27.

Admit my learned opponent's reasoning, and you cannot be sure that ever there was such a man as Peter: admit it, and you cannot pretend to say that you have had grandfathers or grandmothers, or at least that they had had any themselves: you have never seen them; how then can you be sure they ever existed! Sometimes forged notes get into circulation; conclude with my friend, that you may as well part company at once with the genuine notes you may possess, for you can no longer prove them, to any man's satisfaction, to be worth having. I will go still farther: admit Mr. C.'s curious reasoning, and you can never be sure that such a personage as Jesus Christ ever existed, much less that he wrought miracles to prove the divinity of his mission! You did not see the miracles; the book that records them was written long after they occurred; and many of the most important portions of this very book were doubted of for upwards of 300 years after Christ, even by Luther himself, in the enlightened 16th century! His author, Du Pin, says there were abundance of false gospels, false epistles, false acts, in the early ages. *How then, according to his principles, can we be sure of the authenticity of a single book of the Old or New Testament, seeing we have no voucher for the truth but the testimony of men?* Here are chasms to be bridged, and links in the chain of scriptural testimony, to be welded, for full 300 years, ay, 1600 years, before the various books of scripture were collected together: and when they were collected, this collection was made by men, who, he says, were liable to be mistaken like ourselves; and who knows to this day but they were mistaken! Such are the horrid consequences of his illogical reasoning—another sad illustration that, for the deserter from the Catholic church, there is no recourse but to deny every thing, to be-

come a deist. I would advise my friend, when he goes back to Bethany, to prove in the Harbinger that such a thing as the present controversy never occurred. I am sure that he can make some people believe, all editorials to the contrary notwithstanding, that it is all a hoax.

He gratuitously mixes up the names of the first five or six popes, in a way unknown to antiquity, whereas Eusebius, Optatus, Tertullian, and Irenæus, agree *perfectly* in the enumeration of Peter, Linus, Anacletus, Clement, Evaristus, Alexander—and two of these authors have been translated by Protestants! The mixture of the books of scripture is for him a far more insurmountable difficulty. There was much disputing for hundreds of years as to the time and place where the epistles and gospels were written; must we, therefore, reject them altogether? According to his rule of reasoning, we should reject them: but, thank God, Catholics admit no such rule. A few discrepancies about the minor points, where there is perfect unanimity as to the substance, only confirm our conviction of the historian's good faith. And there is as much indisputable testimony of the succession in the chair of Peter, as there is to prove any book of scripture whatsoever. I might, in fact, say there is more. I have already nailed Du Pin to the counter; he leans on a broken reed. He quotes St. Paul, to prove that neither he nor Peter founded the church of Rome, whereas St. Paul says no such thing, but only that they should not indulge in foolish disputes about the ministers who had preached to them the word of life, "I am for Paul, I am for Apollos," but give all glory to Christ who died for them. There were christians at Rome before St. Peter or St. Paul went thither. The Roman soldiers who saw Christ crucified, and witnessed the prodigies attending his death, were, doubtless, many of them, as well as the centurion who smote his breast, and cried out "*truly this man was the Son of God,*" converted to christianity; who, when they returned home to Rome, related what they had seen, to their countrymen, and made others converts. The apostles, afterwards, went to Rome and founded the see. So it was in England. Long before Gregory sent St. Augustin to that country, there were Catholics there—even in the days of pope Eleutherius.

What was the use of quoting Waddington as an author of infallible weight with me? He could not avoid making splendid acknowledgments to the church of Rome. The truth was too strong for him. But if we believe a man when he testifies *against* himself, is that any reason we should believe him when he testifies *for* himself? In fact, the inexplicable confusion of which Waddington speaks, is not to be found in any of the historians I have named and whose works I have exhibited—from which too I have read to this assembly. If any confusion exist, it is with respect to the *time* when each succeeded each, although

in this respect the earliest historians agree, as you have seen. Linus, Cletus, (or Anecletus,) and Clement, are all spoken of in the epistles of St. Paul. They held a conspicuous rank in the church; their names and services in these high places were often seen, and hence could have occurred a mixture of their names and of the dates of their pontificates, among now remote historians. But in every case of doubt as to scripture, or ecclesiastical history, the tests of sound criticism must be applied, and then the sibyls and the Mercurius Trismegistus are sure to go overboard. "*Opinionum commenta delet dies,*" says Cicero, "*maturae judicia confirmat.*" Time exposes falsehood—and confirms truth. What Cicero says time does, a more respectable agent, the church, has achieved—she has selected the genuine books of scripture and stamped forgery upon such as were spurious. Had she not done this where would have been the Bible? There are other ways of detecting error—Du Pin had told you of them. "A third class," says he, "forge for their diversion." You have all heard of the late prodigious humbug at Exeter Hall, England. The king suppresses the Orange lodges. The bigots of the nation rally. They invite a general convention of their brother bigots throughout the empire; a champion, it was the notorious Dr. McGhee, is invited from Ireland. He professes to have discovered a document penned by the reigning pontiff, and addressed to the clergy of England and Ireland, that recommended all the crimes that could be thought of to be committed against the Protestants. The crowd is gathered. The conquering hero comes. The air is vexed with the cries of "down with the Catholics,"—"long life to McGhee!" He opens his mouth, but he cannot speak. His emotions overpower him—some broken accents—the title of the document is heard. "Simpleton," says a tremulous voice from the crowd, "the Rev. Mr. Todd, of Trinity college, Dublin, forged and published that document for his own *diversion* and that of his friends, just to see how he could imitate the pope's Latin, but never dreaming that any man of sense could believe that he intended to impose it on the world as a genuine production of the pope!" McGhee was thunderstruck—the meeting horrified, and one by one they slunk away to their homes, muttering benedictions upon Irish bull-makers! This was diverting; but the consequences of such diversions were not always as harmless to the poor Catholics; in fact they had frequently cost them torrents of blood. The celebrated Dr. Parr, Dr. Johnson, Nix, Whittaker, all agree that the Catholic is the most calumniated society on earth.

My friend should know that the Latin translation of Irenæus is good authority, according to the soundest rules of criticism. It was made in the lifetime of Irenæus, who wrote the preface to it himself; by birth a Greek, he was bishop of the Latin see, (Lyons,) and he says

he hopes the reader will excuse the roughness of his style, for he had been so long among the Celtæ that he had lost the purity of his native tongue. His proximity to the apostles is proof of the clearness of the testimony in his day. Polycarp was converted in the year 80—and St. John lived to the close of the first century—so that John taught Polycarp, and Polycarp taught Irenæus. We all know why Jacob (supplanter,) Sara (Lady,) Isaac, (laughter,) Peter, (a rock,) were so called—was there a reason for the giving of these names to all but Peter? The reason my friend alleges *is not it*; Peter was not the first convert, it was his brother brought him to Christ. John i. 41, 42. The word *head* is figurative; this remark cuts up the web of sophistry my friend has spun around it. The pope is Peter's successor without being all and every thing that Peter was, without being a fisherman, a swordsman, a man of impulsiveness, a martyr. He succeeds to all the power necessary to guide the church. The other apostles were infallible, as my friend admits, and yet their successors claim not to be so, individually; it is enough for every purpose of good government that they are so when they abide in the doctrine of the entire church. Liberius never erred in faith; and Du Pin himself is proof of his orthodoxy. He defended the faithful Athanasius against Constantius and the Arians his accusers! And yet Mr. C. would have us believe Liberius an Arian! He preferred, he said, to go into exile rather than break the ecclesiastical laws against his own conscience. Is not this one of the most heroic sayings recorded of popes? The formula he signed in exile at Perea, in Thrace, was not heretical, but when this act was abused by the Arians, Liberius wept bitterly for the violent interpretation the document was made to bear. The clergy of Rome appreciated the pontiff's magnanimity, they had no doubt of his faith; they would have no other pope—Felix, the creature of the emperor Constantius, they justly despised; and, as in every similar instance, the righteous cause prevailed; God was stronger than the emperor, truth than error. So did the synod approve Damasus, and reject his rival.

Tertullian was quoted about the Eucharist, and prayers for the dead; I will show you how his testimony is in our favor. Talking of Corinth, Ephesus, and other cities, he says to the inquirer, if you want to find the established doctrine and live near Corinth, go to Corinth to find it out; if near Ephesus, to Ephesus; if near to Rome, go to Rome, and so on. This only proves that the doctrine at all these places was exactly the same; but what is the argument? Does it prove that all these churches were equal in authority to Rome? Suppose a man in New York writes to me to know what the Catholic doctrines in any

point is—I tell him he must apply to the bishop or clergy of the churches of New York for information. Does it follow from this that I question the pre-eminent authority of Rome? Does it prove any thing whatever? It is so far in our favor that it proves *a uniformity of doctrine*—like the unity of that light which proceeds from a common fountain.

Mr. C. is stricken with the authority of Peter—it haunts him like a spectre throughout this discussion—it meets him at every turn and corner of his argument,—well! The Greek word *Πολιμανε* means rule, guide, govern, as well as “feed.” See Homer, *passim*. “*Πολιμενι λαων*” was the epithet applied usually to Agamemnon. Feed my lambs means all the flock, with the subordinate pastors spread over the universal fold. The evangelist takes care to tell us, in the parable of the temple, *that he spoke of the temple of his body*. He explained, as St. John says, more than all the books of the whole world could contain, to his disciples, during the forty days from his resurrection to his ascension, spent, as the scripture assures us, in speaking to them of the kingdom of God, as he every where called his church. Mr. C. says there is no priest since Christ. I grant it, in the sense that the high priest holds the place of Christ, derives his power from Christ. In this sense Christ employs the priest as his agent, and exercises by him his own priesthood, in which God the Father hath (Ps. 109) confirmed him by an oath for ever. But in the sense that no such priest now exists, I cannot agree with the gentleman, for St. Paul says, thirty years after Christ’s ascension, “*For every high priest taken from among men, is ordained for men, in the things that appertain to God, that he may offer up gifts and sacrifices for sin. Who can have compassion on them that are ignorant and err, because he himself also is compassed with infirmity, and therefore he ought, as for the people so also for himself, to offer for sins; neither doth any man take the honor to himself, but he that is called by God as Aaron was.*” Heb. ch. 5, v. 1, 2, 3, 4. Does not all this prove a priesthood distinct from the body of christians, thirty years after Christ, as it exists at present? Does not St. Paul say, we have an altar of which they cannot partake who serve the tabernacle? Heb. vi. 13, 10. And what was that altar for but for the sacrifices which the priests were taken from among men to offer?— [Time expired.]

TUESDAY, JANUARY 17TH, *Half-past 9 o'clock, A. M.*

MR. CAMPBELL rises—

I intend if possible, to sum up this argument on my second proposition this forenoon. I could wish that my friend, the bishop would

reply to me instead of anticipating propositions in advance, and of reading or speaking of matters which are wholly irrelevant. He is even now occasionally on my first proposition; anon, on the second; and instantly, on subjects which we have not agreed to debate. He talks about my getting into thickets and circuitous labyrinths, without seeming to perceive that I am in pursuit of him. He makes propositions and assertions for me which I never uttered, and spends his time in descanting upon his own misapprehensions.*

I must however, intimate to him and my audience, my purpose of ceasing to respond to any thing he may introduce not in reply to my speeches. If I must lead the way; he must follow. I cannot be decoyed into all the minor and remote points he may originate. I must go on to sustain my propositions, whether he respond to them or not; and shall appropriate half an hour occasionally to such matters in his speeches as may call for my notice.

I cannot, therefore debate the priesthood, or any foreign topic. But as the gentleman has again reiterated the charge, "*feed my sheep*," and seems to make the whole merits of the question depend on the meaning of the word *sheep*; I will once more, and I think only once more advert to it. It is universally admitted by Protestants and Catholics, that it is the duty of pastors to feed the *flock* of their charge. If there be a *common* duty in the ministry of the old and new law, it is this. But it is essential to the argument to make the word *κληρος* signifying *sheep* denote *clergy*. This is an extraordinary assumption. It would be a waste of time to argue against it. But that you may see its absurdity, I will read from the Catholic version a part of the 10th chap. of John, substituting the bishop's definition for the term.

"He that entereth not by the door into the fold of the *clergy*, but climbeth up some other way, he is a thief and a robber. But he that entereth by the door, is the pastor of the *clergy*. To this man the porter openeth, and the *clergy* hear his voice; and he calleth his own *clergy* by name, and leadeth them forth. And when he hath let forth his own *clergy* he goeth before them, and the *clergy* follow him, because they know his voice. I am the door of the *clergy*. And how many soever have come are thieves and robbers, but the *clergy* heard them not.

11th verse. I am the good pastor. The good pastor giveth his life for his *clergy*. But the hireling and he that is not the pastor, whose own the *clergy* are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the *clergy* and fleeth; and the wolf raveneth and disperseth the *clergy*. And the hireling fleeth because he is a hireling; and he hath no care of the *clergy*. I am the good pastor, and I know mine, and mine know me. As the Father knoweth me, and I know the Father; and I yield my life for my *clergy*. And other *clergy* I have that are not of this fold."

*The other day the bishop asserted that *I affirmed, the apostles wrote only to Greek cities*. This is not found in my speeches: for it is so gross an error that I could not have uttered it, even in a dream. I request the reader to examine my speeches for my own assertions; for he will frequently find the bishop instead of meeting his opponent, demolishing men of straw of his own creation.

I submit this without comment to the good sense of my audience.

The gentleman may find it more to his account, or he is more accustomed to speak to the prejudices of that part of the community who rely on the authority of the Roman church without asking questions, who are told not to think or reason for themselves; but to believe in *the church*—to them he may hold up his map triumphantly. The face of Tertullian or Irenæus on paper is as good to them as ten arguments. But I speak to Protestants as well as Catholics; and, therefore, I must reason, for they are a reasoning population. I expect them to decide by evidence, and not by authority.

Reference has been made to Waddington, on the papal succession. His words *were* not correctly quoted by the gentleman. *His* interpretation is rather an evasion of the question. It is to the succession itself he alludes. He cannot make it out: he acknowledges he cannot; nor can any living man.

To resume the history of the schisms. I will read a few extracts that I have marked in a chronological table of the popes, which will exhibit a bird's eye glance of the fortunes of the Roman see, for little more than a single century.

1261. Alexander IV. dies June 24. The holy see vacant 3 months and 3 days. The cardinals who proceeded to the election, not being able to pitch on one among themselves, chose Francis, patriarch of Jerusalem, who takes upon him the name of Urban IV. and is consecrated Sept. 4.
1265. After a vacancy of four months, cardinal Guy, the Gross, born in Provence, is elected pope, Feb. 5, and consecrated March 18, under the name of Clement IV.
1268. Clement IV. dies Oct. 29. The holy see lies vacant for two years, nine months, and two days.
1271. The cardinals after a long debate on Sept. 1, by way of compromisal elected Thibald, arch deacon of Liege, native of Placenzia, who was then at Ptolemais.
1276. Gregory X. dies Jan. 10. Peter of Tarentaise, cardinal bishop of Ostia, is elected the 21st. under the name of Innocent V. After his death, which happened June the 2d. cardinal Ottobon, a Genoese, is elected in his place, July the 12th, and takes upon him the name of Adrian V. He dies at Viterbo, Aug. 18, without having been consecrated. Twenty-five days after, cardinal John Peter, the son of Julian, a Portuguese, is elected and consecrated Sept. 15, under the name of John XXI.
1277. John XXI. is crushed by the fall of the ceiling of the palace of Viterbo. and dies May the 20th. Nov. 25, John Cojestan is elected, and takes the name of Nicholas III. and consecrated Dec. 26.
1280. Nicholas dies Aug. 22. The holy see is vacant six months.
1287. Honorius IV. dies on April 5. The holy see vacant till April of the next year.
1292. Nicholas dies on April 4. The holy see vacant two years three months and two days.
1304. The death of Benedict July 8. The holy see remained vacant till the next year.

1305. Clement V. is chosen pope June 5. He is crowned at Lyons Nov. 11, and resides in France.
1328. Lewis of Bavaria causes Michael Corbario to be chosen anti-pope, who takes the name of Nicholas V. and is enthroned May 12. He was driven out of Rome, Aug. 4.
1378. Gregory XI. died March 27th. The cardinals entered the conclave at Rome, April 7th. The Romans required a Roman or an Italian pope. The arch-bishop of Paris is chosen in a tumultuous manner, April 9th, and crowned the 17th, under the name of Urban VI. The cardinals fly into Anagnia in May, and protest against the election of Urban. They came to Rome August the 27th, enter the conclave, and chose, September 20th, the cardinal of Geneva, who took the name of Clement VII. which caused a schism in the church.
1379. Clement VIII. flies to Naples, and from thence goes to Avignon, where he arrived June 10. The competitors for the papacy condemn one another. *Du Pin.*—*Vol. ii.*

Touching all that the gentleman has said or may say of the authenticity of Du Pin, I observe that the reporters have recorded my defence of his reputation. They will also have stated the fact that I only quote him as authentic on such matters as all other historians testify. I will not then repeat the same defence again and again.

I know, indeed, that what is authentic with Jansenists may be heterodox with Jesuits, and vice versa. When the Romanists are hard pressed, they have no English authentic historians. And when we quote a Latin one, we are sure to err in the translation. Bellarmine is repudiated by one party; even Barronius is sometimes disallowed. Still being in Latin, he is more authentic than any other. We shall therefore take from him a few words in confirmation of what we read from the Decretals of Du Pin. Barronius, vol. vi. p. 562, A. D. 498, tells us that the emperor's faction sustained the election of Laurentius to the papacy. In this struggle "murders, robberies and numberless evils, were perpetrated at Rome." Nay, such were the horrible scenes that, says Barronius, "there was a risk of their destroying the whole city." In the schism between popes Sylvester and Vigilius in the sixth century, the latter, though an atrociously wicked man, "implicated," says Barronius, "in so many crimes" that all virtuous men opposed him, was raised to the papal chair. Yet this man was pronounced a good pope. Barronius says he is not to be despised though a bad man. Let every man recollect, "says he, that even to the shadow of Peter, immense virtue was given of God!" (*Bar.* vol. vii. p. 420.)

"In the midst of contentions which rent the Roman Catholic church, pope Pelagius I. was chosen. This pope approved the council which pope Vigilius had condemned. This increased the flames of ecclesiastical war to such a degree that the pope could not find a bishop of Rome, who could consecrate him; and he was constrained to beg a

bishop of Ostium to do this service; "a thing," says Barronius, "which never had occurred before." (Vol. vii. p. 475.)

The popes Formosus and Stephen lived in the ninth century. The latter, says Barronius, was so wicked, that he would not have dared to enroll him in the list of popes, were it not that antiquity gives his name. In the exercise of papal infallibility, he not only rescinded the *acts* and *decrees* of his infallible predecessor Formosus; but collecting a council of cardinals and bishops as bad as himself, he actually had the old pope taken out of his grave; and he brought him into court, tried, and condemned him; cut off three of his fingers; and plunged his remains into the Tiber. See Platina's life of Stephen VI. and Barronius do.

"Barronius under the year 1004, names three rival popes, who perpetrated the most shameful crimes, and bartered the papacy, and sold it for gold. He, though a Roman Catholic writer, calls them Cerberus, the three headed beast which had issued from the gates of hell!"

Hear his words in his life of pope Stephen VII. A. D. 900. "The case is such, that scarcely any one can believe it, unless he sees it with his eyes, and handles it with his hands, viz., what unworthy, vile, unsightly, yea, execrable and hateful things the sacred apostolic see, on whose hinges the universal apostolical church turns, has been compelled to see, &c."

"Genbrard in his chronicles, under the year 904 says, 'for nearly 150 years, about fifty popes deserted wholly the virtue of their predecessors, being APOSTATE rather than APOSTOLICAL!'"

"And to crown the climax, Barronius, under the year 912 adds: 'What is then the face of the holy Roman church! How exceedingly foul it is! When most potent, sordid and abandoned women, (Mere-tices,) ruled at Rome: at whose will the sees were changed; bishops were presented; and what is horrid to hear, and unutterable, FALSE PONTIFFS, the paramours of these women, were intruded into the chair of St. Peter, &c.' He adds,—'For who can affirm that men illegally intruded by bad women, (scortis) were Roman pontiffs!' Again: 'The canons were closed in silence; the decrees of pontiffs were suppressed: the ancient traditions were proscribed; and the sacred ceremonies and usages of former days were WHOLLY EXTINGUISHED. See his Annals A. D. 912.'"*

Again: he relates that pope Alexander was elected by cardinals some of whom were bribed, some allured by promises of promotion, and some enticed by fellowship in his vices and impurities to give him their suffrages. He refers to various authors who complained that he

*Brownlee's Letters on Rom. Cath. controversy. pp. 36, 37, 38.

was famous for his debauchery; he tells us of his vile example in keeping a Roman strumpet Vanozia, by whom he had many children; that he conferred wealth and honors on them, and even created one of them, Cæsar Borgia (an inordinately wicked man) archbishop of the church. Vid. Bar. Annals, vol. xix. p. 413 et seq.

“The same writer (vol. ix. p. 145) records the election of Benedict IX. at the age of twelve years, which he says was accomplished by gold, and he calls it (“horrendum ac detestabile visu”) “horrible and detestable to behold;” and yet he adds that the whole christian world acknowledged Benedict, without controversy, to be a true pope!

STEPHEN VII. The unparalleled wickedness of this pope is conveyed in a single line: [*Ita quidem passus facinorosus homo quique ut fur et latro ingressus est in ovile ovium, laqueo vitam adeo infami exitu vindice Deo clausit.*] “Thus perished this villainous man, who entered the sheepfold as a thief and a robber; and who in the retribution of God, ended his days by the infamous death of the halter.” (Bar. vol. x. p. 742.)

Again, Barronius says of the 10th century:

“What then was the face of the Roman church? How very filthy, when the most powerful and sordid harlots then ruled at Rome, at whose pleasure sees were changed and bishoprics were given, and—which is horrible to hear, and most abominable—their gallants were obtruded into the sea of Peter, and made false popes; for who can say they could be lawful popes, who were intruded by such harlots without law? There was no mention of the election or consent of clergy; the canons were silent, the decrees of popes suppressed, the ancient traditions proscribed,—just armed with the secular power, challenged all things to itself.

* * * * *

What kind of Cardinals, do you imagine must then be chosen by those monsters, when nothing is so natural as for like to beget like? who can doubt, but they in all things did consent to those that chose them? Who will not easily believe that they animated them and followed their footsteps? Who understands not, that such men must wish that our Lord would have slept continually, and never have awoke to judgment to take cognizance of, and punish their iniquities.” Ann. Vol. x. 912.

Now if the gentleman objects to any of these quotations which I have hastily, but I believe most correctly made: the originals are here and let them be examined: For, these being admitted it is useless to object to Du Pin, who never uses so severe language against the popes as Barronius and Genebrand, Platina and others.

Finally on this subject. For seventy years, there was no pope in Rome, besides all the other interregnums. The pope resided at Avignon in France and left St. Peter’s chair empty. For almost half a century there were two popes, and two lines of popes existing at one time—one reigning in Italy, and one in France. And at last there were three popes—Benedict XIII. the Spanish pope, Gregory XII. the

French pope, and John XXIII. the Italian pope. Then the council of Constance met—A. D. 1414, and made a fourth, or true pope, and deposed the three anti-popes. Such was the 29th schism in the papacy! Is there,—may I not ask with all these facts before us,—Is there any man on earth that can have the least confidence in any pope as the successor of Peter? A thousand questions the most learned and intricate, which no living bishop has time or means to examine, must be decided before he could rationally or religiously believe that the succession from Peter has any existence at all: or, in truth, it cannot be believed but upon *mere authority!*

We now proceed to show that there has been no fixed and uniform method of electing the popes. Indeed history and tradition furnish us with no less than seven different methods.

1. Irenæus says, “that tradition said, that Peter appointed his successor.” And if he did, why do not all the popes follow his example? for Irenæus is as good authority for this, as for that concerning the founding of the church of Rome.

2. The priests and people are said to have often elected the first popes; or, rather the bishops nominated and the people elected.—I ought to have observed distinctly, that there is as much sophistry in the word *pope* as ever was played off on earth. The word *pope*, in the east was first applied to all bishops, and is so used in Russia to this day. It was in the 5th century applied to the senior bishops and metropolitans of the west. But it was not until the time of Gregory VII. that it was *exclusively appropriated by his own innovation, to the bishops of Rome.*

Hence, in this variety of acceptance, popes many were always in the church, and were elected by the people. But the persons first called popes and those now wearing the title, have no other resemblance than the common name.

3. The emperors nominated and bishops elected, and the emperors appointed on their own responsibility.

4. Leo VIII. transferred the whole power of choosing the pope to the emperor, being tired with the inconstancy of the Romans.

5. Barronius in his Annals, 112, 8, and sect. 141, 1, says, “They (the popes) were introduced by powerful men and women. *It was frequently the price of prostitution!*”

6. By the decree of pope Nicholas II. in his Læteran Synod: “The whole business was given over to the cardinals, an order of men, not heard of for 1000 years after Christ.” The popes now make the cardinals, and the cardinals make the pope. What a glorious républic! My friend, a staunch republican, agrees that a few men in Rome should elect a head for the universal church! But sometimes—

7. General councils (as that of Constance, Pisa and Basil) took upon themselves the making of popes, and, as we have seen, made a fourth pope, when there were already three acknowledged by different parts of the church. Can these facts be denied? They CANNOT *and I presume, WILL NOT.*

It is now affirmed that the intrigues of papal elections incomparably surpass the intrigues of any court on earth. The politics of France, of Italy, of Austria, are so incorporated with the schemes of the cardinals, or so bias or bribe them, that on the election of a pope, it is usually said, "Austria has succeeded" or "Spain," or "France has prevailed this time!" In one word, the papal chair is the most corrupt and corrupting institution that ever stood on earth. The Roman Cæsars, or the Egyptian dynasties, were pure and incorrupt, compared with this mammoth scheme of iniquity. On the whole premises, I ask, would the head of the church so jeopardize all the interests of his kingdom as to make the popes of Rome, or faith in them essential elements of his system of redemption, or necessary to the salvation of any human being?!—

To recapitulate.—This being a fundamental and primary essential element of the Roman church, I have labored it more than any other; and yet I have not said a tithe of what may be said, or even what I have to say on the subject. But I have aimed at establishing four points in demonstrating this proposition. And to adopt the positive and dogmatic style of my learned opponent, may I not say that *I have fully proved*—

1. That the office of pope, or supreme head on earth, has no scripture warrant or authority whatever. Indeed, that the whole *beau ideal* of a church of nations, with a monarchical head, (which, in the estimation of the bishop, is equivalent to the word *church* of Christ,) is as gratuitous an assumption as ever graced a *romance*, ancient or modern.—

2. That it cannot be ascertained that Peter was ever bishop of Rome—nay, indeed, it has been shown, that it is wholly contrary to the New Testament history, and incompatible with his office.—

3. That Christ gave no law of succession.—

4. That if he had, that succession has been destroyed by a long continuance of the greatest monsters of crime that ever lived; and by cabals, intrigues, violence, envy, lust, and schisms, so that no man can believe that one drop of apostolic grace is either in the person or office of Gregory XVI. the present nominal incumbent of Peter's chair! It would be now as easy to prove that Solomon's mosque built by the Turks, is Solomon's temple, in which Jesus Christ stood; as that the popes or church of Rome is a christian institution.

On what, now, rests ROMAN CATHOLICISM?! If the foundation be destroyed, how can the building stand? I need not tell my opponent that this is a blow at the root of his apostolic tree. He feels it, and I am glad to think that if any American bishop can sustain these pretensions, my learned opponent is that man. He has asked, and he may again ask, where was the Protestant church before Luther's time? In reply, I ask, where was the pope before Constantine's time? He brought Mosheim to offset Waddington and Jones on the subject of the Novatians. And what did Mosheim prove contrary to these historians? You have heard with what success my opponent seeks to tarnish the reputation of Novatians, Waldenses and Protestants. As a general offset to all his declamation on this subject, I will give you the testimony of a *good* Roman Catholic: for he was an *Inquisitor*—I mean *Riencrius Saccho*, one of the most inveterate enemies of these old fashioned Protestants. I have the original before me, but shall not read it unless it be required: The translation reads:

"Among all the sects" (there were sects, you perceive, before the Reformation) "which still are, or have been, there is not one more pernicious to the church than that of the Leonites;" (a name by which the Waldenses were sometimes called,) "and that for three reasons. The 1st is, because it is the oldest, for some say it hath existed from the time of pope Sylvester; *others from the time of the Apostles*. The 2nd, because it is more general, for there is *scarce any country where this sect is not*. The 3rd, because when all other sects beget horror by their blasphemies against God, this of the Leonites hath a *great show of piety* because they live *justly before men*, and believe *all things rightly concerning God and all the articles contained in the creed*. Only they blasphemed the church of Rome." *Rein. Sanho, edit. Gritzer, O. S. J. cap. 4. page 54.*

I could give much more Roman Catholic testimony in proof that the doctrines of Protestantism continued from the days of the first Roman schism till now: but this at present would seem superfluous. Nor will I speak now of the old English and Irish churches which the Roman bishops sought in vain for many centuries to bring into their fold. There is nothing betrays a less discriminating regard to the facts of ecclesiastical history, than to ask where was the church before the days of Luther?—But I hasten to the point yet before me, which, like some others, I may not remember, was reserved for a more convenient season. It was an objection drawn in part from Eph. iv. 11, and from the alleged difficulty of obtaining a ministry but through the popes of Rome.

This passage, viewed in common with Matth. xxviii. 18, 19, seems to me, rather to remove all difficulty on the subject. Matth. xxviii. gives all authority to the apostles to set up the christian church, and promises them miraculous aid, till the work was done. "I am with you

continually till the conclusion of this state—*ἕως της συντελείας του αἰῶνος*. Of which I must here speak more particularly. At present it suffices to repeat the fact of such a commission, and such a promise to the apostles.

Now let us hear Paul. When Christ ascended, "he gave gifts to men."—What, let me ask, were they? "He gave apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers"—all miraculously endowed. They were not raised up, out of the church; but given directly from heaven to the church, or for building a church! What, again, let me ask Paul, were they given for? "For the perfecting of the saints:" or, according to the Douay bible, "for the consummation of the saints unto the work of the ministry, unto the edifying of the body of Christ." And for how long, let me ask, still more emphatically? "Until" (it is *Μεχρι* in Greek, *donec* in Latin, adverbs expressive of the time how long) "Until we all come into the unity of the faith and knowledge of the Son of God, to a perfect man" (not men—that is, to a perfect body) "into the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ."—The Roman church being judge, then, these officers were given to the church after the ascension, for a special work, and for a limited time.—Till, out of Jews and Gentiles, they had made one PERFECT MAN, or CHURCH.

Now, these apostles acted in exact accordance with the nature of the case. They preached, baptized, and congregated disciples, in particular places. These disciples had, from the nature of the case, to receive from them the whole christian institution. They knew neither what to believe or do, but as they were taught by these inspired men.—Hence, the apostles preached, baptized, taught, served tables, and dispensed all ordinances, and performed all offices among them, till the body of the church had learned its duty. Then they taught them to select from among themselves certain officers—gave them the qualifications, and showed them in their own persons how they were to be set apart and ordained to these offices.—For example, the *deacons*, or public servants of the church of Jerusalem, the *mother church*. Again, they taught them to send out missionaries or evangelists, as in the church of Antioch; and finally, to ordain elders or bishops over the flock, as soon as they had persons qualified for that office.—They taught the church, then, to have *bishops* and *deacons*. and *evangelists* (or general missionaries, as the case may be). They gave the law, the qualifications, and the mode of inducting them into office. They never taught any one church to depend always upon Jerusalem, or Antioch, or Rome, or Corinth; but they taught the necessity of all these offices—gave the qualifications of the officers, and assisted in ordaining them in many particular congregations, of which

congregations with the same laws, authority, and order, there never have been wanting thousands from that day till now.

Order has its foundation in nature. The highest officers were called *seniors* or *elders*; because of their age; and *bishops* or overseers, because of their office. Deacons, not having so much authority and glory, and not having a salary, like bishops, there never has been among them any controversy about succession! But had there been any great honor or reward in that office, we should doubtless have had as much ado about an unbroken line; and could as easily find one in this case as in that of the bishops of Rome, or Constantinople. The same order obtained in the christian church—I mean, substantially, that obtained in the synagogues of the Jews. The same word *πρεσβυτεριον* or presbytery, is found in the New Testament in reference to both the synagogue and the church. “Stir up the gift,” *office*, “that is in thee, by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery.” Indeed, the synagogue, much more than the tabernacle or temple, was the archetype of the order, which the apostles set up. In every case the question was put to the people, “Look out, choose out, select from among yourselves,” &c.

My friend is almost a Protestant on some points. He occasionally recommends the bible to his flock, and he says that the ordinances of religion do not receive their virtue from an unholy or holy pope—that he has his authority to administer from Christ rather than from the pope.

Indeed, I know not why the spirit of God should be promised through such a wretched and polluted channel as the popes of Rome, rather than to operate from heaven in all its holy influences upon those, who by its appointment, are chosen and ordained by prayer, fasting, and imposition of hands, as deacons or bishops of the christian congregations. We lose nothing, then, in abandoning the leaky and sinking ship of pontifical authority in the Roman Catholic church.—[Time expired.]

Half-past 10 o'clock, A. M.

BISHOP PURCELL rises—

next

My friend has set me the example of recapitulating. I shall not fail to do so in due time. He has talked around one of the invincible texts of Scripture which I had adduced for Peter's headship: “Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, (the plural) that he may sift you as wheat: but I have prayed for THEE, that THY FAITH fail not: and thou, being converted, confirm thy brethren.” St. Luke xxii. 32. And he gratuitously asserts that “Confirm” here means only “Comfort.” But will any man say that such an interpretation has

weakened the force of my argument from the text, or destroyed the avowed effect and object of the Savior's prayer, namely that the faith of Peter should never fail, and that, in that, he should confirm his brethren? Let him shew that Christ addressed a special prayer, for any similar purpose, in favor of all, or of any of the other apostles, and then he may summon Christ's appointed chief of the apostolic band, to surrender his pre-eminence. If he cannot do this, Peter must for ever retain his supremacy—not of age, nor of talents, nor of priority of call, nor of conversion, but of OFFICE.

He again asserts, for Mr. C. seems to think we must grant every thing to his assertions, that I cannot find a solitary proof in Irenæus, or in any other author of christian antiquity, that Peter was ever bishop of Rome. Now in p. 169 of this Protestant edition of Irenæus we find that warrant. It is in chap. I. book 3, "against heresies." He speaks as follows:

"For we have not learned the disposition, or economy, of our salvation from any others than those through whom the gospel came unto us, which, indeed, they first preached, and afterwards, by the will of God, delivered to us in writing, to be the pillar and ground of our faith. Nor is it lawful to say, as some do, who pretend to correct the apostles, that they preached before they had had perfect knowledge. For after the Lord had arisen from the dead, they were clothed with virtue from on high by the Holy Spirit who came down upon them, and they were filled with all knowledge and attained to perfect understanding: they went to the ends of the earth announcing to us the good things which are from God, and proclaiming heavenly peace to men, having both all and each of them the gospel of God. Thus Matthew, in their own language, wrote the gospel scripture in Hebrew, while Peter and Paul were evangelizing and founding the church of Rome. After their departure, Mark, a disciple, and *Peter's interpreter*, likewise announced to us the prescribed doctrines; next John, the disciple of the Lord, who also reposed on his breast, published likewise a gospel, residing at Ephesus, in Asia. And all these delivered to us the doctrine of One God, the Creator of heaven and earth, announced by the Lord and the prophets, and one Christ, the Son of God; to whom, he who assenteth not, despiseth the partakers of the Lord, despiseth Christ the Lord, despiseth the Father, and is condemned by himself, for he resisteth and opposeth his own salvation, which all heretics do."

Tracing the succession of bishops in the same chair, he always makes Peter the first bishop, as I have already shewn from the very next page—170, of this volume.

There is Irenæus, a writer of the 2d century—year 150. I shall follow the devious track of the gentleman as well as I can.

My friend denied that I could adduce a solitary testimony to prove that the legate of the pope presided over the first great general council of the church, after the council at Jerusalem. Now I am going to adduce Barronius, p. 295, year of Christ 325, year of Sylvester 12, Constantine 20: (how faithful and exact our Catholic histories are!)

"Before we proceed to narrate the history of the acts of the Nicene council, I pray you, friendly reader, to pause with me, to notice the most eminent prelates

of that illustrious company of saints, that most flowery crown of fathers, and most distinguished assemblage of holy bishops, whose names shine forth from amidst the obscurity of so ancient a period. He who first attracts our attention, conspicuous for having been twice legate, is Osius, bishop of Cordova, in Spain, representing the bishops of Spain, and, as we have already said, holding the place (the Latin is still stronger—*personam gerens*—personating) Sylvester, bishop of Rome, and chief of the legates, his colleagues. Now, continues Baronius, what good ground could there have been for Osius' signing before his colleagues, the legates, before the bishops of the second and third sees of the christian world, viz., Alexandria and Antioch, and before Cœcilian, the primate of all Africa, nor to speak of others, unless he held the place and represented the person of the highest power of all? He then quotes the commencement of the letter which the legates, immediately after the council, addressed to the pope: "To Sylvester, most blessed pope of the city of Rome, and entitled to all reverence, Osius, bishop of the province of Spain and city of Cordova, Victor and Vincentius, priests of the city of Rome, appointed by your direction," &c. &c. So far Baronius.

Nat. Alex. says, vol. vii. p. 68, "The synod of Nice, first of the œcumenicals, was convoked by the emperor Constantine, with consent of the Roman pontiff, Sylvester—the president of the council, in the name of St. Sylvester, and his legates were Osius, bishop of Cordova, Vitus or Vito, and Vincentius, priests," &c. &c.

It was the custom of the bishop of Rome to send a bishop and two inferior ecclesiastics to represent him in the councils. Osius was legate and Victor and Vincentius were his two assistants.

Natalis Alexander says the same, p. 68, 7 vol. Fleury, another most authentic historian, a man of prodigious learning, a contemporary of Bossuet, and one who has been very severe against the popes, so that we have quarreled with him for it, says the same, p. 107 and 108. He adds:

"St. Athanasius says that Osius presided at all the councils, and it is certain that he presided at the council of Sardica, twenty two years later?"

Now we cannot see why a simple bishop of Cordova should have presided, by any right of his, over all the bishops of the world, even those of Alexandria and Antioch, who were present in person—Gelasius of Uyzicum says expressly that Osius held the place of Sylvester, bishop of imperial Rome, with the priests Victor (or Vito, as he was also called) and Vincentius; and his testimony should not be suspected, as he was a Greek and writing the acts and records of Greeks. Subsequent usage is conformable to what is here observed.—In the œcumenical councils whose acts have come down to us, we see the papal legates at the head, and they are commonly, a bishop and two priests."

Here are Barronius, Noel Alexander, Fleury.—The gentleman says that I deal in rhetoric, but he may say what he pleases; I deal in nothing but stubborn facts. These are the irresistible arguments by which Catholic truth is upheld.

As for Peter's executing the decrees of the council of Jerusalem, I said no such thing. He acted with the rest—but he did, I maintain, lead, and his authority was wanting to give sanction to every decree. When he spoke, the "*much disputing*" ceased. He spoke humbly, but

authoritatively. James and Paul and Barnabas acquiesced. The opposition to his *gentilising* was wrong and much in the spirit of more modern opposition, but Peter's authority then as it has ever done prevailed; for if any thing is certain in historical testimony, it is proved that his authority was acknowledged to reside, in ancient days, in his successors. So is it now acknowledged. We were referred to 10. John, where Christ speaks of the fold and the sheep; and objections were made to my interpretation of the words "lambs" and "sheep," as contradictory and absurd. But now mark, my friends, the signal difference between the two passages. In 10. John, the Savior speaks of *sheep alone*. He says the sheep are scattered, and never mentions *lambs*. When therefore Christ says in the other passage, feed my lambs, do we not remark, that he afterwards changes the passage and says, feed my sheep! and as I observed yesterday Christ means pastors, by the sheep whom the lambs follow. Wide as the world, is Christ's fold—and there are over its various provinces, or pastures, many shepherds, but one above the rest, whose duty it is to watch over them all, to see they do their duty.—This is Peter, this is reasonable, it is as it ought to be. Thus, the rock, the keys, the charge to confirm his brethren, the acknowledgment of Paul that he went to see Peter, lest he might have run in vain, the acknowledgment of the authority of Peter's successors, the very necessity of such an office to keep order, &c. All this is proof positive from scripture and history and reason, of the supremacy of the chair of Peter, and not rhetoric—or if so, it is logical rhetoric. Let not scripture, history and reason be thus dismissed in the nineteenth century, with a wave of the hand.

That eternal Du Pin, my friends, you have had my reasons against his authenticity as a Catholic historian: certainly he is no testimony against the Catholics. All my friend can adduce to prove that the authenticity of Du Pin was ever recognized in this country, is that some Catholic paper in Kentucky, *as he says*, allows his authenticity.—Who the editor of this paper is, I know not. He may be a respectable Catholic. The bishop of Bardstown has nothing to do with it, the editor is liable to be deceived. His opinion ought to have no weight whatsoever in this controversy.

What led my friend into such an error respecting the book itself, was, probably his seeing prefixed to it the censor's license for its impression; but he should have known that the king of France appoints such persons as he thinks fit, to examine whether publications contain any thing dangerous to the state. And Louis Phillip is more strict in this respect than ever Charles X. was, who was exiled from France for the same thing.

The Doctors of Sorbonne, to whom the work was submitted, may have said the book contained nothing against *faith* and *morals*. They do not say that he is an *authentic Catholic* historian. We apply criticism to every work, and our maxim is *nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri*. The opinions of two or three Doctors of Sorbonne form no rule of faith for Catholics, although, in this instance, they say nothing, I presume, to which we may not very safely assent, while we describe Du Pin in his proper colors. After all Du Pin says nothing that does not go to prove my views, if considered fairly, although he was expelled the Sorbonne for heterodox opinions!

Now there were vacancies, breaks, in the chain; but the lapse of a few years, before binding together the links of the apostolic succession, does not affect the great principle for which I am contending. We are no believers in *metempsychosis*: or that, like the supposed divinity of the Lama of Thibet, the soul of a deceased pope goes by a hop, skip and jump, right off, into his successor. We will wait six months, or six years, to find a good pope. Time is taken for this, since so much depends on the result. Now in this change were some bad popes; we weep over the fact, my friends, and lament it. Mr. C. ought to have thrown the mantle over his shoulders and walked backwards with me and covered these frailties, for the sake of our common christianity. The mass of the succession is sound. But there were some bad points.

It is not the *name*, but the *religion* they represented, that we regard. Whether the stream of testimony came to us through conduits of gold, of silver, or of brass, it is not the channel of communication we regard, but the pure chrysal and transparent waters of celestial doctrine, of divine truth. Men are liable to err—Jesus Christ said there must needs be scandals. We look for them; we expect them to occur while there is yet remaining one single human being on this earth. None but God is perfect and man is good only by divine assistance. I have no special apology to offer for a pope who is a bad man. He should be the pattern of the flock from the heart. He should be the salt of the earth—the light of the world. He should remember that the “mighty shall be mightily tormented;” and that “a most severe judgment shall be for them that bear rule if they walk not according to the law.” I should not be surprised if these bad popes were at this moment expiating their crimes in the penal fires of hell. But what is the proper inference to be deduced from their melancholy aberrations? If they like Lucifer have fallen, bright light from the firmament of religion, do the heavens no longer proclaim the glory of God? Do the praises of God resound there no more? Why it is truly wonderful, that, bad

men as they were, they should not only have never severed themselves from the faith but should have been the instruments of perpetuating sound doctrine at home and abroad. Nothing, my friends, gives me more faith in the genuineness and truth of our holy religion, than when in reviewing the history of these disgraceful enormities, I find the church, in the very midst of scandal, enough to blacken and overthrow any earthly institution, still supported and upheld by the almighty hand of God. A church that has stood through all that the gentleman has laid to the charge of the merely mortal men who have presided for a season over its destinies. A FEW OF THEM ERRED IN MORALS, BUT NONE OF THEM IN FAITH; sound doctrine and sound morals were seen and admired, during these sad eclipses, and infidel nations were, during that passing obscurity in Rome, rejoicing in the beams of the orient sun of justice, heralded to Catholic missionaries. Let this be borne in mind when my learned opponent undertakes to prove that the pope is the sea-serpent! And let my Protestant friends understand that the Roman Catholics detest immorality as much as *they* can, wherever it may be found: and most of all, where superior virtue was required by exalted station. We too had labored for a reformation, not of God's truth, for it needed none, but of man's morals which are always liable to corruption. We may cry out like the apostles, when we behold such scandals, O Lord, save us ere we perish—but we hear the divine answer, "why fear ye, O you of little faith." NO CLOUD HAS EVER YET IMPENDED OVER THE CHURCH, THAT THE RAINBOW OF PROMISE DID NOT SHINE THROUGH THE GLOOM.

The object of the institution of the church being no other than to establish the true worship of God, by the overthrow of idolatry, and to sanctify a chosen people for everlasting life, by the purest virtues of religion, we are not to wonder that Satan, the jealous enemy of human happiness, should exert his utmost powers to obstruct the benevolent design. In fulfilment of the Savior's prediction, and from the very nature of man, it was necessary that persecutions, heresies, schisms and domestic scandals should happen; but Jesus Christ had likewise foretold that they should not prevail. The Pagan tyrants of the earth may rage; the courage and patience of our martyrs will triumph and multiply. Heresies may start up in various forms, and for a while seduce thousands into error; they will, at length, sink back again into the dark abyss from which they first emerged. Guided by the spirit of truth, and confirmed in the unity of her belief the church will ever successfully oppose to their impotent attempts, the promises of her divine Founder, the antiquity of her faith, the consent of nations, the order of her hierarchy, the holy severity of her discipline, the

bright example of thousands of her faithful children, the sacred history of her doctrines, and the decisions of her councils. Schisms may at times perplex and divide the faithful, but the church by her authority will either close the breach, or separate the refractory members from her communion. The vicious lives of some of her children may contradict and disgrace their christian profession, they may violate her laws, they may insult her authority, and invade her sacred rights; they never will be able to overturn her ministry, to shake her hierarchy or to alter her doctrine. She will never cease to warn sinners of their duty, to correct, to instruct, to direct mankind in the way of salvation.

By her persevering zeal for God's honor, by the force of her exhortations, by the solemnity of her public service, by the morality of her precepts, and by her practice of the evangelical counsels, she will continue to prepare souls for heaven, while she exhibits to the world a rich assemblage of the most heroic virtues. It is thus, that our history attests the care which God has taken of his church.

The whole number of popes has been nearly two hundred and sixty. Of these, the first forty were saints, or martyrs, a small number only, not more than twenty, can be called bad men; the rest were remarkable for eminent virtue, charity, zeal, learning and patronage of letters. Peter was twenty-five years bishop of Rome; and *non videbis annos Petri*, you will not be pope as long as Peter—is a proverb which every new pope hears. Pius VI. and Pius VII. came nearest to the years of Peter, but they did not attain them. But says the gentleman, the pope transferred his see for some time from Rome, to Avignon. I grant it; but have I not said, were he a wanderer in Abyssinia, he would still retain his title and authority.

We were told of a council which cashiered three popes, and made a fourth! My friends, what sophistry is this? Does my friend think he is addressing people but one remove from barbarism, instead of the enlightened and liberal citizens of the queen of the west? I wish him to understand that we, at least, are equal to the people of Bethany in intelligence. Among these citizens, I thank God, my lot is cast. Does Mr. C.— suppose that they cannot answer his sophistry by the true statement of the fact? The council cashiered three doubtful popes, or rather no popes at all, and elected one true pope. What has become of his logic?

Stephen VI. had the body of Formosus dug up and cut off his fingers. My friend has taken this from Pope and McGuire's discussion, and has seen the answer there. In this unpardonable act of Stephen, we at least discern zeal for the rules of discipline, which forbade the transferring of a bishop from one see to another. For this offense the need-

less act of severity was done. It shews the popes expose what they think wrong in popes; just as my friend would know nothing of their misdeeds, if Catholic historians had not had sincerity, piety and zeal to denounce them. Genebrard said that the popes were more often apostates than apostles. I am sure that, in this case, truth was sacrificed to wit, and faithful testimony to virtue as well as faithful exposition of vice, for the jingle between the words apostates and apostles. But Genebrard says not, absolutely, they were apostates, but that they had fallen short of the virtues of their predecessors.

My friend quarrels with the name, cardinals. The name is Latin and as old as that language. But I will not contend for the name. He says the cardinals, were not so called for 1000 years, but did not show his authority. This was, however, the title given to priests charged with the care of large churches, as far back as the year 150, or at least in 300. But call them what you may, they were a portion, and an eminent portion, of the Roman clergy in all ages. Now, as formerly, there are cardinal priests, cardinal deacons, and even cardinal laymen. They are a superior order of men, the patrons of the arts and sciences, as well as the ornaments and supports of the church, and the benefactors of the poor. They liberally entertain and treat our travelling fellow-citizens with great civility—for instance, Mr. Dewey, an Unitarian minister, lately in Rome, and cardinal Weld, a distinguished English nobleman, in whose father's castle, at Lulworth, if I am not mistaken, our first archbishop, the cousin of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, was consecrated bishop.—Read Mr. Dewey's elegant and thrilling pages. They will almost make you a Catholic. Certainly they will liberalize your minds already raised far above vulgar prejudices. The cardinals elect the pope—but if the pope creates the cardinals, surely he does not create his own electors!

Mr. C.— has not told us yet, from what true and holy apostolic church, the Roman church apostatized. He has told you of the Albigenses, Vaudois, Novatians, Donatists, &c., but they furnish no continuous church. They are, I say again, ignoble ancestry. My friends, read history for yourselves if you wish to see what a miserable set of wretches these sectarians were.

My friend says, that Peter was married—but I defy him to prove that he retained his wife after he became a bishop. I will meet Mr. Campbell on this doctrine of the celibacy of the clergy, and shew him in the words of St. Paul, 1st Cor. i. 26, and in those of Jesus Christ, Matthew xix. 12, whose expressions, although he was purity itself, I dare not repeat in Mr. C.—'s fastidious ears, "*that there are not many wise according to the flesh.*" St. Paul, who was a bachelor, says, 1st

Cor. vii., "I would that all were as myself. I say to the unmarried and the widows; it is good for them if they so continue even as I. v. 8. He that is without a wife is solicitous for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please God. But he that is with a wife, is solicitous for the things of the world, how he may please his wife: and he is divided. And the unmarried woman and the virgin thinketh on the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and spirit. But she that is married thinketh on the things of the world, how she may please her husband." Read the entire chapter. Marriage was ordained by Almighty God for the propagation of the human race. The Catholic church not only approves the institution, but teaches that Christ hath exalted it to the dignity of a sacrament. St. Paul, while he wishes all to be like himself, unmarried, still acknowledges that all are not called to that state; and they who cannot practise continence, he wishes to marry; so does the Catholic church. Her ministers are not allowed to take a vow of chastity until they have attained an age when they can, aided by divine grace, decide on their capability for its pure observance. And now, young ladies and gentlemen, take care you never become what Mr. C. would make you, the successors of Paulicians. They condemned all connubial ties, saying that marriage came from the evil principle. But, married or single, let us not forget that our days in this life are numbered; the gayest are frequently death's earliest victims. "For the *fashion* of this world, says the apostle, passeth away." Let priests then do good, even as Catholic religious have done, to the whole human family, renouncing the ties that would bind them to a few only, that they may be like God, the fathers and benefactors of many.

Mr. C. spoke of ministering to the sick. I thank him for the hint. In deeds of charity, the Catholic priesthood, the Catholic religious of all orders, are unsurpassed. Their "labor of love" is seen in the hospital, the pest-house, the dungeon, the orphan asylum; where the cholera makes its dreadful ravages, where the pestilence stalketh at noon-day, or midnight! Hear Waddington—

"The Ursulines. Of the more modern orders, there is also one which may seem to require our notice—that of the Ursulines. Its origin is ascribed to Angela di Brescia, about the year 1537, though the saint from whom it received its name, Ursula Benincasa, a native of Naples, was born ten years afterwards. Its character was peculiar, and recalls our attention to the primitive form of ascetic devotion. The duties of those holy sisters were the purest within the circle of human benevolence—to minister to the sick, to relieve the poor, to console the miserable, to pray with the penitent. These charitable offices they undertook to execute without the bond of any community, without the obligation of any monastic vow, without any separation from society, any renouncement of their domestic duties and virtues. And so admirably were those offices, in millions of

instances, performed, that had all other female orders been really as useless and vicious, as they are sometimes falsely described to be, the virtues of the Ursulines had alone been sufficient to redeem the monastic name.

But it is very far from true, that these other orders were either commonly dissolute or generally useless. Occasional scandals have engendered universal calumnies." Waddington's Church Hist. page 325, New York edit. 1835.

Mr. C. spoke of bad popes, Nicholas III., &c., &c., and of monks.—Hear again—what this Protestant historian says of them and of this very Nicholas:

"It is not without reason that Roman Catholic writers vaunt the disinterested devotion of the early Mendicants—how assiduous they were in supplying the spiritual wants of the poor, how frequent in prisons and in hospitals, how forward to encounter the fire or the pestilence; how instant on all those occasions where the peril was imminent and the reward not in this world. They were equally distinguished in another, and not less righteous, duty, the propagation of christianity among remote and savage nations. We have noticed, in a former chapter, the method by which the gospel was introduced into the north of Europe before the middle of the eleventh century. In the twelfth, we observe Boleslaus, duke of Poland, opening the path for its reception in Pomerania by the sword; and in like manner, both the Slavonians and Finlanders, were prepared for conversion by conquest. Again, Urban VIII. consecrated Mainhard, an unsuccessful missionary, bishop of the Livonians, and proclaimed a holy war against them; the bishop conquered his see, and promulgated at the head of an army the tidings of evangelical concord. The same methods were pursued by Innocent III. But from that time forward we find much more frequent mention of pious missionaries, whose labours were directed to accomplish their great work by legitimate, or, at least, by peaceful means. It may be true, that some of them were satisfied with mere nominal conversions, and that others had chiefly in view either their own advancement, or the extension of the papal sovereignty. But there were likewise many who were animated by the most admirable motives, and whose exertions, if they failed of complete success, failed not through any want of disinterested devotion. The missions of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were principally directed to the north of Asia. In 1245, Innocent IV. sent an embassy, composed of Dominicans and Franciscans, to the Tartars; and a friendly communication was so maintained, that the envoys of Abaca, their king, were present, in 1271, at the second council of Lyons. Nicholas III. (in 1278) and Nicholas IV. (in 1289,) renewed those exertions. John of Monte Corvino, a Franciscan, was distinguished during the conclusion of the century by the success of his labors; and in 1307, Clement V. erected an archiepiscopal see at Cambalu, (Pekin,) which he conferred upon that missionary. Seven other bishops, also Franciscans, were sent to his support by the same pope; and this distant branch of the hierarchy was carefully nourished by succeeding pontiffs, especially John XXII. and Benedict XII. It is certain that the number of Christians was not inconsiderable, both among the Chinese and Moguls, as late as the year 1370,—and they were still increasing, when they were suddenly swept away and almost wholly exterminated by the Mahometan arms. Howbeit, the disastrous overthrow of their establishment detracts nothing from the merit of those who constructed it; and it must not be forgotten, that the instruments in this work were Mendicants, and, for the most part, Franciscans." *Ib.* p. 547.

The Methodists have done themselves honor by the praises they have bestowed on Francis Xavier, a Jesuit. They have published his life,

DEBATE ON THE

and to-day, if I have time, I will quote from it some beautiful extracts.

They and other Protestants have also published Thomas a Kempis, or the christian pattern. Where, except in the Gospel, can purer morality be found? And Thomas a Kempis was a monk. We are told that Sacchi said that the Albigenses and Vaudois made a *show of piety*. That is a fact, and a pretty show it was. I will not read the indicated, but forbidden page of narrative sincere—better blot it with a tear!

If the pope is charged with severity to kings, it is because kings were tyrants and the pope was the advocate of the weak, and the enemy of arbitrary power. The people were crushed, and had no resource but in the influence which God gave to the head of the church.

“ With all his errors, (the papacy's,) its corruptions, and its crimes, it was, morally and intellectually, the conservative power of christendom. Politically, too, it was the savior of Europe; for, in all human probability, the west, like the east, must have been overrun by Mahommedanism, and sunk in irremediable degradation, through the pernicious institutions which have everywhere accompanied it; if, in that great crisis of the world, the Roman church had not roused the nations to an united and prodigious effort commensurate with the danger.

In the frightful state of society which prevailed during the dark ages, the church everywhere exerted a controlling and remedial influence. Every place of worship was an asylum, which was always respected by the law, and generally even by lawless violence. It is recorded, as one of the peculiar miseries of Stephen's miserable reign, that during those long troubles, the soldiers learned to disregard the right of sanctuary. Like many other parts of the Romish system, this right had prevailed in the heathen world, though it was not ascribed to every temple. It led, as it had done under the Romish empire, to abuses which became intolerable; but it originated in a humane and pious purpose, not only screening offenders from laws, the severity of which amounted to injustice, but, in cases of private wrong, affording time for passion to abate, and for the desire of vengeance to be appeased. The cities of refuge were not more needed, under the Mosaic dispensation, than such asylums in ages when the administration of justice was either detestably inhuman, or so lax, that it allowed free scope to individual resentment. They have, therefore, generally been found wherever there are the first rudiments of civil and religious order. The churchyards also were privileged places, whither the poor people conveyed their goods for security. The protection which the ecclesiastical power extended in such cases, kept up in the people, who so often stood in need of it, a feeling of reverence and attachment to the church. They felt that religion had a power on earth, and that it was always exercised for their benefit.

The civil power was in those ages so inefficient for the preservation of public tranquillity, that when a country was at peace with all its neighbors, it was liable to be disturbed by private wars, individuals taking upon themselves the right of deciding their own quarrels, and avenging their own wrongs. Where there existed no deadly feud, pretexts were easily made by turbulent and rapacious men for engaging in such contests, and they were not scrupulous whom they seized and imprisoned, for the purpose of extorting a ransom. No law, therefore, was ever more thankfully received, than when the council of Clermot enacted, that, from sun-set on Wednesday to sun-rise on Monday, in every week, the truce of God

and peaceable part of the community (always the great, but in evil times the inert, and therefore the suffering part,) regard, with grateful devotion, a power, under whose protection they slept four nights of the week in peace, when otherwise they would have been in peril every hour. The same power by which individuals were thus benefited, was not infrequently exercised in great national concerns: if the monarch were endangered or oppressed either by a foreign enemy or by a combination of his barons, here was an authority to which he could resort for an effectual interposition in his behalf; and the same shield was extended over the vassals, when they called upon the pope to defend them against a wrongful exertion of the sovereign power." *Southey's Book of the Church*, page 293. *Boston*, 1st. edit. 1825.

Now I must follow Mr. C. wheeling right about from rear to van. We are told that Peter exercised the grand commission of Apostle—and that therefore he could not have been bishop of Rome, and again that Paul was sent to the Gentiles and Peter to the Jews. But Peter was the first apostle sent to the Gentiles—*by the angel of God*. He received Cornelius the centurion into the church. He founded the see of Antioch—a Gentile city. If Peter was an apostle of the whole world, where should he place his head quarters? Where, but at Rome, the mistress of the world, worthy field for a chief apostle's zeal; where he could at once be heard by Gentiles and by Jews, by Greeks, Barbarians and Romans?

We are told there are no vicars to be discovered in the Pagan emperors more flagrant and gloomy than those of the Roman pontiffs—that they became proverbial for their iniquity. But I have shown that these sweeping denunciations are glaringly untrue. There were 39 martyrs out of 260 or 270 popes. If there were a few bad men among them, shall we for that reason fling away our faith? Does Christ say so? Did he not say that it must needs be that scandals come? And were not the vast majority of the popes entitled to veneration? Suppose there were about a dozen that were infamous, and that there were even fifty of various shades of guilt, or imperfection, there were still upwards of 200 worthy. Christ has said that "many are called, but few chosen." Show me 200 of the Roman emperors or a like proportion of any other rulers, to the popes, who were as good men, and who have deserved to go to heaven. Shall we point to Nero holding up the dagger which he had plunged into the breast of his own mother? to Diocletian, the man of sin,—the antichrist of the apostles, who mowed down hundreds of meek and peaceful disciples at once?—to Caligula, the murderer of the saints?—to Maxentius?—or the monster Maximin? Where is there a parallel to their atrocities? My friend has talked of the inquisition, and on that point also I will meet him. The inquisition was the vice of the age and not of the church. It was unknown for many centuries. In many Catholic countries it was never

received. Other churches and times have, likewise, their sins of blood to answer for.—[Time expired.]

Half-past 11 o'clock, A. M.

MR. CAMPBELL rises—

My friends, if we proceed in this course we never shall dismiss the propositions we have before us. If we are to sit here and listen to such a variety of matter wholly irrelevant to the question we shall never prove any thing, or know what is proved. Must we have questions introduced reaching back to the beginning of the discussion and forward to its close, and touching upon the whole system of theology in every speech? I have said already I will not lose sight of my duty so as to respond to every thing in one speech.

I almost trembled when my opponent arose with so much pomp and appearance of having found a triumphant proof of his assertions in some hidden, and by me, unexplored corner of Irenæus. What! said I to myself, have I not thoroughly examined this matter? Is it possible that there yet remains one passage unknown to me against my assertion, and have I committed myself? But it was even a little less alarming than his blustering about the consecration of Phocas. Judge of my surprise and great relief, when I found he was only reading one of his elegant extracts, which he styles his proof! that indeed, it was the same old story new vamped and varnished, without any reference at all, to the present debate. Irenæus said, "while Peter and Paul were founding the congregation at Rome." I would ask, is there in this instance, any stripling in knowledge, who understands that founding a congregation makes a man bishop of that church all his life? Missionaries go abroad, they plant congregations in particular places; and they go from country to country, from city to city, to found other churches: Are they bishops of all the congregations that they establish? It is essential to a missionary not to be stationary. But why expose a matter, already evident to all? It is the gentleman's last effort. He has explored all antiquity, and all he can find, after three or four days' search, is this single fragment of a saint, stating on hearsay, that Paul and Peter *planted* the church at Rome! So ends the controversy on that point, the main pillar of the Roman church. There is another little matter (there are too many little matters) which I wish to dispose of.

The gentleman affects a great accuracy in his knowledge, and great precision on the part of his authorities. He seems to glory in that sort of reputation, else I would not select this trifle. How often has he asserted that Sylvester summoned the council of Nice, and that

the pope's legates presided over it! And how often has he tried to prove it! Like some other matters already disposed of, after sleeping two nights upon the subject, as one that had a pleasant dream, he awakens and affirms again, that Osius, a Spanish bishop, was legate of Sylvester, and as such presided at Nice. But did he prove it? I shall read you some testimony on this subject. I do this, not to add to the weight of my arguments one grain of sand; but to prove that when I assert any thing as a fact, I do it advisedly, and will stand to it. Permit me now to correct a mistake into which the gentleman has fallen, that I relied upon the testimony of an ephemeral paper in Kentucky. I did not say, that it was upon such authority I read any author here. My allusion to that paper, was a pure *argumentum ad hominem*; and was made for bishop Purcell and no one else. [The bishop of Bardstown or some of his clergy admitted that Eusebius and Du Pin, though not good Catholics, "were authentic historians." But that admission gives them no new weight, or indeed, no weight at all with me. I have already given my reasons for the authority of Du Pin. But where, may I ask, is his authority for Sylvester's calling the council of Nice! The emperor did it at the general suggestion of the eastern bishops. And if Osius presided, we have no reason to think that he did it as the pope's legate. For this we have ancient authority. The gentleman spoke in warm admiration of Osius: but did he not apostatize, or some way lose his orthodoxy?] He was, indeed, a learned and talented man—a sort of standing president in the early councils; and in that age of the world as among ecclesiastics there were few men of general learning, we therefore find him conspicuous in all assemblies; and his name stands first in the subscriptions of the decrees and creeds of the early part of the 4th century, but that he presided as the pope's legate in any council, especially that of Nice, is insusceptible of proof.

We shall however hear antiquity on the subject:

"Constantine seeing that he had labored in vain to allay the disputes which divided the church, thought it would be the most ready and effectual means to restore peace, to call a numerous synod composed of eastern and western bishops. This council was called oecumenical, i. e. a council of the whole world, or the whole earth, because it was called together from all parts of the Roman empire, to which the title of the world, or earth, was given, and which did almost include the Catholic church. This council was assembled by order of the emperor at Nice, a city of Bithynia, about the month of July, in the year 325, in the second year of Constantine's reign. St. Sylvester was then bishop of Rome, who sent thither Victor and Vincentius, his legates. It is commonly held that this council consisted of 318 bishops; but those who were present at it do not precisely determine this number, but say only that there were about 300 bishops. 'Tis not certainly known who presided in this council, but it is very probable that it was Hosius who held the chief place there in his own name, because he had already

taken cognizance of this affair, and was much esteemed by the emperor, who was then present.

Athanasius, in his second apology, calls Hosius the father and president of all the councils. The name of this bishop is the first in all the subscriptions. Alexander was much esteemed, as appears by the letter of the council. Eustathius, of Antioch, was called the chief bishop of the council by Procius and by Facundus; but it is more probable that Hosius presided there in his own name, and not in the pope's, for he nowhere assumes the title of legate of the holy see; and none of the ancients say that he presided in this council in the pope's name. Gelasius Cizicenus, who first affirmed it, says it without any proof or authority.'

Du Pin, vol. 1, pp. 598, 599.

† Now where is the gentleman's authority for the nature of the bishop of Rome or his legates, either calling or presiding in this council! Upon such disregard of ancient history rest many such assertions now in common circulation and in common belief. But as I said before on this point, I should not have dwelt a moment upon it, had not my opponent affected peculiar accuracy in his details.

The bishop admits Barronius to be an authentic historian. Now, neither Barronius nor Du Pin even admitted so much in reference to the demerits of the popes, as bishop *Purcell* has admitted in the presence of this great congregation: For he says, "I have no doubt but these bad popes are now expiating their crimes in the penal fires of hell." While these words were sounding in my ears, the question simultaneously arose, with the sensation produced, What! Has the Lord Jesus his vicars—his representatives on earth, now roasting in the flames of hell? I put it to intelligent men, whether such an idea is not repugnant to every principle of the christian religion?

When Simon proposed to purchase the gift of the Holy Spirit, what did Peter say to him? "Thy money perish with thee!" Does this look like winking at such enormities? Were not the apostles all persons of unblemished reputation? and if such holy men, the models of every virtue, were first appointed by the Lord to conduct the affairs of his kingdom, how comes it to pass that he has changed his administration and trusted it to such a succession of pretended representatives? Has Christ changed his purpose with respect to his church, that he will allow its supreme head on earth to act every species of crime, and yet be his acceptable vicegerents! May I not say, that the darkest hour of midnight is not more opposed to the light of noon, than is the general character of the popes of Rome to that of the apostles!

The gentleman exclaims, "How precise these Catholics always in their dates!" There is however, an over precision, that creates suspicion. When a man begins to swear very circumstantially before his word is called in question, I begin to suspect his evidence: and when

I see authors testifying that Peter reigned twenty four years five months and ten days, bishop of Rome (as I have it in some tables of the popes;) I think he ought also to come down to hours, minutes and seconds! and then we would know how to appreciate him.

This resembles Peter's putting away his wife after he became bishop of Rome. "What accuracy!" Let the gentleman prove first that he was bishop of Rome, and then we shall show that he still retained his wife.

The gentleman's compliments to the citizens of Cincinnati, however well deserved on their part, will not so blind the eyes of this audience as not to understand the argument; and the design of their panegyrist. Nor will his gratuitous denunciation of the Albigenses, Donatists, Novatians, Paulicians, and others, pass for historic truth. They were such "vile heretics" in the estimation of "holy mother," as are we "schismatical Protestants." Their reputation we have fully sustained from unexceptionable authority.

The gentleman will have Du Pin in every speech. Can he prove, or has he proved him unfaithful in stating a single historic fact? Not one. Nor can he disprove those Roman Catholic vouchers for him on whose testimony I rely.

But as the reiteration of assertion is no proof, and as I am not obliged to repeat arguments as often as he makes assertions, I shall notice one or two new matters to which he would give emphasis.

But it is time to examine the philosophy of the plea for wicked popes. The Messiah descended through a long line of ancestors, some of whom were wicked men. That is, the human nature of the Messiah descended through some wicked progenitors. Indeed! To the honor of Jesus Christ, be it said, he humbled himself for our exaltation; he condescended to be made of a woman, to be descended from Adam, Noah, and others. In such a long line, he must necessarily, have had all the varieties of human nature in his ancestors. He chose to make himself of no reputation—to be born in a stable, of the humblest and poorest parentage. But who would argue from thence, that because his flesh and blood were so descended; therefore, the Holy Spirit must descend to the church, in all its official gifts of authority and governmental influence, through a lineage of persons, whose hearts were full of murder, adultery, and all uncleanness? and that through the hands of such persons all the graces of the ordinances must flow to all the partakers of the christian institution? Does not, let me ask, the defence make the matter worse? Is there any analogy between the descent of flesh, and the Spirit of God? Is the formation of the hu-

man body, and the creation of the mystical body of Christ, matters of equal value and importance?

God has generally, employed the best of our race in all the affairs of our salvation. His agents have often been angels or the *best men*. He did not often impart such sacred trusts to men of bad character. A wicked Balaam or a treacherous Judas may have been amongst those employed, for special reasons in some great crisis. In the case of Balaam, he caused even an ass to open its mouth and reprove the madness of the prophet: but that he ever set such persons over his church, and gave the affairs of his kingdom into such hands—that he went so far as to select these wicked popes to speak his word, is repugnant to all history, and our experience of his dealings with men.

The gentleman says there were *two hundred good popes*. I do not admit this: but I am willing to help him so far as to say I can count *forty nine saints* out of the first *fifty* popes according to my calendar. But they lived long ago. Not one of the last fifty has been a saint.—

BISHOP PURCELL.—Yes, there is one.

MR. CAMPBELL.—I beg the gentleman's pardon. There is one saint, then, out of the last fifty popes! It is a happy thing for human nature, that the vices and faults of those who have redeeming qualities, die with them, while their virtues live and magnify, long after their death. Hence, our remote ancestors and those of ancient times, if at all distinguished, are canonized in the admiration of the living, and are supposed greatly to excel our contemporaries.

The bishop says, that if the pope were a poor wanderer in the mountains of the moon, it would not destroy his authority.—Though the see of St. Peter should be vacant for seventy years! If so, the whole argument for Roman episcopacy falls to the ground. If the gentleman admits that the pope has as much authority in the mountains of the moon as in Rome, why all this controversy about Rome?

The gentleman made himself very merry with the council's deposing three popes and creating a fourth. But I repeat, there were in all four popes created and destroyed at that one time. I feel no misgivings of conscience for making this assertion. I ask now, how are we to decide which of these four had the best title in St. Peter's chair? Where is the authority for a council's creating one and destroying three popes? No council before ever took so much on them. But if we say with the bishop, that not one of the three popes was a true pope, then what a long link is wanting in the succession; and how could the council of Constance furnish it?

My friend the bishop spoke of marriage quite in jocular style—: but he told one great truth which I hope he will stick to, to the end. It

was this: He said that *the church had made marriage* one of the seven sacraments—mark it. *The church* has made it a sacrament; and she has made other things sacraments: which the great universal Father of heaven and earth has not so made and designated.

Peter was sent to convert the Gentiles.—He opened the kingdom of heaven to Cornelius and his family: but this does not interfere with his being specially the apostle of the Jews.

There were various vacancies in the Roman see of shorter and longer duration—several of two or three years' continuance. The church was often without a head for years at a time.

Was it the intention of the great Author of the christian institution to hazard such a contingency? Would he have set on foot such an order of things?—The chair often vacant and often filled with wicked popes. Now, if the church could get along for years without a pope, could it not dispense with one altogether? For if faith in the pope be an essential part of *the faith*, would Jesus Christ have suffered the whole administration of the affairs of salvation to be so often and so long suspended? How many persons were born and died during these vacancies! How many souls were detained in purgatory; and otherwise endangered in their spiritual interests by these unavoidable interruptions!—[Time expired.]

Twelve o'clock, M.

BISHOP PURCELL rises—

The question for to-day is the uniformity of the Catholic faith and practice; and we are still upon the subject of apostolicity. Mr. C. cannot go ahead as fast as he anticipated. He has discovered that Paulicians, Donatists and Novatians have the *bar sinister* on their coat of arms, and he takes up with the Vaudois, for whom Reynier and Waddington have said a good word. Well let us hear the latter, as he is a Protestant. I may not quote, if I can avoid it, Catholic testimony, p. 290. "At the same time we must admit that the direct historical evidence is not sufficient to prove the apostolical descent of the Vaudois." There! the chain of evidence breaks off right short; and the Novatians, Donatists and Paulicians cannot weld it. "Besides," says our historian, "while they (the Vaudois) obliged their clergy to be poor and industrious, they compelled them to be *illiterate* also." This, at least, my friend will condemn.

He says, I have slept and dreamed for two nights on the subject of my testimony, concerning Osius' presiding, in the name of Sylvester, at the council at Nice. But have I not already produced **Barronius**, and have there not been for the last two days of this debate, other respectable authorities on the table, modestly waiting to be heard? He

said I could not get a single proof earlier than the fifth century, and then, that the reason why Osius presided in the councils was the want of learning at that age, in the East. Why, when my friend says this he admits all, himself, and leaves me nothing to say. But the fourth century was the golden age of the whole church. There were many learned men, not only in the West but in the East, and if he will consult Barronius, he will find that there has rarely been presented to the veneration of the Catholic world as bright an array of great and good men, as that, which in 325, assembled in the council at Nice—and Du Pin *encore*. He makes for me. He does say that Victor and Vincen-tius, were legates of Sylvester.

To give more solemnity, and if possible, more complete effect to their decision, the bishops of the Christian world met to banish Arianism and establish the grand cardinal doctrine of the divinity of Christ, while the Arians impugned. Constantine was there; but he acknowledged the distinctness of the ecclesiastical authority. We hear of no collision between him and Sylvester, or any of the Nicene bishops. The church was in no absolute want of his aid, but as it was freely given, it was gratefully accepted. There were no canals, rail-roads, or hotels in those days. In the emperor's munificence, the fathers of Nice found those resources which their poverty denied them. To his son Constantius, it was, however, that Osius fearlessly said, "Do not interfere in ecclesiastical matters, for to you God gave the empire; but to us ecclesiastical concerns. Now as he who should deprive you of your kingdom would resist the ordinance of God, so do you beware lest you fall into some grievous sin by taking away the independence of the church."

My learned friend says he will not go further on these matters. It is well—discretion is the better part of valor. The voice of all antiquity has spoken.—The authority of Rome has ever stood pre-eminent.

I did not say, *I did not doubt* these popes were in hell. I beg the gentleman to quote me correctly. Far be it from me, to arrogate a right which belongs to God alone, to decide on man's eternal destiny—but I said, *I should not be surprised*, at it, when I consider their defects and sins on the one hand, their knowledge, responsibility and grace, on the other. The more eminent their station, the more conspicuous to the whole world, like spots on the sun, were their frailties—the brighter the example of their predecessors, the darker, by contrast, did they appear. But the circumstances of the times in which they lived, must be taken into the account to palliate, if truth will not permit us to excuse, their failings. The *lights and shadows* are blended, perhaps necessarily, in the moral as well as in the physical world; and

as we do not deny the existence of an infinitely wise and good God, because we discover apparent imperfection in the material world, the volcano, the poison, the venomous reptile, the whirlwind, the pestilential malarial, so neither do we conclude that religion, or the church, is not his work, because we sometimes meet with examples of moral deformity and disorder which mar the beauty of the heavenly design. But Mr. C. thinks that God would never allow men whom he had selected for the high function of Roman Catholic popes, to fall into sins that would merit for them hell-fire. Does he then forget that God created Lucifer, as a bright leader of the angelic throng, and yet Lucifer is now a reprobate spirit in hell? Does he forget that Judas was selected to share in the infallibility, which he allows was granted to the twelve? Did not Jesus train him up in his own school for three years? And did not Judas, after all, betray his God and sell him for the thirty pieces of silver? Did he not afterwards go and hang himself in despair, and his bowels gushed out? Was it not because of the excess of his own favor to Judas, and the inconceivable ingratitude of the apostle, that the Son of God had said by the mouth of his prophet? Ps. liv. 14. "If my enemy had reviled me, I would verily have borne with it, and if he that hated me, had spoken great things against me, I would perhaps have hidden myself from him: *but thou, a man of one mind, my guide and my familiar.*" This is what makes a priest's, or a bishop's sin so great. This, awful as it is, is what sustains us when scandals befall the church, when the lights of the sanctuary are eclipsed and its pillars broken and scattered on the earth, for we say to ourselves Christ has allowed all this beforehand in that miniature band, his own apostles—the exemplar of his church: *and the number of bad popes has not yet equalled the proportion of one to twelve!* God has allowed all this to teach us, that if men fall away, the faith for which his holy promises are pledged, is invincible. "*The gifts of God are without repentance,*" Rom. xi. 29, in other words, Christ established the primacy of Peter. He wished it to persevere. If any of the successors of Peter are bad men; the answer of Paul comes up, "*The gifts of God are without repentance.*" If man behaves badly, it is for his own ruin, but his evil conduct shall not change the order and design of heaven.

It was attempted to show that there was no analogy between the ancestry of Christ, and the succession of St. Peter. Now I maintain that if the ancestry of Judah's royal line, magnificent as it was and destined to be the forerunner of Him, of whom Paul had many and great things and hard to be understood, to declare, could yet include some of the worst sinners, why might not the apostolical succession, in

which was, individually or collectively, nought so holy as He to whom all the prophets bore witness, in whom was seen on earth, all the glory of the Father, full of grace and truth?

I refer to the first chapter of Matthew where the temporal generation of the Savior is traced from David, and my argument is this; that as it has not impaired the sanctity of Jesus to come according to the flesh, from him, though he sinned, and from others who sinned as he had sinned, so neither did it detract from the sanctity of the office of pope, that there were some bad men among the number. The cases are therefore, so far as that argument is concerned, analogous; and we may exclaim with a holy awe—Oh!—the depth of the riches, and of the knowledge, of the wisdom of God! How incomprehensible are his judgments, and how unsearchable his ways! Who hath known the mind of God, or who hath been his counsellor? St. Paul, Rom. xi. 33, 34. My friend says that holy men were always selected by the Holy Ghost for holy purposes! and what will he say of Luther, who proves, as I can show by his own testimony, himself to have been a bad man! I have his works here in three vols. folio—a Daniel come to judgment! He was “a hard wedge to split knotty blocks!” &c. Yes, he had a hard mouth, and a hard heart. But I will not speak of Luther nor of Calvin, hard, unless compelled.

The gentleman says there were forty-nine saints in the first fifty. I said there were 39 who were *saints and martyrs*. Since that, there have been many pontiffs, saints. Pius the 7th possessed all the virtues which may entitle him to be so considered. So did his predecessor Pius VI., so did Benedict XIV. and Pius VIII and Leo XII.—So does the present pontiff, a man of the purest morals, profound humility, enlightened zeal and eminent learning. We have heard many silly predictions of the doctrine of his temporal influence in Rome, but I repeat that he would retain his spiritual authority, if he were compelled to leave that city, which I hope after his predecessors have stood their ground for eighteen hundred years he never will. His authority does not reside in the stones, and bricks and pavements of Rome!

The gentleman speaks of the schism of Avignon, for my friend thinks that if the pope should leave Rome, the Catholic faith would be annihilated. He does not know that the title of the see would follow the pope. We never suffer even the name of a see to perish. If christianity forsake a country, where it has, once, been established the names of the sees would survive. Thus the present, learned and pious Coadjutor—bishop of Philadelphia, takes his ecclesiastical designation from Arath *in partibus infidelium*. The titular bishop of Phil-

adelphia is blind from his great age. The bishop of Bardstown is also, nominally, bishop of a foreign see.

Now let me, once for all, say that my friend has several times mistaken my views and words, on the subject of appointment to office. I need not repeat what I have said on that subject. We do nothing without the pope's concurrence and sanction, in spiritual matters. This communion is a peculiar trait in our church. We exult in it. It keeps us together as the sheep of one fold. "He who gathereth not with me scattereth," saith the Lord. By this communion with the see of Peter, we know that the church is orthodox and sound. On this account we yield all due deference to the pope. On this account we ask of him the "canonical investiture," which signifies that a person is authorized by him to be made bishop, and inducted into the sacred office by his authority.

We were told that councils met together and elected popes. There is nothing extraordinary in this. Why, my dear friends, common sense teaches this course. Christ's foreknowledge of all the occurrences that were to take place in the government of the earth, caused him to organize society. If not, disorder would ensue. On such a principle as the gentleman's, there could be no common bond of union. If Christ's society in the world and men will not consent to be held together by social rules, his design is baffled. The church is a society. Hence St. Paul says, "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers, for they who resist, purchase for themselves damnation." Rom. xiii. 1. Again, "Remember your prelates who have spoken to you the word of God; whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation." And again "obey your prelates, and be subject to them. For they watch as being to render an account of your souls, that they may do this with joy and not with grief. For this is not expedient for you." Heb. xiii. 17. Without subordination there can be no peace, and consequently no happiness, in any society of men, but particularly in a religious society. The church is the pillar and the ground of the truth, 1st Tim. iii. 15.—[Time expired.]

Three o'clock, P. M.

MR. CAMPBELL rises—

Before the third proposition is read, I beg leave to offer both an explanation and an apology.

In reference to the proposition which has just been discussed, I have lying before me an index of the popes from the time of Peter to Innocent II. A. D. 1676. Here are two hundred and forty popes. In the first fifty, forty-nine were saints. We notice a diminution in sanctity as we descend to our own times; for in the last ninety popes on

the list, there is only one saint. The church made her own saints. She ought, therefore, to know the reason why. It rests in her own judgment: but, in my judgment, she has made in her popes as many as, in any decency, she possibly could; and many more in name than she even had in reality.

The gentleman (and it was one of his most lucky hits) compares the fact that there was one traitor among twelve apostles, to the fact, that there were fifty bad popes among two or three hundred popes. This is a happy salvo. Judas has relieved many a hard case; but the conduct of Judas is no apology for the popes. It has another meaning in scripture, than to justify or excuse such flagitious cases. The Savior, you will remember, in his prayer (John xvii.), says: "Of all thou hast given me I have lost only one, the son of perdition;" because he was spoken of in the Old Testament, and described as a traitor. The use of Judas among the twelve, is not always duly appreciated. But for him, as respects the credibility of the testimony, it might have been said, that the twelve apostles were all the personal friends of Christ; and, although persons of fair reputation, yet their testimony was that of friends. To prevent this reflection, and to make it perfect in every point of view, one enemy is made the confidant of Jesus, as much as any one of them. He is admitted to all the secrets of the schemes of the Messiah, as much as his other companions. He is a covetous wretch, and sells his master for fifteen dollars. Yet, under the conviction of his guilt, after a little reflection, he goes to the high priest, and makes confession of his sin, saying: "I have betrayed innocent blood." This, at this crisis, in all the circumstances, is the best testimony of the twelve. It was essential to the consummation of the testimony against the imputation of collusion amongst his friends; and Judas is as much a martyr to the truth of Christianity, as any one of his companions: a martyr, indeed, not to his own honor, but to the blameless reputation of the author and founder of the christian faith. This, then, explains the reason of such a *permission* in that case. But, hearken to the sequel. To prevent a bad use of such a permission or allowance even, the Lord suggested to his disciples to cast lots—to appeal to heaven in electing a successor to Judas, that they might not be endangered in the reputation of another apostle, and that he might be sent from God. To have permitted persons of this character to stand forward in the front rank of the gospel, would have endangered the cause. The delinquency of the popes is opposed to the plan and government of the christian institution; and had it not been for the reputation of the Roman clergy, we cannot tell how much more the

cause of Christ would have triumphed ere now. This is *the explanation*.

Now, for the apology. It is for the difficulties, which our worthy friend had to encounter in finding a succession in the bishops of Rome, that we offer an apology. This apology ought to be a part of this book, for the sake of a particular class, who have not leisure to trace the causes of these things.

The bishop could find no testimony in behalf of Peter's having had the see of Rome; because that was not the ground on which that see first claimed the supremacy; if it had, we should have had plenty of old traditions to sustain it. The ancient and true ground of ascribing to the bishop of Rome superior importance, and of his arrogating any sort of superiority over other bishops, was, that his see was the imperial city: not because Peter or Paul had ever been bishop of Rome. Rome was mistress of the world, the metropolis of the empire, the great city, the emperor's residence. The bishop of Rome, moreover, had the richest church in the world, and most honorable diocese; and being neighbor to the emperor, he became proud: for, said he to himself, "As the emperor governs the whole world, so ought *I* to govern the whole church." From such seeds sprung the apostolic tree!

Constantine became a Christian: Byzantium is changed into Constantinople: the Constantine family take up their residence there: it begins to be called *New Rome*; and with that began the rivalry between *old* and *new* Rome. Soon there are two empires (for the empire was divided), one of the east, and one of the west. There must be, now, two great imperial bishops; and the east and west churches, or, the Greek and Roman, began to feel the spirit of rival aggrandizement. The controversy began, and the prospects of the new city outrivalled those of the old city. But, just as the sceptre and mitre were about passing from Rome to Constantinople, some ingenious person, whose name no monument records, thought of a happy expedient to save the sinking fortunes of the eternal city. It was, that Peter and Paul had founded the church of Rome: nay, that Peter and Paul were buried there!

Constantina, the empress of the east, at the close of the sixth century, finding that this discovery was unfortunate to the rising majesty of the east, sent an express to Rome to obtain the remains of Paul, and have them conveyed to Constantinople. She was willing that Peter should remain in the Lateran; but she wished to possess Paul. She thought this would equalize the pretensions of new Rome and old Rome, and give her equal claims upon the devotion of the saints and pilgrims of the church. Had it not been for her failure in this strata-

gem, no one can tell whether Rome had not been, ages since, like Thebes or Babylon. On this subject, thus speaks the elegant Gibbon:

"Like Thebes, or Babylon, or Carthage, the name of Rome might have been erased from the earth, if the city had not been animated by a vital principle, which again restored her to honor and dominion. A vague tradition was embraced that two Jewish teachers, a tent-maker and a fisherman, had formerly been executed in the circus of Nero, and at the end of five hundred years their genuine or fictitious relics were adored as the palladium of christian Rome." Decl. and Fall Rom. Emp. Vol. viii, p. 161.

"A *vague tradition*." This is happily expressed. But the superiority of St. Gregory saved Rome from this misfortune; and he managed the petition of Constantina with great address, as we shall presently show. I beg leave to read from Waddington:

Reverence for Relics. The empress Constantia, who was building a church at Constantinople to St. Paul, made application to Gregory for the head of that Apostle,* or at least for some portion of his body. The pope begins his answer by a very polite expression of his sorrow "that he neither could nor dared to grant that favor; for the bodies of the holy apostles, Peter and Paul, are so resplendent with miracles and terrific prodigies in their own churches, that no one can approach them without great awe, even for the purpose of adoring them. When my predecessor, of happy memory, wished to change some silver arment which was placed over the most holy body of St. Peter, though at the distance of almost fifteen feet, a warning of no small terror appeared to him. Even I myself wished to make some alteration near the most holy body of St. Paul, and it was necessary to dig rather deeply near his tomb. The superior of the place found some bones which were not at all connected with that tomb: and, having presumed to disturb and remove them to some other place, he was visited by certain fearful apparitions, and died suddenly. My predecessor, of holy memory, also undertook to make some repairs near the tomb of St. Laurence: as they were digging without knowing precisely where the venerable body was placed, they happened to open his sepulchre. The monks and guardians who were at the work, only because they had seen the body of that martyr, though they did not presume so much as to touch it, all died within ten days; to the end that no man might remain in life who had beheld the body of that just man. Be it then known to you, that it is the custom of the Romans, when they give any relics, not to venture to touch any portion of the body: only they put into a box a piece of linen (called *brandeum*;) which is placed near the holy bodies: then it is withdrawn and shut up with due veneration, in the church which is to be dedicated, and as many prodigies are then wrought by it as if the bodies themselves had been carried thither; whence it happened, that in the times of St. Leo, (as we learn from our ancestors,) when some Greeks doubted the virtue of such relics, that pope called for a pair of scissors, and cut the linen, and blood flowed from the incision. And not at Rome only, but through the whole of the west, it is held sacrilegious to touch the bodies of the saints, nor does such temerity ever remain unpunished. For

*Baronius, who cites the pope's reply with considerable admiration, attributes the empress's exorbitant request to ecclesiastical ambition,—to a desire to exalt the see of Constantinople to a level with that of Rome, by getting into her possession so important a portion of so great an apostle. Fleury quotes the letter chiefly in proof that the *transfer* of relics was forbidden in the Roman church, while that abuse was permitted in the east.

which reason we are much astonished at the custom of the Greeks to take away the bones of the saints, and we scarcely give credit to it. But what shall I say respecting the bodies of the holy apostles, when it is a known fact, that at the time of their martyrdom, a number of the faithful came from the east to claim them? But when they had carried them out of the city, to the second milestone, to a place called the catacombs, the whole multitude was unable to move them farther,—such a tempest of thunder and lightning terrified and dispersed them.

The napkin too, which you wished to be sent at the same time, is with the body and cannot be touched more than the body can be approached. But that your religious desire may not be wholly frustrated, I will hasten to send to you some part of those chains which St. Paul wore on the neck and hands, if indeed I shall succeed in getting off any filings from them. For since many continually solicit as a blessing that they may carry off from those chains some small portion of their filings, *a priest stands by with a file*; and sometimes it happens that some portions fall off from the chains instantly and without delay; while at other times, the file is long drawn over the chains, and yet nothing is at last scraped off from them." Wad. Chh. Hist. pages 140, 141.

By this rhetoric, the bodies of Paul and Peter were saved for Rome. And thus, when she lost the government of the world, and ceased to be the imperial city, she had a better argument for her supremacy than before. But, had this been thought of a few centuries sooner, my opponent would have been able to confound me with a host of traditionary witnesses, assuring us that Peter was made bishop of Rome and universal father of the whole church.

[Mr. C. here called for the reading of the third proposition, which was read by one of the moderators.]

PROP. III. "She is not uniform in her faith, nor united in her members: but mutable and fallible, as any other sect of philosophy or religion—Jewish, Turkish, or Christian—a confederation of sects, under a politico-ecclesiastic head."

I will proceed to define some of these terms. It is truly alleged that most controversies are mere logomachies; and that perspicuous and precise definitions would settle a great number of them cannot be doubted.—

To narrow the debate on this proposition, the Roman church claims universal homage on the plea of unity and uniformity, as resulting from infallibility. Every other church is mutable and fallible: but *she* is immutably the same! Why? Because infallible. Infallible in what respect? Infallible in faith and in morals; but not in discipline. But where shall this infallibility be found? In any individual person? No; nor in all individual persons taken singly. But she is infallible in her faith and morals, as written in her creed! The Protestant church is then just as infallible as the Roman church: for her faith and moral code are written in a book which is the fountain of all moral truth. We must then define faith: and let me ask, what does the gentleman mean by faith? persuasion of a fact, doctrine, or

opinion? It cannot include every thing. If faith mean with them, something in the head or heart; then, where is the pre-eminence of the Roman church, whose members individually are all fallible? and if it be faith as written in the creed: again, I would ask, where is the pre-eminence of the Roman church, over the English church? for she is as infallible in her creed as the Bible itself.

The gentleman says, "that the symbol of his faith is *the apostles creed*." If that be the elements of his faith; all Protestants believe it; but if he means doctrine, opinion, speculation; then folios would not contain the differences. What is faith *subjectively* considered, but a belief in testimony, divine or human? and what is religious faith *objectively*, but the Bible? Five words comprehend the order of things in regard to faith: 1st the *fact*, or the thing said or done—2nd the *testimony*, concerning it—3rd the *belief* of that testimony—4th the *feeling*, consentaneous with that faith—and 5th the *action*, corresponding with that feeling.—These are the golden links, in that divine chain, which binds our hearts to God, and explains all the mysteries of the moral power of the remedial scheme. The gospel facts, as Paul sums them up, 1 Cor. xv. 1, 2, 3, which engross the whole, are the death, the burial and the resurrection of Jesus. The whole Protestant world believes these facts. England, Scotland, America—all christendom believe, or acknowledge these great gospel facts. So far all are of one faith. The Romanist and Protestant here, are equally infallible as respects faith! And do we not all acknowledge the same perfect moral code? But while there is, indeed, but *one faith*, there are many doctrines, opinions, and traditions; and these are what make the "*Bible*" and the "*One Faith*" of the Bible of little or no account! Hence, has not the Roman church, like the Jews, made void the law of God by her traditions? It is not because the scriptures do not contain the right faith: but because men have chosen to add to it folios of human opinions, that the divine faith has lost its power.

It is a serious question, why is the Roman church infallible in faith and not in discipline?—in theory, and not in practice? in the head, and not in the heart?—Is it not of more value and importance, that she should be perfect in the order and moral discipline of her members; than in the theory or doctrine of religion? She found that she never could make herself infallible—why then, does she choose to claim infallibility in the theory, and give it up in practice? Because her plea of infallibility on that ground, she well knew, she could not at all sustain; and how well she can sustain it on other grounds will appear in the sequel. She has changed her discipline in every century; and her theories and doctrines of order and government are as various

as the Protestant sects. In the 19th century, she is not the same as in the 18th; nor in the 18th as in the 17th, nor in the 17th as in the 16th, &c.

My friend has made concessions here, which I never expected from him. He has avowed principles, which, till within a few years, were unknown in the Roman Catholic church. I look upon this fact as an evidence, that better days are coming. I could wish that the Roman Catholic faith, under the mild genius of our institutions, might become so modified, as to be suited to the character of our republic; especially to abandon the absurd pretensions of infallibility, which indeed, she must do, if ever she can become American.

But the Roman church is not united, nor uniform in this notion of infallibility. There are four theories and four parties on the question, *where shall infallibility be found?* The gentleman believes that the pope is as fallible as himself. This, I conceive, is not the common belief among Roman Catholics. The Jesuits, if I am rightly informed, teach that infallibility must, of right, be in the *head*. Indeed, so I should reason: for what use would be an infallible body under a fallible head? and would not that be most unnatural? Is not the body subject to the head, naturally and necessarily? and ought not every body political and ecclesiastic, like the natural body, to be governed by its head?—[Time expired.]

Half-past 3 o'clock, P. M.

BISHOP PURCELL rises—

I would prefer, for the satisfaction of the audience, and to do the subject justice, to enter at once on the proposition of the infallibility of the Church. I should go over the ground, my learned opponent has traveled, and if permitted, should make a regular argument on the subjects to which he has alluded. My good friend is dissatisfied with himself for having made any concessions in favor of the purity of the popes, and he has re-examined, and found for the last ninety years but one saint in the calendar. If there was but one canonized, does it follow that there was but one worthy? There were many worthy. There have been many great and good men among the popes who have not been canonized. Rome is very particular whom she proposes as models for her children's imitation. She is anxious that there should be no blemish in the splendor of holiness, no faded flower in her coronal. She must be so well assured by the evidence of facts and miracles of the eminent virtue with which it has pleased God to endow the subject whose life is examined with reference to this holy distinction, that she has appointed a personage in Rome, called the

Devil's Advocate, whose duty it is when a candidate is proposed for beatification, to rake up all he can against him, and thus prevent, not his entrance into heaven exactly, but the admission of his name into the calendar of saints. So that, what an illustrious Protestant has said, "it is a miracle to prove a miracle in Rome," is in fact, a proverb in the Ancient City.

Well, now, my friend says that it was necessary that there should be a Judas,—that he was mentioned in the Old Testament—his is a special case—unique. But my argument is so strong on this point, that I will give up even the strong case of Judas, and yet prevail. Even Peter, with oaths, denied the knowledge of his God and Savior Jesus Christ. The other apostles also abandoned him—a crime, be it noted, which the Novatians would have never pardoned. *All this* was foretold as well as the particular instance of Judas. So that, if he please, I will abandon this particular case, and argue as follows:

Peter fell and was resuscitated; the rest of the apostles fled; they were ashamed, or afraid, of being thought the disciples of Christ. They were not, however, rejected. The gifts of God were without repentance in their regard, who having seen and conversed with the Word made Flesh, witnessed his miracles, and beheld the example of his virtues, were, therefore, to human judgment, less excusable for their desertion of the stricken Shepherd. Why may not, at least, equal mercy be extended, if not to the popes, who were in this respect less highly favored, at least, to the *doctrine* of truth which the apostles, and the popes were appointed to announce and to preserve among men? Must God's holy law be broken to pieces, and truth perish from the earth, because there have been bad men, like Aaron, who bow to the golden calf—to their passions? It is believed by some to have been specially ordained by the good providence of God, that Rome, once the mistress of the entire Pagan world, should be forever the chief see of the Christian world; thus verifying the almost prophetic words of one of her most gifted minds, "that the sun in his course cannot behold any thing greater." We are told a fine story about Constantia—like some less ancient rivals of the see of Peter, she was three hundred years too late to establish any claim to the headship of the church, and especially by such means, in favor of Constantinople. Now, my friends, why did Constantia want to have the head of Paul at Constantinople? It was because it was known that from the beginning Rome had possessed the prescriptive right to the chief honor and authority, not only in the temporal, but likewise in the spiritual kingdom. The seat of temporal power had been transferred to Constantinople; but the see of ecclesiastical supremacy was

still at Rome, and like another Queen of lofty and arrogant pretensions, Constantia aspired to reign supreme, in Religion as well as in Politics. According to the ideas of that time which show in what veneration relics were held, she could set up no good claim for the spiritual independence of Constantinople, unless she had the head of St. Paul brought from Rome, and in this she failed.

Gibbon says, and it is one of the few sterling truths he ever said, (though it is a bull) that Rome would have perished amidst so many revolutions, if she had not had within her A VITAL PRINCIPLE. This reminds me of what my worthy antagonist said in the Presbyterian church, quoting a French physician, during the session of the College of Teachers, "that we might live forever if we could live without eating." Rome lives, and is likely to live forever, whether by porous absorption of vital aliment, or by the "*vis medicatrix Naturae*" which expels all *peccant humors*, it is unimportant to enquire.

Now I cannot see the applicability of the long passage from Gibbon, containing the answer of the Pope to Constantia. They tell a similar story, and I believe Protestants credit it, about Julian's undertaking to give the lie to the predictions of the prophets and of Christ, regarding the temple of Jerusalem, by rebuilding that structure consigned by God to endless destruction. Globes of fire, as historians say, issued from the foundations, and so terrified the workmen as to compel them to desist. I think it likely that this may have happened, but like the story of Constantia, it is no article of faith.

Now we come to the important doctrine of infallibility. It is a doctrine of the Roman Catholic church, that, when the whole world was in error, when every thing was adored as God, save God himself, and vice kept pace with error, the Almighty, pitying this darkness, sent his Son, Christ Jesus, the Word made flesh, into this world to teach and to redeem mankind. Jesus Christ was God, equal to the Father in every divine perfection. He possessed infinite wisdom to choose, and infinite power to use the means necessary to the accomplishment of the great TASK imposed on him by his Heavenly Father. He performed miracles. He stood over the grave of a putrified corpse, and cried, "Lazarus, come forth," and the dead man arose and went home with his extácied sisters. He placed his hand on the bier in which was borne the only son of the widow of Naim, and the mourner's tears were dried in that son's living embrace. He gave hearing to the deaf, he opened the eyes of the blind, he healed the paralytic. The evidence of these wonders was such that even the skeptical Jew was convinced, and all the people exclaimed that *man* had never done the like.

not reach. To show this, I will relate an anecdote. Some one, in New-York, stole a quantity of silver spoons, and, having confessed the crime to the priest, was told, that neither confession nor absolution could be of any avail, without restitution of the ill-gotten goods. Restitution was accordingly made. Here is a fine practical comment on the subject. The police, having heard of the affair, insisted that the priest should disclose the name of the thief, and wished to compel him to do so, to promote thereby, as they supposed they should do, the cause of justice. The priest, of course, refused to commit a flagrant breach of trust, and modestly contended, that the cause of justice was much more effectually promoted, by the course which a priest in such case pursued. Restitution had been made: was not this enough? The police subpoenaed him to appear before the mayor of New-York, the celebrated De Witt Clinton, who decided that the priest could not be compelled to give up the name. The lawyer employed by the priest, was Mr. Sampson, a Protestant, and an ornament to the bar. He reported the trial. Before reading his speech, touching on this very topic of the morality or immorality of auricular confession, hear the admirable, but too brief preface, he has prefixed to the volume. I am sure, every high-minded and honorable man here, whether Protestant or Catholic, will subscribe cheerfully to his sentiments. "The general satisfaction given to every religious denomination, by the decision of this interesting question, is well calculated to dissipate antiquated prejudices and religious jealousies; and the reporter feels no common satisfaction in making it public. When that adjudication shall be compared with the baneful statutes and judgments in Europe, upon similar subjects, the superior equity and wisdom of American jurisprudence, and civil probity, will be felt; and it cannot fail to be well received by the enlightened and virtuous of every community, and will constitute a document of history, precious and instructive to the present and future generation." Having produced before the court a book called, "The Papist misrepresented, and truly represented," and read the misrepresentation first, he continued:

"The papist *truly represented*, believes it damnable in any religion to make gods of men. However he firmly holds, that when Christ speaking to his apostles said, John xx. 22, '*Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained;*' he gave them, and their successors, the bishops and priests of the Catholic church, authority to absolve any truly penitent sinner from his sins. And God having thus given them *the ministry of reconciliation*, and made them *Christ's legates*, 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, 20, *Christ's ministers and the dispensers of the mysteries of Christ*, 1 Cor. iv., and given them power that *whatsoever they loosed on earth shall be loosed in heaven*, Matt. xviii. 18, he undoubtedly believes, that whosoever comes to them, making a sincere and humble confession of his sins,

jarring sects into the same mass, and making the old chaos the plan of the new reformation.

I might dissert for hours on this subject, but I am compelled to leave off here; yet I beg my Protestant, I sincerely and from my heart say, most respected fellow-citizens to reflect on these matters, that they may not believe the misrepresentations of our doctrines, which they have too often heard, as if we had no good, scriptural grounds for our faith. Such misrepresentation has done us much injury. It has been indulged in so long that I do not wonder at the horror of Catholics, it has, in many instances, inspired. To this illiberal feeling multitudes of Protestants are superior, I could almost say they are utterly incapable of it—they abhor it. Some of them are among the best friends I have in this city. And it is not the only one where I am proud to recognize them, and send them this humble tribute of my esteem and grateful reminiscence.

My friend said I had made concessions; he too has been misinformed, and knows more of our doctrine since the commencement of this discussion, than he ever knew before. He will allow me to say that I understand something of my own religion, and that as I can neither add to nor detract from it, I exhibit its own portrait, and not a caricature, and still less a flattering likeness. He says, the Protestants believe in the apostles' creed. Would to God they would even believe in one single article of that creed! "I believe in the Holy Catholic church." But they do not: or one other article, in the same creed, in the true sense of the words; "I believe in Jesus Christ."

Suppose I tell a man that I believe him; but persuade him to his face, in spite of his repeated asseverations, that he did not say what he says he did. Do I believe him? Suppose I say I love him, and yet do all I can to his injury, are my protestations what they ought to be? So it is with Jesus Christ. If you believe in him, you obey his words and hear his church which he commands you to hear. It is vain to say, I believe in Jesus Christ, unless we follow him also, and keep his commandments. If we do not so, we are hypocrites, or, at least, we deceive ourselves; and if we despise his church, he assures us most positively, that we despise himself. "If any man," says he, "will not bear the church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican." Matt. xviii. 17.

But we are told that the meaning of "*the church*" is the whole congregation of the faithful scattered through the earth. If so, must I traverse the whole earth and appeal to every individual believer for an explanation of the law, or a defence of my innocence? This is clearly impossible. Whereas Christ's injunction supposes the existence of a

tribunal, which he commands me to hear, as I would hear him; which he commands me to hear, under the penalty of being reputed a heathen and a publican. If this tribunal could pronounce falsely, would Christ have commanded me thus to hear and obey it, as I should hear and obey himself? I hope the desired answer will be given to this question.

Again, my friend says all Protestants believe the apostles' creed. But suppose a gentleman of the Unitarian denomination should say, I believe in the apostles' creed—would a Protestant of another denomination credit it? A Unitarian believes in Jesus Christ, but how does he believe in him, when he denies his divinity? Here is the vice and error of the Protestant system. They all say, I believe Christ, I believe the bible; when they make Christ and the bible teach the most contrary doctrines; and all think they are going to heaven—all think they believe the same Savior. Alas! how many souls has not this error lured from the only path that conducts to eternal life! "There is a way which *seemeth* to a man to be right," says the holy scripture, "but the end thereof leads down to hell." The sects of Protestants are diametrically opposed to each other. They are at greater antipodes than the two Indies. Two men of different sects will meet: says one, "Do you believe in Christ?" "Yes." "But you do not believe in him as God?" "No." "No matter, we are both good believers." Again, two others—"Do you believe in Christ?" "Yes." "But you do not believe in a hell?" "No." "No matter, we are both sound orthodox christians." Or again, "Do you believe in Christ?" "Yes." "But you don't believe in baptism"—and so it goes.

Now Jesus Christ cannot contradict himself: he cannot say things incompatible with each other, as that two and two make four; and two and two make five. My friends, I come here not to attack other sects. I come only to defend the truth. Of all religions, all teaching, as they do, contrary doctrines, one only can be right. If one only can be true, all others must be untrue. Have you ascertained which is that true one? And if so, how have you ascertained it? To whatever denomination you may belong, your Protestant neighbor, as enlightened, as conscientious and as pious in his own opinions as you are, thinks you have embraced dangerous error, and Jesus Christ sounds in your ears the dreadful words, "He that believeth not"—not what he thinks is right, but what is right—"shall be *damned*." Mark xvi. 16.—[Time expired.]

Four o'clock, P. M.

MR. CAMPBELL rises—

I hope we shall better understand each other. The question between Protestants and Roman Catholics, on the subject of infallibility

as respects the faith, is usually propounded in the following form: "*Is there an infallible rule of faith?*" Both parties, answer in the affirmative. Then, "*Where shall it be found?*" Each party then sets about defining and wrestling about this said infallible rule. The Protestant says, the bible alone is his infallible rule; and the Romanist says the church, or the bible explained by the church, is his infallible rule! Thus the Protestant rests upon the bible and the Romanist upon the church—neither of which make men infallible. We apprehend there is a sophism some where in the phraseology: for both parties have exhausted folios on this subject and seem often to have retired from the arena equally perplexed. My antagonist seems to be much in advance of me, and sometimes so far in my rear as to be out of sight. Meanwhile, he will please not to forget that it is my province, at least, to sketch out my own methods of discussion, and lead the way. My last speech is certainly yet unanswered.

I do not choose the phraseology which has been popular in some discussions, on the subject of the rule of faith. There is too much ambiguity, too much room for logomachy in some of these definitions. There is, in strict propriety, no infallible rule of faith. Nor is it possible there can be: for men and angels have erred under all rules. I wish to be understood. The terms *fallible* and *infallible* do not at all apply to *things*; they only apply to persons. We may have a perfect and complete—or a sufficient rule: but we cannot have an infallible one. The fallibility, or the infallibility is in the application of the rule—not in the rule itself. The mechanician may have a perfect rule; and yet err in measuring any superficies. It is not possible in mechanics, nor in morals, nor in religion, to have a rule which will prevent error, so long as those who use it are free and fallible agents. As Paul said on an occasion, not exactly similar, we may here say: "If there could have been a law given to free agents, which would have precluded error, verily God would have given it. But as he has not given any such law, therefore, there has been error in heaven as on earth. Angels fell and Adam apostatized. I own, it may be said, that in common *parlance*, we figuratively talk of an infallible rule. I admit that we do, and that is the reason, when we come to debate the matter, the parties are confounded: for the bible alone, or the bible on the table; and the church alone, or the church and the bible together, have made no one free from error. Therefore, there is no *infallible* rule in truth: but we have a perfect rule, and if we apply it perfectly, it will make us perfect. So far, then, as infallibility is concerned, if there be truth in these remarks, both parties are again equal. OUR RULE IS THE BIBLE ALONE. The Roman Catholic

rule contains ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY FIVE LARGE FOLIO VOLUMES SUPERADDED TO THE BIBLE, and the APOCRYPHA! These are composed of the following parts and parcels: 1st Apostolical Fathers 35 folios, 2nd Eight volumes of Decretals, 3rd Ten volumes of Bulls of the Popes; 4th Thirty one volumes of Canons and Decrees of Councils; 5th Fifty one folios of the *Acta Sanctorum*—Acts of the Saints, amounting in all to,—one hundred and thirty five volumes folio. Our rules, then, differ exceedingly in point of length, breadth and thickness. The Roman Catholic rule is exceedingly unwieldy. It requires a whole council to move it, and apply it to a single opinion. Ours is, at least, portable.—But still the phrase *rule of faith* is not Protestant. The bible is the faith; and that testimony is the rule and measure of our belief: for in logical truth testimony is the only proper rule of faith. However, the question is not strictly, what is the rule of faith?

We both agree that the true reason of infallibility is inspiration. I was glad to hear this noble concession from my learned opponent. Jesus Christ was able to give a perfect rule. He therefore inspired twelve apostles to form that rule, and enjoined us to *hear* them. So far, there is no difference between us. We both have a perfect rule, and that perfect rule is the bible; and the reason of its perfection is its *inspiration*. But where is the inspiration of *the one hundred and thirty five folios*? Does it require this immense library to make us understand the bible? However, if my friend can establish their inspiration, and show that Jesus Christ has spoken in these volumes; we will adopt them without controversy. But there is a want of uniformity in the Catholic faith (even with the help of these volumes:) and hence the four sects mentioned just before I sat down, on the question, where shall this infallibility be found: for after all the one hundred and thirty five volumes lying on the table, are no better than the bible lying on the table, the Roman Catholics being judges.—They must have an infallible interpreter of these volumes. Where shall he be found? “Some say that infallibility resides in the head of the church: 2nd, Others, that it resides in a general council, in which the church is represented: although such a general council never sat. 3rd, Others argue, that it lies neither in the pope, nor in the council separately: but in the two combined—a 4th party says that it lies neither in the pope, nor in the council, nor in both: but in the whole church, responding to any question. Now might we not call these four *parties*? Do our controversies about atonement, or election, &c., make us more truly *sects*, than do these different interpretations make parties in the Roman church? But where shall infallibility be found? If this cannot be shown, it is of no more use to us in time of need, than a moun-

tain of gold in the bottom of the ocean; or a field of diamonds in the moon. I hope the gentleman will clearly ascertain this point, and make us all understand where we shall find this infallibility. We would like to know, how the combination of a given number of fallibles will make one infallible being; or, by what laws of neutralization the fallibility of every member of the church is destroyed, and the whole mass becomes infallible. But if the infallibility of a dogma depends on inspiration, what is the use of councils, unless the promise of infallibility be made exclusively to councils?

But I have no necessity for the argument which I had framed on this point. The bishop attributes infallibility to inspiration—not to combination: So do Protestants. Therefore on this cardinal point we seem more likely to agree, than I expected. Protestants have then an inspired creed, and this gives to them all the infallibility, which Roman Catholics claim to themselves: but should any one say that the majority of a council constitutes infallibility, then we should have to enquire into the reason of the infallibility of said majority; and for the sake of some of that class, I would here state that these majorities often are very lean minorities of the church. The council of Trent debated eighteen years, during which time she held twenty five sessions. In one session there were but forty eight bishops, and they not the most learned. A majority of these determined that the apocrypha was inspired, and that it with the Vulgate Old and New Testament; was of paramount authority in the church. Twenty five bishops, a majority of forty eight, represent the whole christian community! The question now is, were these men inspired while they were voting this dogma? I wish the bishop to state his views on this point clearly, if indeed he thinks that inspiration is at all an attribute or a gift promised to majorities however lean.

But, my friends, when you have got this ponderous creed from the decisions of general councils, must it not be interpreted? Must not the dogma of a majority be also interpreted? And who is to interpret them? Every man for himself? Then are you Protestants; or, Romanists working by the Protestant rules. After all, I see nothing gained by all this expensive and ponderous machinery. Is not every Roman Catholic obliged to judge for himself on the meaning of every dogma, and whether he ought to receive or reject it? Then, I ask, are not the inspired verses of the Old and New Testament as easily interpreted, as the inspired decrees of these councils? Did not the Spirit that inspired the apostles, teach as clearly, as the fathers in their councils? I wish to understand the bishop more accurately on these points.

The gentleman (I regret to state it) spoke of Protestants as hating the Roman Catholics, from a supposed ignorance of their creed. For myself, and for Protestants generally, I disavow the idea, and the language of hatred towards Romanists, as such. We feel the same humanity and benevolence towards Roman Catholics, as men, as to Protestants. We always discriminate between tenets and men, a system or theory, and those who hold it. With open arms, I would welcome to our shores the oppressed of all nations, Romanists and Protestants. I would extend to the Roman Catholic every facility to improve his condition by immigration into this favored land, provided only I were free from all suspicion, that his faith in the pope and mother-church, would not induce him or his children to wrest from me or mine, that freedom and liberty which I would gladly participate with him. I oppose his religion; because, I sincerely think it enslaves him, and would enslave me, if it had the power. But, in all this there is no *hatred* to Roman Catholics as men. We are devoted to American institutions, because they are humane. For the sake of Romanists, as well as Protestants, we desire to see them permanent. We fear the exclusive, proscriptive, and despotic system of Romanism; but we feel nothing but benevolence to Roman Catholics.

My worthy opponent has done us great honor in saying, that he knows many excellent Protestants, whom he esteems highly as good men. Of course, then, they may be saved out of the Roman Catholic church. If so, what is the difference between his infallible and our fallible faith? I cannot find time to reply to any remarks of my opponent, not made in reference to my arguments.—[Minus 5 minutes.]

Half-past 4 o'clock, P. M.

BISHOP PURCELL rises—

I shall reply to what has been said, and then pursue my own line of argument. The Catholic church claims to have an infallible rule of faith and an infallible code of morals. The former would be of little use without the latter. So intimate is the connection between sound faith and sound morals, that we hold that if the Catholic code of morals is vicious, she is not infallible in doctrine. If the working of her code of morals is proved to lead, or to have led, into vice, she is not infallible. This never has been proved, nor ever can it be. But the contrary to this has been proved, and its proof is cumulative. The darkest ages furnish some of its brightest illustrations. She does not pretend to be infallible in discipline, in the sense of its immutability. The gentleman confounds discipline with morals, and this want of clearness of ideas is the source of the entire difficulty. Discipline, I think, I have explained. It regulates the dress of the

clergy, the liturgical language, the time of singing hallelujah, the mode of shaving the head, or making the tonsure, the giving of the cup to the laity, the use of leavened, or unleavened bread for the sacrament, selection of days for feasts and fasts, &c., &c. The church must have the power of changing in these respects—in other words of adapting her discipline to times, and countries. And all this, so far from being an imperfection is a proof of her perfection, of her having been established by Jesus Christ to teach, and guide, and sanctify *all nations for ever*. I did not state the crude proposition, which the gentleman has attributed to me, viz., that the pope is as fallible as I am. I would not compare myself thus to him. I occupy an humble station compared to his, and I am conscious of the want of those eminently distinguished qualities of head and heart which compose his character. He has grace and lights which I have not. The gentleman tells Protestants a flattering tale, that they have as infallible a rule, as Catholics. This is keeping the word of promise to the ear and breaking it to the heart. Does he not in the same speech, acknowledge that their fallible opinions, doctrines, traditions make their own rule, the bible, vain and nothing worth? The bible is a dead letter—all pretend to find their conflicting tenets in it. Where is then, the infallible rule? Does he not charge Protestants as well as Catholics with error? And why? The gentleman said, where is the use of the head, without the body? I ask where is the use of a body without a head? And he said, if the body regulates the head it is anomalous. But what is it that sends vitality to the head? Is it not the heart with its healthful pulses and its quickening current? The pope is the head—the council is the heart—and I have no objection to his calling the laity the members, to continue the figure. While there is no schism in the members, no separation of the head or of the heart, all is soundness and life—so in the church—pope, pastors, and laity. *United we stand, divided you fall*. The true theory of the church, like that of the human body, is union. Ask not, does the heart, alone, or the head alone, or the members alone contain the vital principle—they sympathize; they live and move and have their being *together*. God seems to address himself to the head and to the heart in the revealed definitions of his essence. "I AM WHO AM," and "GOD IS LOVE," one of these definitions is for the reason, the other for the affections; one for the Old Testament, the other for the New. Both, however, come from the same source and tend to define Him—LIFE, WISDOM and LOVE.

The division of truth into objective and subjective is correct—but objective revealed truth is the *whole* truth revealed by God, wherever

found and in whatever manner conveyed. What is the use of this, without subjective truth, or our own knowledge and conviction that we possess objective truth, and that we are *sure* of possessing it? Of this, the Protestant, who rejects authority in religion, and pretends to find out religion for himself, from a book, which he acknowledges, fallible men handed to him, can never be sure. The fact, the testimony, the belief of the testimony, the feeling consentaneous with the belief, and the correspondent action, are all human faith and natural feeling, struggling, and striving for some *higher and better gifts*, which it cannot attain without infallible assurance, without the Catholic rule. What is the testimony that might be deceived itself and might deceive me?

He says we Catholics have a very broad rule—135 folios. No such thing. We have a quite convenient pocket-rule. It is the pearl of great value—a diamond, with which we cut the brittle glass of mere human creeds in pieces, and with which we solve every difficulty. It is this: “I believe in the Holy Catholic church.” They were the apostles—he was Christ who gave it to us. It does not suppose ignorance, or servile acquiescence. It lifts us above error, giving us a divine warrant for every tenet of our faith, and directing our understandings and hearts to God, who speaks to us by his church. I hope I did not understand my friend correctly this morning, but if I have he has uttered horrid blasphemy. I understood him to say that God could not have given a perfect rule (to make man infallible, and prevent him from error.)

MR. CAMPBELL explained. He had said that God could not create a hill without a valley—could not make man a free agent and bind him.

BISHOP PURCELL. Could not God have created the angels so that they could not fall into sin?

MR. CAMPBELL. There can be no virtue nor vice, without liberty of choice: neither in man nor in angel.

BISHOP PURCELL. My friend has said that God could not have created angels or men virtuous without making them free to sin. The angels of heaven are not free to do wrong, are they not virtuous?

MR. CAMPBELL. If such is the nature of angels, they are virtuous by nature. Perfect liberty consists in acting in unison with our nature.

BISHOP PURCELL. Then the angels are virtuous without being free. If the rebel angels were virtuous *by nature*, how did they happen to fall? And could not God have made the angels who are now good, by nature, or by grace, such from creation? I will now continue my argument. It does not exceed the power of God to make man infal-

lible. Christ was infallible; for he was God. Now if he could make twelve men infallible, as Mr. C. admits the apostles were, why could he not perpetuate the same power in favor of his entire church, since such infallible authority to teach his true doctrine is as necessary now, as it was at any former time?

Now I have another strong argument here—it is old with us, but suggested anew by reading one of the Protestant papers, from New York. It is the Palladium, and my friend seems to know the editor, for he himself has given occasion for the very article in question. The argument is this: If tradition be fallible, and it was not known for 500 years, what books of the bible were genuine, and what spurious, how shall we ascertain that we have the bible? How shall we ever know that the book is the book of God? The making of the canon or list of books composing the inspired volume, was a difficulty yielding to but few others in magnitude, during the first four hundred years of Christianity, when, if we must believe my friend, infallibility had departed, with the last of the apostles, to heaven. How then can we be sure that our present canon is correct? Catholics can be sure on this vital point, for they have the voucher of an infallible guardian of the holy deposit, for its correctness; but Protestants, who have no such tribunal to enlighten them, how can they be sure? Catholics hold that infallibility was promised to the church by Jesus Christ. Its testimony is heard in a general council, or in the pope's decision in which all assent. The church can subsist without a general council. General councils are not essential—though frequently of use, because, though we all believe *without exception*, that the pope's decision, in which, after it has been duly made known, all the bishops of the Catholic world acquiesce, is infallible, still the decision of a general council declares in a more impressive and solemn, though not more authentic, manner, the belief of the Catholic world on the contested doctrine, and thus more effectually proscribes the contrary error. The celebrated Protestant, Leibnitz, remarked that there could be no certainty of a correct decision on religious matters, equal to that afforded by the decision of a general council. The four-sects Mr. C. speaks of *all agree* in the belief of the infallibility of the church representative and of the church responsive; if I must employ these technical terms—and as he asks "could not the Holy Ghost, who inspired the apostles, teach as clearly as the Fathers in their councils?" I answer, "Yes," and he has so taught us to "HEAR THE CHURCH," for, *no prophecy of scripture is of any private interpretation.*

Let me now vindicate the humblest Roman Catholic of my flock, or of the world, from the charge of pinning his faith to the sleeve of any

man, or of surrendering his conscience to the keeping of his priest. Catholics do not believe because the priest tells them to believe, but because they consider him to be the faithful interpreter of Christ and the organ of the church, but should he dissent from the oracles of God and his ecclesiastical superiors, that moment they would quit him. They see his teaching accords with that which they have heard from others, which they have read, as the Catholic doctrine. If they doubt, they ask other priests, or the bishop. Thus while they know the priest to be orthodox, they hear him, or rather the church, they hear God and they believe God. And in this there is no servility. The faith he teaches and the moral law he expounds, have both come from God, and to God they owe and pay their vows. My friend misapprehends me. I did not say that Protestants hated Catholics. I say that some Protestants are often prejudiced against them, and I wondered they are not more so. If he could prove the odious proposition so long before you, the Catholic church would be a monster. I am sorry my friend has misunderstood the doctrines of the Catholics, and I am glad of the opportunity which is thus afforded me, of coming before the public and showing what are our real sentiments.

I come to the doctrine of infallibility again. I will begin my argument this evening, and conclude perhaps to-morrow morning. I beg leave to read what I have myself written on this subject:

Whoever reflects upon the countless varieties of human character, the ignorance of some men, the prejudice of others, the passions of all, will scarcely require that we should expend much time or labor to prove, that as long as men are commanded to form their religion for themselves, even though the book they receive for their guide should be the plainest in its language that divine wisdom could bestow, the sources of error will be never drained. No matter how pure the doctrine of that book, how holy its purposes, how luminous its evidences, occasions will occur, when these doctrines will be contested, these precepts denied, these beaming evidences obscure to the pride, the voluptuousness, and the love of independence, inherent in a perverted nature. Man, under the influence of such feelings, will read, will write; he will communicate his doubts and impart his prejudices to others; he will originate new creeds, and form new sects; he will raise altar against altar, and desk against desk; nor will any one, consistently with Protestant principles, have a right to ask him why he does so. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, when the right of forming religion, every man for himself, and the bible for us all, was first promulgated, the fierce self-constituted apostle sounded a deafening peal of defiance, and denounced all authority in religious concerns as spirit-

ual tyranny. "Read the scriptures!" he vociferated to the astonished crowd of wise or foolish, learned or unlearned, that thronged to hear him. "Read the scriptures, and judge for yourselves: your reason and the spirit will enable you to understand them, as easily as you can discern hot from cold, or sweet from bitter. Read the scriptures: they that run may read. Judge for yourselves!" They did read, they did judge for themselves; and they decided against their apostles, and against one another!

"When hell," says an illustrious writer, "prepares some terrible calamity for mankind, it flings upon the earth a pregnant evil, consigning its development to time." The time for the development of this mischief was brief. The word was uttered, and it could not be recalled: the principle was established, which it was too late to rescind. The disciples of the new apostles, reading, judging, deciding, became apostles themselves. They claimed the right their teachers exercised. They claimed it to change, as they had changed. The Lutherans, multitudes of them, became Calvinists; Calvinists, Independents; Independents, Anabaptists; each sect the prolific parent of twenty others, all differing from one another, as much as each one differed from its parent—innovation. Mark now the inconsistency to which the evil working of this scheme reduced the first claimants of a right unheard of for fifteen centuries. "Obey!" they now cried aloud, with terror, "obey your superiors; submit to the pastors whom God has appointed to rule the faithful. It is their duty to instruct you, yours to follow the guidance of their wisdom." "What," they exclaimed, "becomes of the subordination which the scriptures so frequently enjoin, if each one can be the arbiter of his own belief? What becomes of humility, which religion so forcibly inculcates, if every individual presumes to be an oracle and a judge? What would become of civil law and social harmony and order, if the acts of our legislatures were left to the interpretation of every interested litigant? Forbear! forbear!" Such was the restraint, as every one knows, which Luther was under the inevitable necessity of imposing on the first followers of his revolt, in order to counteract the effects of the disastrous principle of mental emancipation, so highly eulogized when it was first proclaimed, and received with so much enthusiasm, until it was found to be a very Babel of the confusion of all creeds—another name, or else a cloak, for deism and positive infidelity. When we reason on principles rightly understood, whose immediate bearings and remotest consequences have been exposed to the examination of the reflecting world, for the last three hundred years, these arguments are as conclusive to-day, as they were when first urged; and when the right of

any individual to believe whatever errors he honestly conceives to be truths revealed in scripture, is contested, he may say to his accusers, in the eloquent language of the Protestant remonstrants to the synod of Dort (itself Protestant), which had infringed their privileges in this respect: "Why exact that our inspiration, or our judgment, should yield to your opinion? The opinion of any society, our apostles, the first reformers, declared to be fallible; and, consequently, to exact submission to its dictates, they, with great consistency, defined to be tyranny. Thus they decided with regard to the church of Rome; and you, yourselves, have sanctioned their decision. Why, therefore, exercise a domination over us, which you stigmatized as tyranny in a church, compared to whose greatness you dwindle into insignificance. If resistance to the decisions of our pastors be a crime, then let us wipe out the stain of our origin, and run back together to the fold of Catholicity, which you and we have abandoned. If such resistance be no crime, why require of us a submission which we do not owe you? Allow us to differ from you, as you do from the parent church."

From the unanswerable logic of this remonstrance, the conclusion follows irresistibly: 1. That every society formed on Protestant principles, being essentially fallible, none should assert the inconsistent pretension of controlling faith by authority, or of regulating creeds, under pretense of superior wisdom. 2. That no such society, and, therefore, no individual, in such society, can be sure of being in the right, as long as his Protestant neighbor, with as many resources of information, and as piously inclined as himself, has embraced the very contrary to his opinion. 3. That as the entire system is based on the possibility of each one's being mistaken, where the most learned and pious have adopted such opposite conclusions, no one can ever make an act of divine faith, which is incompatible with uncertainty, and much more so with error. 4. That, as long as such a principle is upheld, there is no hope of union, no security; consequently, that either the whole system is false, or some expedient of union and unity must be discovered, to induce any conscientious and rational inquirer after truth, to believe that the Protestant society exemplifies the efficacy of the prayer of Christ for his disciples, the night before he suffered, that "*they may be made perfect in one.*" We entreat our readers seriously to look into the different religions professing to have been founded by Jesus Christ, and seriously ask themselves the question, in which of all these, that "PERFECT ONENESS" (which, better than all other proofs, establishes the divinity of the Son of God, and convinces the entire world how much his heavenly Father loved him, and those whom he had given to him) may be found. Let not this inquiry be neglected,

nor yet performed lightly: eternal life or death may be the consequence of its good or bad prosecution.

Error in religion, when it results from the neglect of sincere and prayerful enquiry, is criminal. This no intelligent Christian will deny. God is as essentially the God of truth, as he is the God of virtue. He can no more sanction error, than he can tolerate vice. His right is as absolute to the submission of the understanding, as to the obedience of the will; and as he, who violates one commandment will not be saved for the observance of the rest, so he that rejects one truth, which Almighty God has revealed—not that we may examine, contest, adopt or reject—but that we may *believe* it, has lost the merit of saving faith. It is to fix the otherwise perpetual variations of the human mind, and secure the anchor of our faith, not in the moving sands of man's vacillating judgments and uncertain opinions, but by lodging it deeply and indissolubly in the *rock* which the Divine Architect has made the foundation of his church, and against which the winds of error and the rain of dissolving scandal will rage and beat in vain, that *the Word made Flesh* vouchsafed to become the Light of the world.

The misfortune of the great majority of mankind at the present day, is not so much a blind fanatical attachment, (bad as this is) to the sect in which they chanced to be born, or were first instructed, as a certain latitude of principle, which has obtained the specious name of liberality, and which resolves itself into a fatal and unreasonably indifference to all religions, true or false. The infidel who has had but too frequent occasion to exult at the success of a wily system of hostility to revealed truth, affects to be unable to restrain his delight at beholding *variety* pervading the religious, as well as the physical world. Diversity of creeds is as pleasing to his eye, as the discrepancy of features in the human countenance. Incapable of reasoning, out of the sphere of matter, of which it is his inverted ambition to be a part, he holds the different religions professed by men to be so many institutions, prescribing for each country a uniform manner of honoring God in public; all founded and having their peculiar reasons in the climate, the mode of government, the genius of the people, or in some other local cause, which renders one form of religion preferable, for them, to another.

The conclusion to be drawn from this doctrine, in as much as it levels all distinctions between truth and falsehood, good and evil, is humiliating to reason—but the infidel, for once consistent, recoils not before it: the following is his language—"Sincerely profess, piously practise the religion of the country in which you live. In other words, born in a pagan country, adore its gods—sacrifice to Jupiter, to Mars,

to Priapus, or to Apollo. In Egypt, you will render divine honors to the sacred ox, and the crocodile; in Phenicia, you will pass your children through the fires of Moloch; in one country, you will immolate human victims to your idol; in another, you will humbly bow before a block of marble, or of wood—before an animal, fossil, or a plant. Be not afraid; God will not send one man to heaven for having been born in Rome, nor another to hell for having been born in Constantinople. Therefore, in the latter place you will cry, 'God is God and Mahomet is his prophet; and in the former, you will anathematize the impostor. A Christian in Europe, a Mussulman in Persia, an Idolater in Congo, on the banks of the Ganges an adorer of Vishnou, let not truth dictate the choice of your religion, but chance—let not reason divide, but the measurement of a degree of latitude, or longitude. Your credulous parent paid divine honors to an onion; preserve this domestic worship—a son can never do wrong in following the religion of his father.' But all this, it will be said, is unworthy of God and degrading to man. Not at all, he replies, all religions are equal—you were born in this, to practise another would be presumption. Such is the reasoning of the instructor of Emile, the theology of Hobbes, the profession of faith of the author of Zaire.

" Chretienne dans Paris, Mussulmane en ces lieux,
J'aurois avec la Grece adoré les faux Dieux."

That the unbeliever should thus eat promiscuously of the fruit of the tree of good and evil, life and death, should not create surprise. His joy consists in his being able to doubt of the validity of the proofs of religion—his only peace in life, his only security in death being made to depend on the delusive conviction of the improbability of ever arriving with certainty at the knowledge of revealed truth—the only truth, after all, it must be admitted, which it is necessary for man to know—and consequently the only truth which God is bound by all his essential and unchangeable attributes to enable us to attain.

The basis of Protestant belief is, that the Scripture, this book of divine revelation, is the only rule of faith; and that Jesus Christ having left on earth no living infallible authority to interpret it, every man is obliged to expound it, for himself, or in other words, to seek in it the religion, in which he is to live and by which he must be saved. His duty is to believe, what, *it seems to him*, this book clearly teaches and what as far as he has ascertained by subjecting it to the test of private examination, contradicts not *his* reason: and as no man has a right to say to another, "my reason is more vigorous, my judgment more sound than yours," it follows that every man should abstain from condemn-

ing the interpretation of another and should consider all religions, at least, as good and as safe as his own. This is the infidel principle in disguise. The Deist takes the book of nature, the Protestant takes the Bible. The former reads in *his* book, that the Supreme Being must be pleased with the diversity of worship rendered him by his creatures, that no one is to be more accountable for errors which, however discordant in themselves, when softened and mellowed by being mingled with the errors of others, ascend to the deity in the grateful harmony of universal praise. The latter, with this only difference that he contracts the range of the Infidel's misapprehension of religion, and for the book of the universe takes the bible, contends for the same erroneous principle.

I need not shew its workings to this enlightened audience. They are ruinous in the extreme.—[Time expired.]

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18TH, *Mr* Half-past 9 o'clock, A. M.

Mr. CAMPBELL rises—

I appear before you this morning, fellow-citizens, in prosecution of my third proposition: and as this is the fifth day of the discussion, we must proceed with more despatch. We shall then advance directly to that part of our proposition which speaks of Roman Catholic unity and uniformity—only intimating to my hearers, that the bishop's remarks in his last speech upon the infallibility of tradition; and his efforts to make the succession of the popes to rest upon the same authority with our faith in the bible, will be disposed of under proposition the 6th.

There are two bonds of union in all societies, general and special,—the first connects with the whole; the second with a part, one or more individuals. We explain by examples: 1st. Take the Turkish empire. It is united on the divine authority of the Koran, and the divine mission of Mahomet. Acquiescence in these is the general bond of union. But 2nd. There are special bonds, such as unite the respective orders of Mahometans, as the orders of Ali and Omar. These orders are distinct: they are united by a special construction of the Koran. Belief in the Koran is like general attraction: agreement in a particular view of it is like attraction of cohesion. So among christians. Roman Catholics are united in one great generic idea which characterizes the whole sect. That is, the belief in a supreme head of the church on earth—a vicar of Christ: and add to that, the exclusive power and authority of the bishops. "Bishops are the bond of union amongst Catholics." The clergy, indeed, are the general bond of union amongst Romanists. But there are also special bonds and parties in

that society, of which we shall take some notice. Protestants have a general bond of union in a generic consideration, as distinguishing as that of Mahometans and Roman Catholics. Acknowledging the bible alone, as the only perfect and sufficient rule of faith and manners, and the duty of all mankind to examine it for themselves, according to their respective abilities and opportunities, is the generic characteristic of Protestants. It is one of the general ideas, in which are united, and which unites all Protestants. But in the second place they are united in a most perfect and unanimous renunciation of that hierarchical authority which is the very essence of Roman Catholicism. I affirm that all Protestants are as perfectly united in these two grand principles, as the Roman Catholics are in that of a supreme head in Rome, and in the belief of tradition. Different saints and their peculiarities in the Roman Catholic church are specific bonds of union, and as much heads of orders, as are the leaders and views of Protestant sects. But the Protestants are as much united in acts of worship, as Roman Catholics. There are one or two Protestant sects, who differ in some important matters, and are as repugnant to each other as are Jansenists and Jesuits in the Roman church: but all Protestant sects unite in several essential acts of religious worship—in the acknowledgment of the same code of morals, and in the positive institution of Christianity, such as the Lord's day, the Lord's supper, baptism, prayer, praise, &c. Sects and differences exist which ought not: but still they harmonize as much in their general and special bonds of union, as do the Romanists themselves. What are the Augustinians, Dominicans, Franciscans, Jansenists, Jesuits, &c., but orders (or sects) called after different saints, and united under special bonds and peculiarities? These parties in the Roman church are as pugnacious as Protestant parties: communing with each other not more frequently, nor more cordially than do Lutherans, Calvinists, Arminians, &c. They contend warmly against each other. Their quarrels are as rank and fierce as those of Protestants. But this is not all, my friends. Their society is divided on all the great orthodox points of Catholicism. Some say the pope of Rome is supreme in all things on earth, temporal and spiritual, that he is a perfect representative of all the power of Christ, religious and political. A second class disavow these large claims—they say he is supreme only in ecclesiastical power: but that he is absolute lord of the church. A third class differ again on the extent of that ecclesiastical supremacy. Some say the pope is above and beyond the councils and clergy; and that he can annul them at pleasure. A fourth party say he is subject to a general council, and is only a general superintendent, a mere president, or executive officer—that

the decrees of councils are the supreme law, and that the pope merely executes them. Here are four distinct sects, on the generic idea of the supreme head. Again there are four parties on the essential doctrine of infallibility. Some say it resides in the pope alone. Bellarmine says, (and he is the organ of a principal party,) "that the pope *cannot possibly err*." Gelasius says, "The church represented by a general council is above the pope." A third party say, that infallibility resides in both the pope and a general council united. A fourth say, that all this does not constitute infallibility, but that when the whole church shall have acquiesced in a decree, and signified it by a concurrent response, then, and not till then, are dogmas and decrees infallibly correct. The first of these parties believes in the church *virtual*; the second in the church *representative*; the third in the church *diffusive*; the fourth in the church *responsive*,—as some of their canonists have taught.

Yesterday, in discussing infallibility, I said it should be in the head, if any where. My friend the bishop, says, it should be in the body: and, to carry out the figure, if infallibility be in the body, the head must be under the control of the body: for the fallible must yield to the infallible. Now, the body is the animal part of every individual, the seat of the passions and affections; and therefore ought to be under the dominion of the intellectual and moral head: yet this theory makes this body, the sensual and animal body govern. No wonder, then, that the Roman Catholic church is always corrupt. But from nature and reason and revelation, I would incline to that party that places the government in the head. There are the powers of government, and there ought to be the sceptre. It is abhorrent to reason—nay it is rather monstrous, to have the head under the dominion of the body.

But I hasten to show, that be the government where it may, in the pope, the council, or the whole body, it is always fallible. I shall begin with the head; and here we have pope against pope. Adrian VI. did, unequivocally, disown the pope's infallibility. Now, from this single fact, I prove the fallibility of the pope; for Adrian was either right, or he was wrong. If right, the pope is fallible; for he avows that he is. If wrong, the pope is fallible; for he was a pope and yet did err. This is a dilemma never to be annihilated nor disposed of. Pope Stephen VI. rescinded the decrees of pope Formosus. Pope John annulled those of pope Stephen, and restored those of pope Stephen. Sergius III. so hated Formosus and all that he did, as pope, that he obliged all the priests he ordained to be re-ordained.

Sometimes popes have at one time condemned what themselves passed at another time; for instance, Martin V. confirmed the decree

of the council of Constance, which set a general council above the pope, and yet he afterwards published a decree, forbidding all appeals from the pope to a general council. He was certainly fallible, or, rather, he certainly erred in one case or in the other. What then is true of one pope officially, is true of all popes officially, and in proving a few regular and canonical popes to be fallible, we prove them all to be fallible.

Is the second opinion better—is a general council infallible? I will state a fact or two: the council of Constance says the church in old times allowed the laity to partake of both kinds—the bread and the wine, in celebrating the eucharist. The council of Trent says, the laity and unofficiating priests may commune in one kind only. Here, then, we have council against council. In the time of pope Gelasius it was pronounced to be sacrilege to deny the cup to the laity: but now it is uncanonical to allow it. The fourth council of Lateran, A. D. 1215, says, with the concurrence and approbation of pope Innocent III., that the bread and wine in the act of consecration suffer a physical change. Then we begin to read of transubstantiation. Coun. Lat. iv. canon 1. "Did the church always maintain this doctrine?" Nay, verily, for a host of fathers; nay the whole church for the first four centuries say "the change is only *moral*,"—a sanctification, or separation to a special use. Here we might read a host of fathers, if we thought their testimony necessary. The third council of Lateran, or the eleventh œcumenical council, has decreed that

"Non enim dicenda sunt juramenta sed potius perjuria quæ contra utilitatem ecclesiasticam et sanctorum patrum remanent instituta." Con. Lat. iii. cum 16 Labbe. Council Sacrosanct. vol. x. p. 1517.

Literally, they are not to be called oaths, but perjuries, which are taken against the interests of the church and the holy fathers.

Now does not this contradict Numb. xxx. 2, Lev. xix. 12, Deut. xxiii. 23, Zech. viii. 17, Psal. xv. 4, and Matthew v. "Thou shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths."

Again, the second council of Lateran, the *tenth* œcumenical council, forbade the marriage of clergy. *For 800 years the clergy were allowed to marry!* For the first 600 years one-half the canons of councils were regulating the clergy as to the affairs of matrimony and celibacy. The ancient church had not yet learned to forbid marriage to the clergy, for with Paul the clergy yet believed, that "marriage was honorable in all."

I have thus shown that the church of Rome is not uniform; and need we farther proof that she is mutable and fallible;—without that real unity and uniformity of which she boasts? Have we not found pope

against pope, council against council, the church of one age against the church of another age, and, by the acknowledgment of a pope, as much strife and party as amongst Protestants?

Instead of reading that long essay yesterday, (I do not know what it was about, nor who wrote it; I paid no regard to it, it being obviously read to fill up the time)—I say, that instead of such readings, I expected a reply to my remarks on infallibility, or on some of the great matters yet unnoticed; but without any more distinct avowal of his notion of infallibility, I am left to plod my way as before. My opponent admits his faith is not the bible alone, but that immense library of *one hundred and thirty-five folios*, already mentioned. But as he is so silent on this point, I have an author in my own hand whom he has already commended in this city as good Roman Catholic authority; and, therefore, I quote him with his approbation. He has these 135 folios in his eye; and on the question, who shall interpret for public use—the Rt. Rev. J. F. M. Trevern, D. D., bishop of Strasburg, late of Aire, thus speaks:

not

“ If each of us was obliged to distinguish, among many articles, those which come from tradition, and those which do not, he would find himself, in a general way, condemned to a labor above his strength. In fact, that part of the preaching of the apostles which they did not commit to writing, was at first confided solely to the memory of the faithful, fixed in particular churches by the oral instructions of the first bishops, and afterwards collected partially and as occasion fell out, in the writings of the fathers, and in the acts of the synods and councils. Whence it follows, that to prove that such an article is truly of apostolic tradition, we must consult the belief of the particular churches, examine carefully the acts of the councils and the voluminous writings of the fathers of the Greek and Latin churches. Who does not see that this labor requires a space of time and extent of erudition, that renders it in general impracticable? There are, indeed, to be found, men of extraordinary capacity and application, whose taste and inclination lead them to this kind of research; with the aid of the rules of criticism, all founded upon good sense, they balance and weigh authorities, they distinguish between what the fathers taught, as individual teachers, and what they depose as testifiers to the belief and practice of their time, and they attach with discrimination the different degrees of credibility that are due, whether to their doctrine or their deposition. The world is well aware that such labor is calculated but for a small number: and again, after all how successful soever it may be, it scarcely ever leads to incontestible conclusions. We therefore are in want of some other means that may enable us altogether with certainty to arrive at the apostolic and divine traditions? The question is, what is this means?

* * * * *

Our author proceeds:

“ The same judge, the same interpreter that unfolds to us the sense of the divine books, manifest to us also, that of tradition. Now, this judge, this interpreter, I must tell you here again, is the teaching body of the church, the bishops united in the same opinion, at least in a great majority. It is to them that in the person of the apostles, were made the magnificent promises: ‘Go teach, I

am with you; he that heareth you, heareth me. The Spirit of truth shall teach you all truth,' &c. They alone then, have the right to teach what is revealed, to declare what is the written or unwritten word: they alone also have always been in possession of the exercise of it. No other ecclesiastics have ever pretended to it, whatever have been their rank, their dignity, and learning. They may be consulted and heard; it is even proper this should be done, and it always has been done; for they form the council of the bishops, and their erudition acquired by long study, throws light upon the discussions. But as they have not the plenitude of the priesthood, they are not members of the eminent body that has succeeded the college of the apostles, and with it received the promises." Vol. I. pp. 168, 169.

So then, to quote his words, as found on p. 108, "The opinions adopted by the majority of the bishops are for all an infallible rule of faith!" That is, "I believe in the holy Catholic church."

But the priesthood are sworn "to interpret the scriptures according to the unanimous consent of the fathers." And if they do not, the people that believe them are innocent!! But how can they unless they examine all these fathers? And what living man has read these 135 folios, with or without much care? In what a predicament is the conscience and faith of this people! Here is a task, which I say, never was, or can be, performed by man. The bishop can only fulfil his oath by teaching what the Catholic church teaches. We have our Old and New Testament without the apocrypha. They have the bible, the apocrypha, and 135 folios. Let us now compare the Roman and Protestant rules and interpretations! Both rules, for the sake of argument, be it observed, need interpretation. But it so happens, that a Protestant bishop, and a Roman Catholic bishop, are equally fallible, my opponent being judge. As the stream, then, cannot rise above the fountain, both interpretations are fallible. Are we not equal?

Where do you find an infallible expositor of the bible? says the Roman Catholic. I answer, Where do you find an infallible expositor of these volumes? You have a more difficult task, and no better help, than we. The Protestants say that God can speak as intelligibly as the pope, and that he is as benevolently disposed as any priesthood. He does not require an infallible expositor; he is his own expositor. His Spirit is the spirit of knowledge and eloquence, and can speak intelligibly to every listener. As well might we say, that he who made the eye cannot see, as that he who gave man mind and speech cannot address clearly and intelligibly that mind of which he is the author! I ask the Romanist, however, on his own principles, where is his infallible expositor of these 135 volumes? I request a categorical answer.

BISHOP P. A general council, or the pope, with the acquiescence of the church at large.

MR. C. How do we approach—where shall we find this council?

It has not met for two hundred and seventy-five years. How can they, therefore, settle a point between the bishop and me? Every age has its errors and divisions. Every individual has his doubts. Ought there not to be a general council eternally in session? If, then, there is none—no infallible expositor extant; wherein is the Romanist, with all his proud assumption, superior to the Protestant? It was three hundred and twenty-five years from Christ before the first general council; and it is two hundred and seventy-five years since the last general council of Trent; and the church has been *six hundred years*, at two periods, without an infallible expositor! To show the equality of the two parties, suppose a Jew were converted to Christianity. Suppose he had heard of just two sects of Christians; all the rest being annihilated, but the Roman Catholic and the Protestant. He has read the New Testament. He wishes to join the church. He goes to the Roman Catholic bishop, and says: "I see two churches, sir: I don't know which to join. I read that there is but one true church." What does the bishop respond? "Sir, you ought to join our church." The Jew asks, "Your reason, sir? for the Protestant also says, I ought to join his church." The bishop shows him *fifteen marks of the true church*. He says, "Read the Bible, and see if these marks are not characteristic of us; and then judge for yourself." He finds these marks involve the principal part of the New Testament. He reads, however, and joins the church. Has he not decided this question by examining the holy scriptures? Has he not interpreted for himself? Is not the bishop so far a true Protestant? or, has he only become Protestant for the purpose of introducing this proselyte? There is no getting out of this difficulty. I trust my good friend will not pass it with a laugh, and a bold assertion, as usual. Has he not in this renounced his own principles, and turned Protestant, for the sake of gaining the Jew?

But, when the Jew has entered the church, and the bishop has told him he must now believe as the church believes, for he cannot understand the Bible: "What!" responds the Jew; "sir, have I not decided the greatest question to me in the universe? I believed in Jesus, and I have found *the true church* by exercising my own judgment on the scriptures; and can I not now judge of minor questions?" May I not again say, that the two systems are perfectly equal? The eternal circle of vicious logic—you must believe the scriptures on the authority of the church, then the church on the authority of the scriptures: or, you must act as did the aforesaid Jew, on the advice of the bishop. There is not a middle course. My learned antagonist cannot show you

a middle way. But I have not yet done with this great theme. I wish to display in other attitudes, these two "*rules of faith.*"

And, first, I shall sketch the Protestant rule. Its attributes are seven. 1. *It is inspired.* 2. *It is authoritative.* 3. *It is intelligible.* 4. *It is moral.* 5. *It is perpetual.* 6. *It is catholic.* 7. *It is perfect.* We will now prove this.

1. It is inspired: for, "*Holy men of God,*" says Peter, "*spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit.*"

2. Authoritative. "The word that I speak to you, shall judge you in the last day," says the Lord from heaven.

3. Intelligible. To the Ephesian converts he saith, "When you read, you may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ."

4. Moral. "The word of the Lord is pure, rejoicing the heart."

5. Perpetual. "The word of the Lord endureth for ever; and this is the word which has been announced to you as glad tidings."

6. Catholic. "He that is of God, heareth God's word." "Preach the word." "Preach the gospel to every creature."

7. Perfect. "From a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, *which are able to make thee wise to salvation.*" "All scripture given by inspiration of God, is profitable for doctrine, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, *thoroughly furnished to every good work.*"

All christendom assents to this. My opponent admits the bible to be inspired. His rule makes his church a sect; for only a part believe in his traditions. All christians admit our rule of the bible.

It is *perfect.* Such is the Protestant rule. Now for the Romanist rule! The bible being a part of the Roman Catholic rule, is such only as explained by the apocrypha, the traditions of the fathers, the decrees and canons of councils, or in the hands of bishops; so completely humanized, as to lose all its peculiar attributes, and is made to partake of all the characters of the mediums, through which it is given to that people; and, therefore, of the whole Roman Catholic rule, the attributes are just the opposite of those seven of the Protestant's.

1. It is uninspired: consequently, being human, it can have no authority over the conscience; and this makes it

2. Unauthoritative. God alone is Lord of the conscience, and no man can make a law to govern it. Hence a christian never can be subordinate to any institution in religion, that wants the sanction of divine authority.

3. Unintelligible. No man can ever find time to examine all the creed of Roman Catholics. It is constantly accumulating; and if any one had time to read it all, he never could understand it.

4. Immoral. This is that attribute which I wish specially to con-

sider. The other properties are all consequences of those already noticed. But this demands a candid and faithful examination. It gives me no pleasure to dwell upon this theme, to expiate on the immoral character of the papistic rule of faith. 'Tis here, indeed, we find the root of all manifold corruptions of that institution; and as I came here not to flatter, but to oppose error and defend truth, it is my duty conscientiously and benevolently to expose the immoral tendencies of this system.

We have heard the gentleman say, he was glad of an opportunity to discuss Catholicism, to make Protestants understand better its peculiar doctrines. I wish, myself, to hear his expositions, to see if he can make it more acceptable. Therefore, I shall endeavor to tell my story, candidly and faithfully, and give him the opportunity he desires. This is my first effort against Romanism. It was not of my selection or seeking, that I now appear before you: but as I am providentially, as I regard it, on this arena, I shall reveal to you some of the secrets of that institution, which seeks to be rooted in this Protestant soil. I shall attempt this in the best spirit: for I wish to see my opponent honorably wipe from his escutcheon any stain of the kind, that I may allege. On these points, I shall be happy to be assured that his system is better than we Protestants can now regard it.

I say, then, the Roman Catholic rule of faith is *immoral*. This, my friends, is a serious and weighty charge, and deserves to be clearly and fully sustained. Before displaying my proof, I will only premise, that auricular confession, penance, the mass, absolution, and other parts of the system will pass before us in this allegation, sustaining which, will anticipate some of our labors on the other propositions.

I shall first read from the Catechism of the council of Trent on the power of the priesthood to forgive sin, according to their rule of faith. Auricular confession, is by this infallible council declared "necessary for the remission of sins."

"The voice of the priest," says the council of Trent, who is legitimately constituted a minister for the remission of sins, is to be heard as that of Christ himself, who said to the lame man, "*Son, be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee.*" Cat. Council of Trent, p. 180.

Penance by the same council is thus defined:

FORM OF PENANCE.—"Penance is the channel through which the blood of Christ flows into the soul, and washes away the stains contracted after baptism." Id. *ib.* "The form of the absolution or pardon, granted by the priest, is this, 'I ABSOLVE THEE.'" Id. p. 181.

The priest says positively, "*I absolve thee.*" Unlike the authority of him, who anciently declared the leper clean, he claims really and truly to absolve. The council declares:

"Unlike the authority given to the priests of the old law, to declare the leper cleansed from his leprosy, the power with which the priests of the new law are invested, is not simply to declare that sins are forgiven, but *as the ministers of God really to absolve from sin.*" Id. p. 182.

The priests, then, *as the ministers of God, really absolve from sin.* And more insolent still, the priest is said not only to represent Christ, but to discharge the functions of Jesus Christ:

"The rites used in the administration of this sacrament, also demand the serious attention of the faithful. Humbled in spirit the sincere penitent casts himself down at the feet of the priest, to testify, by this his humble demeanor, that he acknowledges the necessity of eradicating pride, the root of all those enormities which he now deploras. *In the minister of God, who sits in the tribunal of penance as his legitimate judge, he venerates the power and person of our Lord Jesus Christ; for in the administration of this, as in that of the other sacraments, the priest represents the character, and discharges the functions of Jesus Christ.*" Coun. Trent, p. 182.

Again Roman Catholics teach that penance remits all sin:

"There is no sin, however grievous, no crime, however erroneous, or however frequently repeated, which penance does not remit." Id. p. 183.

This is the proper ground on which to claim the most servile obedience to the priests:

"If therefore, we read in the pages of inspiration, of some who earnestly implored the mercy of God, but implored it in vain, it is because they did not repent sincerely, and from their hearts. When we also meet in the sacred scriptures, and in the writings of the fathers, passages which seem to say that some sins are irremissible, we are to understand such passages to mean, that it is very difficult to obtain the pardon of them. A disease may be said to be incurable, when the patient loathes the medicine that would accomplish his cure; and, in some sense, some sins may be said to be irremissible, when the sinner rejects the grace of God, the proper medicine of salvation." Id. ib. "The penitent *must submit himself to the judgment of the priest* who is the vicegerent of God." Ib. p. 183.

Therefore, all must confess once a year.

"According to the canon of the council of Lateran, which begins: *Omnes utriusque sexus*, it commands all the faithful to confess their sins at least once a year." Id. p. 193.

But this immoral law presumes farther yet. It changes the laws of God, and divides sins into venial and mortal, and fixes the price. As every thing depends upon the authority of these *allegata* I have hitherto quoted from the catechism of the council of Trent,* I now introduce one of the most popular of the saints of the modern church. This saint Ligori was sainted by saint Pius VII., that best of modern popes, who restored the order of the Jesuists, and the "Holy Inquisition."

*See Catechism, council of Trent, as revised by John Hughes of Philadelphia, priest of St. John's church, pp. 192, 193.

Saint Ligor writes the moral theology of the church of Rome in some eight or nine volumes: and so orthodox, that his works are owned almost by every priest. I quote from a synopsis of that system of which we shall hereafter speak more particularly. We shall hereafter hear the saint in his definitions of sins.

"This is a mortal sin," says Ligor, "which, on account of its enormity, destroys the grace and friendship of God, and deserves eternal punishment. It is called mortal, because it destroys the principle of spiritual life, which is habitual grace, and kills the soul.

Venial sin is that which, on account of its levity, does not destroy the grace and friendship of God although it diminishes the fervor of charity, and deserves a temporal punishment. It is called venial, because the principle of the spiritual life, grace, being still sound, it affects the soul with languor, that is easily cured, the pardon of which is easily obtained." Ligor. lib. v. n. 51. [Synopsis, p. 20.

The Roman Catholic rule of faith erects a tribunal of confession unknown to scripture, and commands all to come to it at least once a year. It moreover institutes a new office called confessor, unknown in the New Testament, and gives to him the office of a father, a physician, a teacher, and a judge.

"The offices that a good confessor is bound to exercise," "are four: namely, those of Father, Physician, Teacher, and Judge." Ligor. Theol. T. viii. p. 7.

The confessor forgives all sins on confession, even the sin against the Holy Spirit:

"There is no sin, however grievous, no crime however enormous, or however frequently repeated, which penance does not remit." Cat. Conn. Trent, p. 183.

PENANCE here means the "Tribunal of confession:" for this tribunal is sometime called simply "*confession*," "The sacrament of confession:" at other times it is called the "tribunal of penance." Sometimes simply "Penance," and he who confesses is called "the penitent." But satisfactions and penances are to be apportioned according to the discretion of the priest.

"According to the council of Trent, (Sess. xiv. c. 8.) the satisfactions" (by which they mean penances,) "ought to be in proportion to the crime, since those confessors who enjoin light penances for grievous sins, participate of those sins; nevertheless the confessor, for just reasons, can diminish the penances, provided the penitent is affected with violent compunction, or if it be during the time of a jubilee, or a plenary indulgence, and especially, if he labor under any infirmity of body and mind. And lastly, (to be brief,) always whenever a prudent fear is entertained, lest the penitent would not perform penance due to his sins. Such is the common doctrine taught by the doctors, with St. Thomas." Ligor. Prax. Con. N. ii.

But still worse: this immoral law or rule of faith repeals and annuls certain positive divine laws. I have here two catechisms, published by the authority of the church. They have both expunged wholly the sec-

ond commandment; so that it should not stand in the way of paying reverence to images.—[Time expired.]

Half-past 10 o'clock, A. M.

BISHOP PURCELL rises—

If my friend, Mr. CAMPBELL, has failed to establish against the Catholic church, a single one of those propositions, which have been so conspicuously before the public for the last two or three months, and if I have established two or three of them against his own vague theory, it is not for want of splendid abilities on his part, or the possession of them on mine. The reason of his failure, is the inherent weakness of the cause he advocates, as the true secret of my success, is to be found in the impenetrable, diamond strength and beauty of the institution, which, in an evil hour for his *past* glory as a controversialist, he volunteered to attack. He has this day (and again I thank him) brought up, for discussion, the most important subject that can occupy or engross the attention of this enlightened audience, viz., the rule of faith. If fairly published, as I have every reason to believe this controversy will be, it will send forth sound and useful information, through the whole length and breadth of the land, upon a topic of the most vital interest; and I will, most joyfully, meet Mr. C. on that question, for I hail with exultation such an opportunity of dispelling prejudice and misunderstanding with regard to our real principles. *I will give categorical answers to all the questions* he has propounded; and, therefore, do I take up the subject he has been pleased to touch.

1. He says, the methods of electing the pope are various. But let that pass; the method is nothing. It is with his authority we are concerned. He has wasted much time in building up a house of sand, to show how easily he could demolish it, by showing that the pope is not infallible; whereas, I have repeatedly told him, that the Catholic church has never taught that the pope's infallibility was an article of faith. He spoke of some more or less important but unessential points of difference of opinion between Dominicans and Jesuits. But he should have shown, to establish the proposition before this house, that these orders disagree with regard to articles of faith. Their minor differences are nothing, so long as they implicitly believe every article of faith revealed by almighty God and proposed for their belief by the church, which they all hear, and which they regard as the "pillar and ground of the truth." This is the solid and immovable foundation of their union. The case of the cup given to, or withheld from, the laity, as I have already told him, is one merely of discipline. It may now be given, or not, as the pope may see cause. In the time of Gelasius, it

was pronounced sacrilege to deny the cup to the laity; and, if all my hearers had read church history, I need not tell them, it was because of the leaven of Manicheism still working in pretended communicants, who forbade the use of wine as coming from the evil principle. No father of the church, however, said, that the consecration of the eucharistic species, is a mere "separation," or the change only a "moral change." I defy him to the proof. Mr. C. says: "So far Protestants and Catholics are equal;" for, that they have also a grand generic principle, viz: that the Bible is their rule of faith, and the Bible alone. Now, I take up the organ of a numerous body of christians, the Christian Palladium, and I meet him here with a strong argument in my favor, upon this principle. Speaking of Mr. Campbell, (I mean by this no personality, that can be thought invidious: I intend none) the editor observes: "He frequently speaks of '*the Bible alone*;' but this is not a term used generally by the brethren in New England, and is taught by few except Mr. C. We never knew our brethren to boast of walking by the Bible *alone*. THIS WE REGARD AS AN ERROR, LET WHO WILL PROCLAIM IT. We say, give us the Bible, but *not* alone. LET US HAVE A GOD, A CHRIST, A SPIRIT, AND A MINISTRY ACCOMPANYING IT. There was a law given to the Jews, and also a testimony, which they were bound to observe. *The testimony of the inspired prophets did not contradict the law*, but taught and enforced the same truths. The ancients were to walk by the *law* and the *testimony*, which was called a *word*. (Is. viii. 20.) What this 'redoubtable captain' of *reform* says, of sailing sometimes under this flag and sometimes under that, is perfectly applicable to—" but I will not read further: this is sufficient for my argument. The *Bible alone* is not the rule of faith to *all Protestants*. Quakers, Mormons, &c., think not so, as I have already proved. And, now, Mr. Campbell can do infinitely more with the intellects of his hearers, than the pope has ever done with those of Catholics, if he can persuade them that the differences between Protestants, who all take the Bible for their rule of faith, are *unimportant*. Is the divinity of Christ an important or an unimportant article? One class of Bible-reading Protestants admit the doctrine; another reject it with horror: pretty unity this! The Episcopalians believe in the necessity of submission to the bishops; and eloquently have I heard the authority of the church advocated by them. They do not say that the church is infallible, and in this they are inconsistent. But will they allow that the difference between them and Presbyterians is unimportant? Is the doctrine of a hell, with endless torments there for the wicked, unimportant? One class of Bible-readers hold this also, and another class reject it! Alas! for the declaration of my friend, that he can prove

whatever he states to be a fact. I strongly suspect a man who makes such asseverations.

He is loud in his panegyrics on the unity of Protestants in essential acts of worship: they pray together, &c. If this were even so, of what avail is it, when they differ in essential doctrines? But, is not my friend aware, that this is by no means a fact? And what reliance can we place on his statements of what occurred centuries ago, when here, at home, and refutation nigh at hand, he makes such curious assertions?

Did not a case occur, last summer, within sixty miles of Cincinnati, at Dayton, when the Episcopalian minister, the Rev. Mr. Allen, forbade the Rev. Mr. Peabody, a Unitarian clergyman, of irreproachable morals and great amiableness of disposition, to preach in his church? Did not the bishop reprimand the vestry, and Episcopalian minister, for having previously allowed him to preach there? I think the Episcopalian bishop acted, in this respect, as he should have done. I blame none of the parties concerned, but I state an incontrovertible fact. Again, at Pottsville, Pennsylvania, another case occurred. A Unitarian minister died there, and the Episcopal clergyman refused to say prayers at his funeral, because of his religious belief. What, then, becomes of my friend's vague and general assertion, about unity among Protestants in essential acts of worship? Will he, then, excommunicate the Unitarian? and, if he once begin, how many more sects must be put out of the pale?

Let him shew me that a Jesuit or a Dominican, a Franciscan, or a Benedictine, or an Augustinian ever refused to let a member of either of these orders preach in his church, or to say prayers over a corpse because of the difference of orders? Such a thing has never been heard of; so that we have unity, and Protestants have none, neither in doctrine, nor in worship; neither in essentials nor in non-essentials, themselves being judges.

If my hearers wish for a practical and convincing proof of Catholic uniformity of faith, they have only to enquire of the emigrants from the various countries of Europe, who have fled from the oppression of their rulers at home, to find free and happy homes amongst us here, and I promise them that however awkward their appearance, however broken their language, or uncouth their apparel, they will all answer the same on doctrinal points. America, Asia, Europe, Africa, New Holland, our faith is every where the same, like our God and our church. Who can make void the prayer of Christ for unity? Who can disturb the church's union? As well might he pretend to make the harmony of heaven to sleep. Is this union exemplified among

Protestants? The very contrary is true. And why? ^{TLC} Because the apple of discord is flung among them. The seeds of disorganization and death were thickly sown in Protestantism from the birth. Sects multiply without end—their name is Legion. My friend was quite witty, about the 135 ponderous folios which, according to him, a Catholic must read to understand the doctrines of his church. But does he not perceive that a Protestant is infinitely worse off? For he must read languages in which the fathers of the church have not written—Hebrew, Syriac, Arabic; as well as those in which the fathers did write, Greek, Latin, &c., before he can form a prudent judgment that he has acquired the *elementary* knowledge necessary to understand his rule of faith. He must read folios of commentators and learned dissertations on controverted texts. He must decide for himself what books of scripture are genuine and what apocryphal, or spurious. For this purpose he must explore the archives of the ancient churches, all the dusty tomes and ponderous folios of the ecclesiastical writers, to ascertain what books were regarded in their times as canonical, and what as uncanonical. And when he has, if ever, accomplished this herculean task, he will be no better off than when he began, for he can never rely on the testimony of those fathers, whom he considers just as liable to have been mistaken as himself! Thus he can never be sure that he possesses objective truth, or the revealed will of God: he can never be sure that he possesses subjective truth, that is, that he has a perfect knowledge of what that will is. Thus he can never be sure that his rule of faith is inspired, authoritative, perfect. *I call on my learned friend to prove the contrary of this argument, if he can.* And if he cannot, I have clearly established the contrary of his proposition, viz.: that Protestants are not uniform in their faith, neither can they be. Now mark the difference on the Catholic side of the argument. We go for the *Bible and tradition*—the whole word of God, written and unwritten. We take the Bible and the church; the Bible and the testimony. This renders for us assurance doubly sure. We believe that Christ established a church on earth which he made the guardian of the divine deposit. From that church, that divinely appointed guardian we receive the heavenly gift. She vouches for its accuracy, and on her testimony we receive the Bible, as an inspired, authoritative, perpetual, Catholic, perfect, and, explained by her, intelligible volume. But as we know on the authority of St. John xviii. 21, 25, that the world itself could not, as he thought, contain all that Christ spoke, and he always spoke to instruct or edify—as we know that Peter “*with many other words*” not recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, convinced the Jews that Jesus was the Messiah—as we know moreover that St. Paul com-

manded the Thessalonians, 2d. Ep., 2d. ch., 14. v. to hold the *traditions* which they had learned, *whether by the word*, or his epistle; and ordered Timothy to hold the form of sound words which he had heard from him, in faith; we therefore place the word of God, so conveyed to us, by the side of Scripture, and in this, as I have just shewn, the Scripture itself is our guide. Our traditions do not, like those of the Pharisees whom Christ reproached, make the Scripture void. We believe nothing contrary to the Bible—nothing that the Bible does not clearly approve. The same God that revealed the Bible, established the church. They do not contradict, they mutually sustain each other. I did not say that the pope is inspired, that the council is inspired, or that the church is inspired; but I do say that the church, whether assembled in a general council, or diffused throughout the world, is as certainly assisted by the Holy Ghost to teach all truth, as the evangelists and other writers of the Holy Scriptures were inspired by the same divine Spirit to *write the special truths which they were commissioned to reveal* to particular churches, and on particular occasions. A Catholic is under no necessity of knowing every thing that has been ever said or done by the doctors and fathers of the church, before he can understand what are the articles of his faith. He knows that, in regard to doctrine they unanimously agree in receiving the Apostles' creed. Hence he is sure that, "I believe in God, the Father Almighty, Creator of Heaven and Earth" is an article of faith which none of these fathers contradict, and he has the same absolute certainty with regard to all the remaining articles, viz: I believe in Jesus Christ, in the Holy Ghost, the holy Catholic church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins. So far for the doctrine; besides which articles he is in the habitual state of mind to believe implicitly whatever God has revealed and proposed by his church. Then for the natural and moral law he has an equally comprehensive epitome, viz: the Ten commandments of God; with respect to which he knows that there has never been the *slightest difference of opinion*.

Neither the pope, nor a general council, nor the whole church has now, or ever had, the power to change, or suppress an article of the creed, or a precept of the decalogue. Is there any thing vague in this? any thing indistinct? any thing unscriptural or antisciptural?

My friend does not hear, or correctly state what I say. I did not say that the body ruled the head. It would be a contradiction in terms; because the body supposes a head and a heart, which every body ought to have. There must be no schism in the body. He has made some very eloquent observations on the impossibility of determining where the infallibility resides, whether in the head or in the body or both,

&c., in the pope, or in a general council, and argues that we may therefore as well have none at all. Now, let me illustrate this point. Has not my friend a mind and one too highly endowed by nature? Well, does he know where it resides? Is it in his head; or in his heart, or in his stomach? (a laugh). Does he know where to put his hand upon it? There are various theories upon this subject among scientific men. But who denies that he has a mind? I repeat, who denies the existence of mind? Does it affect this belief to say that we cannot tell whether it is here or there—in the body or around it? So it is with the heavenly mind that guides the church. Even if we did not know its exact place of residence, we could easily judge of its influence and guidance by its effects. But we do know where it evinces its presence, as I have more than once explained to the gentleman.

What has Adrian's opinion to do with the question? It was but his personal, private opinion, and no article of faith. Whether this opinion was right, or wrong, all I said stands good. The witty conceit of my friend was a sophistry suggested by the pagan oracles, who could respond in such ambiguous terms, that it might be interpreted in favor of the oracle's foreknowledge according to the event; for instance a king going out to battle would be told, "You will destroy a great city;" but whether it was his own, or his enemies', depended on the issue. The idea is borrowed from Pagan craft.

I am now admonished to dilate a little longer on the decision of the council of Constance with regard to the "Cup." I have frequently, in my intercourse with persons not Catholic, heard this difficulty proposed; and I am glad of the opportunity, once for all, of explaining it. Why does the Roman Catholic church withhold the cup from the laity? In the early ages, the holy eucharist was communicated to the faithful under either species; often under both. When the eucharist was carried, as it was the practice of primitive christians to carry it with them in all their sojournings, by sea and land, as wine was exposed to sour in tropical climes, they consequently carried, on their travels, only the species of Bread. Did they believe that the virtue of the eucharist was thus destroyed? No. They knew with St. Paul that Jesus Christ, rising from the dead, died no more. Death shall no longer have dominion over him. They knew therefore that his flesh was living flesh, not dead and bloodless; and that, consequently, in the eucharist, under either species the flesh and blood are inseparably united.

What was the reason of the abolition of the practice? When the deacons distributed the consecrated elements to the faithful, there were many infirm, decrepit, and palsied communicants, from whose

trembling hands, or lips, it was feared, as it had frequently occurred, the cup might fall, and thus might the holy elements be trodden under foot and profaned. A contrary usage was therefore instituted, and it has since prevailed. The dislike, indeed disgust, which many persons feel for wine, the unwillingness to drink from a chalice which had passed from mouth to mouth, &c., &c., are causes which, in all probability, prevent a change in the present disciplinary regulation, but the church could to morrow re-establish the abolished practice of giving the cup to the laity, if she please. She did so, since the Protestant reformation, in favor of the Bohemians.

The subject of oaths and perjuries was quoted. Any man in his sober senses must discern that my friend has mistaken the meaning of the pope. Examine the circumstances. He supposes the truth that the church neither can nor does require any thing contrary to *justice* and judgment, and truth, which, in all her standards, and in all her catechisms, she teaches as the essential conditions, for every lawful oath. Again, she every where teaches, with St. Paul, that an oath, contrary to conscience, is a sin.

The pope knew that the church could not—that God himself, who founded her as the pillar and ground of the truth, could not be pleased with sin, or served by a lie. Let me illustrate this matter and set it at rest for ever. An infidel, swears that he will write against the utility of the bible, deny its authenticity, undermine its evidences, cast it into the flames. Is his oath an act of religion? Is it not rather a perjury? Again—a man swears to take away the life of another man, justly or unjustly, he boots not. Is not his oath a perjury, rather than an oath, since it is manifestly against the *utility* of society and, consequently, against the order of God? It is remarkable that the pope speaks too of an oath against the *teaching of the fathers*, "*contra instituta patrum*," than whose sermons against all grievous crimes, and in an especial manner, against perjury, nothing can be conceived more denunciatory, more truly terrific. Is it fair—is it logical, to draw from the premises a conclusion so vituperative?

To force a shadow of uniformity, the thirty-nine articles were drawn up by the church of England, and the clergy of that church, by a cruel tyranny over conscience, compelled to swear to them. Many eminent divines of that church have taught that the articles are not to be sworn to with unqualified assent, but that the mental reservation, "as I understand them," is allowed: while the sovereign lord, or lordess, of church and state, and many no less eminent divines, have insisted that the articles must be sworn to with the most entire and unqualified submission. Is this, in my friend's estimation, the reverence due to

the solemnity of an oath? or is it not taking the holy name in vain? Catholic priests in this country take no oath. I took none. The first oath I took was one of allegiance to the United States, abjuring all foreign potentates, &c., as the oath is couched. This oath I took in the hands of Judges John and Thomas Buchanan, in Frederick, Maryland. I also took an oath, several years afterwards, when consecrated a bishop, to testify my belief in and faithful adherence to the doctrines of my church. This was a further confirmation of the oath which I had previously taken. This is no immorality.

We are again referred to a change in the "*doctrine*" of the church. "The second council of the Lateran," so says Mr. C., "*forbade the marriage of the clergy, whereas nothing was more common in the first eight centuries than for priests to marry.*" Now, in the first place, celibacy is no part of Catholic doctrine, at all. It is not an article of faith. The pope could, to-morrow, change that law, and allow the Roman Catholic clergy, as the Greek priests do, to marry. It is one of the bright features of our ministry, that the time and means, which the care, and support of a family would engross, are devoted by a priest to the advantage, spiritual and temporal, of his flock. Marriage is a good, wise, and noble institution. "Increase and multiply," is the command of God. But we hold that it is more perfect, or as St. Paul says, "*it is good*" for the "Priests of the Lamb" to abstain. God, for whose sake they make the sacrifice, will sustain them through temptation. Keep thyself chaste, says St. Paul to Timothy, 1st Ep. ch. v. 21. Again, St. John says: "And I heard a voice from heaven, as the voice of harpers harping on their harps, and they sung as it were a new canticle, before the throne, and before the four living creatures and the ancients; and no man could say the canticle, but those hundred and forty-four thousand, who were purchased from the earth. These are they who were not defiled with women: for they are virgins. These follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. These were purchased from among men, the first-fruits to God and to the Lamb: and in their mouth there was found no lie; for they are without spot before the throne of God." What does all this mean? Is it not evidently the highest eulogy that could be pronounced on the state to which their holy functions, as priests of the spotless Victim of our altars, daily summon the clergy of our church? I glory in this feature of our discipline. Death before dishonor to a virginal priesthood!

In the second place it is a wide mistake, to say that nothing was more common, for the first six hundred years, than for priests to marry. The general council of Nice enforced, by a special enactment, the celibacy of the clergy. This was the first general council of the Catholic

church; and the practice, it enforced, was no innovation. The councils of Neo Cæsarea and Ancyra had, several years previously, made laws to this effect for priests and deacons. How was the circumstance introduced into the council of Nice? Several bishops, priests and deacons, had been married before their ordination. It was proposed to compel those who had not voluntarily returned to singleness of life, to separate from their wives. Paphnucius, an unmarried bishop, in consequence of the abuse of the Manichæans, who considered marriage as coming from the evil principle, dissuaded the council from this course, and so the bishops agreed, for all past marriages. So generally, however, was the celibacy of the Greek clergy then established, that even Protestant historians—Mosheim, 1st vol. p. 65,—complain of the melancholy, morose and unsocial institution, in the second century. “The sensual man,” says St. Paul, “perceiveth not the things that are of the Spirit of God, for *it is foolishness to him.*” 1st Cor. ii. 14. But of the many curious things which my friend has said, most unwittingly, in my favor, in the course of this debate, the most curious of all is that he should have, himself, informed us, that for the first six hundred years, one half the canons were occupied with the regulation of the clergy as to this affair of celibacy!! And why, if the clergy were allowed to marry? Is not this, independently of the acts of these councils, which have reached us, irresistible proof of the care taken to obtain an unmarried, a pure clergy? This is not immorality.

Confession is not an immoral doctrine. It is a holy institution. This I shall prove in due course of time. I agree with the venerable bishop Trevern, the learned author of the “Amicable Discussion,” and of the “Answer to Faber’s Difficulties of Romanism.” Let my friend but study these pages with sincerity, and he, too, will become a Catholic. How different the doctrine of the Catholic bishop of Strasburgh, and of the Protestant bishop Onderdonk, of Philadelphia. The former shews clearly how the most humble Catholic can have a divine assurance for the truth of his religion; the latter, as I have myself heard him declare, in St. James’ church, Philadelphia, in the year 1832, (and his pastoral charge has been since published, and it will prove what I here say,) teaches that not even the most learned Protestant can ever be positively sure that either himself or his church is right! And yet, St. Paul says, without faith it is *impossible* to please God. By faith, he of course means true faith—and yet the Protestant bishop says we never can be sure that we have that faith. What becomes now of the Protestant infallibility, for which my friend so strenuously argued to-day? The bishop’s conclusion, on Protestant grounds, is more *reasonable* than Mr. C.’s. As long as two pious and able men, of different

denominations, after all their efforts at truth, come to different and opposite conclusions upon essential matters, how can either say, "I am right," and "my neighbor is wrong?" What, I am asked, is the course I would pursue with one who is not yet a christian, but anxious to be instructed in the evidences of christianity? Why, the course I would pursue is this: *I would address his reason alone*, as long as he has no better guide—convince him that the bible is, at least, authentic history—and that he can rely upon the truth of the facts recorded in it, as he would on human testimony. I would introduce him to Jesus Christ, whose character is there portrayed, whose miracles are there recorded. I would tell him why he came on earth; how he founded a church to explain whatever was difficult in the bible, after having collected all its books together, what no man could do for himself; how he established that church as the pillar and ground of the truth, and said of its pastors, "He that heareth you, heareth me;" and when I had convinced him of the authority of the church, I would not require of him to abjure reason, but I would consign him to a higher and safer guide, that church, herself the immaculate bride of Christ.

Now my friend's allusion to the Jew, brings a story to my mind, and I cannot answer his queries better than by relating it. A Protestant and a Catholic clergyman walking together, met a Jewish Rabbi. "Well, Solomon," says the Protestant minister, "here we three are met, and all of different religions, which of us is right?" "I'll tell thee," says the Israelite, "if the Messiah has not come, I am right; if he has come, the Catholic is right; but whether he has come or not, you are wrong." (A laugh.)—[Time expires.]

Half-past 11 o'clock, A. M.

MR. CAMPBELL rises—

I shall respond to such matters as have a bearing on the question, as soon as I have finished my exposition of the immoral tendency of the Romish rule of faith.

That common cursing or damning, which offends our ears in all the lanes and streets and highways, is authorized in the following words:

"To curse insensible creatures, such as the wind, the rain, the years, the days, fire, &c., is no blasphemy, unless the one who curses, expressly connects them in relation to God, by saying, for instance, *cursed be the fire of God, the bread of God,*" &c. Ligor. Prax. Conf. N. 30.

Again: the Roman Catholic rule of faith sanctions a violation of the third commandment.

—————"To curse the living is a mortal sin, when it is *formal*; that is, (as Cajetan explains it,) when he who curses intends and wishes

a grievous evil to befall the one he curses; but it is no mortal sin to curse the living, when the curse pronounced is merely *material*; that is, when it is pronounced without any evil intention. And why is it not a mortal sin?—because he who curses a living man does not always intend to curse the soul, or to despise its substance, in which, in an especial manner, the image of God shines forth, but he curses the man without considering, or reflecting about his soul, and therefore, in cursing him he does not commit a grievous sin." Id. ib. 29.

License is given to violate, in some way or other, every precept of the Decalogue. The Sabbath as a divine institution is thus set aside:

—————"As to the obligation of hearing the HOLY THING," (which is the popish epithet for attending mass,) "let the penitent be questioned in regard to whether he has omitted that HOLY THING?" (to attend mass.) "As to servile works, let him be asked how long he has worked? and what kind of work he did? for, according to the doctors generally, those who work two hours are excused from grievous sin; nay, other doctors allow more, especially if the labor be light, or if there be some more notable reason. Let him also be asked, why he labored; whether it was the custom of the place, or whether it was from necessity? Because poverty can excuse from sin in working on the Sabbath: as the poor are generally excused, who, if they do not labor on the Sabbath, cannot support themselves or their families; as they also are excused who sew upon the Sabbath, because they cannot do it on other days." Id. ib. N. 32, 33. [Synopsis, pp. 52, 53.

"Merchandising, and the selling of goods at auction on the Sundays, is, on account of its being the general custom, altogether lawful." "Buying and selling goods on the Lord's day and on festival days, are certainly forbidden by the canonical law—but where the contrary custom prevails, it is excusable." Id. ib. N. 293. [Synopsis, p. 192.

—————"He who performs any servile work on the Lord's day, or on a festival day, let him do penance three days on bread and water. If any one break the fasts prescribed by the church, let him do penance on bread and water twenty days."—[Synopsis, p. 115.

"The pope has the right and the power to decree, that the sanctification of the LORD'S DAY, shall only continue a few hours, and that servile works may be done on THAT DAY." Id. ib. [Synopsis, p. 188.

Custom, indeed, is fast becoming, as St. Ligori teaches, an excuse for any thing. The tradition of fathers, the canons of councils, the decrees of popes—all wear away by the attrition of custom. Hence, in a Roman Catholic population, pure and unmixed, there is a degree of grossness of immorality, that Romanists themselves could not endure in Protestant countries. Even the morals of New Orleans could not be endured in Cincinnati. There, it is custom to go to mass in the morning, to muster at noon, and to go to the theatre in the evening on the Lord's day. This is indeed, the custom, or something very like it, in all Roman Catholic countries.

On stealing, in general the casuist directs as follows:

—————"In respect to the seventh commandment," says the saint, "let the confessor ask the penitent if he has stolen any thing? and from whom, whether it was from one person, or from different persons? whether he was alone,

or with others, and whether it was once or oftener? Because, if at each time he stole a considerable amount, at each time he sinned mortally. But on the contrary, if at each time he stole a small amount, then he did not sin grievously, unless the articles stolen came to a considerable amount; provided, however, that in the beginning, he had not the intention of stealing to a large amount; but when the amount already stolen has become considerable, although he did not sin grievously, yet he is bound under a grievous sin, to restitution; at least, as to the last portions that he stole by which the amount became considerable. It is to be observed, however, that a larger sum is required to constitute a heavy amount in small thefts, and more is required if the things are stolen from different persons, than if they were stolen from the same person; hence, it is said, that in small thefts, which are made at different times, double the sum is required to constitute what is to be considered a large amount. And if a considerable time intervene between the thefts, for instance, two months then the theft probably does not amount to a grievous sin." Id. ib. N. 42.

On stealing to pay masses:

-----"If the person is unknown," continues the saint, "from whom another has stolen, the penitent is obliged to restitution, either by having masses said, or by bestowing alms on the poor, or by making presents for pious places," by which the saint means churches, nunneries, &c.; "and if the person himself is poor, he can retain the amount stolen for the use of his family. But if the person on whom the theft has been committed, is known, to him the restitution is to be made; wherefore, it is wonderful, indeed, that there are to be found so many confessors so ignorant, that, although they know who the creditor is, enjoin upon the penitent, that, of the stolen goods, which they ought to restore, they bestow alms, or have masses said. It is to be observed, that if any one takes the property of another, or retains it, under the presumption, that if he were to ask it of the owner, he would willingly give it to him, he ought not to be obliged to make restitution." Id. ib. N. 44.

Thus we see theft can be made available to the behoof of priests in saying masses—what they ought to say, and by the old canons, are bound to say *gratis*.

On lying. There is a way of making lying no lying:

-----"Relatively to the ninth commandment, of popery the eighth, the saint proceeds as follows:—'In regard to the reparation of the character of a person, if the fault of which he has been accused, is false, he who defames him is bound to retract. But if the fault is true, the defamation that is given ought to be looked upon in the most favorable light that it can be *without lying*: let the penitent say, for example, [by way of excuse,] 'I was deceived, I erred.' Others also admit that he can *equivocate*, by saying, *I lied*, since every sin is a lie, as the scripture says. Again, by an *equivocation*, he may say, 'I only made this up in my head,' since all words which proceed from the mind may be said to come from the head; since the head is taken for the mind." Id. ib. N. 46. [Synopsis, p. 56.

The difference between insulting or dishonoring one's parents and a spiritual father, bishop or pastor:

"He who curses his parents, let him do penance, on bread and water, forty days. He who insults his parents, three years. If any one rebel against his bishop, pastor, and father, let him do penance in a monastery, during his whole life."—[Synopsis, p. 116.

Rules given to confessors:

“The saint continues: ‘The confessor ought to be extremely cautious how he hears the confession of women, and he should particularly bear in mind what is said in the holy congregation of bishops, 21, Jan. 1610. *“Confessors should not, without necessity, hear the confessions of women after dusk, or before twilight.”* In regard to the prudence of a confessor, he ought, in general, rather to be rigid with young women in the confessional than bland; neither ought he to allow them to come to him before confession to converse with him; much less should he allow them to kiss his hands. It is also imprudent for the confessor to let his eyes wander after his female penitents, and to gaze upon them as they are retiring from confession. The confessor should never receive presents from his female penitents; and he should be particularly careful not to visit them at their houses, except in case of severe illness: nor should he visit them then, unless he be sent for. In this case he should be very cautious in what manner he hears their confessions; therefore the door should be left open, and he should sit in a place where he can be seen by others, and he should never fix his eyes upon the face of his penitent; especially if they be spiritual persons, in regard to whom, the danger of attraction is greater. The venerable father Serrotius Capotus says, that the devil, in order to unite spiritual persons together, always makes use of the pretext of virtue, that, being mutually affected by these virtues, the passion may pass from their virtues over to their persons. Hence, says St. Augustin, according to St. Thomas, confessors, in hearing the confessions of spiritual women, ought to be brief and rigid; neither are they the less to be guarded against on account of their being holy; for the more holy they are, the more they attract.’ And he adds, ‘that such persons are not aware that the devil does not, at first, lance his poisoned arrows, but those only which touch but lightly and thereby increase the affection. Hence it happens, that such persons do not conduct themselves as they did at first, like angels, but as if they were clothed with flesh. But, on the contrary, they mutually eye one another, and their minds are captivated with the soft and tender expressions which pass between them, and which still seem to them to proceed from the first fervors of their devotion: hence they soon begin to long for each other’s company; *and thus*, he concludes, “the spiritual devotion is converted into carnal. And, indeed, O, *how many priests*, who before were innocent, have, on account of these attractions, which began in the spirit, lost both God and their soul!”’ Id. ib. N. 119.

The saint proceeds: “Moreover, the confessor ought not to be so fond of hearing the confessions of women, as to be induced thereby to refuse to hear the confessions of men. O, how wretched it is to see so many confessors, who spend the greater part of the day in hearing the confessions of certain religious women, who are called *Bizocas*,” (a kind of secular nuns,) “and when they afterwards see men or married women coming to confession to them, overwhelmed in the cares and troubles of life, and who can hardly spare time to leave their homes, or business, how wretched it is to see these confessors dismiss them, saying, ‘*I have something else to attend to: go to some other confessor;*’ hence it happens, that, not finding any other confessor to whom to confess, they live during months and years without the sacraments, and without God!” Id. ib. N. 120. [Synopsis, p. 78.

The Romanist rule of faith both in word and deed places the Virgin Mary above Christ, in the religious homage of the church.

“Nuns,” says the saint, “ought to have a special devotion towards St. Joseph, towards their guardian angel, and their tutelary

saint and principally towards St. Michael, the universal patron of all the faithful, but above all towards the most holy Virgin Mary, who is called by the church *our life and our hope*; for it is morally impossible for a soul to advance much in perfection, without a particular and a certain tender devotion towards the most holy mother of God." Id. ib. N. 171.

"*Our life and our hope!*" These words are in Protestant faith and Bible propriety due to the Lord alone.—We cannot have two *lives*; and two hopes; and if Mary is our life and hope, the Lord Jesus is not. I before alluded to this person under the Roman name of a being called "the mother of God;" which my opponent, as his manner is, served up rhetorically, as if to produce a sympathy in favor of the superstitious veneration of his party. He has not, however, a Roman Catholic audience. I mean no disrespect to any person. I know that the more intelligent Romanists discard the phrase as too gross and unauthorized. There is no being in the universe, say they, who ought to be called *the mother of God*. I had in my eye at the moment some wretched designs in some Roman churches, a scandal to any christian people: a sort of family group, in which there is the picture of a venerable old man, said to represent the Father of the universe—next an old woman, the image of the Virgin Mary, and between them the picture of the "*holy child*, Jesus." It has disgusted the more intelligent Romanists. This family of divinities is much more in the style of the Pantheon, or the poetry of Hesiod, than in the spirit, or letter, or taste of Christianity.

While on this subject we shall hear the moral theology of the church on the use of images; and, first, of the use of the virgin Mary's image:

"Let him, who is in the habit of blaspheming, be advised to make the sign of the cross [†] ten or fifteen times a day, upon the ground with his tongue: and thrice every morning, to say to the most blessed Virgin: 'O, my Lordess! give me patience.'" Id. ib. N. 16. [Synopsis, pp. 44, 45.

"Daily to visit the most holy sacrament, and the image of the most holy Mary, to beg of them the *grace of perseverance*." Id. ib. N. 14.

"O my Lordess, give me patience!" Is not this idolatry? To beg of the *image* of the virgin the grace of perseverance!!! No wonder that these folks find it expedient to expunge the second commandment, which says, "Thou shalt not worship an image"—no, "Thou shalt not bow down to it." But we shall hear the directions given concerning the divine mother:

—————"The saint now proceeds to give instruction to the parish priest how to lead his flock in the way of '*salvation*.' 'Let him be watchful,' says he, 'to render his flock studious in their devotion towards the Virgin Mary, by declaring to them how merciful this DIVINE MOTHER is in succoring those who are *devout to her*.' Id. c. x. N. 216. 'Therefore,' continues the saint, 'let him intimate to them, that they daily recite, in common with their families, five decades

of the Rosary; that they fast upon Saturday, and celebrate Novenas upon the festivals of our Lordess (nostrae Dominae.) Lastly, and above all, let the parish priest intimate to his flock, that they become accustomed often to commend themselves to God, begging of him holy perseverance through the merits of Jesus Christ and of Mary." Id. ib.

"A certain image of the Redeemer," so says the saint, "once upon a certain occasion, spoke to the venerable brother Bernard of Corlion, who *begged of the image* to let him know whether it wished him to learn to read? and the *crucifix answered*, 'What will it avail thee to learn to read? What are books to thee? I am thy book,—this is enough for thee.'" Id. ib. N. 220.

"Now, that this is the very kind of reading that papists, or at least, those who wish to be saints, are addicted to, let us turn to the great Bernard, and hear what he says on the subject of such books. This saint, speaking of the Romish churches, exclaims, 'There is so great, and such an astonishing variety of different figures (images) presented on all sides, to the view, that the people prefer reading upon the marble stones, than reading in books, and to spend the whole day in wondering at these things, rather than in meditating upon the Law of God.' Bernard, Apol. p. 992. The same saint says, 'The bishops excite the devotion of a *carnal minded people by corporal ornaments*, because they cannot do it by spiritual.' Id. ib. The saint does not mean that their devotion is excited by such shows, for just before, he said, that these carnal minded people 'preferred spending the whole day in wondering at these things, rather than to be meditating on the law of God.' He could have meant nothing else there fore, than that these splendid images were placed in the churches under the PRETENCE of exciting devotion, while the real object was, that the 'foolish people,' (as he calls them,) 'might bestow A GIFT.' Id. ib. 'O Crux ave, spes unica!' 'Hail, O Cross, our only hope!' as exclaims the Romish church in her 'BREVARY.'"

"Besides the little images of Christ crucified, and of the Blessed Virgin," continues the saint, "which the priest ought to be careful to place near the sick person, if it can be done, let him also place before his eyes large images of the Mother of God, and the Redeemer, that the sick man, turn which way he will, may see them and commend himself to them." Id. ib. N. 233.

So much for this lesson on the morality of the Romanist rule of faith. On these matters we have not time to comment. For those who think they need a comment, my worthy friend knows how to manage the cause admirably! His talents suit this exigency. He is fluent in all the dogmas of Catholicism. To these he has devoted many years and is a good judge of a certain class of human nature. He knows the power of a laugh—an anecdote—a sigh—a compliment—a picture—and, above all, he knows how much it weighs, with one class, to say, with a triumphant air, "There's logic for you!" "what an argument is that!" "I have proved it now!" "this is sound logic!" "my friend Mr. C. feels it—it is the badness of his cause—my cause is so good, so ancient, so venerable, so holy, so catholic!" &c. &c. I say, in this sort of rhetoric, my learned opponent is an adept. It has only one fault, it is too luscious sometimes, and he lays it on rather thick, to stick long upon the audience. He is performing his part nobly! For myself, I regard all this as a grave, serious, scriptural and

rational discussion; I expect the good feelings of my audience, of which I am already conscious, only by addressing myself to their understanding, and in the cool argumentative dignity of reason, fact, and argument. But really, no man, in my knowledge, could sustain the Romanist cause better than my learned and ingenious respondent; and if he fails, Roman Catholicism in the West need not look for an abler defendant.

My friend has admitted the seven methods of electing popes, but says it is no matter how they are chosen. Americans! How would you relish such doctrine in respect to your governors, judges, and presidents? If some city or county in this state should elect a governor for the whole state, would it make no difference to you? Should your chief magistrate be elected by a mob, by a party, or by force, or bribery, would you say it matters not—the virtue is in the office, no matter how the incumbent has come into it?!

The “Palladium” and “Baptist Banner” prove as much against Protestantism, and for Catholicism, as they deal in ribaldry and personal abuse. If these are arguments on which the bishop relies, they may be good authority for him; but, for myself, I need no such logic, and my cause disdains such auxiliaries. He has great use for Unitarians also, and sometimes for Universalists, and even Quakers; but in his last argument he has mistaken the point. These all appeal, in their controversies, to the bible alone, just as the Jansenists and Jesuits, the Dominicans, Bernardites, Benedictines, Franciscans, &c., &c., while they have disliked and opposed one another, all acknowledge the pope as supreme head of the church, the judge of controversies.

I am glad that he has at last admitted that the Jansenists in all essentials are Catholics, and that they are repudiated only for a difference of opinion. But where now are his objections against Du Pin? He objected to him that he was a Jansenist, as if a difference in opinion destroys the credibility of a witness—a principle that forever roots up all history; for no one upon this principle is authentic, unless he be a Roman Catholic; nor then, unless a Jesuit, and this is equivalent to saying, that no one is authentic unless he bear witness for him.—[Time expired.]

Twelve o'clock, M.

BISHOP PRETTE RISES

I shall begin where my friend left off. I am charged with appealing to the feeling, and not to the reason of my hearers: “my rhetoric is too luscious; I lay it on too thick; it won't stick,” &c., &c. Well! if my rhetoric is too luscious, that of my friend is too insipid; if mine is too thick, his is too thin. The fallacy it *would* cover, grins

through the flimsy gossamer: the weakest eye can see it beneath the veil. But I trust, I need not offer any vindication of my arguments to this assembly. They are able, and, I thank God, willing, too, to judge for themselves. They see that all, or the main force of my friend consists of two renegade priests, Smith and Du Pin. These are the two pillars of his logic. The published volume will shew how superior and how *honest* are mine. In the oral debate, I address the judgment, without neglecting the heart: and if I did present my argument chiefly to the former, it would be because of an observation of the celebrated John Randolph, in the Virginia convention for altering the constitution of the state. Speaking of my learned opponent, who was a delegate to that convention, Randolph said, "He had politics in his heart and religion in his head." I cannot vouch for the authenticity of the anecdote, I have just heard it. I hope it was not founded in fact—[Mr. C. explained—Mr. Randolph had never said so to him.] I proceed to more important matters. I did not pretend to say that an informal election had any force. But that any form on which the entire church agreed, according to the majority principle governing our own elections, was valid. It was Christ who drafted the constitution of our church. I do not much like to see any comparison instituted between it and the works of human legislators. But if closely examined, it will be found to contain the excellencies, while it excludes the defects of the most popular forms of civil government. We have a perfect feature of the Republican Model, in this, that with us, merit is the grand criterion of fitness for office. No favoritism is allowed. No matter how humble the parentage or obscure the kindred of the individual, virtue, talent and common sense are sure, sooner or later, to elevate him to any situation he may be advised to accept. The church often selects her chief officers, as God did David, "from the flocks of sheep," Ps. 7. viii. 70, from the humblest walks of life. It is to this system, of giving merit a *fair field*, that we are indebted for the brightest ornaments in civil society, a Curran, chosen for his intelligent blue eyes, his wit and archness, from among his playmates, when "*they that won, laughed, and they that lost cheated;*" as is very often the case.

To finish the conversion of the Jew, where I discontinued my argument, at half past eleven, on different principles. He knew there was a synagogue which the people were bound to consult, by the express command of God, and that it was no servility, it was blasphemy against God and often visited with the heaviest penalties, even in this life, to oppose its authority, or to contradict its teaching. He is therefore prepared to hear of authority in religion—in fact, the syna-

gogue was a type of the church, its introduction—as the church is the fulfilment and the consummation of the teaching and testimony of the LAW. The Jew having had reason to question the truth of his religion, for which, he remembers he had often read, a better was to be substituted, and aware that the time marked so distinctly by the prophets for the coming of the Messiah, has long ago past, he looks for any religious society, that can illustrate the splendid prophecies of Isaiah, respecting the catholicity, or universal diffusion and the duration of the church, from the time of the CRUCIFIED ONE. He has only to open his eyes to see that the Catholic church extends the dominion of Christ, the limits of his spiritual kingdom from sea to sea. Then he looks at the other denominations. He finds none of the qualities of such a kingdom in them. They are not Catholic, they are not old, they are not uniform. They are the contrary of all this. This is enough for him. He uses his reason, thus far, alone, because he is not yet baptized. Like the wise men, he follows the light of that star, until he reaches Jerusalem—when its light fails him, there, as the star did them, he asks, as they did, of authority, where the truth may be found, and reason and revelation concur to shew it to him in the church. He consigns himself to its guidance, he becomes a Catholic—and reason tells him, every day, *he has done right*. He lives and he dies without a doubt of the soundness of his decision, for this blessed security is the distinctive character of the Catholic. All other creeds based on the *essential* maxim of their fallibility, leave the human mind, in life and death, a prey to the most torturing anxiety. But I have not done with this very instructive incident in the discussion. If the Jew witnesses an occasional scandal in the church, he calls to mind how Adam fell in Eden, and Aaron fell, at the foot of the smoking Sinai, and Heli and his sons, the priests, fell in Silo, and that Christ said not, reject a religion, whose ministers have, personally, transgressed, but on the contrary, that he said: “*Upon the chair of Moses have sitten the Scribes and the Pharisees. All things therefore, whatsoever they shall say to you, observe ye and do ye: but according to their works, do ye not, for they say and do not.*” Thus truth is not abandoned; if the bad liver meets his merited doom.

I now come to all that farrago of the *Renegade Smith's translation* of Liguori. My friend says the Catholic rule is immoral. He approaches this topic with so much reluctance, and with so many struggles, that, conscious of his having nothing *true* to produce against Catholic morality, I was going to say to him, “SPEAK OUT.” But I didn't, and now he has said all. Well, what does it amount to? Why to this, that the Catholic church is blackened, but beautiful (*Nigra sum, sed*

formosa, as the spouse says in the canticle). She is, though misrepresented, fair, though slandered, pure. If a Catholic were always what his church teaches, and the sacraments she is appointed by Christ to minister, give him grace, to be, he would be an ornament to human nature, as well as to his faith. But "the Catholic rule is immoral and dispenses with the law of God." No; it enforces dreadful penalties here and eternal torments hereafter, for a violation of the law. If her ministers make any mitigation of her strict code of morals in consequence of the arduous duties, weak health, or other circumstances of her children, she teaches them, that if the alleged motives of such mitigation do not, indeed, exist, it is not "a faithful dispensation, but a cruel dissipation" of the heavenly ordinances; that the priest has no power but what he derives from God, and that God will infallibly inflict all the rigors of his vengeance for its abuse, as well on the priest, as on the people. If all the priests and bishops in the world were to pronounce the words of absolution over a sinner, in whose heart God did not see true sorrow for his fault, with a sincere resolution to sin no more, the absolution would be null and void, and the horrid crime of sacrilege superadded to the previous guilt of the transgressor. The hope of the hypocrite shall perish, says the scripture. We have a maxim, which must make the pope and bishops and priests, as well as the laity tremble, when we approach the dread tribunal of penance. It is this: "a good confession is the key of Heaven, a bad one is the key of Hell." How admirable are the lessons read to-day from Liguori—and they were faithfully rendered for a sinister motive—and how well does the Catholic church describe the perils and the obligations of their sacred office to her ministers! Hence it is that we assume our religious robes and hear confessions of the open church, where are also our confessionals, under the eyes of all. If Liguori were the immoral man that Smith would make him, would he have given such lessons to the clergy and pointed out so impressively the dangerous consequences of a single indiscretion, or the slightest familiarity on the occasion to which he was adverting? "I make a covenant with my eyes, says Job, xxxi. 1. that I would not so much as think of a virgin; for what part should God from above have in me, and what inheritance the Almighty from on high?" Liguori says: "He that does any servile work on the Lords day, let him do penance, three days, on bread and water." To what does my friend object in this, on the score of immorality? Is it the enforcing of the observance of the sabbath? Surely that is not immoral. Is it to the severity of the penalty? But did not God ordain the pain of death against the man who gathered a few sticks on the sabbath? Liguori allows work on the sabbath, on certain occasions.--

So do we.—Doctors work on the sabbath, without sin. So do printers, though I think not always, especially when they publish *pious* lies against the Catholics. "Which of you, says Christ, whose ox, or his ass, falls into a pit, will not quickly draw him out, on the sabbath? If a house is on fire on the sabbath, will not the Presbyterian bell ring and the citizens haul out the hose and engines? Will we not save the harvest, on a Sunday? New Orleans' profanity on the sabbath! Why, they are not all Catholics, many of them are infidels and Protestants, who there break the sabbath—and their sin, though bad enough, is not so bad as theirs, who, as it has been done elsewhere, meet in gangs for forgeries and other such frauds, on the sabbath. "Custom is fast becoming an excuse for every thing."—*No where does Liguori say this.* I call for the original. Let Mr. C. produce his proof, if he can. If he cannot, what will this community think of him?

"The Romanist rule of faith places the Virgin Mary above Christ." It does no such thing. It says "cursed be every Goddess worshiper," while it renders "*honor to whom honor.*" We know and profess that the mother has no power but what she derives from the Son. To Him, we say: "have mercy on us;" to her "pray for us." Mr. C. says, "No being in the universe should be called *mother of God.*" Was not Christ God? And does not the gospel call Mary, his mother? Did not one hundred and fifty eight bishops so call her, in the year 431, in the council of Ephesus? Who is the *intelligent Catholic*, as my opponent states, who is ashamed of what the gospel and the church sanction? I ask who is he? Let us have his name. The streets of Ephesus rung with loud applause when the decision of the council was announced, vindicating the name and dignity of the mother of God, and the words *Μαρια Θεοτοκος* were echoed from mouth to mouth, mingled with the most joyful and exulting cries of the populace, to the consternation of Nestorianism. "Son! behold thy mother!" were among the last words spoken by the expiring Savior on the cross. Will my opponent call them ill timed at that hour, when all was consummated!

"The Catholic rule makes a distinction between mortal and venial sins." And why should it not? Does not the bible, which proportions the penalty to the offence, does not the civil law, which punishes not every offence alike, does not common sense point out the distinction? Is it as great a sin for a child to tell a little, *white* lie to excuse itself, as for a son to whet the razor and cut his father's throat? I am sensible that a lie is never innocent. Nor do I excuse it under any circumstances—but it is of various shades of guilt, according to the circumstances when it is uttered. I know of national legislatures which give a bribe of forty pounds per annum to an apostate priest, to tempt him

by filthy lucre to act against his conscience—and which not so many years ago, encouraged a son to turn Protestant, by empowering him to take his father's estate and turn both his aged parents and with them his brothers and sisters, if they persisted in being Catholics, out of doors, and it would be easy for me to prove that this law was passed by many Protestant ministers, and that it was not over scrupulous in point of morality in papistical distinction between mortal and venial sins; but let us have more of *Smith's translation of Liguori*, he says let stolen money be paid for masses? No; he says first, let the rightful owner be hunted out by the penitent thief, and to him let the restitution be made. If he can be no longer found, let the money be given for masses, for his spiritual benefit, or distributed, for his sake, in alms to the poor, and what better use could be made of it—what better counsel given?

Another proof of Catholic immorality is that we are bound to go once a year to confession! Where the immorality of this is, I cannot conceive. Is it not good to be obliged to examine, at least, once a year, if not more frequently, the state of our consciences and to confess ourselves sinners? Is not this an admirable institution for the acquiring of the best kind of knowledge, the knowledge of oneself? Is it not worthy of God? Is it not God himself that instituted it? Did he not leave to his church, the power of binding and loosing from sin, when he said to his apostles, after having mysteriously breathed upon them and given them the Holy Ghost, "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained: Whatever you shall bind on earth, it shall be bound in Heaven, and whatever you shall loose on earth, it shall be loosed in Heaven." John xx. 22, 23. And my friend quoted St. Thomas Aquin, and St. Augustin, as well as Liguori, for the holy rules the priest must observe, in hearing confessions. That establishes the important fact, that in the last century, and in the fourteenth, and as far back as the fifth age, the practice of confession existed, as it does at the present day. In every age from the time of Christ it has been practised, and experience has proved it the most effectual restraint that religion has ever imposed upon vice, on passion, and on human frailty. Who can tell what crimes it has arrested? What virtue it has preserved and purified? What restitutions, of reputation and of fortune it has caused to be made? How many sinners it has stopt in the down-hill path to destruction? Voltaire and Chillingworth and a hundred others, not Catholics, have pronounced the most splendid eulogies on confession. These disinterested witnesses will furnish you ample proof on this point. But my friend before he closed, uttered one word, while he read

from the catechism of the council of Trent "*fixing a price, &c.*," for the forgiveness of sin. Now in the name of truth, in the name of this community, I ask him for the proof, for I pronounce it absolutely false.

MR. C. explained that he did not say it was done by the council of Trent.

He says that we have exalted the confessional to an equality with the throne of grace. Well might it be the footstool of that throne, if its pure principles were carried out. On the throne, or in the confessional, it is the same God that pardons the penitent sinner.—[Time expired.]

Three o'clock, P. M.

MR. CAMPBELL rises—

The gentleman challenged me this mornnig upon an important point, viz., that Protestants cannot make an act of faith—that is, be perfectly certain in their belief of the holy scriptures, or of Jesus Christ. I accept the challenge. It now only remains for him to appoint the time when, and the place where, and I will meet him on that point. But that is not the question for to-day. Let him not think to take me off, by raising incidental and foreign questions. They may remove the *ennui* of the audience for a while; but his time would have been better spent in answering my allegations on the great question. I have heard not one answer, as yet, to the question, "What gives general councils their infallibility?" and various other points of great moment to his cause: to which he had better attend, than to propose new debates. I will remind him of another question which he had better solve. "*How can a thousand fallibles make one infallible?*" Do they, by meeting together, become infallible? or, by an ecclesiastic combination, give out infallibility? This would have been more instructive than much of what the gentleman has given us. He observed at one time that the Jansenists were a Roman Catholic sect. But again, he says, that they are not Roman Catholics at all! To preserve the union of the church, their plan is a very easy one. When persons dissent, cut them off. While Jansenists agree with the majority of the church, call them good Catholics: when they dissent, as they do in some very cardinal matters, call them heretics in the bosom of the church: but not *of* it. But the gentleman's explanation of the council of Trent will never satisfy Protestants. The council of Trent at one session, had forty-eight bishops, forty-five of whom were very ordinary men. They decided that the Apocrypha and the Vulgate were authentic; that the Latin Vulgate is the true and only authentic copy, more authentic than the Greek original. These mat-

ters had often been discussed before amongst Romanists; but were finally adjudicated by the council of Trent. The modern doctrine of Catholics is, that a simple majority is infallible. "That the *opinions* adopted by the majority of the bishops are for an *infallible rule of faith*." So says the worthy bishop of Strasburg; but the proof is another matter. Now the present doctrine is, that twenty-five bishops, being the majority of forty-eight, are infallible. The opinion of a majority of a council, then, is the essence of infallibility. Father Paul, who writes the history of the council of Trent, a good Catholic, truly! says, "beardless youths were sent to that council by the pope to obtain majorities for his measures—That the pope sent packed juries, who in every question were expected to support his measures." So provoked was the good Catholic with the aberrations of Trent, that he solemnly asserts that the bishops of Trent were "a pack of incarnate demons." I think I quote his very words. He was complaining that the pope had hired and sent off young men from every part of the empire to vote as he pleased to dictate. So much for the infallibility of œcumenical councils.

My friend has pronounced glowing encomiums upon the pure virginity of the Roman priesthood, and has extolled the purity of celibacy, as essential to perfect holiness. That these priests have not been such immaculate purities, half the decrees of these very councils attest. Half their legislation is about the specks and blemishes of this virgin priesthood, as if they assembled for the purpose of hiding their shame. The bishop quoted Rev. xiv. 4., and was not ashamed before this audience to apply it to marriage. I blushed for our audience, and could not but be shocked with the freedom of attack upon the ordinance of God. Marriage is the oldest and most venerable institution in the history of man. God himself instituted and celebrated it, on the flowery banks of Eden in the state of primeval innocence and bliss. It was then and there said: "*It is not good for man to be alone.*" I believe with Paul that marriage is honorable *in all*. And as for purity; earth knows no purer, no holier state than that of holy wedlock. And could I tell—or dare I tell before this assembly, but half that I have learned of that virgin state of which my friend has spoken with such warmth; he would be slow to learn who could not perceive, that "forbidding to marry," one of Paul's attributes of the grand apostasy, has been the *fons et principium*, the fountain of untold pollutions in the hierarchy of Rome. In times of persecution, and of great distress, it may, indeed, be *prudent*, as Paul advised on such occasions, to refrain from marriage, and for some great and laudable purpose, it may be convenient, to prefer a single state; but that youth, male or female,

who for the sake of greater purity prefers celibacy, has yet to learn the very first principles of both religion and morality; and is as far out of the tract of truth and reason, as he that would cut off his own hands to prevent him from plunder.

It is essential, in my opinion, that the bishop be a married man. Indeed, the Holy Spirit by Paul has decreed that he should be the husband of one wife. As my opponent is a bachelor, I ought, perhaps to ask his pardon. Did he, indeed, possess all the other qualifications, I should withhold my vote to his becoming a bishop so long as he continued a "*virgin*." To preside over a christian congregation, he should have all a christian's feelings and experience. He should know experimentally the domestic affections and relations. He should study human nature in the bosom of his family. There is a class of feelings, which no gentleman, of single life, can comprehend; or in which he can sympathise: and these are essential to that intimacy with all classes, sexes and duties, which his relations to the church often impose on him. If he does not know how to rule a single family, and to enter into all its customs and feelings with practical skill, how can he take care of the church of God? So argues Paul: and so must I reason and judge.

Next to his remarks against marriage, as necessarily less pure than celibacy; I was sorry to hear the gentleman defending "white lies," and "little sins." When I think of the nature of sin, and the holy and immutable laws of God, against whom it is committed, I see no difference between one sin and another. There may be great and little sins as to their temporal relations and consequences: but when HE against whom every sin is committed, and that divine and holy law, which is violated in the least offense, is considered; we must say with the apostle James, "He that offendeth in one point is guilty of all." It may be the veriest peccadillo on earth: but in Heaven's account, one sin would ruin a world, as it has done, for he that keeps the whole law and yet offends in the least point, is guilty of all. He that said, not a jot or tittle of his law shall fall to the ground—He that magnified his law and made it honorable, will suffer no person to add to—to subtract from, to change or to violate a single point with impunity.

I wish the gentleman would come up to the point and defend his Catholic rule, that I might fully deliver myself on this subject; but I have as yet given a very few instances of the impurities and immoralities of his rule of faith. But from the specimens given, I would ask, does it not teach the worship of creatures and the images of creatures—does it not countenance idolatry? Does it not command the invocation of the spirits of dead men and women? Are not multitudes of

saints invoked, of whose abode in heaven there is no witness on earth? Does it not pay religious homage to beings, who by nature are not God? Does it not blaspheme the name of God, and his apostles and prophets, who are in heaven? And, may I not add—does it not annul the laws of God, and by a system of unparalleled casuistry set aside every moral obligation?

The gentleman represented confession as a christian duty. So it is; but not auricular confession; not confession to a priest. Leo I. opened the flood-gates of impurity by ordering and substituting private confession to a priest; for public confession before the whole congregation. The last entrenchment against the rapid declensions of public morals in the fifth century, was broken down by their dispensing with public for secret confession. All sensible historians, or, rather, commentators on historic facts, agree that there was no greater check to flagitious offences than bringing the defaulter before the whole congregation; and this being commuted into auricular confession, inundated the church with unparalleled impurities and immoralities. "Confess your faults one to another," is not, whisper your faults into the ears of your priest! Why do not the priests, on this their proof, confess their faults to the people?—*confess to one another!* But this authorizes no man, no woman, to degrade themselves by falling upon their knees before an old or young bachelor, and telling to him all their impure and sinful thoughts, words and actions. And ought he then to say, as if the sin were committed against him, "I absolve thee?" This is the climax of folly on the part of the penitent, and of impiety on the part of the priest!

There is no ear but God's to which our errors and our faults ought to be confessed. The secrets of all hearts are his; and he has graciously assured us that he will hear the acknowledgment and penitential confessions of all who approach him through *the one Mediator*. Is there more condescension or mercy in a Roman priest than in God? No, my friends, there is no ear more ready to hear than his; and he only can forgive. To suppose the contrary, mistakes wholly the christian institution, and argues consummate ignorance of God. It is wholly incompatible with the genius of the religion, and repugnant to both the law and gospel. And with what propriety, modesty, piety, males and females, old and young, should mutter their sins and secrets into the ears of any bachelor, priest, or confessor, as if his ears were a common sewer—or conduit to carry down to oblivion the impurities of mortals, I cannot even conjecture, unless to give them power over the penitents. I opine that I am yet in the pale of logic, though I am upon a very unpleasant theme.

The gentleman objects to some of my reasonings. He says that the church has fixed no tariff of sins! Does he wish me to tell the whole story? Is not the principle clearly asserted in the penances already read? Why fix a penance of *three* days for violating the sabbath, and *twenty* days for breaking a human fast? For insulting his parents he must do penance for three years; for rebelling against his bishop he must do penance all his life! He who kills a common man does penance three years; but he who kills a priest must do penance twelve years!

The gentleman says there is no possibility of effectual pardon from a priest, unless contrition be sincere. A word from Ligori here:

"In order to receive the sacrament of penance rightly, perfect contrition in the penitent is not required, but it is sufficient if he have attrition."—Id. ib. N. 440. The saint proves this in his exposition of the 4th chapter of the 14th session of the council of Trent:—Id. ib. [Synopsis, p. 105.

Will the gentleman explain what he means by *attrition*? I have, perhaps, said enough on this topic to prepare the way for my speech to-morrow morning on the "sea serpent!" But while on the whole premises of the rule of faith, and the mutability, fallibility, and tariffs of the Romanist sect, I beg to read, in the words of the most illustrious of the champions of Protestantism—The great Chillingworth:

"Know then, sir, that when I say the religion of *Protestants* is in prudence to be preferred before *yours*; as on the one side I do not understand by your religion the doctrine of *Bellarmino* or *Baronius*, or any other private man amongst you, nor the doctrine of the *Sorbonne* or of the *Jesuits*, or of the *Dominicans*, or of any other particular company among you; but that wherein you all agree, or profess to agree, *the doctrine of the council of Trent*: So accordingly on the other side, by the *religion* of Protestants, I do not understand the doctrine of *Luther*, or *Calvin*, or *Melancthon*, nor the confession of *Agusta* or *Genoa*, nor the *catechism* of Heidelberg, nor the articles of the *church of England*, no, nor the harmony of Protestant confessions; but that wherein they all agree, and which they all subscribe with a greater harmony, as a perfect rule of their faith and actions, that is the BIBLE.

"The BIBLE, I say the BIBLE only is the religion of Protestants, whatsoever else they believe besides it: And the plain, irrefragable, and indubitable *consequences* of it well may they hold as matter of opinion; but as matter of faith and religion, neither can they with coherence to their own grounds believe it themselves, nor require the belief of it of others without most high and schismatical presumption. I, for my part, after a long and (as I verily believe and hope) impartial search of the *true way to eternal happiness*, do profess plainly that I cannot find any rest for the sole of my foot but upon this rock only.

"I see plainly, and with mine own eyes, that there are popes against popes, councils against councils, some fathers against others, the same fathers against themselves, a consent of fathers of one age against a consent of fathers of another age, the church of one age against the church of another age: Traditive interpretations of scripture are pretended, but there are few or none to be found: No tradition but only of scripture can derive itself from the fountain, but may

y

be plainly proved to be brought in, in such an age after Christ, or that such an age it was not in. In a word, there is no sufficient *certainty* but of scripture only, for any considering man to build upon. This, therefore, and this only I have reason to believe: This I will profess, according to this I will live, and for this if there be occasion I will not only willingly, but even gladly, lose my life, though I should be sorry that *christians* should take it from me.

"Propose me any thing out of this book, and require whether I believe or no, and seem it never so incomprehensible to human reason, I will subscribe it with hand and heart, as knowing no demonstration can be stronger than this, 'God hath said so, therefore it is true.' In other things, I will take no man's liberty of judging from him; neither shall any man take mine from me. I will think no man the worse *man*, nor the worse *christian*, I will love no man the less for differing in opinion from me. And what measure I mete to others, I expect from them again. I am fully assured that God *does* not, and therefore men *ought not* to require any more of any man than this, to believe the scripture to be God's word, to endeavor to find the true sense of it, and to live according to it."—[Time expired.]

Half-past 3 o'clock, P. M.

BISHOP PURCELL rises—

I am pursuing my opponent, to-day, though various assertions, and vain endeavors to establish against the Catholic church, the charge of immorality. I said, that the grace of penance was, in our estimation, so powerful, that there is no sin which it may not efface by the mercy of God. This, Mr. C. says, is a proof of our immorality! If it be immoral to lift a heart-broken penitent from the depths of despair, and tell him there is hope in God, my friend is right. Catholics believe that there is no sin which God cannot forgive to sorrowing man. One drop of the infinitely precious blood which was shed for us on Calvary, is more than sufficient to cancel the iniquities of a thousand worlds: "If your sins be as scarlet, saith the Lord, they shall be made as white as snow." (Is. i. 18.) "Come to me, all you that labor and are burdened," says Christ, "and I will refresh you." (Matt. xi. 28.) "But," we are told, "the scripture speaks of an irremissible sin, a sin against the Holy Ghost." That sin, my friends, is indeed a deadly one. That sin is, obstinately resisting the known truth, and final impenitence, the almost inevitable consequences of suffering ourselves to be blinded by religious prejudice. This sin is more common than many (alas! too many) are willing to believe. They are in that way of which the scripture says: "*It seemeth to a man right; but the ends thereof lead to death.*" (Prov. xvi. 28.) To such Christ solemnly declares that "*they shall call upon him, and he will not hear; and they shall die in their sins.*" Such persons as these, find it easier to accuse our church of a few riots in Rome, or elsewhere, which all the power of religion could not have prevented, (and the only wonder is that they did not occur more frequently,) than to study her divine evidences, be-

Heve the mysterious truths she proposes, and practise the holy lessons she enjoins. But I must hasten to answer the multitude of heterogeneous questions which my friend has proposed.

"What gives general councils their infallibility?" The power and omniscience of God: the Holy Ghost abiding with the church, all days, until the consummation of the world.—"Can a thousand fallibles make one infallible?" Yes; and, according to your own showing, every one of twelve fallibles made an infallible; for you allowed that the twelve apostles were, individually, and of course, collectively, infallible. And, if you need more homely illustrations, does it follow, that because one thread cannot keep a seventy-four to her moorings, that a cable consisting of a thousand strong threads cannot do so? What one cannot do, many can, humanly speaking: how much more so when there is a divine promise: "*Behold I am with you all days; the gates of hell shall not prevail against you.*" (Mark xvi. 18.) I never said the Jansenists were Roman Catholics. I objected to Du Pin from the very commencement of this controversy, on the ground of his being a Jansenist. The Jansenists have been condemned by the pope. Hence, they lose no opportunity of insulting them, exaggerating their faults and suppressing their virtues. My friend, then, followed a notoriously treacherous guide, when he trusted himself, and his cargo of *notions* about the popes, to such a helmsman as Du Pin. But, bad as the Jansenists are, they are too learned in church history and in the scriptures, to become members of any Protestant sect. Their magnificent work, *The Perpetuity of the Catholic Faith*, is, probably, the most learned production recorded in the annals of religious controversy. I should be happy to lend it to any gentleman of this assembly, and thereby convince him how venerable are the doctrines, which want of knowledge induces some persons to assail. The *opinions* of all the bishops in the world, are no articles of faith. Articles of faith are defined, and they are no longer opinions. "Siquis dixerit;" "If any say:" in this manner commence the canons of doctrine to define articles of faith; and they end by the words, "Anathema sit;" in imitation of St. Paul, who said: "Were I, or an angel from heaven, to preach to you any other gospel than what has been preached, let him be anathema." This formula always marks the definitions of Catholic faith, among the acts of general councils. But it will make even the smatterers in theology, the sciolists, I could have almost said, the school-boys of Europe, laugh, to see the gentleman gravely quote Fra Paolo, or Father Paul, the sycophant of the senate of Venice, the excommunicated monk, or, to say all in two words, the "*Calvinistic heretic*," as he is justly called by the Protestant bishop, Burnet, as his authority for the proceedings of the

bishops in the council of Trent. "He hid," says Bossuet, "the spirit of Luther under the frock of a monk." Henry IV. of France detected his hypocrisy, and denounced him to the senate of Venice; and Pallavicini convicted him of three hundred and sixty errors in his pretended history of the council of Trent. I have got Paolo Sarpis' book in English, and will prove on him some, at least, of these errors, if he is quoted again, with his worthy compeers, Smith and Du Pin! Now the truth is, that there were upwards of two hundred and fifty bishops, or prelates, of different nations, nearly two hundred of the most learned theologians, and the ambassadors of many Catholic princes, at this council. It was held in Trent, a free city, and the utmost liberty was allowed in the discussion of the different questions, previously to the definitions of faith. The council met to decide anew, what had been *always, every where, and by all believed*, in the Catholic church; and the canon of scripture which is defined, was no other than what had been settled in all the previous councils for upwards of a thousand years; and the whole Catholic world perfectly understood. What, now, becomes of the gentleman's 48 by 25? Why does he *exaggerate in figures* when he talks against Catholics, and *figure in miniature* when he speaks for them? Those beardless youths he speaks of, had, I presume from Italian faces generally, as much of that excrescence as other animals distinguished by a late senator. My friend was quite tender to-day, indeed excessively eloquent, on the subject of marriage. Had he confined himself to its just praise, as the primeval institution of God, on the flowery banks of Eden, without outraging the express declarations of Christ, and the inspiration of his Holy Spirit, in the new law, I would have repeated what I have already said, in acknowledgment of the purity and sanctity of the nuptial union. But, I must borrow his own words, to say, with still more truth, that "I blushed for our audience, and was shocked by the freedom of his attack upon the ordinance of God." The gentleman may talk until the end of the year, and I would meet him at every pause with the words of Christ, Matt. xix. 12; or, if these are not plain enough to the "sensual man who thinketh this virtue foolishness," with those of St. Paul. (1 Cor. vii.) "*I would that all men were even as myself.*" "*I say to the unmarried and the widows, it is good for them if they so continue, even as I.*" (ver. 8.) "*He that is with a wife, is solicitous for the things of the world, how he may please his wife; and he is divided. He that is without a wife, is solicitous for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please God.*" (verses 32, 33.) "*Art thou loosed from a wife, seek not a wife . . . if a virgin marry, she hath not sinned: nevertheless, such shall have tribulation of the flesh. But I spare you.*"

(ver. 28.) Can holy writ more unequivocally reprobate all the gentleman's romancing about *wedlock*, to the proscription of that pure devotedness to the holy offices of the ministry, of which Jesus Christ, St. John, and St. Paul, have left us the brightest examples in their own persons? Mr. C. said: "Dared I to tell, before this assembly, but half that I have learned of that virgin priesthood;" and I, my friends, dared I tell, before this assembly, but half that I have learned, from old Protestant residents of this city, of that married priesthood, in Elyria, on Lake Erie, and in towns in the interior of this state, without casting the net over heads nearer home, I would fill your souls with tenfold horror! I would advise my friend to tread lightly on these ashes. Holy as marriage is, and holy as I confess it to be, St. Paul advises married people to forego, at certain times, the privilege of that state, to give *themselves to prayer*. (ver. 5.) The same is commanded in the prophet Joel, xi. 16. The high-priest was forbidden, in Leviticus, to neglect the foregoing injunctions, when he ministered unto the Lord; as, also, to take a widow to wife, but only a virgin. Now, a widow, according to my friend's notion, would have a better title than a virgin to have a high-priest for her husband, inasmuch as she had shown her reverence for the institution of marriage, by a previous union. And, now, let me ask again, why did my opponent labor so hard to give his Protestant hearers, the Paulicians for their ancestors, when it is well known, that these heretics condemned marriage? This, the Catholic church has not done. But, when a vow is made to God, she says, with St. Paul, (1 Tim. v. 12.) "it is damnable, in either man or woman, to break it." Has my opponent read all these texts? Does he not remember to have read in history, the honor in which the light of reason taught *all the nations of the earth* to hold virginity, and the privileges to which it was every where entitled? Has he read of scandalous damages recovered in courts, in England, by Reverends, who were mocked to scorn the following Sunday, when they went into the pulpit to preach? Has he read of other reverends, who have, had to pay damages for the slanderous reports, put in circulation by their fair companions in weal and woe? Is this the tribulation according to the flesh, of which St. Paul speaks? "The decrees of councils attest that priests have not been such immaculate purities." Well; and what do these records of the civil courts of England, and the domestic annals of broken hearts and blighted honor, attest? As well might the gentleman charge marriage with the shocking excesses, which it did not prevent in David and Solomon, as the law of celibacy with the specks and blemishes of the Catholic priesthood.

In every religion there will be bad men, and by them every virtue

will be outraged, but must we on this account blame virtue and expunge it; must we, like Moses descending from Sinai, break the tables of the law, because of a stiff-necked and a revolted people; or, on the contrary, hold up that law before them in terror, remind them of their duty, and reclaim them, by exhibitions of divine justice and mercy, to virtue? "It is essential for a bishop to be a married man." And the gentleman's vote would be withheld from me, because I am a bachelor. Why, sir, St. Paul does not mean that a bishop *should be* a man of one wife, but that *he should have had but one*—otherwise, as he was himself unmarried, he would have acted against his own rules. Now I claim to be as clear-sighted, and as well read in the bible, as my friend, and I maintain it is essential a bishop should not be a married man; for he will not then be afraid to bring home from the bed of death the small-pox, the cholera, or the plague, to his wife and children; he will not be prevented by the engrossing care of a family from visiting the "widow and the orphan;" he will have more money to spare for the wants of the poor. "To preside over a christian congregation," says Mr. Campbell, "a bishop should know experimentally the domestic affections and relations; he should study human nature in the bosom of his family; there is a class of feelings which no gentleman of single life can comprehend, or in which he can sympathise, and these are essential to that intimacy (what intimacy!) with all classes, sexes and duties, which his relations to the church often impose upon him." What does all this mean? I am sincerely shocked at this freedom. But if it mean any thing that I should answer, it would mean, that a bishop should be a bachelor to sympathise with a numerous class of christians, viz., old maids; he should have a *scolding* wife to be able to *sympathise* with a scolded *husband*; a sickly wife, an ugly wife, a drinking wife, an arbitrary wife, an ignorant, stupid wife, to *know experimentally* what husbands suffer in all these domestic relations; he *should*, and he *should not*, have children. Can there be any thing more superlatively ridiculous! As well might you exact of the physician, that he should have had all the diseases you may call upon him to cure. A bishop can study his own heart, and as Cicero says, "Timeo hominem unius libri;" if he will not learn human nature *there*, he will not learn it any where. I have much more to say on this subject, which queen Elizabeth, Oxford college, (England,) regulations to the "fellows," and Dr. Miller, of Princeton, furnished me; but whether I resume this unpleasant task or not, depends on my learned opponent. I have a large family to provide for, and I try at least to take care of it. Fifty little orphans, in want of an asylum, look to me for bread! and as Christ and St. Paul have

taught me to live, while I have ears to hear, and a heart to commiserate the hard lot of the fatherless and motherless, and claims to present in their name to a generous public, so, must I reason and judge, I should continue to live. These little beneficiaries gather around me when I visit them, and they call me by the endearing name of father! and their appealing looks, their grateful smiles, their wants and artlessness and joy excite in me emotions which a virtuous parent well might share, and an unfeeling one, who neglects or abuses his children, well might envy! I invite my friend to visit these little interesting orphans, and see how an old bachelor gets along among them.

Did I really defend white lies? I think not. "One sin, in the sight of heaven is as great as another." This I deny. This doctrine saps the foundation of sound morals; it leaves us no energy for virtuous effort; it writes the mysterious "Mane, Tecel, Phares," on the wall, for the first and least offence; it has no warrant in scripture. God often speaks of nations filling up the measure of their guilt, and what could this mean, if one sin were as bad in divine estimation, and filled up as much space as a thousand? It is true, He punishes all sins, but not alike; therefore all are not equally heinous in his sight. Mr. C. says, "I wish the gentleman would enable me to deliver myself," &c. You may deliver yourself on any point you please, I have no objection.

His next attempt at proof of immorality, was the allegation that we have destroyed the second commandment, rejecting the law against making graven images, that we may worship creatures, and images of creatures, and introduce idolatry! the invocation of the spirits of dead men and women, &c., &c. My friends, this charge of leaving out the second commandment is very stale, and, no doubt, my Protestant hearers will be astonished to see and hear for themselves that it is utterly unfounded. Here is the Catholic catechism of this diocese: it thus reads. 2. "Which is the first commandment?" Ans. "*I am the Lord thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, and out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt not have strange gods before me. Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing, nor the likeness of any thing, that is in the heavens above or the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth: thou shalt not adore them nor serve them.*" The Douay catechism is equally full, (holds it open,) so are all our bibles. I will display this little catechism here, or I am willing to pitch it among my audience for inspection. They will see that it contains the commandments in full, and that there is nothing in it, in violation of the law of God, on this, or on any other subject. It is an admirable abridgment of faith and morals. If there have been any catechisms published without the commandments in full, it is because they were

published for the use of children, whose memories were not to be encumbered by too long answers, when the sense and substance of the precept could be sufficiently expressed in fewer words. As to the division of the commandments, my friend knows that the bible was not originally divided into chapters and verses as it is at present. But with this question we are not now concerned.

It is not a crime to make an image, if we do not adore and worship it instead of the Creator, who is blessed for ever; otherwise God would have transgressed his own prohibition, for he commanded Moses to make a graven image, namely, the image of a brazen serpent, and to set it up before a people exceedingly prone to idolatry, that they may look on it and be cured of the bites of the fiery serpents that stung them for their murmurings in the wilderness. The divine lawgiver also directed (Exodus xxv.) two images of Cherubim to be made, with their wings overshadowing the mercy seat of the ark of the covenant, *towards which the people turned in prayer*, and before which Joshua and the ancients of Israel fell flat upon their faces until the evening, at Hai, when they were defeated, for the sin of Achan, by the men of that city; and Joshua said, "Alas, O Lord God," &c., vii. 7. What was the temple of Solomon, built by the special directions of that God who had forbidden the making of graven images *to adore and serve them*, but a temple of images? Never has any house, perhaps, since or before, not excepting the celebrated picture galleries of the Louvre, abounded more in pictures and likenesses of things in heaven and things on earth, than did that venerable pile, and yet God was not offended, but promised that *his ears should be attentive to the prayer of him that prayed in that place*, as we read in the book of Kings. The objection is unphilosophical, as well as unscriptural. What, I ask, are the letters G. O. D. but pictures, representing a certain idea? So written language, when first used, was a series of pictures, as every scholar knows; and the bible abounds, like the temple, with these pictorial signs. Again, where is the immorality of looking on the emblem of our dying Savior? Is it not the gospel narrative of his sorrows and his love, condensed? The council of Trent, Sess. xxv., teaches, what every Catholic knows, "that while we venerate the memorials of Christ and his saints, we are not to believe that any divinity or power resides in them." I would, therefore, express in a few words, the motive of our respect for the crucifix, and our sense of its lifelessness and want of power, in the following apostrophe: "Thou canst not see, thou canst not hear, thou canst not help me, but thou remindest me of my God."

Were the objection of my worthy opponent rigorously urged, it

would be impiety for the orphan girl to wear around her neck the likeness of a fond, but alas! prematurely deceased mother: or a soldier boy the miniature of the father of his country. The different trades and professions should be arraigned for the idolatrous practice of suspending before their doors the signs of their various occupations. The United States' mint would be a factory of idols, and every money-holder, in bank notes, or the hard metal, an idolater! Finally, if the Catholics substitute the words "honor and veneration" for "worship," when speaking of the relative respect paid to the emblems of Christ and his saints, yet even the use of this word could be defended from the Bible, Chron. last ch., where the people, as it reads in the Protestant bible, *worshipped the Lord and the King*, but surely not with the same kind of worship. The exterior act appeared the same, but in the heart, there was distinction of homage. If it be wrong and an outrage to the mediation of Christ to seek inferior intercessors with God, why did Paul ask the prayers of the christians to whom he addressed his epistles? Why did God command the importunate friends of Job to ask the just man's prayers for them? Why did he appoint a priest to offer gifts and sacrifices for sin? And why did the apostles teach us to say, "I believe in the communion of saints?" *It was strange, said king James, to the Scotch bishops, to allow those honorable places in the churches, to unicorns, lions, and devils, (griffins) which were refused to prophets and apostles! "Let them not lead people by the nose," says Dr. Herbert Thorndike, Prebendary of Westminster, "to believe they can prove their supposition that the pope is anti-christ, and the papists idolaters, when they can not."* Just Weights and Measures, p. 11. "It is a shame to charge men with what they are not guilty of, in order to make the breach wider, already too wide." Dr. Montague, Prot. bishop of Norwich, Inv. of Saints, p. 60.

Another proof of immorality is the distinction between material and formal sins! This is a just distinction. The civil law recognizes it. An injury done with *malice aforethought, or formally*, is very different, as to the guilt of the agent, from accidental and unintentional injury. A child, a maniac, a man in his sleep, or otherwise unconscious of what he does, and not the culpable cause of that want of consciousness, may inflict an injury, with impunity, for which liberty, and life should, under different circumstances, be very justly forfeited. My friend has brought up casuistry. The tendency of such punishments is salutary: and if a severer penalty is inflicted for the murder of a priest, &c., it is to preserve the inviolability of religion, which watches over the rights of parents, to the fear and love of their children, and of the law, to the obedience and respect of those for whose preserva-

tion and wellbeing it was enacted. My learned friend traduced the clergy of the Catholic church and described the dangers of the confessional. As well might he denounce the medical profession: He read numerous extracts from publications of Smith, Slocum & Co's joint-stock concern, for the defamation of innocence. He may sit down, in the lowest places, with these worthy associates, if he will. I shall not molest them in their calculations of the "*pieces of silver.*" "I will leave them alone in their glory."

The gentleman allows that auricular confession was the law of the church in the fifth century. This is generous, and he is contradicted in the concession, by some Protestants, who, for want of better knowledge, give the institution a later date. It remounts, however, farther up the chain of holy usages, viz., to the time of Christ, who gave such power to men as that expressed in the text, St. John, xx. 22, 23. This power was not to be exercised without a knowledge of the dispositions of the sinner, and this knowledge could only be obtained from his own confession. Leo I. did not, therefore, "open the floodgates of impiety by substituting private for public confession." The practice is of divine institution, and how horrid is it not, to speak thus of what all ages and nations of christianity, the Greek and the Latin churches and the sects of the east, have ever held as the work of Christ, taught by himself and every where preached by his apostles! Tertullian and Origen, who lived in the age next to the apostles, hold the following language: "*If you withdraw from confession, think of hellfire, which confession extinguishes.*" "*Look carefully about thee in choosing the person to whom you confess—confess to him your most secret sins.*" "*It is necessary,*" says St. Basil, in the 4th century, "*to confess our sins to those to whom the dispensation of the divine mysteries is committed.*" "*Let no one,*" says St. Augustine, "*say to himself: 'I do penance to God, in private.' Is it then in vain that Christ has said, whatsoever you loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven? Is it in vain that the keys have been given to the church?'*" These texts abundantly prove that auricular confession was practised before the time of Leo I. in the fifth century, and consequently that Christ and his apostles must share the odium in which my opponent presumes to involve the Catholic church. He says the practice of the public confession of sin, before the whole congregation, was the last entrenchment against the rapid declension of morals in the fifth century. And yet with glaring inconsistency, after contending for the practice so vehemently, in almost the same breath, he tells us: "There is no ear but God's, to which our errors or our faults ought to be confessed, for that the secrets of all hearts are his." Can there be contradiction more palpa-

ble? And does not the Catholic practice save the sinner's honor, gently withdraw him from the downward path to ruin, admonish him of his ingratitude and restore him to religion and to society a better man, in all probability to sin no more? "Is there more condescension or mercy in a Roman priest," asks my opponent, "than in God?" Why, the blasphemous question might have been put to Christ by the leper, when the Savior ordered him "to go show himself to the priest." Matth. viii. 4. "Is there more condescension, or mercy, in a Jewish priest than in God?"

My friend quotes St. James, "confess your sins to one another:" but he takes care to omit the *antecedents and the consequents* of the text. "Is any man sick among you. Let him bring in the *priests of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him.*" James v. 14. Is not obedience to the directions of the Holy Ghost, the calling in of the *priests and availing himself of their ministry, the indispensable condition prescribed by God himself, in the scripture, for the cure of the corporal maladies, but, much more, of the sins of the sick man?* Could my friend have been more effectually refuted than he evidently is by a text of his own selection?—[Time expired.]

Four o'clock, P. M.

MR. CAMPBELL rises—

From the beginning I have said, and I repeated it yesterday, that I would not state any fact which I could not sustain. I do not care how often I am put to the test. I have here three catechisms, in which the second commandment is omitted, and to keep up the number *ten*, they have made two out of the 10th. Here are two catechisms, published by the authority of the Roman Catholic church. The title of one, from the highest authority since the council of Trent, is as follows:

"The most Rev. Dr. James Butler's catechism: revised, enlarged, approved, and recommended by four Roman Catholic Archbishops of Ireland, as a general catechism for the kingdom. Suffer little children to come to me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God. Mark x. 14. This is eternal life, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent. John, xviii. 3. Twelfth edition: carefully corrected and improved, with amendments. Dublin: Printed by Richard Coyne, 4. Capel st. Bookseller and Printer to the R. C. College of St. Patrick and Maynooth, and publisher to the Catholic Bishops of Ireland, 1826." [See page 36.

Q. "Say the commandments of God.

A. 1. I am the Lord thy God; thou shalt have no strange gods before me.

2. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.
9. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife.
10. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods. Exod. xx."

Are these *the ten commandments of God*, as all Roman Catholic children are taught!!

The single fact that the four archbishops of Ireland, and the Roman Catholic college of Maynooth should have impiously dared to strike one commandment from the ten, which God wrote on two tables with his own finger, and should have changed and divided the tenth into two, speaks volumes in proof of my allegata against the Romanist rule of faith. But we shall hear another witness—Title:

"The General Catechism revised, corrected and enlarged by the Right Reverend James Doyle D. D. Bp. &c. and prescribed by him to be taught throughout the diocese of Kildaire and Lerghlin. [Motto the same as in the other, stereotyped and printed at Dublin by the same printer, A. D. 1827.] See p. 25.

Q. Say the ten commandments of God.

A. I am the Lord thy God; thou shalt not have any strange gods before me. Thou shalt not make to thyself neither an idol or any figure to adore it.

2. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that shall take the name of the Lord his God in vain.

9. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife.

10. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods."

This merits the reprobation pronounced on the preceding.

Again: here is an American catechism.—Yes, in this land of bibles has been published a catechism, in which the same liberty is taken. Its title is:

"An abridgement of the christian doctrine, with proofs of scripture on points controverted, by way of question and answer: composed in 1649 by Rev. Henry Tuberville, D. D., of the English college of Douay: Now approved and recommended for his diocese, by the right Rev. Benedict bishop of Boston. This is the way, walk ye in it." Isa. xxx. 21. New York; published by John Doyle; No. 12. Liberty street, stereotyped by A. Chandler. 1833." See p. 54.

Q. What is the second commandment?

A. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain."

Is *this the second commandment?* It is not. That child is taught falsehood, which is taught thus to learn the decalogue. If the Roman bishops and archbishops in Ireland and America, in this our day can thus impose on all the youth in the Roman communion, and thus pervert and annul one of God's commandments, to make way for the worshiping of images, what shall we say of the morality of her rule of faith in this and other matters?

It is a poor apology for this expurgation of the decalogue, that it is

not so done in the Douay bible: for when these catechisms were introduced, and even yet in most Catholic countries, not one layman in a thousand ever read that bible: the catechism intended for universal consumption contained all his knowledge of God's law. What myriads, then, through this fraud, must have lived and died in the belief that the second commandment was no part of God's law! It is clearly proved, that the pastors of the church have struck out one of God's ten words; which not only in the Old Testament, but in all revelation, are the most emphatically regarded as the synopsis of all religion and morality. They have also made a ninth commandment out of the tenth, and their ninth, in that independent position, becomes identical with the seventh commandment, and makes God use a tautology in the only instrument in the universe that he wrote with his own hand! But why this annulling of the second commandment? Because it is a positive prohibition of the practice of bowing down to images, and doing them homage; a custom dearer to the Romish church than both the second and the seventh commandments! It is, however, gross idolatry. So far at least as the ignorant and uneducated part of the community is concerned; no spiritual, no highly cultivated mind needs such aids of worship—nay, they would, to such persons, be hindrances rather than aids of devotion. But the uneducated and sensual mass, which are in that community,—the vast majority, literally adore the image, and delight in the picture more than in the Creator. And, therefore, the abrogation of the second commandment, by the priests, is the positive introduction of idolatry.

The Hebrew bible says and all versions of it in effect say, "Thou shalt not make unto thyself any graven image, nor the likeness of any thing in heaven above, nor in the earth beneath. Thou shalt not bow down to them nor serve them." The gentleman made as handsome and eloquent a defense of the practice of violating this solemn precept as could be well imagined. He referred us to the tabernacle and temple, of ancient time full of types—patterns of things in heaven, &c.: but unfortunately for his logic, none were permitted to worship these patterns of ideas. They were but to portray the things to be revealed in the gospel age—a picture-book, to sketch the outlines of that redemption, which the Messiah wrought, and of the worship of the kingdom of heaven. They never presumed to worship them, they looked through these outward symbols, or signs of ideas, to the spiritual substance as we look through unfigurative language to the sense.

The "*brazen serpent*," introduced by my opponent, had the authority of God, for its being made, and was a splendid type of him that destroyed the serpent, that old serpent the devil, who had bitten the

human race. When men bitten, looked at it, they were healed: but when they began to worship it, it was destroyed. I say, it had the authority of God. But where is the same authority for carrying about the bones of a dead saint, or the hair of the Virgin Mary, or the feet of Balaam's ass? Where is the first word, in favor of worshipping or making an image of the cross, or of the Savior, or of any saint? or of venerating a grave, a relic, or a picture?

My opponent ingeniously asked, if the name of God were not a picture? Profound reasoning! The name of God a picture of the same class with the image of the cross and of the Virgin! But a mother says to her infant, "my life!" and she may say to Lady Mary in the same style, "my life!" Ingenious! I would ask this Roman Catholic lady when she looks upon her child, and exclaims "my life," if she feels the same religious affections, the same pious emotions, as when she looks up to the Virgin Mary and exclaims, "*my life?*" Is not the gentleman rather playing the sophist, or sporting in jest, than gravely reasoning the subject? Certainly, he would not so teach his congregation in the absence of Protestants! This is as felicitous and as rhetorical as his allusions to the device and images on medals, or on gold and silver coin. There is, indeed, idolatry here! But there is no hypocrisy in the temple of mammon. Moreover, these worshippers adore not the image of money; but the money itself.

Next came the cherubim. What an association of ideas! What confusion in the mind that associates the cherubim in Solomon's temple, with the image on a dollar! Is the gentleman serious? Did the people see the cherubim, in the holiest of all? Aaron, the priest, only stood before those cherubim, as the type of our high priest, who offers his sacrifice in heaven: and Aaron stood there only once in a year. If he understood either the type or the anti-type, he could not adduce it either for the worship of an image or the offering of any sacrifice on earth: for, like Aaron in the holiest of all, Christ offers his sacrifice in heaven. Aaron presented the blood upon the propitiatory: but Christ entered *once for all*. As the bishop's high priest is not in heaven, but at Rome; all the sacrifice which he can offer on earth is not worth a farthing: for in the Christian and Jewish sense, no sacrifice on earth can avail any thing. Such were the types, and such, certainly, are the anti-types. Offerings for sin, now, are only made in heaven. The very allusion to Aaron, strikes a blow at the priesthood of the Roman Catholic church, as if God had not accepted in heaven, the sacrifice of his Son, and called for their assistance!!

But it is hinted that I should more fully prove the immorality of the Roman Catholic rule of faith. I have no lack of documents on this

subject. The saint Ligori, by the help of saint Pius VII. has richly furnished us with indubitable authority. "The attorney general of the devil lives at Rome," says my opponent, "and prevents the beatification of all saints." How great, then, must have been the virtues of St. Ligori, who, in spite of the devil, was canonized by pope Pius VII?! See how equivocation is taught in this rule of faith and morality:—

"To swear," says St. Ligori, "with equivocation, where there is a *good reason*, and equivocation itself is lawful, is not wrong. And if a person swears without a good reason, it is *not* to be considered a perjury; since, in one sense of the word, and according to mental restriction, he swears what is true." Ligor. Lib. iii. N. 151. [Synopsis, 159.

Dissimulation is variously taught.

—————"It is lawful," continues Ligori, "for a Catholic, when he is passing through a country belonging to heretics, and is in danger of losing his life or property, to pretend that he is not a Catholic, and to eat meat on fast days." Id. Lib. ii. N. 15. [Synopsis, p. 216.

This new old rule of faith has made some new sins, which neither patriarchs nor Jews did ever commit; and here is one of that class which no American can ever commit:

"Is it a mortal sin," asks the saint, to steal a *small* piece of a sacred relic? Ans. "There is no doubt, but that, in the district of Rome, it is a mortal sin. But out of this district, if any one steal a small piece of a relic, it is probable that it is no mortal sin, provided the relic be not thereby disgraced, nor, its value lessened; unless it be some notable or rare relic, such for instance, as the Holy Cross, or the hair of the blessed Virgin Mary," &c. Id. ib. N. 532. [Synopsis, p. 167.

There is a secret on the subject of infallibility, which the saint Ligori has begun to divulge. Custom, it would seem, since general councils are gone out of fashion, is from this time forth to be the standard of orthodoxy and infallibility; at least, in morals. Listen to the moral theology of the Romish church on this point:

"Custom," says the saint, "is defined the unwritten law. In order that custom should obtain the force and obligation of law, three things are required. 1st. That it be introduced not by any particular person, but by a community, or at least, by the majority of a community, which is capable of making laws, although, in fact, said community cannot make the laws. 2ndly. It is required that the custom should be reasonable. Custom has a threefold state. In the beginning all those persons who introduce a custom contrary to law, sin. In process of time, those who follow a custom that has already been introduced by their ancestors, do not commit a sin in following the custom, but they can be punished for it by the prince. In fine, those who follow a custom after it has become a rule, neither sin, nor can they be punished for it." Id. ib. N. 107.

"THE TIME REQUIRED ACCORDING TO THE CANONS OF THE ROMISH CHURCH, FOR A CUSTOM TO BECOME A LAW. In order that custom should obtain the force and obligation of law, it is required,

"3dly," continues the saint, "that it should continue a long time with repeated acts. In regard to the time that is sufficient to render a custom lawful, one opinion is, that it is to be left to the judgment of the prudent, according to the repetition of the acts, and the quality of the matter. The second opinion is, that ten years are required, and are sufficient; for this is the length of time required for the introducing and legalizing of a custom by the canonical law, unless it be in some place where the contrary is sanctioned." *Id. ib. Lib. i. N. 107. [Synopsis, p. 183.*

"Merchandizing, and the selling of goods at auction on the Sundays, is, on account of its being the general custom, altogether lawful. Buying and selling goods on the Lord's day and on festival days are certainly forbidden by the canonical law, but where the contrary custom prevails, it is excusable." *Id. ib. N. 286.*

"He who makes use of the knavery and cunning," says the saint, "which is usually practised in gambling, and which has the sanction of custom, is not bound to restore what he wins, since both parties know that such tricks are customary, and consequently they consent to them." *Id. ib. N. 882.*

Gambling consecrated for priests and people by the law of custom:

"We will now show, however, the *canons* to the contrary, notwithstanding, that all sorts of gambling are allowed. This we prove from Ligor's own concessions. He teaches as follows;—'The canons,' says he, 'which forbid games of hazard do not appear to be received except inasmuch as the gambling is carried on with the danger of scandal. Be it known,' continues he, 'that the above mentioned canonical law is so much nullified by the contrary custom, that not only laymen, but even the clergy do not sin, if they play cards principally for the sake of recreation, and for a moderate sum of money.' " *Id. ib. N. 883. [Synopsis, p. 235.*

A new way of sanctifying the sabbath:

"BULL FIGHTS AND PLAYS ALLOWED. On the entrance of a prince or nobleman into a city, it is lawful on a Sunday to prepare the drapery, arrange the theatre, &c., and to act a comedy, also to exhibit the bull-fights; the reason is, because such marks of joy are morally necessary for the public weal." *Id. ib. N. 304. [Synopsis, p. 193.*

The Roman Catholic rule of manners makes it even lawful to sin:

"It is lawful," says Ligor, "to induce a person to commit a smaller sin, in order to avoid one that is greater." *Id. N. 77. [Synopsis, p. 255.*

"Let the confessor," says the saint, "enjoin upon those scrupulous, who are afraid of sin in every action, that they act freely, despite their scruples, and do contrary to what they dictate, where sin is not evident." *[Synopsis, p. 173.*

This law licenses drunkenness:

"It is no sin to get drunk, by the advice of a physician, if one's health cannot otherwise be restored." *Id. N. 76. [Synopsis, p. 254.*

Hence drunkards may be acceptable communicants!

"It is lawful," says Ligor, "to administer the sacraments to drunkards, if they are in the probable danger of death, and had previously the intention of receiving them." *Ligor. vi. N. 81. [Synopsis, p. 260.*

Ignorance is the mother of devotion, even yet:

THE SINNER MUST BE LEFT IN IGNORANCE.—The doctrine is as follows: (I take it from the saint *verbatim*.) “If the penitent (says he,) is in *inculpable* ignorance, in regard to those things concerning which, it is possible to be invincibly ignorant, although this ignorance be of the ‘law of God,’ and the confessor prudently thinks that to admonish the penitent would not correct him, then, and in that case, the confessor must abstain from admonishing the penitent, and must leave him in his ignorance.” *Id. ib.*

Heretics are still to be punished, not only by virtue of the general council of Lateran, A. D. 1215, which says, “Let the secular powers be compelled, if necessary, to *exterminate*, to their utmost power, all heretics denoted by the church:” but according to the moral theology, as reported by the saint.

HERETICS TO BE PUNISHED.—“A bishop is bound,” says Benedict XIV., “even in places where the tribunal of the *holy inquisition* is in force, sedulously and carefully to purge the diocese that is committed to his care, from heretics; and, if he find any of them, he ought to punish them according to the canons; he should however, be cautious, not to hinder the *inquisitors of the faith* from doing their duty.” *Ligor. Ep. Doc. Mor. p. 378. [Synopsis, p. 294.*

From the influence of all these laws, why should it be thought strange that the clergy are exceedingly corrupt! Listen to the saint:

How many relapsing sinners are involved in eternal ruin by following the directions of bad confessors! “The saint has told us, that, **AMONG THE PRIESTS, WHO LIVE IN THE WORLD, IT IS RARE, AND VERY RARE, TO FIND ANY THAT ARE GOOD.**” [*Synopsis, p. 180.*

Yet according to these assumptions, under the sanction of Christ, all are bound to hear them on peril of damnation: for, “he that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me: and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me.” So, to despise these priests, is to despise God!

Once more, from Ligor, and I shall have given almost a specimen of the immorality and impiety of the Roman Catholic rule of faith, on general points of religion and morality. There is no one subject on which we could be more copious than this one: but from respect to our audience we shall give but the remotest hint.

“A bishop, however poor he may be, cannot appropriate to himself pecuniary fines without the license of the apostolical see. But he ought to apply them to pious uses, which the *council of Trent* has laid upon non-resident clergymen, or upon those *clergymen who keep nieces.*” *Ligor. Ep. Doc. Mor. p. 444. [Synopsis, p. 294.*

Now, if a priest should keep a *niece*, it is a very expiable and trifling offence; but should he marry a wife, he must be excommunicated forever! Thus the Roman Catholic rule of faith treats the Bible, and

annuls, at pleasure, every law and institution of heaven! Have I not, then, my respected auditors, fully proved the fallibility and immoral tendency of the doctrine and rule of faith, of the bishop's church—to say nothing of that system upon the clergy themselves, who expound and inculcate it?

One word, before I sit down, on the unanimous consent of the Greek and Latin fathers. I have said before, and I repeat it, if they agree on any two points, they are, in giving testimony to the scriptures, and that it is the duty of all to read them. So far they are all Protestant, and not Roman Catholic.—[Time expired.]

Half-past 4 o'clock, P. M.

BISHOP PURCELL rises—

The extract from Chillingworth will be viewed by men of intelligence, as one of the strongest arguments advanced in this debate on the Catholic side of the question. And it may be as well to observe, that my friend has probably first seen it in the Catholic work, the *Amicable Discussion*, from which he has quoted. Chillingworth was distinguished as a controversialist. He had a public disputation, like the present, with some Jesuits, by whom he was not only defeated, but converted to the Catholic faith. But yielding, like Gibbon, to the solicitation of friends, the importunities, the livings presented to him, or to which he was presented, by Laud, archbishop of London, he recanted, and finally, as it is on good grounds asserted, he died a Jew. The only apology he could offer for his versatility was, that he found every one of these religions in the bible—it was the only resting place for *the soles of his feet*—that is to say, he trampled upon it, to subserve the purposes of base, worldly interest! But I have now, thank God, something more tangible to offer in the way of *proof*, that nothing can be conceived more inexcusably unfair, than the arguments employed against the Catholic religion. I now pledge myself to shew to every man of honor in this city, that the last allegation read by the gentleman, purporting to be from the works of Liguori, is not to be found in the works of that writer. It is all a base fabrication, I will not say of Mr. C.; but of *somebody*. I will meet this charge with a complete and an overwhelming refutation. We have now come to an important crisis in this debate. My worthy opponent reduced to the desperation of defeat, like a drowning man, is induced to grasp at anything and to resort to abuse. But this will not sustain him. He cannot now quote from Du Pin, or send his readers back to the dark ages, and draw a grossly exaggerated picture of the personal frailties of a few popes and then ask if there can be a drop of apostolic

grace in the whole world. I have three editions of the complete works of Liguori, in my library, or in this city, to refer to; and in none of them can this vile doctrine be found. Mark, then, the proposition, my friends. It is this. That priests are allowed to keep mistresses, upon payment of a fine, but that, if they marry, they are excommunicated! I now call upon Charles Hammond, Esq. Judge Hall, General Harrison, Judge Este, Judge Wright, or any other five equally learned and honorable citizens of Cincinnati—for I only mentioned the first that came to my mind—to decide this issue of fact. I pronounce the whole charge a base, unfounded assertion, and I again thank Heaven, that I am in a city, where justice will be done to the truth, and where falsehood will be triumphantly defeated.

The volume from which the gentleman has been all day reading, is one of those books of abomination and falsehood; put forth, in the city of New York, by Smith, Slocum and Co., and it is a fair specimen of their fashion of circulating truth. Does it not furnish strong presumption to the reflecting mind, that there must be something divine in the religion which such men and women combine to abuse? It was the monster Nero, notorious for parricide and lust, who first drew the sword against the christian religion. Forget not then, I pray you, my friends, the proposition that is before us. I am determined not to slumber or sleep on this matter, but to probe it thoroughly and expose its rottenness to the world. Mr. CAMPBELL'S allegation against the Catholic church, is that Liguori, a standard moralist in that church, teaches, *that priests may keep concubines by paying a fine, but that if they marry, they must be excommunicated.* Whereas I distinctly deny that Liguori has ever taught any thing so abominable, and that all who say so, are guilty of a most flagrant violation of the commandment of our God, which says, "THOU SHALT NOT BEAR FALSE WITNESS AGAINST THY NEIGHBOR." Exod. xx. 16.

The charge of suppressing the 2nd commandment, while proof to the contrary, from the Catholic catechisms every where in use in the U. S. and from every Catholic bible in the world, was staring him in the face, may be placed along side of the foregoing! Add to these, the hardihood with which the plainest words of the Redeemer, the emphatic declaration of St. Paul, and the highest eulogy of the Apocalypse, on the superior sanctity of the unmarried state, have been violently tortured by my opponent, and a fair estimate may be made of the respect he entertains for the bible. Even his jests are but little help to his argument, for error was never genuinely witty. And when he affects to laugh at St. Paul for his having been a bachelor, I shall content myself with replying, yes! St. Paul was a bachelor: but would

he not have looked well, with seven little squealing children trotting after him, *visiting the churches* of Asia! The remark of St. Paul, "have I not a right to lead about a sister?" has reference to the practice then early introduced, of entrusting in some cases, the instruction of females, to persons of their own sex, and to the greater facilities afforded in this respect, to the apostles and preachers of christianity, to convey the knowledge of true religion to promiscuous society, whether Jewish or Pagan. I consider marriage a holy, nay, a divine institution. I respect the sanctity of the union, and pay a willing tribute of praise to the eminent virtue of persons engaged in that state; but I must reason and judge with Christ and St. Paul, that if, "he who marries does well, he who does not does better." A priest assumes the obligation of celibacy, at mature age, and voluntarily. God's grace is sufficient for him, as it was for St. Paul, and his virtuous struggles against the evil spirit, that dared to tempt even the Savior, in the desert, and Paul, who had been rapt up even to the third heaven, can make *virtue perfect* in infirmity, without the priest's being as foolish as the thief, who cut off his hands, to keep himself from stealing. I hope however that my opponent, or his auxiliary, Smith, will not be tempted to cut off his hands, for stealing from Liguori, what is better to any man than trashy gold, *his good name*. One word more. If marriage were as pleasing in the sight of God, as celibacy, why did God and St. Paul direct abstinence from marriage privileges as a preparation for seasons of greater devotion? According to my friend, should they not have commanded the contrary?

I pass, in the next place, to *relics*. The chair in which the signers of the declaration of Independence sat, the pen with which they wrote the glorious document, a bit of the wood of the tree overshadowing the grave of the illustrious Washington, are all treated with respect, and sought for with avidity: shall religious memorials alone be treated contemptuously? What says the scripture, Acts xix. 11. *And God wrought by the hand of Paul more than common miracles, so that even then were brought from his body to the sick, handkerchiefs, and aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the wicked spirits went out of them.* "The woman, troubled twelve years, with an issue of blood, said within herself, 'if I shall touch only his garment, I shall be healed,' and she was healed; and Jesus turning and seeing her said: *Be of good heart daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole.*" Even without faith or consciousness, there is a miraculous cure recorded in IV. Kings xlii. 21. "And Eliseus died and they buried him. And the Rovers from Moab came into the land, the same year. And some that were burying a man, saw the Rovers and cast the body into the sepulchre of

Eliscus. And when he had touched the bones of Eliseus, the man came to life, and stood upon his feet." I have no doubt that these texts have never been read, or at least reflected on, by learned Protestants, like my friend, who ridicule Catholics in the pious simplicity of their souls, for venerating *dead men's bones*. If the corpse of a prophet who had never seen Jesus Christ, could impart such a miraculous virtue, as to resuscitate the dead, why is it considered absurd to invoke the prayers of the living and beatified spirit that knew and loved, and watched over the Savior on earth, and that now reigns gloriously with him in heaven? If Eliseus was good, was not Mary good? If the prophet of the Savior had so much power, had the mother of the Savior none? Having now disposed of celibacy and relics, I resume the subject of confession.

I shall now proceed to vindicate the scriptural origin, the moral tendency and the immense benefits conferred on society by the theory and practice of the sacrament of penance, as held in the Catholic church, from the weighty charges preferred against it by my opponent. On this subject the council of Trent, ch. vi. teaches: "the penance of a christian after his fall (from the grace of baptism) is very different from that of baptism, and consists, not only in REFRAINING FROM SINS, AND A DETESTATION OF THEM, namely, a *contrite and humble heart*, but also a sacramental confession of them, at least in desire and at a proper time, and the priestly absolution; and, likewise, in satisfaction, by fasting, alms, prayers, and other pious exercises of a spiritual life; not, indeed, for the eternal punishment, which, together with the crime, is remitted in the sacrament, or by the desire of the sacrament, but for the temporal punishment, which the scripture teaches is not always wholly remitted as in baptism." Such is, and ever has been, the doctrine of the Catholic church, which thus ascribes the whole glory of man's justification to God, through Jesus Christ, our only Savior. She teaches that God alone can forgive sin, and that without sincere sorrow, which induces us to detest sin more than all other evils together, the words of absolution would be a mockery; and this sorrow may be called contrition, or attrition, the name matters little; it must be true, interior, preter-natural, universal, sovereign; that is to say, it must come from the heart, and from a motive suggested by faith; it must extend to all sins without exception, and be accompanied by a sincere resolution to suffer every evil, even death itself, rather than offend God any more. This is the only idea of penance, as a sacrament, inculcated by the Catholic church, and from this, it appears, how horrid is the guilt of our calumniators, who, when they find us otherwise invulnerable, assail us with the poisonous shafts of

slander and misrepresentation, pretending, while they know full well how sincerely we reprobate the doctrine they impute to us, that the pope grants license to commit sin, and that priests forgive it for money!

The power of the priests to absolve the contrite sinner, is based on the texts, John xx. Matthew xvi. where Christ gives the keys of heaven to Peter, and Ch. xviii. 13, when *he declares to all the apostles, after breathing on them, and giving them the Holy Ghost, "Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven."* By these words we consider the priest vested with a judicial power by Jesus Christ, to bind or to loose from sin; and as this power cannot be exercised without a knowledge of the sinner's dispositions, especially as to his sorrow for past sins, and his sincere resolution to refrain from them in future, which knowledge none but the sinner himself can give, we conclude on the necessity of sacramental confession to the priest, who holds the place of Christ in the spiritual tribunal. There is no immorality in this belief; on the contrary, the most incalculable benefits have accrued from it to religion and to society. If my friend say that it is impious to ascribe to man a power which belongs to God alone, I answer, that if God choose to give such power to man, it would be impious in man to deny such power to God, and a grievous sin of disobedience, to refuse to use it. If he persist in saying, that man cannot be empowered by God to forgive sin in the sacrament of penance, I will ask him, why then is man empowered to forgive sin in the sacrament of baptism? I ask, why does he quarrel with Catholics for employing the words—"I absolve thee from thy sins," when Episcopalians do the same? Here is the church of England book of common prayer; and in it, I read as follows: "When the minister visits any sick person, the latter should be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feels his conscience troubled with any weighty matter; after which confession, the priest shall absolve him, if he humbly and heartily desire it, after this sort: 'Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to his church, to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in him, of his great mercy, forgive thee thine offenses, and by his authority committed to me, I ABSOLVE THEE FROM ALL THY SINS, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'" Amen. Soon after king James I. presented to the world, in his own person, the anomaly of head and member of the English church, and lord spiritual and temporal of the realm, he asked his prelates at Hampton court, what authority this church claimed in the article of *absolution from sin?* (Mark—the new Peter

did not know his powers!) Archbishop Whitgift began to bamboozle him with an account of the general confession and absolution in the communion service; with which the king being dissatisfied, Bancroft bishop of London, fell on his knees and said, "It becomes us to deal plainly with your majesty; there is, also, in the book, a more particular and personal absolution in the visiting of the sick. Not only the confessions of Augsburg, Bohemia, and Saxony, retain and allow it, but also Mr. CALVIN doth approve both such a general and such a *private confession and absolution*." "I exceedingly well approve it, replied his majesty, it being an apostolical and godly ordinance." Bancroft was right in quoting the Augsburg confession, for the Lutherans, the real Simon Pure of the reformation, in the confession of faith, and apology for that confession, expressly teach, "*that absolution is no less a sacrament than baptism and the Lord's supper; that particular absolution is to be retained in confession, that to reject it is the error of the Novatian heretics; and that by the power of the keys, sins are remitted, not only in the sight of the church, but in the sight of God.*" Luther himself, in his catechism, required, *that the penitent in confession should expressly declare that he believes "the forgiveness of the priest to be the forgiveness of God."*

On this topic, before taking up the voluminous evidence before me for the doctrine of the Episcopalians, on this side the great water, I must produce evidence, not to be contradicted by the champion of all Protestantism. It is that of the redoubted Chillingworth. Treating of the text, John xx. 22, 3, he asks: "*Can any man be so unreasonable as to imagine, that when our Savior, in so solemn a manner, having first breathed upon his disciples, thereby conveying and insinuating the Holy Ghost into their hearts, renewed unto them, or rather confirmed that glorious commission, whereby he delegated to them an authority of binding and loosing sins upon earth, can any one think, I say, so unworthily of our Savior, as to esteem these words of his for no better than compliment? Therefore, in obedience to his gracious will, and as I am warranted and enjoined by my holy mother, the church of England, (you see Protestants use the style 'holy mother church' as well as Catholics) I beseech you that by your practice and use, you will not suffer that commission which Christ hath given to his ministers, to be a vain form of words, without any sense under them. When you find yourselves charged and oppressed, have recourse to your spiritual physician, and freely disclose the nature and malignity of your disease. And come not to him only with such a mind as you would go to a learned man, as one that can speak comfortable things to you; but as to one that hath authority, delegated to him from God himself, to ab-*

solve and acquit you of your sins. If you shall do this, assure your souls, that the understanding of men, is not able to conceive the transport, and excess of joy and comfort, which shall accrue to that man's heart, who is persuaded he hath been made partaker of this blessing."

An accredited writer in the *New York Churchman*, of the 7th Jan. one of the ablest periodicals in the United States, quotes the most convincing texts from Origen, Cyprian, Basil and Gregory, under the head of *antiquity*.

Origen (flor. A. D. 220) in Hom. 10 in Numb.

"Laiicus si peccet, ipse suum non potest auferre peccatum, sed indiget sacerdote, ut possit remissionem peccatorum accipere." The same father, in his seventh homily on Luke, "Si enim hoc fecerimus et revelaverimus peccata nostra, non solum Deo; sed et his, qui possunt mederi vulneribus nostris atque peccatis: delebuntur peccata nostra ab eo, qui ait, ecce delebo, ut nubem, iniquitates tuas et sicut caliginem peccata tua." (Lat. ver. ex Taylor.)

St. Cyprian (flor. A. D. 240) in lib. de lapsis.

"Confiteantur singuli, quæso vos, fratres, delictum suum; dum adhuc, qui deliquit, in seculo est, dum admitti ejus confessio potest, dum satisfactio, et remissio facta per sacerdotes apud Dominum grata est."

St. Basil (flor. A. D. 360) in Regul. explic. et Reg. Brev.; 228.

Δεῖ τῶν τεταγμένων ἕκαστον μηδὲν μὲν τῆς ψυχῆς κίνημα ἀποκρυφῶν φυλασσεῖν ἀλλ' ἀπογυμνῶν τὰ κρυπτά τῆς καρδίας τοῖς πιστευομένοις ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τῶν ἀσθενούντων,
Ἐλαγκαῖον ἐξομολογεῖσθαι τὰ ἀμαρτήματα τοῖς πεπιστευομένοις τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῶν μυστηρίων τοῦ Θεοῦ.

St. Gregory M. (flor. A. D. 590) in hom. 26 in Octav. Pascho.

"Cause pensandæ sunt, et cum ligandi atque solvendi potestas exercenda, videndum est, quæ culpa ante, quæ sit pœnitentia sequuta, post culpam; ut quos omnipotens Deus per compunctionis gratiam vivificat, illos pastoris sententia absolvat: tunc enim vera est absolutio præsidentis cum æterni arbitrium sequitur iudicis."

"When St. James exhorts all christians 'to confess their sins to one another,' certainly it is more agreeable to all spiritual ends, that this be done rather to the curate of souls, than to the ordinary brethren. The church of England is no way engaged against it, but admires it and practises it. The Calvinist churches did not practise it much, because they knew not well how to divest it from its evil appendages, which are put to it by the customs of the world, and to which it is too much exposed by the interests, weaknesses, and partialities of men. But they commending it, shew they would use it willingly, if they could order it unto edification. "Interim quin sistant se pastori oves, quoties, sacram cœnam participare volunt, adeo non reclamo, ut maxime velim hoc ubique observari." Calvin. Institut. liber. iii. c. 4. Sec. 12, 13. And for the Lutheran churches, that it is their practice, we may see in Chemintios, 2. part. Gan. Conc. Trid. Cap. 5. Penit, who is noted to this purpose by Bellarmine: only they all consent (how very consistently) that it is not necessary, nor of divine institution." Jeremy Taylor of auricular confession.

"For they who are spotted with sins, unless they be cured with the priestly

authority, cannot be in the bosom of the church," said Fabianus Martyr (cited by Taylor.)

Translation of the above extracts from the Latin fathers.

(1) If a layman sin, he cannot himself take away his sin, but has need of a priest, that he may obtain the remission of his sins.

(2) For if we do this, and reveal ourselves not only to God, but to those who can heal our wounds and sins, our sins will be blotted out by him, who says: "Behold, I will take away your iniquities as a cloud, and your sins as darkness."

(3) I beseech you, brethren, let each one confess his sins, while he who has sinned is yet in life, while his confession may be admitted, while the satisfaction and remission made by the priests is ratified with God.

(4) It behooveth each subject to conceal no passion of his soul, but to reveal the hidden things of his heart to those entrusted with the care of the infirm.

(5) The causes are to be weighed, and when the power of loosing and binding is to be exercised, we must see what cause preceded, and what penance has followed the fault, that the sentence of the pastor may absolve those whom the Omnipotent God, by the grace of compunction, enlivens: for then the absolution of the minister is correct when he follows the decree of the eternal Judge.

[For English divines, see close of last speech of Saturday, January 21.]

THURSDAY, JANUARY 19TH, *Half-past 9, A. M.*

The 3d Proposition being read—

"She is the Babylon of John, the Man of Sin of Paul, and the Empire of the Youngest Horn of Daniel's Sea Monster,"

Mr. CAMPBELL rose and said:

I could have wished, my fellow citizens, that this proposition had been nearer the close of this discussion. But as my nine propositions were first arranged as themes for lectures, rather than as propositions for debate; I could not materially alter either the verbiage or order, after I had been invited to discuss them with my present opponent. Without further ceremony, I proceed to sustain the proposition.

I am not insensible of the difficulties and objections we have to encounter, when we presume to prove any thing from the figurative and symbolic language of prophecy. The difficulties are not, however, so great as at first view may appear. Symbols are exempt from some of the objections lying against literal descriptions—*They need no translation.* Sun, moon, and stars speak the same sublime language to every eye, and suggest the same devout and lofty emotions to every heart. A lion, a leopard, a bear,—an earthquake, a tempest, a swelling sea, are types of the same ideas, and call forth the same thrilling sensations in every spectator. Hence the wisdom in selecting appropriate symbols of the persons and scenes which fill up the great drama of human existence, and diversify the prophetic chart, which the revealing Spirit holds

up to the eye of the diligent and faithful student of the word and providence of God.

But, as on a globe of 13 inches diameter, the earth with all its oceans and continents, its mountains and valleys, its lakes and islands, cities and districts, can be displayed in the proper positions and relative sizes of all its parts, and in an instant presented to the eye; so in a symbol, can be grouped together all the grand characteristics of a people or an event, and so accurately and comprehensively, that by a single glance of the eye more can be learned than from the perusal of a volume.

This is, indeed, an advantage which figurative representation has over that which is purely literal and descriptive. By a glance of the eye on a globe, or a map, one can have a better idea of a country, or of the earth, than from the reading of volumes; so by considering a symbolic representation, we may acquire a more vivid and comprehensive view of a subject than by the perusal of many pages.

There is but one eye in the universe that pierces all nature through; to which the past, the present, and the future are equally plain. God alone knows the future. He has revealed it. In the seventh chapter of Daniel, now lying before me, we have one great meridian line, which runs from the Euphrates to the ends of the earth, and from the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, the proudest of Assyrian kings, to the ultimate triumph of the Gospel throughout the whole earth.

We shall rapidly sketch the contents of this chapter, which embraces more of human destiny than can be gleaned from all human records. Daniel is in vision translated to the Mediterranean—the great sea—symbol of people in commotion; as the *earth* is of the people at rest. There can be no more appropriate or striking picture of human society than the sea. Sometimes it is tranquil and smooth as oil, like a splendid mirror reflecting the azure vault of heaven: anon it is ruffled by a gentle breeze that ripples softly on its bosom: again, it swells and foams and rages in huge mountain waves that strike with a sublime awe the eye of every beholder. So the people who, to day are all in peace and amity in the smooth current of their daily avocations, by some evil wind or passion are swollen into some mob, or tumult, or tremendous conflict, which for a moment rends the social compact, destroys all confidence, and jeopardizes the best interests of all. Thus in the symbol now before us;—the winds, the passions of men, are in some great tumult. They strive upon the great sea. Four terrific and appalling savage monsters in quick succession rise.

They were all sea monsters, for God's symbol of a tyrannical government has always been a savage wild beast. The first was like a lion with eagle's wings—the fortunes of this eagle-winged lion com-

ing out of a tempestuous sea, fitly symbolized Assyria in its rise, glory, and decline, after the dynasties of more than fourteen hundred years.

The savage beast, like to a bear, raising itself on one side, standing with three ribs in its mouth, viz., Babylon, Lydia and Egypt, represents, because of its *rapacity* and *cruelty*, the empire of the Medes and Persians. This rose from the sea which overwhelmed the Assyrian power: and it continued for two hundred years.

A leopard-like monster, with four heads and four wings upon its back, indicates the rapid conquests of Alexander. His short-lived empire of ten years, reared upon the ruins of the Medo-Persian, and spotted with various nations, finally partitioned among his own four principal generals, is most appositely represented by the symbol of the sixth verse.

But a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly, having great iron teeth: which devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it, diverse from all the beasts that were before it, having *ten horns*, portrays the Roman empire in those fortunes connected with the principal figure in the group. Interpreters are as much agreed about the import of these symbols as are lexicographers in defining the ordinary words of human speech. For, although they may differ about the time when, or the place where, one of these symbols may rise, or fall, there is scarcely any controversy on the symbols themselves, or subjects to which they refer.

But the principal figure in these four monsters remains yet to be described. "I considered," says the prophet, "and, behold, there came up among them (rather, 'behind them' and unobserved) another LITTLE HORN, before which, three of the first horns were plucked up by the roots." *Horns*, as defined by the Spirit, mean kings or kingdoms. The Roman empire was first partitioned between ten kings or states, after the irruption of the northern barbarians.—Pepin, the king of France, gave to a pope of Rome one horn, viz., the exarchate of Ravenna. Charlemagne gave to Peter's successor the kingdom of the Lombards—the second horn; and Lewis *the Pious* confirmed to the Pope the *State of Rome*, a third horn of the original ten. Thus, before the *little horn* became very conspicuous, three horns made room for it, and it occupied their places.

But the *eleventh horn* is particularly described in the words following, to wit: "In this horn were *eyes* like the eyes of a man, and it had a *mouth* speaking great things." Here we have a horn, a government, full of eyes,—sagacious, politic, cunning: and eloquent, persuasive, boastful, rhetorical, for such are the chief attributes of the *horn* full of eyes, having a *mouth*. &c. The identification of this horn is the grand

point before us. We shall, therefore, hastily seek out its distinguishing attributes.

By reading the chapter with, now and then, the interposition of a word, we shall see that the peculiarities of the *little horn* are clearly and definitely marked.

"I beheld," says Daniel; "I contemplated the horns till the thrones were cast down (rather set up: as in the Vulgate, *positi sunt*,) and the ANCIENT OF DAYS did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool, his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him, thousand thousands ministered to him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him, the judgment was set and the books were opened. I beheld then, because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake, I beheld till the beast was slain and *his body destroyed*, and given to the burning flame." Mark, the entire and complete destruction of the beast of the *little horn* is assigned to his arrogance and blasphemy,—because of the words which he spake against God and his saints." The other beasts simply lost their dominion, but their lives were spared. "As concerning the other beasts, they had their dominion taken away, but their lives were prolonged." So ends the general statement concerning the whole, and the broken, and the restored, empire of the fourth beast.

But to proceed to the second part of the vision. "I saw," &c. "One like a SON OF MAN—(*bar-enosh*) came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the *Ancient of days*, and they brought him near before him, and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed. I asked the meaning of all this, so he told me and made me understand the interpretation of the things."

We have now an interpretation authorized and confirmed. "These great beasts which are four, are four kings which shall arise out of the earth. But the saints of the MOST HIGH shall take (receive) the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever—even for ever and ever." "Then I would know the truth (meaning) of the fourth beast (empire,) and of the ten horns; and of that horn that had eyes, and a mouth that spake very great things, whose look was more stout than his fellows." The interpreting angel then explains this portion of the vision. "The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom." (King and kingdom are sometimes used interchangeably.) There never were but four great universal empires on earth, and *there never will be another*, except that

of the Messiah.—His universal empire will be the fifth. The fourth beast “shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down and break it in pieces.”—So did the Roman empire. And the ten horns are ten kings (or kingdoms) which shall arise out of this empire or kingdom; and *another* (THE LITTLE HORN) shall arise AFTER them. And he shall be DIVERSE (not merely political) from the first (ten) and he shall subdue three kings; not only shall three of the kings give place to him,—but he shall destroy the antagonist power of the three empires that preceded his. “He shall speak great words against the MOST HIGH, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws.—(These three never met in any beings save the popes of Rome.) And they shall be given into his hand until a time, and times, and the dividing of a time.”

A *time* is one annual revolution; a *times*, two; and half a *time*, half a year; in all, *forty-two* months; or one thousand two hundred and three score days,—the product of forty-two thirties; or forty-two Jewish months. Of all this, and of one day being given for a year, there is no controversy among Catholics or Protestants. The continuance of the empire of the LITTLE HORN is therefore predestined to twelve hundred and sixty years.

But the judgment shall sit. The long prayed for and expected judgment shall be given *in favor of the saints*. Then shall be taken away his dominion to *consume* and to DESTROY it unto the end or consummation. “Then” with anticipated triumph be it spoken—“the kingdom and dominion and the greatness of the kingdom, under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the *Most High*.—(They were not all worn out by the *Little Horn*) whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, AND ALL DOMINIONS SHALL SERVE AND OBEY HIM.” Hitherto is the end of the matter.

Now of all these items the sum is—

1. It is a beast, or empire, or power, that grew out of the Roman beast.
2. It rose after the empire was divided into *ten* kingdoms
3. It was a *new* and *different* power, sagacious and politic—with human eyes—an eloquent, persuasive, and denunciatory power.
4. It supplanted and displaced *three* of the original states of the Roman empire or of the ten kingdoms into which it was at first divided.
5. It assumed more than any other empire. It uttered great things and its look was more stout (daring) than its fellows.
6. It made war not against sinners, like other empires—it made war against *saints*.

7. It prevailed for a long time against them. It "*wore out the saints.*"

8. It presumed to change *times and laws*. How many fasts, and feasts, and saints, and new laws, and institutions has this power set up!

9. It had power to hold in subjection all saints, and to lord it over them for a long time.

10. It was to be *consumed*, gradually wasted as the Protestant Reformation has been wasting its power and substance for three centuries—and is yet finally, suddenly and *completely* to be destroyed. Can my learned opponent find all these characteristics and circumstances in any other power or empire in the history of all time? I trust he will give me an opportunity to expatiate on these points and to defend them more fully.

Meantime, to excite attention, I positively affirm that these items never met in any King, Kingdom, State or Empire, save that of Papal Rome. There, and there only, can they all be found as large as life; and as exact as answers the image in the mirror to the face.

But I hasten to identify this prediction with the Babylon of John. And in doing this I can at present but sketch the rudest outline. Let us open the 13th chapter.

John stands in vision on the shore of the great sea, the Mediterranean. He saw a savage beast rising out of the sea. It had *seven heads* and *ten horns*, and on its heads the names of blasphemy.—It resembled the lion, the bear, and the leopard. It was composed of all that is savage. The dragon, the serpent of my opponent, Pagan Rome gave him his power and his throne, and great authority.—How much does this resemble the vision of Daniel! This seven headed Empire with ten horns—It is on this beast the women sat—subsequently pictured out as **BABYLON THE GREAT**. This is the *Latin* Empire which sustained the Latin church. This is the beast out of which the **LITTLE HORN** grew.

The wounded head or the *imperial*, which was the sixth head, was healed by the great Charles, and his new empire controlled by the ecclesiastical beast, spoke blasphemies and daring things against God, his name, and all that dwell in heaven. This new religion and political Empire "*made war against the saints and overcame them.*" "*And it continued for forty-two months,*" "*a time, and times and a dividing of time.*"

His dominion extended over all the western Roman Empire. But next comes the *Little Horn*—the ecclesiastical beast.—In John's vision this beast resembles a lamb, but it speaks like a *dragon*! Christian Rome spoke like Pagan Rome! It obliged *all the earth* to worship the dragon—It was *Catholic*!! It made an *image* of the Pagan beast. It

gave life to this image, and compelled all to die or worship the image of the Pagan beast. It was then a bloody persecuting beast. It was idolatrous as Pagan Rome. But instead of worshipping dead heroes it worshiped dead saints—instead of Goddesses it has Lordesses; angels instead of demi-gods.—

Indeed Papal Rome has borrowed much from Pagan Rome—Old Rome had her *pontifer maximus*, her purgatory, priests and priestesses, her victims and “*hosts*.” She had her lustral water as modern Rome has her holy water. She had her vestal virgins as her descendant has her nuns. She had her Pantheon as modern Rome has her Vatican, and in the niches where stood the gods of the *dragon* now stand the saints of the Roman Draconic lamb.

My present argument requires me to identify this beast with the Roman church or with the Little Horn.—And therefore in addition to the resembling attributes already traced I proceed to the most definite of its marks. “Here is wisdom. Let him who has understanding compute the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man, and his number is six hundred and sixty six.”—

The ecclesiastic beast, or kingdom is thus definitely the letters of a name which together make 666. The name of a man is the name of this kingdom. Now we begin with a Roman saint—even with the great Irenæus. We shall find in the name of the king and founder of the Latin empire the name of this prophetic personage—It is said by the *saint* that among the Greeks the king’s name was written *Lateinos*, the letters of which being numerals in that language exactly made the sum: for

Δ	30
α	1
τ	300
ε	5
ι	10
ν	50
ο	70
ς	200
	<hr style="width: 50px; margin: 0 auto;"/>
	666

He made the name of the founder stand for the name of the empire. But Bellarmine, a learned Jesuit, objects to this—that in the language and at the time the Revelation was written the orthography of this name was *Δατινος*, and not *Δατεινος*. And this being so there is a plausible, nay a relevant objection against the interpretation of Irenæus. We pause not to examine this matter; because we find a much more consistent and convincing exposition in the true and proper name of the Institution which in Greek was always written in full.

Η *Δατινη βασιλεια*. The Latin Kingdom. H=8, Δ=30, α=1, τ=300, ι=10, ν=50, η=8, θ=2, α=1, ς=200, ι=10, λ=30, ε=5, ι=10, α=1: The sum, 666.

The conclusion from these premises is, that as there is no other kingdom on earth whose name is exactly 666—and as the beast, the symbol of this kingdom, has been proved to be the *Latin empire*, and *He Latine Basileia*, being proved to contain 666, this definitely and clearly marks out the Roman Institution as that to which the 13th chapter of the apocalypse and the 7th chapter of Daniel refer.

The only question of apparent difficulty that can be here asked, is:—Whether Rome Pagan or Rome Papal is intended: for that Rome is intended cannot be questioned. That it is Rome Papal is evident from the fact that what is called the second Beast, chap. 13, verse 12, is, chap. 18 and 20, called the false prophet—and this is the beast whose name is given as numerically equivalent to 666.

This moreover explains that love of *Latin* which to this day distinguishes this party. They not only have long gloried in the name *Roman* or *Latin Catholic* or Church of *Rome*, but they still say mass in Latin, and perform their religious services in that dead language; for although Paul “had rather speak five sentences in the vernacular, than ten thousand sentences in an unknown tongue”—that he might edify his hearers,—and although in the age of the “primitive Fathers” the whole church prayed and taught in the language of every country where they worshiped; still for the sake of *Latin*, to this day and even in this country, Romanists perform their most devout services in that dead and foreign tongue as though God himself preferred that language to every other. Thus they are providentially bearing to all nations and languages the grand mark, and the number of the name which identifies them as the beast and Babylon of John.

To return to the imagery of the Prophet John:—In the 17th chapter this ecclesiastic establishment is compared to a great harlot, with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication, and as having intoxicated all the inhabitants of the earth with the wine of her whoredom. The woman is further identified by being described as sitting upon a *scarlet beast*, full of blasphemous names, having *seven heads* and *ten horns*; and she is adorned with purple and scarlet, with gold, and diamonds, and pearls; having a golden cup in her hand, full of the abomination and pollution of her whoredoms. She had upon her forehead her name written:—“MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS, AND OF THE ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH.” And to make the matter more certain, the Spirit testifies, verse 18: “The woman which you saw is the great city (spiritually called Babylon, literally, Papal Rome) that rules over the kings of the earth.”

Having thus connected these symbols, and seen the co-adaptation to the same subject we shall here introduce the Apostle Paul with his

plain and unfigurative description of the Man of Sin, 2d chap. 2d Thessalonians, and examine the congruity of his description with the symbols of Daniel and John. He may be regarded as the literal interpreter of them both.

“ Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work; only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all powers, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. Verses 3-10.

The Apostle foretells an *apostacy* (a falling away) in the Church; which apostacy would issue in the full revelation or manifestation of THE MAN OF SIN, (or of *idolatry*, for this is *the* sin of Jews and Gentiles.) The *Man of Sin* is again designated as the SON OF PERDITION. He was the subject of past prophecy as Judas was; for on that account he too was called the Son of Perdition—foredoomed to ruin. The names of *Man of Sin* and *Son of ruin*, fitly represent this apostacy. The attributes and circumstances peculiar to this passage are the following:

1. He was to come forward stealthily by degrees and unobserved, (like Daniel's Little Horn, to grow up behind the others) “ The secret, or mystery of iniquity already inwardly works.”

2. He could not be revealed till “ He who restrains or lets (the Pagan power) be taken out of the way.” Political power as well as ecclesiastic was necessary to his development. So the Little Horn did not appear conspicuous till after the ten horns grew out of the fourth beast. The Man of Sin is, in historic truth, the youngest horn that sprung from the Pagan beast.

3. He was to exalt himself above all that is called *a God*, or an object of worship. My learned opponent will agree with me that *God* here may mean, as sometimes it does in the Bible, a magistrate or king. And certainly not only in the arrogant titles which he assumes, but in the dispensations which he has granted, in respect to laws divine and human, no magistrate, king, or potentate, ever claimed so much on

earth as the Man of Sin, as the Popes of Rome. He is not only styled "Universal Father," "Holy Father," "His Holiness," "Sovereign Pontiff," "Supreme Head of the Church on Earth," "Pater Familias," "Successor of Peter," "Prince of the apostles," "Infallible One," "Vicar of Christ," "Lieutenant of Christ," "Prince of the World;" but he is styled, still more blasphemously, "Lord of Lords," a god on earth, "Lord God the Pope."

4. He places himself "in the temple of God." This ascertains the Man of Sin more specifically than any other attribute or circumstance in the passage. He is no Pagan idolater; he is no infidel Jew; he is no author of a new religion; but he sits in the Church of Jesus Christ—God's building—God's temple—holding the fundamental truths of religion, as did this community when the Man of Sin invaded the Church; for, yet, the great *facts* of Christianity are acknowledged by the Church of Rome, though "*made of no effect* by her traditions."

5. He exhibits or "shows himself to be a god." He claims to reign not only for Christ as his vicar, but the homage due to a representative of God he haughtily appropriates to himself. Such is the prediction of the man of sin; and who that is conversant with the history of the popes of Rome, from their coronation, standing on the altar in St. Peter's church, receiving the title of God's vicegerent, assuming the honors of the supreme head of the whole church; power over the angels of heaven, over the inhabitants of Hades, and over the laws and statutes of the bible, can think that Paul exaggerates the picture by saying that this son of perdition, and man of sin, was to pass himself off, was to "*show himself as a god.*"

6. He is called THE LAWLESS ONE; verse 8, "*the wicked one.*" So Daniel's little horn is represented as "changing (or seeking to change) the times and the laws." Instances of such dispensations and indulgencies could be multiplied, *ad libitum*, demonstrative that such have always been the professions and assumptions of the "*Princes of the Apostles.*"

7. But another incident in the history of the decline of the man of sin deserves our attention, and singularly identifies him with the empire of the little horn. "Whom the Lord shall *consume* (or slay) by the spirit of his mouth, and *destroy* by the brightness of his coming." And of the dominion of the little horn, says Daniel: "They shall *consume* and *destroy* it to the end." Paul seems to have quoted the very words of Daniel, and thus most unquestionably identified the *man of sin* and *little horn* as designating the same apostacy from Christ and his religion.

8. In describing the coming of this man of sin, he is compared to

the deceptions, assumptions, and approaches of Satan, who has often assumed a divine mission or the power of miracles. So the Roman church has ever pretended to the power of working miracles, and has gained and still retains much power by false signs and lying wonders.

Of this apostacy, and of the rise and progress of this man of sin, as described by Paul, we may mark his growth and progress in full agreement with the records of authentic history in the following order and style:—He was an embryo in Paul's time. (The mystery of iniquity doth already inwardly work). He was an infant in the time of Victor I., 195. He was a bold and daring lad in the time of Constantine the Great. A sturdy stripling in the days of Leo I., when auricular confession came in. He was nineteen years old in the days of Justinian's code; and a young man full twenty-one, when Boniface III. received from Phocas the title of Universal Patriarch or Pope, A. D. 606. He was twenty-five when Pepin and Charlemagne gave him political power and glory, A. D. 760: and at full prime, or at thirty-five when Gregory the Great took the crown from the emperor Henry and gave it to Rudolphus. He had reached his grand climacteric in the days of Wickliff, and Luther gave him a mortal thrust, which introduced into his system that chronic consumption under which he has ever since lingered. But it remains for John the apostle, and last prophet of the church, to declare his last agony and final overthrow.

As we have no time more than to sketch the naked outline, we shall hasten to the consummation, as respects the Babylon of John, so exactly identified with the subject before us. In his apocalyptic developments, 18th chapter, he declares her final doom. My proposition carries in it the indication of a monster. *She is the Man of Sin! Babylon the Great—a city, a beast, a woman, a state, a persecuting power; scarlet, purple, drunken with the blood of the saints, with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus!!* MYSTERY! By mystery she rose, she reigns;—her mystery of purgatory, transubstantiation, relics, miracles, signs, sacraments, and unfathomable doctrines, have given her power: for, says Paul, (2d Thess. ii.) describing the advances of this son of ruin, and lawless one, "His coming is according to the operation of Satan, in all power and lying wonders."—Douay Testament.

Babylon, the ancient capital of Chaldea, great as it was, was but the type. Her antitype is the spiritual city. This city sits upon the seven mountains of the "*Holy Roman Empire*," which the heirs of Pepin erected. For thus did they blasphemously designate the new empire erected out of the seven grand electorates of Germany, the seven heads of that empire which sustained the assumptions of the papal see.

But we have now to do with her overthrow. The means of her decay are, first, the spirit of the Lord's mouth. The reading, preaching, and circulating of the Bible. The second is the hatred of the ten horns; "For the ten horns which thou sawest upon the beast, these shall hate the whore, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh and burn her with fire." *Flesh* is the symbol of riches. And riches she has had beyond comparison. It is said, that in two churches in Spain, some fifty years since, there were more gold and silver, in saints, apostles, and angels, than the richest sovereign in Europe was worth. Her real and personal estate has never yet been valued. But the political powers shall get tired of the cupidity and insatiable appetite of this monster, and shall plunder her resources and confiscate her estate, as in France and England, and thus shall her ruin commence. But at the moment when judgment shall be given in favor of the saints of the Most High,—when the hour of her destruction has come suddenly and in an instant, as when an angel hurls a millstone into the sea, shall Rome with all her glory be swallowed down, and engulfed in immediate and eternal ruin. We do expect in the final catastrophe of Papal Rome a combination and concentration of Almighty wrath. The vials of God's fiercest anger await her. The Plagues of Egypt, Sodom, and Jerusalem are in store for the Son of Perdition. In the battle of Armageddon, blood shall flow for 1600 furlongs, to the bits of the horses' bridles. It is remarkable, that this 1600 furlongs make exactly the whole extent of *the State of Rome*, which the popes have so long held. From the Tiber to the Po is just 200 miles or 1600 furlongs. Still the last act of this appalling drama will be short. The artillery of Heaven's vengeance shall burst upon her in a moment; for Omnipotence has a long controversy against her for her evil deeds. I have only time to add, that all things said by Daniel, Paul, and John perfectly harmonize in the suddenness and completeness of her destruction. However gradual, for a time, the consumption and decay of her strength and glory, she will die a violent death; for all the witnesses attest that a sudden and overwhelming destruction awaits her.

But amid the tremendous darkness of this dread hour, the bright and morning star of Israel appears: for as soon as the flying angel, as it flits cross the heavens, announces in words of everlasting joy, that the hour of her judgment has come, the angel in his rear, attendant on his flight, shouts triumphantly from east to west: "It is fallen! It is fallen! Babylon the great is fallen!" Then shall there be "voices and thunders, and lightnings, and the universal earthquake which shall bring the cities of the Gentiles to the dust." Then will

be the time when a voice from heaven exultingly shall say: "Rejoice over her, ye holy apostles and prophets; for God has avenged you on her! Then the immense multitude of saints,—the martyred millions in heaven shall say: Hallelujah! Salvation, and glory, and power be to the Lord our God: for his judgments are true and righteous: for he has judged the great harlot, who corrupted the earth with her fornication, and he has avenged the blood of his servants shed by her hand! And a second time they said, Hallelujah! and the smoke of her torment ascended forever and ever!"

Then, indeed, shall the kingdoms of the whole earth become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his anointed. Then the cause, so long oppressed, shall universally triumph: for ages of prosperity and joy are yet to crown the labors of Messiah; and untold millions, the trophies of his mediation are yet to gladden heaven and earth by their cheerful submission to his authority, who shall then be acknowledged the rightful *King of kings and Lord of lords*.

Such a catastrophe is even feared at Rome itself. The popes have uttered it abroad; they have proclaimed to the world that they felt St. Peter's chair tremble under them;—that the throne of the prince of the apostles now totters to its fall. In dolorous strains they lament in their encyclical letters the prevalence of liberal (with them infidel) principles. Even in Italy and in Spain the sovereign pontiff observes indications of the spirit of the age. Free discussion, the liberty of the press, or even a whisper about free government, in the environs of Rome, grievously afflicts him. It has been said by the most intelligent in the internal affairs of Roman Catholic countries, that it would not be the most unexpected event if the present incumbent of the Papal chair should be the last of the popes of Rome.

Public opinion is fast changing even in those countries, and there is an under-current which, like a subterranean fire, is liquifying the foundations of the hills and mountains on which this proud superstructure rears its aspiring head. The pope is looking abroad, perhaps to the "mountains of the moon," or to the great valley, as to a wilderness, in which there may be an asylum reared for him in such a contingency as might drive him from the Eternal city. Who knows but that the ecclesiastic politics of Roman Catholic Europe have aided the tide of emigration prospectively, on the chances that are to decide the fortunes of the hierarchy in the Old World?

But the destinies of western Rome, the theatre of the prophecies before us, exhaust the symbols of these predictions. The fortunes of our country and of the Papacy here, belong to another chapter. Whether it shall simultaneously fall in the New World, or shall seek

here to recruit its shattered interests, and seek to found a great American Roman Catholic hierarchy, is a question of grave import, which it is not my province to examine.

Such, however, are its origin, its history, and its doom in the Old world, as sketched by the finger of God. And the history of Europe, for twelve hundred and thirty years, proves, beyond a reasonable doubt, that Daniel, Paul, and John spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit.

I cannot sit down without an apology for the rudeness of this great outline. It would require hours to fill up the map which I have laid before you. I have endeavored only to establish the grand landmarks, and point out the bearings of prophecy upon this institution. In hopes that my learned opponent will give me an opportunity to fortify the weak points, and to illustrate the obscure, I give place; having, as I judge, redeemed the pledge which I tendered in my fourth proposition: for in the history of all time, no person will ever find any one subject in which so many—nay, all the grand characteristics of this prophetic tyranny, so clearly, literally, and harmoniously meet as in Papal Rome. On this point I challenge special investigation.—[Time expired, *plus 9* minutes.]

Half-past 10 o'clock, A. M.

BISHOP PURCELL rises—

Before I take review of my friend's last speech, I wish to complete my previous one. I was speaking on the subject of auricular and private confession, when I was last up, and endeavoring to prove that it was a practice not contrary to scripture, nor immoral. I have, in proof of this position, quoted authorities from scripture, from the ancient records of the Catholic church, and from the divines and practice of the English church. I now add to them, a quotation from the discipline of the Methodist church, edition of 1835, New-York. And, to show that every argument addressed to you by my friend, falls with as great force, nay greater, on Protestants, I will read the following extract, (p. 84.) You will observe, my friends, that I do not arraign the Methodists, as immoral, or quote their discipline from insidious motives; but, to show that our practice is *imitated* in a way, by which it is not improved, but liable to great abuse; and that every thing that is said against us, may be said against others.

Section III.—*Of the Band Societies.* ¹Two, three or four true believers, who have confided in each other, form a band.—Only it is to be observed, that in one of these bands, all must be men, or all women; and all married or all unmarried." p. 83, "*Rules of the Band Societies.*" "The design of our meeting is to obey

that command of God, Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed." James, v. 16.

"Some of the questions proposed to one, before he is admitted among us, may be to this effect." p. 84. "1.° Have you the forgiveness of your sins? (a pretty hard question, my friends, to answer, when the scripture assures us, Eccles. ix. 1, "Man knoweth not whether he be worthy of love, or hatred;" in other words, whether he hath, or hath not, forgiveness of his sins.) 5.° Has no sin, inward or outward, dominion over you? (What scrutiny!) 6.° Do you desire to be told of your faults? 7.° Do you desire to be told of *all* your faults, and that *plain* and *home*? 8.° Do you desire that every one of us should tell you from time to time, whatsoever is in our heart, concerning you? 9.° Consider! Do you desire we should tell you whatsoever we think, whatsoever we fear, whatsoever we hear concerning you? 10.° Do you desire that in doing this, we should come as close as possible, that we should cut to the quick, and search your heart to the bottom? 11.° Is it your desire and design to be on this and all other occasions, entirely open, so as to speak without disguise, and without reserve? ~~Any~~ Any of the preceding questions may be asked as often as occasion requires: the four following at every meeting. S5. 1.° What known sins have you committed since our last meeting? 2.° What particular temptations have you met with? 3.° How were you delivered? 4.° What have you thought, said, or done, of which you doubt whether it be sin, or not?"

They must reveal the whole soul and body, inward and outward sins; and I defy my friend to quote any thing, even from Smith's Liguori, to surpass that. In the Catholic practice, the confession is to the priest alone; who is bound by holy vows, before God and man, not to abuse his trust; and it is unheard of, that a priest has ever violated his oath, by divulging the secrets confided to his ear, as the minister of the sacrament. But tell such secrets to one woman, and, as the witty Frenchman said, when asked why he began a deed with the words, "Know one woman," &c.: "Why, if one woman knows it, it is equivalent to 'all men,' for they will all know it soon enough from her." (a laugh.) I suspect, that my opponent also suspects by this time, that he has got into a pretty bad *fix*. I shall be amused to see how he will *get* out of the noose.

Now, my friends, I have advanced Protestant testimony, to show, either that the champion of Protestantism has trodden most awfully upon Protestants' toes, or to prove that the Catholic practice of confession is not immoral. Did time permit, I might cite the most convincing testimony, from the fathers of the reformation, and from the German princes, to show, that when the restraints of the confessional were removed, the barriers of virtue seemed to be broken down. I do not choose to use their testimony before this audience. It is sufficiently well known, and it follows from it, that my opponent ought not to speak ill of confession; for it has every where proved itself to be a useful practice, and one beneficial to society. It has been one of the most remarkable aids to justice, in cases which legal process could

not reach. To show this, I will relate an anecdote. Some one, in New-York, stole a quantity of silver spoons, and, having confessed the crime to the priest, was told, that neither confession nor absolution could be of any avail, without restitution of the ill-gotten goods. Restitution was accordingly made. Here is a fine practical comment on the subject. The police, having heard of the affair, insisted that the priest should disclose the name of the thief, and wished to compel him to do so, to promote thereby, as they supposed they should do, the cause of justice. The priest, of course, refused to commit a flagrant breach of trust, and modestly contended, that the cause of justice was much more effectually promoted, by the course which a priest in such case pursued. Restitution had been made: was not this enough? The police subpoenaed him to appear before the mayor of New-York, the celebrated De Witt Clinton, who decided that the priest could not be compelled to give up the name. The lawyer employed by the priest, was Mr. Sampson, a Protestant, and an ornament to the bar. He reported the trial. Before reading his speech, touching on this very topic of the morality or immorality of auricular confession, hear the admirable, but too brief preface, he has prefixed to the volume. I am sure, every high-minded and honorable man here, whether Protestant or Catholic, will subscribe cheerfully to his sentiments. "The general satisfaction given to every religious denomination, by the decision of this interesting question, is well calculated to dissipate antiquated prejudices and religious jealousies; and the reporter feels no common satisfaction in making it public. When that adjudication shall be compared with the baneful statutes and judgments in Europe, upon similar subjects, the superior equity and wisdom of American jurisprudence, and civil probity, will be felt; and it cannot fail to be well received by the enlightened and virtuous of every community, and will constitute a document of history, precious and instructive to the present and future generation." Having produced before the court a book called, "The Papist misrepresented, and truly represented," and read the misrepresentation first, he continued:

"The papist *truly represented*, believes it damnable in any religion to make gods of men. However he firmly holds, that when Christ speaking to his apostles said, John xx. 22, '*Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained;*' he gave them, and their successors, the bishops and priests of the Catholic church, authority to absolve any truly penitent sinner from his sins. And God having thus given them *the ministry of reconciliation*, and made them *Christ's legates*, 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, 20, *Christ's ministers and the dispensers of the mysteries of Christ*, 1 Cor. iv., and given them power that *whatsoever they loosed on earth shall be loosed in heaven*, Matt. xviii. 18, he undoubtedly believes, that whosoever comes to them, making a sincere and humble confession of his sins,

with a true repentance and a firm purpose of amendment, and a hearty resolution of turning from his evil ways, may from them receive absolution, by the authority given them from heaven, and no doubt but God ratifies above the sentence pronounced in that tribunal; *loosing in heaven whatsoever is thus loosed by them on earth.* And that, whosoever comes without the due preparation, without a repentance from the bottom of his heart, and real intention of forsaking his sins, receives no benefit by the absolution; but adds sin to sin, by a high contempt of God's mercy, and abuse of his sacraments."

No wonder then, this latter being the true character of confession, if the bitterest enemies of the Catholic faith have still respected it: and that discerning minds have acknowledged the many benefits society might practically reap from it; abstracted from its religious character. It has, I dare say, been oftener attacked by sarcasm than by good sense. The gentleman who argued against us, has respected himself too much to employ that weapon, and I believe he has said all that good sense could urge against it, which we take in very good part.

But while this ordinance has been openly exposed to scoff and ridicule, its excellence has been concealed by the very secrecy it enjoins. If it led to licentiousness or danger, that licentiousness, or that danger, would have come to light, and there would be tongues enough to tell it. Whilst on the other hand, its utility can never be proved by instances, because it cannot be shown how many have been saved by it: how many of the young of both sexes, have been in the most critical juncture of their lives, admonished from the commission of some fatal crime, that would have brought the parents' hoary hairs with sorrow to the grave. These are secrets that cannot be revealed.

Since however, the avenues that lead to vice are many and alluring, is it not well that some one should be open to the repenting sinner, where the fear of punishment and of the world's scorn, may not deter the yet wavering convert? If the road to destruction, is easy and smooth, *si facilis descensus averni*, may it not consist with wisdom and policy, that there be one silent, secret path, where the doubting penitent may be invited to turn aside, and escape the throng that hurries him along? Some retreat, where, as in the bosom of a holy hermit, within the shade of innocence and peace, the pilgrim of this chequered life, may draw new inspiration of virtue and repose.

If the thousand ways of error, are tricked with flowers, is it so wrong, that somewhere there should be a sure and gentle friend, who has no interest to betray, no care, but that of ministering to the incipient cure? The syren songs and blandishments of pleasure, may lead the young and tender heart astray, and the repulsive frown of stern authority, forbid return. One step then gained or lost, is victory or death. Let me then ask you that are parents, which would you prefer, that the child of your hopes should pursue the course of ruin, and continue with the companions of debauch and crime, or turn to the confessional, where if compunction could once bring him, one gentle word, one well timed admonition, one friendly turn by the hand, might save your child from ruin, and your heart from unavailing sorrow? And if the hardened sinner, the murderer, the robber, or conspirator, can once be brought to bow his stubborn spirit, and kneel before his frail fellow man, invite him to pronounce a penance suited to his crimes, and seek salvation through a full repentance, there is more gained, than by the bloodiest spectacle of terror, than though his mangled limbs were broken on the wheel, his body gibbeted or given to the fowls of the air. If these reflections have any weight at all: If this picture be but true, in any part, better forbear and leave things as they are, than too rashly sacrifice to jealous doubts, or shallow ridicule, an ordinance sanctified by antiquity and founded on experience of man's nature. For if it were possible for even faith, that removes

mountains, as they say, to alter this, and with it to abolish the whole fabric, of which it is a vital part, what next would follow? Hundreds of millions of christians would be set adrift from all religious fastening! Would it be better to have so many atheists, than so many christians? Or if not, what church is fitted to receive into its bosom, this great majority of all the christian world? Is it determined whether they shall become Jews or Philanthropists, Chinese or Mahomedans, Lutherans or Calvinists, Baptists or Brownists, Materialists, Universalists or Destructionists, Arians, Trinitarians, Presbyterians, Baxterians, Sabatarians, Millennarians, Moravians, Antinomians or Sandemanians, Jumpers or Dunkers, Shakers or Quakers, Burgers, Kirkers, Independents, Covenanters, Puritans, Hutchisonians, Johnsonians, or Muggletonians. I doubt not that in every sect that I have named, there are good men, and if there be, I trust they will find mercy, but chiefly so as they are charitable, each to his neighbor. And why should they be otherwise? The gospel enjoins it; the constitution ordains it. Intolerance in this country could proceed from nothing but a diseased affection of the *pia mater*, or the spleen." Catholic Question in America, p. 87.

I will now dismiss the question of confession. There are many things to which I should like to give answers, in set speeches; but, whoever reads this controversy, must not suppose that because I have not time to answer every accusation at length, there is no answer to them. I catch all I can of what my friend hurriedly utters; for I cannot hear him, for his occasional hoarseness of voice.

When my worthy opponent stated, in his long-blazoned proposition, "*She* is the *man* of sin," I imagined that he meant no more than the exciting of an innocuous laugh at the expense of "MOTHER CHURCH," by making a man of her in her old age. How great, then, has been my surprise, to see him, all sail set, dash headlong upon this rock of commentators, the "*infames scopulos interpretum*," around which are scattered in profusion, the wrecks of so many learned lucubrations, for the last 1800 years! Catholics and Protestants, churchmen and laymen, ancients and moderns, Papias and Newton, and last, not least, Mr. Alexander Campbell, have all egregiously foundered upon this hidden shoal of controversy.

No wonder, the learned Protestant, Scaliger, observed that Calvin was wise, in not writing upon the Apocalypse. "*Sapuit Calvinus, quia in Apocalypsin non scripsit!*" Had we a congregation of scary old women, instead of intelligent and sensible men, around us, I should expect to be looked at by many a prying eye, confident of seeing one, at least of the ten horns, sprouting, or already strong, full-grown, and threateningly prominent from my forehead. But as I address reasoners, not visionaries, nor rhapsodists, nor fanatics, I must reason, leaving to my fanciful friend, the regions of imagination, into which he has flown, far above my reach.—I would not fetch him too hastily down, but by sending a few arguments, at respectful distances after one another to pluck a feather now, and a feather then from his wings,

we may fetch him safely, and slowly, and with dignity back again to the apprehension of logic, and common sense. These are the weapons with which I, in the first place, proceed to grapple with the gentleman.

1st. Is he an *infallible*? He pretends not, verily, to be such. Then what is all his fanciful theory worth? It is based on reason and history, is it? Well but Hugo Grotius, and Hammond, and Dr. Herbert Thorndike, not to mention fifty others, of different religious denominations, but all Protestants, and at least as good biblical and classical scholars, as my learned antagonist, have ridiculed the notion of calling the pope of Rome Antichrist! If only one learned and pious Protestant were pitted against my friend, I would be even with him, or more than even.—How much superior in this argument, when I have so many wise men on my side, while all the monomaniacs are on his? “*Let them not lead people by the nose,*” says Thorndike, “*to believe they can prove their supposition that the pope is antichrist, and the Papists, Idolaters, when they cannot.*” Thus the most learned and orthodox Protestant divines cannot subscribe to—they are, on the contrary, ashamed of—this interpretation of my learned opponent.

2nd. Those Protestants, who agree with him in calling the pope, antichrist, disagree as to the particular pope to be so called, and still more, as to the time when the downfall of Babylon was to have taken place, or is to take place—as in the case of the Jewish testimony against Jesus Christ, there is no agreement among the witnesses. Braunbom confidently asserts that the popish antichrist was born in the year 86; that he grew to his full size in 376; that he was at his greatest strength in 636; that he began to decline in 1086; that he would die in 1640; and that the world would end in 1711. (Bayle Art. Braunbom) bishop Newton, Napper, Fleming, Beza, Melancthon, Bullinger, had all their peculiar and conflicting theories, and none of them, we may safely assert, has found the Apocalyptic key. Turien, Alix and Kett, are in nothing more wise, and equally unsuccessful.

3d. The scripture is opposed to him. For St. John says, 1st Ep. ch. 2. v. 22, “*That the liar who denieth Jesus to be the Christ is antichrist.*” Now this, the pope has never done; but, on the contrary, he contends earnestly for the faith in the divinity of Christ, once delivered to the saints.

4th. Church history is opposed to him. For it shews, at every page, how the pope sent missionaries into every part of the world, even the most distant, to gather barbarous nations into the fold of Christ, to preach to them salvation through his blood. Now according to the rule of the Savior, “*a kingdom, divided against itself, cannot stand.*” And it is unheard of among all the signs of the antichrist,

that he was to be the strenuous, and for many centuries, the only apostle of the true Christ, the Savior. Even the worst pope, was true to doctrine, and made the beams of the sun of righteousness, of pure christian faith, gild the villages of Tartary and cheer the roving hordes in its deserts.

5th. My friend is opposed to himself; for he said to day, that the eyes of the little horn signified wisdom and knowledge. Now as the Catholic church is the mother of ignorance, the victim of blind and ridiculous superstitions, the cause of all the obscurity of the dark ages, she cannot be the antichrist. Again its mouth indicated eloquence, was eloquent.—Then my opponent is, himself, the beast, for his speech was truly eloquent. Indeed the ingenuity with which he dressed up even the old story of “she is fallen, the mighty Babylon, the great harlot, which corrupted the earth—Allelujah, Allelujah!” is proof positive that he would, *by his command of language*, deceive, *if possible*, even the elect, into the belief, that he had succeeded, where so many had failed, in breaking the seal of the mysterious volume. He has clearly put the lion in a net, and not so much as a mouse durst approach, to gnaw a hole, to let him out.

6th. He is opposed to Catholics. For they have been wont to apply the words of St. John, just before he speaks of the antichrist, to the Protestant sects, which, they conceive, are fast hastening into the arms of the Unitarians, who deny the divinity of Christ. “They went out from us; but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would, no doubt, have remained with us, but that they may be manifest that they are not all of us.” I have already said something of the “monster,” not merely “beast,” but “monster,” which my friend attempted, like Prometheus, to form and steal fire from heaven to animate, that he might call it “Apostolic Protestantism.” This, in our estimation, may be found to possess, some, at least, of the characteristics of the Apocalyptic beast. But we should beg leave to baptize it “Polypos” or “Legion.” We could very satisfactorily shew that it has made war on the saints, and devoured them by thousands, not to say millions; that a portion of the beast so detains, even now, when light from heaven is breaking, MILLIONS of the saints, of those who for the Confession of Jesus Christ and for *conscience sake* are reduced to a galling servitude, a poverty, and a degradation, *far worse* than the lot of the negro, of the southern rice-fields.

My friend began by observing that symbolical language gives great scope for the imagination. It sets us adrift upon a sea of speculation. Is he ready to embark upon that sea? Are his sails trimmed? Is his compass ready? If the *sad* experience, to which I have alluded, has

not disinclined him to the voyage, I assure him that he will find it to eventuate like that of the three wise men of Gotham, whom our illustrious compatriot Washington Irving, sent to sea in a bowl. We may drift with every wind, and current, through a thousand perils, on this wide ocean of imagination. But, my friends, what has imagination to do with this question? She is a very good slave, but a very bad mistress. Give me full scope with your imagination and I can prove to you any thing and every thing, until we all are like the novel and romance writers of the present day—"in fancy ripe, in reason rotten." Novels and romances are, confessedly, works of fiction. They are not expected to contain reason, and therefore they escape censure. But when men pretend to pass off their day-dreams for the oracles of Heaven, they should remember the law of Deuteronomy, xiv. 5. "*that the Prophet and forger of dreams shall be slain,*" and if they fear not even the fate of the false seer, at least, they should apprehend the lash of criticism and ridicule. I know in this good city, a respectable dame, who is not a Catholic, but who has written a ream of paper on the Apocalyptic visions. I suggest to my friend that he may possibly gather additional light on the subject; by comparing notes with her. She has made it the study of years, and on one occasion, as I am credibly informed, under the influence of the text's inspiration, she came into church, with the sun, moon, and stars pictured upon her dress, and trailing beneath her feet as she solemnly moved through the aisle. You, sir, may have surpassed this lady in eloquence, though of that I am not quite sure, but, certainly, she was a match for you, in imagination. My friend observed that the sun would go down, it would take him a whole day, to shew the audience the *rational* of the conceit with which he has favored us—I could not help assenting to the gentleman's remark, and saying, in my mind, that it was even so—nay, that it would take 365 days, before he could shew that there was *any thing* in it that was reasonable.

Southey observes that the "ROMISH CHURCH WAS, in the worst of times, HOWEVER DEFILED, the SALT OF THE EARTH, THE SOLE CONSERVATIVE PRINCIPLE, BY WHICH EUROPE WAS SAVED FROM THE LOWEST AND MOST BRUTAL BARBARISM;" and yet in the very face of this reluctant tribute, by a first-rate Protestant historian, Mr. Campbell labors to demonstrate that this very church was Anti-Christ! He places her on the Mediterranean, although it is a weary ride before you reach her splendid domes and everlasting—maugre the liquifying—hills, on which she sits, in humble, if in queenly majesty. The Tiber, like its namesake in the district, instead of being called a sea, may well be called a "*Goose creek*" now.

My friend's Lexicography, Iconisms and Synchronisms, must have all passed for argument strong as the rock of Gibraltar, in his own opinion. It is unanswered and unanswerable. He says that God always by a beast, means some monster or other. Then Jesus Christ must be "some monster or other," for what is the cry of Heaven's Jubilee at the end of all things? "*Behold the 'Lion' of the tribe of Judah hath prevailed;*" and again—"Worthy was the Lamb that was slain," &c., &c. My friend would make a strange havoc with the language and imagery of heaven—a curious monster of a Lamb and a Lion, than which notwithstanding all he has said, I will force him to confess that there can be nothing, as there is nothing, more beautiful than this entire passage. The Evangelists are represented in the vision of Ezekiel as Beasts and Birds of prey. Are they too Anti-Christ? England has chosen the Rampant and Roaring Lion for her emblem. My friend has praised and dispraised her. What portion of Anti-Christ, of the *man* of sin, is *she*? She has persecuted—and I might with far more truth say to her, what the martyred Robert Emmett said to Lord Norbury, "*If all the innocent blood your ladyship has shed could be collected into one great reservoir, your Ladyship might swim in it.*" My friend spoke of Elizabeth's long life. He did not say of how many years she abridged the life of the "*Fair Queen of Scots.*" Politically, intellectually, and morally, Rome, or if you will, the papacy was the Savior of Europe, as all historians agree. How, then, could she be the "Beast?" It is preposterous. Why all this has been prophesied and falsified, and prophesied and falsified again. Forty, or fifty years ago, as my venerable friend there (Rev. Mr. Badin, the first priest ordained in the United States) can inform you, almanacs were published in Kentucky, stating the precise day and minute, when the Hallelujah was to be intoned for the Downfall of Babylon! The day has passed, and what of it? I have got a book here, which makes Napoleon Bonaparte the man of sin. Born on an island, in the Mediterranean, Corsica, deriving his power from the French Revolution, which affected to crush Christianity, p'infame; which substituted decadi for Sabath; profaned temples; adored a vile woman in the temple of God, immolated and expatriated thousands upon thousands of priests, and hoped that the last of kings might be strangled with the viscera of the last of priests: plucked Pius VII. from the chair of St. Peter, dragged the saints, the venerable monks by their beards, from the horns of the altar, &c., &c. The Apocalypse is a sealed book, which God has not vouchsafed to unfold to man. Better practise what we do know, with certainty, of his adorable will, rather than blaspheme what we do not understand. Meanwhile, if ever there was made a plausible application

of this mysterious prophecy, behold it in the rise, progress, and arrest of Mahommedanism. The sea, or lake, the year 666, the war on Christ and the saints; the sword and Koran; the watch-word BELIEVE OR DIE, the conspiracy of Christendom during the crusades to check its power, the gloriously disastrous battle of Lepanto, the present crippled, but still formidable state of Islamism, all pictured so vividly as almost to convince us that we have surely discovered the object of the prediction. Let us read from Waddington. I shall make a few brief pauses which you will fill up by appropriate reflections. How few have understood the appalling dangers that this civil and religious despotism of the IMPOSTOR OF MECCA, threatened, during so many ages, to Christianity and the world!

The seventh century was marked by the birth of a new and resolute adversary, who began his career with the most stupendous triumphs, who has torn from us the possession of half the world, and who retains his conquests even to this moment. Mahomet was born about the year 570; we are ignorant of the precise period of the nativity of that man who wrought the most extraordinary revolution in the affairs of this globe, which the agency of any being merely human has ever yet accomplished. His pretended mission did not commence till he was about forty years old, and the date of his celebrated flight from Mecca, the Hedjrah, or era of Mahometan nations, is 622, A. D. The remainder of his life was spent in establishing his religion and his authority in his native land, Arabia; and the sword with which he finally completed that purpose, he bequeathed, for the universal propagation of both, to his followers. His commission was zealously executed; and, in less than a century after his death, his faith was uninterruptedly extended by a chain of nations from India to the Atlantic.

The fate of Persia was decided by the battle of Cadesia, in 636. In Syria, Damascus had already fallen, and after the sanguinary conflict of Yermuk, where the Saracens for the first time encountered and overthrew a christian enemy, the conquerors instantly proceeded to the reduction of Jerusalem; that grand religious triumph they obtained in 637. In the year following Aleppo and Antioch fell into their hands, which completed the conquest of Syria. Thence they proceeded northward as far as the shores of the Euxine and the neighborhood of Constantinople.

The invasion of Egypt took place in 638, and within the space of three years, the whole of that populous province was in possession of the infidels. Alexandria was the last city which fell; and in somewhat more than a century after the expulsion of philosophy from Europe by a christian legislator, the schools of Africa were closed in their turn by the arms of an unlettered Mahometan.

The success of the Saracens was not inconsiderably promoted by the religious dissensions of their christian adversaries. A vast number of heretics who had been oppressed and stigmatized by edicts and councils were scattered over the surface of Asia; and these were contented to receive a foreign master, of whose principles they were still ignorant, in the place of a tyrant whose injustice they had experienced. But in Egypt, especially, the whole mass of the native population was unfortunately involved in the jacobite heresy; and few at that time were found, except the resident Greeks, who adhered to the doctrines of the church. The followers of Eutyches formed an immediate alliance with the soldiers of Mahomet against a Catholic prince; and they considered that there was nothing

unnatural in that act, since they hoped to secure for themselves, under a Mahometan, the toleration which had been refused by an orthodox government. We should remark, however, that this hope, the pretext of their desertion, was with many the suggestion of their malice: that besides the recollection of wrongs, and the desire to escape or revenge them, they were inflamed as furiously as their persecutors by that narrow sectarian spirit, which is commonly excited most keenly where the differences are most trifling; and which, while it exaggerated the lines that separated them from their fellow christians, blinded them to the broad gulf which divided all alike from the infidel.

From Egypt, the conquerors rushed along the northern shore of Africa; and though their progress in that direction was interrupted by the domestic dissensions of the prophet's family, even more than by the occasional vigor of the christians, they were in possession of Carthage before the end of the seventh century. Thence they proceeded westward, and after encountering some opposition from the native Moors, little either from the Greek or Vandal masters of the country, they completed their conquests in the year 709.

Hitherto the Mahometans had gained no footing in Europe; and it may seem strange that the most western of its provinces should have been that which was first exposed to their occupation. But the vicinity of Spain to their latest conquests, and the factious dissensions of its nobility, gave them an early opportunity to attempt the subjugation of that country. Their success was almost unusually rapid. In 711 they overthrew the Gothic monarchy by the victory of Xeres; and the two following years were sufficient to secure their dominion over the greatest part of the peninsula.

The waters of this torrent were destined to proceed still a little further. Ten years after the battle of Xeres, the Saracens crossed the Pyrenees and overran with little opposition the southwestern provinces of France—the vineyards of Gascony and the city Bourdeaux were possessed by the sovereign of Damascus and Samarcand; and the south of France, from the mouth of the Garonne to that of the Rhone, assumed the manners and religion of Arabia. Still dissatisfied with those ample limits, or impatient of any limit, these children of the desert again marched forward into the centre of the kingdom. They were encamped between Tours and Poitiers, when Charles Martel, the mayor, or duke of the Franks, encountered them. It is too much to assert that the fate of christianity depended upon the result of the battle which followed; but if victory had declared for the Saracens, it would probably have secured to them in France the same extent, perhaps the same duration, of authority which they possessed in Spain. Next they would have carried the horrors of war and Islamism into Germany or Britain; but there, other fields must have been fought, against nations of warriors as brave as the Franks, by an invader who was becoming less powerful and even less enthusiastic, as he advanced farther from the head of his resources and his faith." Waddington's Church Hist. page 135. New York edit, 1835.

This is the tyranny from which the pope has saved us, and for it civilization and religion owe him a debt which they will never be able to repay.

My opponent ran a parallel between pagan and Catholic Rome. Does he not know that the pagan religion borrowed many of its essential rites, and not a few of its forms, from the indistinct knowledge of a primary revelation made to Adam and to the patriarchs,

and afterwards from the written law? And might I not run a more perfect parallel between the Catholic and the Jewish institutions, while the latter was DIVINE? The Catholics have a Pontifex Maximus, or High Priest; so had the Jews. The Catholics have a church to guide the people; the Jews had a synagogues for the same purpose. The Catholics have a famous temple, to whose doctrine and worship all must conform; so had the Jews. The Catholic pontiff enjoys some temporal power; so did the Jewish pontiff. The Catholic pontiff sprinkles holy water on the people; the Jewish pontiff sprinkled them with the blood of a heifer, that was slain. The Catholic says, when reminded by the lustral water, emblematical of the blood of Christ, of the power and mercy which can cleanse the stains of the conscience, "Thou shalt sprinkle me, O Lord, with hyssop, and I shall be cleansed, thou shalt wash me, and I shall be made whiter than snow." David also said, "Thou shalt sprinkle me, O Lord, with hyssop, and I shall be cleansed; thou shalt wash me, and I shall be made whiter than snow." The Catholics have nuns; so had the Jews nuns, like the prophetess Ann, who for "four score and four years departed not from the temple, by fastings and prayers during night and day." Luke, xi. 36, 37. It is thus that his parallel crumbles! Lateinos is not the name of the Catholic church. The title that the pope assumes is "*servus servorum Dei*," servant of the servants of God. The name of Luther, Dioclesian, Julian, of the true God, himself, could be made to tally with the numbers 666—see Robinson's Calmet, p. 71. I could take letters out of the name of ALEXANDER CAMPBELL to mean the same thing.

MR. CAMPBELL.—If you can, I will give up the argument. (A laugh).

BISHOP PURCELL.—What language must it be? Hebrew, Syriac, Greek, Latin or English? No matter. E is in some languages—300—L is 50.—

MR. CAMPBELL.—You have not yet learned the numeral alphabet.

BISHOP PURCELL.—I cannot make the sum RIGHT OFF, but have a little patience with me and I will pay you all. (A laugh.—The audience having composed themselves at the request of the Moderators, Bishop PURCELL proceeded.) Thus, you see, my friends, the name of my friend helps us in this matter, for it is the name of a man, and the name of a beast, too, with a hunch on its back, when we can find the lacking numerals to *decipher* him. He has made a certain admission, after having denied it all the week, that the apostles founded the see of Rome. This shows that the truth *will* prevail, and that my friend will laugh in his sleeve at you, if you believe all his fanciful and romancing conjectures about the *man of sin*. Again—another contradiction. If all that blood is to be shed, in the exarchate of Ravenna, we are here, in Ohio, and safe enough from the danger under our happy

constitution.—We need have no fear of being crushed beneath the fragments of that crazy and tottering chair, the pope is sitting in so uneasily; the very rumblings of the volcanic hills will die, and their last echoes be inaudible on this side of the Atlantic, and as the Apocalyptic magician has pointed his wand, to the dilapidated jaws of the Beast, the conclusion is plain, that, *as he has lost all his teeth, he can't bite!* we need not be afraid of him.

We are told the pope suffers himself to be adored, and calls himself God. So far from this, we have seen how he humbles himself before the altar, how he prays the humblest of the saints to *pray* for him to God, and how he has had a prayer inscribed in our church liturgy, whereby we ask of God to preserve him from all evil, especially from the worst of all evils, sin. Does this look like exalting himself above every thing that is called God? The present pope is said to be one of the best of men. The only faults alleged against him are that he gives employment to a large number of poor tradesmen, rebuilding the burned church of St. Paul—and that he *takes snuff* somewhat profusely. I wish every one here had as little to answer for.

Much has been said about the gold and silver of the Vatican. My friend, I am sure, knows that money is a necessary evil. If we all had a little more of it, we might purchase heaven with the mammon of iniquity; but the pope is now poor. If I am rightly informed, his treasury is drained. He has fortunately, or unfortunately, lost this mark of the beast, if it be one. But my worthy opponent has overlooked this remarkable fact. Judea abounded in gold; St. Peter's, in Rome, was never covered all over, like the temple of Jerusalem, with *plates of gold*. When Titus besieged Jerusalem, the Jews swallowed their gold to hide it from their rapacious conquerors—and this was made a new incident in the dreadful vengeance of heaven upon that deicidal people, for the soldiers, in quest of gold, ripped open the bodies of the ill-fated victims whom famine, or the arrow, had precipitated from the ramparts. After the sacking of Jerusalem, so great was the quantity of gold obtained in it, that gold fell, in sterling value, throughout the Roman empire. This would prove, that Jerusalem was the beast. How vain are all the gentleman's eloquent remarks! Not one of these marks is peculiar to Rome, while many of them are not applicable to her at all. I will say nothing about the millstone; it went to the bottom, and so did the gentleman's argument.

My friends, I have one or two arguments to borrow from a very distinguished Catholic writer, Dr. Lingard, author of the history of England. We shall see whether my friend has any of the symptoms of mania here so graphically described.

“ During the long lapse of more than fifteen centuries, the visions of the apostle St. John had been enveloped in the thickest obscurity. At the era of the reformation, a strong ray of apocalyptic light dissipated the clouds which popery had raised; and since that period every old woman, of either gender, has been able to unravel with ease the web of mystery, and to reveal to the world the true meaning of the book of Revelations. From the days of Luther to the present, we have possessed a numerous and uninterrupted succession of translators, lecturers, expositors, and anontators, who may truly be said to have seen visions, and to have dreamed dreams; and, lest by some mishap the pious race should become extinct. Bishop Warburton has left a fund for the support or the reward of the more fiery among its members.* I may admire his zeal, but not his wisdom. He probably did not see that he was thus endeavoring to diffuse and perpetuate an alarming species of intellectual disease, which, for the sake of distinction, I shall beg leave to call the apocalyptic mania. It has not, indeed, been hitherto classed in any system of nosology; but it is on that account less real, or less general; and, I trust, I shall confer a benefit on the public by proceeding to point out the origin, and to describe the symptoms of this theological malady.

When “ the magnanimous fathers of the reformation ” broke from the communion of the Catholic church, they found it convenient to justify their schism by pleading that the Pope was Antichrist, and Rome the scarlet w—— of Babylon. This doctrine, while it inflamed the bigotry, flattered the spiritual pride of their disciples; with conscious superiority of birth, they sought in the apocalypse for proof of the ignominious descent of their opponents, and their sacrilegious familiarity with the mysterious volume, quickly produced the disease, which is the subject of the present observations. Its progress was rapid. It soon pervaded every department in life: but its most distinguished victims were, and still are, chosen from among those churchmen, who, from the instructions of the nursery or the university, have imbibed a lively dread of the horrors of popery. The mania first manifests itself by a restless anxiety respecting the future fortunes of the church, and a strong attachment to prophetic hieroglyphics: the antichrist, and the man of sin; the beast with ten horns, and the beast with two horns; the armies of Gog and Magog; the fall of Babylon, and the arrival of the millennium, become the favorite, the only subjects of study; false and ridiculous perceptions amuse the imagination; the judgment is gradually enfeebled, and, at last, the most powerful minds sink into the imbecility of childhood. Of the truth of this description we have a melancholy proof in the great Sir Isaac Newton. To him Nature seemed to have unlocked her choicest secrets: as a philosopher he was and is still unrivalled: but no sooner did he direct his telescope from the motions of the heavenly bodies to the visions in the apocalypse, than his head grew dizzy, the downfall of popery danced before his eyes, and he hazarded predictions which on the scale of prophets, have placed him far beneath the well known Francis Moore, physician and almanac-maker.

It should be observed, that this intellectual malady, like the other species of mania, assumes a thousand different shapes, according to the predispositions of the subject which it attacks. I shall produce a few instances. In 1789, Mr. Cook published a translation of the apocalypse, with keys to open its meaning to his readers. This reverend gentleman was Greek professor in the university at Cambridge; and, as his reading naturally led him to the Greek poets, he was determined that the author of the apocalypse should be a poet, and, more-

*According to his will, an annual sermon is preached in Lincoln's Inn Chapel, to prove the Pope to be Antichrist, &c., &c.

over, the rival of Sophocles. In his opinion, the apocalypse is a tragedy formed on the same plan as the *Œdipus Tyrannus*. "The drama opens with the temple scene; the seals, the trumpet, and the vials unfold the plot; and though the antichrist does not die, no more than *Œdipus*, yet he falls into such calamity as makes him an object of pity, and justifies the lamentations pronounced on his downfall." Nor is this all. By trying one of his apocalyptic keys on the *Odyssey* of Homer, he has discovered that poem also to have been inspired, and informs us that the suitors of Penelope represent the vassals of popery, who, under the pretence of courting the bride, the christian church, devour all the good things in her house, till Christ, the true Ulysses, the *σδος σδος* or safe way, arrives, and wreaks his vengeance on them.

In Mr. Granville Sharp, the favorite apocalyptic Nostradamus of the Rector of Newton Longville, (Le Mess reply, p. 193. 202,) the mania has shown itself in a different manner. This gentleman is known to be singularly partial to monosyllables. He has written a volume on the Hebrew letter *vau*, and another on the Greek articles, *ο, η, το*. From letters and articles, he was induced, by his previous success and the importunity of his friends to proceed to the explanation of the visions in the book of Revelations. Here the apocalyptic mania soon discovered itself: but the appearance of the disease was modified by his previous habits of monosyllabic investigation. He convinced himself that the name of the beast was *Lateinos*, and that *Lateinos* must signify the Latin church. The proof is curious. *Lateinos*, he contends, is derived from the Hebrew monosyllable *LAT*, which means to cover or conceal. Now the Latin church, in the celebration of the mass, conceals some of the prayers from the people, by ordering them to be pronounced with a low voice: therefore the Latin church is *Lateinos*, the beast in the apocalypse. Moreover the head of the Latin church resides in the palace of the Lateran, a name derived from the same monosyllable *LAT*; and the Lateran palace is situated in the country anciently called *Latium*, an appellation also derived from the same monosyllable *Lat*: and *Latium* is a province of that part of Europe called Italy, which also derives its name from the same monosyllable *LAT*. Be not startled, gentle reader: apocalyptic maniacs can with equal facility read backwards or forwards; and Mr. Sharp informs us, that, if we read Italy backwards, we shall have *Ylatl*, in the midst of which is the Hebrew monosyllable *LAT*. *Naviget Antieyram!*

Were I to describe all the varieties of the disease, these observations would swell to an unmeasurable bulk. I shall therefore content myself with noticing the prophetic, which is perhaps the most prevalent, species. When the mind is seized with this mania, the regions of futurity are instantly opened to its sight: it can point out the date and nature of every event which is to happen; it can inform us in what year popery, Mohammedism, and infidelity are to perish; when and where antichrist is to be born, reign, and die; who is to restore the Holy Land to the Jews; and in what year the new Jerusalem is to descend from heaven. It is in vain that preceding prophets have frequently outlived their own predictions: the lessons of experience are heard with contempt: and each new seer is convinced of the truth of his own visions. Among those who have suffered lately under this form of the disease, the most distinguished are Mr. Whitaker and Mr. Faber, both scholars of extensive erudition, and both equally animated against the Church of Rome. They both agree that Luther is the angel with the everlasting gospel; and, if by his gospel they mean the solidian doctrine already noticed, they have a chance to be right. It may justly be called everlasting, for it will probably find proselytes as long as man shall dwell on the earth. Mr. Whitaker discovers that the two horns of the beast are the two monastic orders of the Dominicans and Franciscans. Why they should claim the

preference before their brethren, of greater antiquity, or more general diffusion, I know not; but it is certainly unfortunate that the beast has not four horns, then you, ye sons of Benedict and Loyola, might have had the honor of being seated on the remaining two. The same gentleman informs us that the Ottoman empire will soon fall, Rome be wrested from the pope, and the seat of the papacy be transferred to Jerusalem. Mr. Faber makes an equal display of erudition; but the third angel, Mr. Whitaker's Zuingle, he has placed in a most uncomfortable situation: he has bound him fast in the midst of the ocean, and transformed him into the *insular church of England!* Nor does he always agree with his rival in more important points. The two beasts he shews to be the two contemporary Roman empires, temporal and spiritual, under the emperors and the popes: and gives his readers the pleasing intelligence, that both the Turk and the Pope will expire in the year 1868. Though he does not expect to witness this happy event, himself, yet he has the goodness to promise a sight of it to many of the present generation:

Τλητε, φίλοι, και μενυαλ' επι χρονον, οφρα δαωμεν
Ει ετεον Χαλχας μαντευεται, ηε και οκι.

Unfortunately for these two prophets, each disputed the accuracy of the predictions of his rival: an animated controversy followed; and the result has been a conviction in the minds of most of their readers, that each has completely succeeded in demolishing the system of his adversary, and completely failed in establishing his own.

Thus have I attempted to describe the different symptoms of this disease; but I hope I shall be excused from indicating the method of cure. When the mania has once obtained possession of the brain, I doubt whether three Anticyra would be sufficient to expel it. I would rather, like Dr. Trotter in his treatise on the nervous temperament, endeavor to correct that *predisposition* which naturally leads to it. I would advise the Protestant theologian to suspend, for a while at least, his assent to some of those doctrines, which education has taught him to revere as sacred. I would have him learn to doubt whether it be certain, that a long succession of bishops, through many centuries, can be that one individual described by St. Paul as the man of sin: or that the church, from which almost all other churches have received the knowledge of the gospel is, "the great mother of harlots," and the kingdom of Antichrist. I would recommend to him, if he must decipher the apocalyptic hieroglyphics, to attend to the solemn asseveration of their author, which is frequently repeated both in the first and the last chapters, that his predictions were, even at the time in which he wrote, on the point of being fulfilled. In the destruction of Jerusalem, and the first period of the christian history, he may find enough to exercise his ingenuity, and may perhaps stumble on the only clue which can lead to the solution of the difficulties contained in this mysterious volume. I am aware that what I ask, will not readily be granted to me. The doctrine that popery is the beast, the pope antichrist, and christian Rome the whore of Babylon, is, I know, an important part of the new gospel preached by Luther and his associates: it forms, to use the words of a learned prelate,* "a primary pillar of the reformed faith." But when I consider the dangerous consequences of this doctrine, its deleterious effects on the judgment of some among the most distinguished writers of the Protestant communion, the ridicule which it serves to throw on the inspired writings, and the handle which it gives to the sneers and contempt of the professed infidel, I indulge a well-founded hope that, for the sake of religion and humanity, it will

*Watson's Theological Tracts, vol. v. p. 7.

meet with little support from the enlightened characters, who now preside in the established church. If it once formed a pillar of the reformation, I conceive it could only be a temporary support, which may now be removed without danger to the fabric. To the pious fraud, from its utility, the first reformers might easily reconcile their consciences; at the present day it may be rejected by their successors with some credit: it cannot be retained without disgrace.

Half-past 11 o'clock, A. M.

MR. CAMPBELL, rises—

The bishop has not given one but many and various proofs of the truth of an adage of some currency and authority. Napoleon in his flight from Moscow, musing on recent disasters, often uttered this expression: "There is but one short step from the sublime to the ridiculous." I never before witnessed so illustrious a proof of the invincible force of the argument from prophecy. I looked at the gentleman writhing under the accumulating evidence, amounting almost to demonstration, that I had asserted no defamation in my fourth proposition. Instead of meeting the subject with scripture and argument, like the scuttle fish, he darkens the waters that he may escape the eye and the hand of his pursuer. His effort at mystification is as ridiculous as it is imbecile. He invokes the assistance of some old lady to create a laugh; but the audience has got tired laughing at his manœuvres. The subject is too grave, and the audience too deeply penetrated with the awful truth which they had just heard to be amused by such levity. Failing so manifestly, in the attempt to disparage all use of the prophecies, he undertakes to explain. He is driven into Asia to the Koran, and to Mecca for the man of sin! How have the weapons of war perished! Facts are not found in the history of Mahomet or Mahometanism, to explain these prophecies: and conscious of this, his own courage fails, and a second time he resorts to ridicule. As Voltaire, Volney, and other wits, have fruitlessly attempted to laugh christianity out of countenance, he endeavors to place the whole matter before you as idle and absurd. Could my rhetorical and ingenious opponent afford more unequivocal manifestations of confusion and dismay, than you have now witnessed? But, my friends, we are not to be laughed out of our argument, that stands before us like the rock of Gibraltar. The waves that strike it, but foam out their imbecility, and are broken to pieces. He may, indeed, torture his ingenuity to escape from an argument, which he dare not, which he cannot meet; but he will torture it in vain.

The effort of my opponent has been as much to disparage prophecy itself, as any mode of interpreting it. According to him, prophecy is no gift: On our principles, it is at least as useful and interesting

as history. It is one of the kindest boons of heaven, that we are permitted sometimes to peep into the future, guided by the lamp of eternity. The whole Bible, is for the most part, history and prophecy. It is almost all history, for prophecy is the history of the future. God never held the human family in suspense respecting their vital interests. Their origin, duty, and destiny, he has equally regarded in all his communications. Soon as our first parents had transgressed in Eden, he permitted not one sun to go down, till he appeared to them and revealed a portion of his purposes. In a single period he condenses a miniature view of the future destinies of mankind: "I will place enmity," said he to the serpent, "between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." I thank our Heavenly Father, that he has thus from the beginning vouchsafed to his children something of the future. Indeed, so abundant are his revelations, his promises which are all prophecies, and his prophecies which all threaten or promise, that there is scarce a single page of the whole Bible without a prophecy inscribed upon it. Certainly my opponent has forgotten this! Has he not, according to his ability, been turning into ridicule prophecy itself, the Bible itself, God's good and perfect gift? But if prophecy be wholly unintelligible; Why, I ask, should it constitute so large a portion of God's only book to man? But I will not farther debate this question. The gentleman himself would admit this, on any other occasion.

I did not intend, indeed, and I am sorry I proposed, an argument of this kind before such an assembly, limited as I am at present to an hour or two, at most to complete it. If my opponent would devote with me a day or two to this subject, I might even satisfy himself, not only that prophecy is a gift, an intelligent gift; but that much of it pertains to the origin, progress, and catastrophe of that very hierarchy, of which he is himself a member.

There are two kinds of maps in schools; one gives both the place and the name of it, the other (sometimes called a blank map,) gives the place without the name. The former represents history; the latter, prophecy. Prophecy is as correct a map of the future, as history is of the past; but it is not always quite so obvious. I have taught geography with these two sorts of maps. The pupil studied on that inscribed with the names of the places, and we examined him on the blank map. The study of fulfilled prophecy, with the history of the past, prepares us for the blank map, the outline of the future. On the blank map, we can learn the great outline of things—their relative positions, distances and magnitudes. We may sometimes err, in fixing the proper name on every place: but we cannot greatly err, in form-

ing a useful acquaintance with the whole; especially, having a correct knowledge of what is past, or of certain portions of the past, which must ever be a key to the future. Thus we can acquire a clear and satisfactory outline of the vast expanse of future time, although we may, sometimes, err in a date, or in the name of a particular place, person, or thing.

But as my opponent has so perfectly failed to meet my argument, I shall have to give it to the public without much amplification or proof I will, therefore, recapitulate, emphatically, a few of the grand landmarks; and

1. The two tyrannies mentioned in Daniel and John, arose out of the great sea, the Mediterranean; or, from among the nations bordering thereon, in a state of tumult. Does not Rome stand on these waters; and is not Italy almost surrounded by them? The Tiber itself, inconsiderable as it is, is nevertheless, a part of this very sea. This beast came not from the deserts of Arabia; nor from the Pacific, nor the Atlantic; but from the Mediterranean.

2. The origin or commencement of these two despotisms, or of the symbolic beasts of Daniel and John, exactly synchronize. They were contemporaries: indeed, they are identical. They both rise at the same time and place.

3. They are co-existent, and continue the same time, 1260 years.

4. The types, in both pictures, or the grand incidents and characteristics, are the same.

5. Their latter end is the same. There is, indeed, no argument on this subject: it is as plain as history. My opponent will never debate it. Paul occupies the place of a commentator or interpretator, and without a figure explains the mystery of iniquity. He avers the impossibility of the appearance of this monster, this papal hierarchy, so long as pagan Rome, which then hindered a pope, should continue to hinder. All commentators understand, "he that lets," as referring to pagan Rome. We have already seen, that we could not find a pope before the time of Phocas the usurper, and Boniface III. No politico-ecclesiastic communion of nations, under a ghostly monarchy, ever stood on earth before that day.

Paul speaks of the temple of God, as the residence of this mammoth antagonist power. It was not in a pure church he appeared, and, certainly it was not among the pagan Arabs, that this man of idolatry (for such is the import of sin in this passage) showed his blasphemous face.

I said not, that there was no church of God at Rome, before the papacy. If there never had been a true church of God, at Rome; the

papacy, or the man of *sin*, never could have been born there. For, be it observed, emphatically, the man of *sin* is not a pagan, a Turk, a professed infidel; but, an apostate Christian.

Does not the pope of Rome, and none but the pope of Rome, fill up all the grand lineaments of the painting? He exalts himself above all that is called a god—a magistrate, a pagan god; nay, above God himself: for no false God, nor the only living and true God, proposed to forgive sins before they were committed! His name is covered with blasphemy. There never stood on earth such a monster; looking like a lamb, and speaking like a dragon. I need not, however, repeat what has not been contradicted.

My argument is unanswered. I regret that it must go to the public, without being more fully tested. As to *Lateinos*, the gentleman may laugh at it; but can he show state or empire, whose name like that of *He Latine Basileia*, will spell 666? If he cannot, this alone ought to check his opposition.

My opponent did me great honor, in giving me such a colleague as Sir Isaac Newton, to bear half the brunt of his indignation. Greater literary and ecclesiastic names, than that of this great philosopher, and brighter stars in universal knowledge, adorn those prophetic heavens, and concentrate their light upon this map, which I have traced so hastily and imperfectly. What, if I should let the gentleman see a star of the first magnitude, or hear an archdeacon, in his own church, say a word on Babylon, and on the woman that sits on many waters!

“Who can there safely live, where not only wicked things are lawful, but all men are compelled by the severest punishments to believe, speak, and follow the most wicked and ungodly things; and to embrace them as things just and laudable; where they do not only *not receive sound doctrine*, but bitterly persecute all those who do resist the madness of their wills? * * * * *

* What is it, think you, to be drunk with the cup of Babylon, but from long conversation with her to be so infected with the contagion of her, that, following the erring herd, you willingly embrace false things for true; perverse for righteous, mad things for sound: and to desire rather to be mad with the multitude, than to be wise alone with danger and derision? He that is different in manners from them, ought not to live there, where the plague of corruption hath so prevailed as to infect all men with its contagion.” *Nicholaus de Clemaugis Epist.* p. 177.

In his book of *Simoniacal Prelates*, he says, cap. 1.

“The church is now become a shop of merchandize, or rather of robbery and rapine; in which all the sacraments are exposed to sale. * * * And therefore, you see such men admitted to the priesthood and other holy orders, who are idlers, unlearned, and scarce able to read, though waywardly, and without understanding one syllable after another, who know no more Latin, than they do Arabic, who, when they read, pray, or sing, know not, whether they bless God or blaspheme him—men undisciplined, unquiet, gluttons, drunkards,

praters, vagabonds, lustful, bred up in luxury, and in one word, idle and ignorant."

In his book of the *corrupt state of the church*, cap. 3.

"That she was defiled with the sink of all vices; and might be fitly called the *church of Malignants*; that the saying of the prophet was now verified, that *from the least of them to the greatest*, every one was given to covetousness; that from the prophet to the priest, every one dealt falsely. * * * * * Who preaches or declares the gospel? Who either by word or deed shews the way of life eternal?"

Again:

"What should I speak, (saith he) of the learning of the priests, when it is visible that scarce any of them can read? They know not words, and much less things: he of them that prayeth, is a barbarian to himself. If any man is idle and abhors labor, if he loves luxury, he gets now-a-days into the clergy, and then presently he joins himself to the rest of the priests that are voluptuous, and live according to Epicurius, rather than according to the laws of Christ. Cap. 25.

"Such (saith he) is the abundance of wicked men in all professions, that there is scarcely one among a thousand, who sincerely doth what his profession doth require; if there be any sincere, chaste, sober, frugal person, in any college or convent, who doth not walk in the broad way, he is made a ridiculous fable to the rest, and is continually called insolent, mad, and hypocritical fellow: so that many who would have been good, had they lived with good and honest men, are drawn by wicked company into their vices, lest they should suffer the forementioned reproaches among their companions." Cap. 26.

He then concludes with an apostrophe to the Roman church, as follows:

"What thinkest thou of thine own prophecy, the Revelations of St. John? Dost thou not think they do at least, in part, belong to thee? Thou hast not surely so wholly lost all shame as to deny this; look, therefore, into it, and read the damnation of this great whore, sitting upon many waters, and then contemplate thy famous facts and future ruin." Declarat. Defect. Virorum Eccl.

So testifies Nicolaus de Clemaugis, an archdeacon of the church of Rome, in the fifteenth century.

Not only have the sins of Sodom and Egypt been multiplied in this Babylon the great, but she had superadded to these the blood-guiltiness and cruelty of Jerusalem. Persecution is of the very essence and spirit of the supremacy, not merely as the martyred millions of Protestants, of every age, declare; but according to the doctrine of the church, and the oaths of her bishops. Every Roman Catholic bishop is sworn to persecute heretics and schismatics: even this very gentleman has sworn to persecute and oppose heretics and schismatics to the utmost of his power. This is no mere allegation. I will hereafter produce the oath, and if it can be otherwise explained, I shall give him an opportunity to do it. Till then, I proceed to allege, further, that learned Roman Catholics have tremblingly interpreted these prophecies, as

belonging to Rome papal. I have another witness here, in confirmation of my speech, and with his testimony I shall close these remarks, and proceed.

“Whence is it that this happened? *to wit, because* all flesh had corrupted its ways, we were all citizens and inhabitants not of the holy city Rome, that wicked city; of which that of the prophet Isaiah is fulfilled, ‘How is the faithful city become a harlot.’ Let no man think this prophecy has been fulfilled already in the destruction of Babylon, or Jerusalem. No! future things were present to the prophet’s eye, and this the prophet hath declared to us, saying, ‘the daughter of Zion shall be left desolate, as in the wasting of the enemy. St. John doth in the Revelations tell us, the daughter of Zion is not Jerusalem, but Rome: and his description of her makes it plain: For the woman which thou sawest (saith he) is *that great city* which hath dominion over the kings of the earth, that is spiritual dominion. She sits, saith he, upon seven hills, which *properly agrees to Rome*, which upon this account, is styled septicolis. She is full, saith he, of the names of blasphemy—she is the mother of uncleanness, fornications, and abominations, which are in the earth; than which words, *no more particular demonstration of the city can be requisite*, seeing these iniquities do almost generally reign, yet here they have their seat and empire.” Orat. habit. ad auditores Rotar Mail 15, A. D.

My friend is again on celibacy. But, really, I cannot return to these matters as often as he chooses to explain away, or deny, or otherwise dispose of, his own sayings and concessions. In this matter, as in a hundred others, it might suffice to show, that he differs from both Peter and Paul, and all the other apostles. For, as an apostle of Christ, Paul says of himself and Barnabas, that they had a *right* to have wives, “*sister-wives*,” as well as the other apostles. In this way Paul proves the point: “Have we not power to lead about with us a wife, as the other apostles have? Or, are Barnabas and myself debarred this privilege?” Such is the spirit and point of that passage; and excepting in time of public calamity, as Paul elsewhere teaches, “Let *every man* have his own wife, and every woman her own husband.” So we teach.

The bishop owes an apology for speaking on a subject, which I did not introduce for discussion. The whole merits of auricular confession is not the question; but the simple fact, that it is a tenet of the party, growing out of a human rule of divine faith. I introduced it, to be admitted or denied; not now to be debated. The same is true of transubstantiation. I introduced these institutions, as proof of the immoral nature and tendency of the Romanist rule of faith. I think it almost enough to have these doctrines or institutions acknowledged in this age and country, to prove that Roman Catholicism is not susceptible of reformation; and would be the same in this community as in Spain, Italy, or Portugal, under similar circumstances. My friend had the opportunity of a simple denial of these items at the moment, if they

were not parts of his system; and he may have the full discussion of them again.

On the subject of confession, one word as to the quotations from Episcopalians and Methodists. Would the gentleman wish you to understand, that *auricular confession* is an ordinance of those religious communities, as taught and practised in his church? If he does not, where is the relevancy of these quotations? If he does, where is the truth and candor? "Confess your *faults* to one another," will justify any two or more persons *mutually to confess* to each other, and to *pray for one another*; but will he affirm, that Methodists and Episcopalians say to one another, "I absolve thee," at their mutual confessions?! Why, then, I ask, seek to make Episcopalians and Methodists bear a part of the shame of these unscriptural and sinful practices? They disavow them: they would say to the bishop, confess your faults to us, and we will confess to you; but on no other condition. We may pray for you; we cannot forgive you. You may pray for us; but you cannot forgive us. I must, on this point, read you another extract from Smith's Synopsis of the works of Ligori, that you may see what justice my opponent renders to Episcopalians and Methodists, in his alliancing them with himself on the subject of confession:

"The saint continues thus: St. Philip Neri used to tell his penitents, that they who desire to progress in the way of God should submit themselves to a *learned confessor*, whom they should obey *as God*. [Is this Methodism?] He who thus acts will be *secure* from having to render an account of any of his actions. A confessor must be believed, because God will not suffer him to err. Nothing is safer than to follow the will of one's director, and nothing is more dangerous than to be directed by one's own judgment. [Is this Episcopalianism?] 'If,' continues Ligori, quoting from Glossa, a commandment be doubtful, he who acts in obedience to his confessor is excused from sin, although in truth, what he does is sinful.' [Is this Methodism?] Quoting from St. Dionysius, he has the following: 'If there be a doubt whether what one is about to do is against the commandment of God, we must obey the commandment of our *prelate*,' (bishop, priest or confessor,) 'because, although what we do be against God, nevertheless, on account of the virtue of obedience, we being subject to our prelates do not sin.' [Is this Episcopalianism?]---Id. ib.

"Let the confessor," continues the saint, "strenuously insist upon the penitent's obeying him, and if he refuses to obey, let him be sharply rebuked, be deprived of communion, and let his obduracy be blunted as much as possible."---Id. ib. N. 16. [Time expired.]

Twelve o'clock, M.

BISHOP PURCELL rises---

It was not heaven's holy oracles, but man's presumptuous freedom with the word of God, that I ridiculed. It was my friend who exposed the holy record to contempt; and afforded to infidels occasion

for triumph and insult, by forcing upon it his own preposterous interpretations, and making it say what its divine Author never intended it to say. I tell him again, in the very words of that sacred book, that "no prophecy of scripture is of any private interpretation;" that these blind who are "leaders of the blind," and that "both fall into the pit:" Matthew xv. 14. that, as Peter says, *there are many things in the scriptures* which my friend says are so very plain, *hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures to their own destruction:* 2d Peter, ch. iii. v. 16; finally, that "as there were FALSE PROPHETS among *the people*, even so shall there be lying teachers, who shall bring in sects of perdition, and deny the Lord who bought them, bringing on themselves swift destruction, and many shall follow their riotousness, through whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of." Having exposed the scriptures, our learned friend gave us a smart lesson in geography and chronology, proving, at least, one point to my satisfaction, if not to his own, that we may err in a date, place, person, or thing, the which he veritably hath done in his symbolical dissertation. I may, but I will not, apply to him the figure of Isaiah, "he has broken the eggs of asps, and may eat them; he hath woven the spider's web, and may clothe himself with the filmy texture." Isaiah lix. 5. The fragile egg and filmy texture are proper emblems of fickleness, inconstancy, and change of religion; but in ours there is neither mutability nor "shadow of vicissitude."

My friend has taken us a fishing again; the sea monster has discolored the waters, and like the wolf and lamb in the fable, he charges upon me the troubling of the stream. There is no escape for the gentleman. "*I absolve thee*" are the very words of the Episcopalian ritual in England; and private and particular confession is practised by the Methodists in the United States. Even he, himself, admits that the words "confess your sins to one another," will *justify* (St. James and christians, ought to be much obliged to him,) *any two*, or more, to confess to one another! What, then, does he mean by denying and admitting, rejecting and adopting, every creed and practice alternately? He blows hot and cold with the same breath. St. Philip Neri gave wise directions on the decalogue, and shewed that God, himself, could not authorize a violation of his own laws, much less a confessor. Hence his advice—"obey your confessor as God," was perfectly intelligible. I wish my friend would study the saint's life, and he would find in it maxims and examples well worthy of imitation, and nothing that could scandalize him.

My argument upon the subject of confession was perfectly pertinent; and the gentleman felt it—*hinc illae lachrymae*,—hence his charge of

irrelevancy. It was elaborately argued by him, that the practice was immoral, and it behoved me to vindicate it, as I have done, by proving that it was authorized and commanded by scripture, practised by the early church in its purity, and advocated by two of the most numerous and respectable sects, viz., Episcopalians and Methodists. Now, if my friend says, that persons in those communions never go to confession, according to the discipline and ritual, it only proves their inconsistency. Priests and bishops do confess, and that frequently. The more plous and sincere they are, the more faithfully do they comply with the salutary ordinance.

We do not dissuade young people from marrying, we only regret that those who are called to that state, do not marry faster. What is the object of all that tirade of abusive extracts against the Catholic church? Must I have to read dissertations to my opponent on all the humbugs, which his *criticism* has not been long enough at school to detect? The book "*De Corrupto Ecclesiae Statu*," was not written by its putative author Nicholaus de Clamangis, who was secretary to the anti-pope Benedict XIII. John De Chelm, James De Cleur, and John of Bavaria, have had respectively the honor of a production of which, its real author had reason to be ashamed. I wish my friend would spare me the necessity of such frequent exposure of his — I won't say it.

Here are the complete works of Liguori, in eight volumes, with an index consisting of one volume. I have performed a work of supererogation. I have examined these volumes, from cover to cover, and in none of them can so much as a shadow be found for the infamous charge. I exonerate my friend from the sin of wilful misrepresentation. I will say he has been deceived, misled by—anti-christ, perhaps, who can deceive the elect, *if possible*, that is to say, *if I'll let him*, which I have, in this instance, no notion of doing. The original tells the truth. The translation lies. My friends, I hope that the same audience, which is here now, will be here this evening, and I pledge myself, before the heavens and the earth, that this base slander is what I call it. There is no foundation for it whatever in the works of Liguori. On the contrary, in the place indicated, the severest punishment, known to church discipline, is pronounced against the ecclesiastic who violates the holy law; "Thou shalt perform unto the Lord thine oath." Numbers xxx. 2 and seq.

I know of no better vindication of Catholic doctrines and practices, than their simple and faithful announcement. It is the misrepresentation of our tenets that did us injury for times and a time and half a time; but now the light from heaven is breaking. "Thou hast ap-

pointed darkness, and it is night, *in it* shall all the beasts of the earth go about,—the sun riseth—and they shall lie down in their dens." Ps. ciii. 20, 22.

My learned opponent says the Tiber runs into the Mediterranean. That is a fact, and so do the waters of a thousand other streams. He says that I did not prove that there was a head of the church in Rome before Constantine's time. This I may simply deny; but have I not quoted the testimony of general councils, of the fathers, of numberless appeals to Rome, of Pagans, historians and emperors, to prove that, now incontestible, fact? I refer to Eusebius, and add one remark that Eusebius was born in 270. His history extends to the year 324, the epoch when Constantine was sole master of the Roman empire. Eusebius narrated the belief of the whole church during the preceding *two hundred* years, for no longer period had elapsed since the death of St. John—and Polycarp, Ignatius, Irenæus, Caius, a Roman priest, and Hegesippus, the ecclesiastical historian, lived in that interval. Read Eusebius. My friend has now allowed that, for a long time, the church of Rome was pure. This is true; but when will he fulfil his promise at the opening of the debate and inform us, at last, from what church she is an apostacy? We are coming near the end of the discussion and this is too important a point to be *forgotten*.

"The church formerly used the vernacular language." So she did. And there was a very good reason for it. The Latin then was the vernacular of the greatest part of the civilized world, in consequence of the Roman conquests. It was generally known, where other languages continued to be the vernacular. St. Paul wrote to the Romans in Greek, a language which *all* the Romans did not understand. My friend Mr. Campbell has stated the very best reasons, in the preface to his new Testament, for the adoption of a uniform language as the vehicle of revelation. The learned Southey agrees, if not with him, at least, with the Catholic church on the subject of its peculiar fitness to be the language of the Christian Liturgy.

"Latin," says Southey, Vol. I. p. 59, "was made the language of religion; there had been the same reason for this in Italy, and Spain, and France, as for making it the language of the laws; and in England also, there was reason, which, though different, was not less valid. A common language was necessary for the clergy, who considered themselves as belonging, less to the country, in which they happened, individually to have been born, or stationed, than to their order, or to christendom, for in these ages christendom was regarded as something more than a mere name. No modern language was as yet fixed, or reduced to rules or regarded as a written tongue; of necessity, therefore, Latin, in which the western clergy read the scriptures, and in which the fathers of the western church had composed their works, and the councils had issued their decrees, was every where retained as the natural and professional language of

the ministers of religion. They preached and catechized, and conferred in the common speech of the country, and that the church service was not verbally intelligible to the congregation was, upon their principles no inconvenience.

But if, in this respect there was no real disadvantage in the use of a foreign tongue; in other respects many and most important advantages arose from it. The clergy became of necessity a learned body; and to their humble and patient labors we owe the whole history of the middle ages, and the preservation of those works of antiquity, which, for the instruction of all after ages, have been preserved: The students at Canterbury in Bede's time, were as well skilled, both in Latin and Greek as in their native speech; and Bede, himself (worthy to be called venerable, if ever that epithet was worthily applied) had acquired all that could possibly be learned from books, and, was master of what was then, the whole circle of human knowledge."

The people have the substance, frequently the literal translation, in their prayer books, of what the Priest reads, during the sacrifice, in the ancient language of Catholic Europe. They know as well as the priest, himself, does, to what they answer, "Amen." When a foreigner from any of the countries where Greek is not the vernacular comes into our churches, and I need scarcely except even the Catholics, of the Greek rite, he is perfectly at home, among his brethren in faith and worship. Their ceremonies and prayers are the same as in his native land—Germans, French, English, Irish, Poles, Swiss, Palians, Portuguese, like the Jews, devout men from every nation under heaven, we hear our priests, as they did the apostles, speaking in a tongue which we well may call our own, "the wonderful works of God." The sermons of our church are not preached in Latin, but in as plain English as we can find in common use.

I have answered all I could note of the gentleman's remarks. I have only two of my own to add at present. It is in referenee to the assertion of my learned opponent that monsters are always emblematical of bad men or tyrants. Now what will my friend say of Ezekiel 1st ch.? "And I saw—and behold, a whirlwind came out of the earth: and a great cloud, and a fire infolding it, and brightness was about it; and out of the midst thereof, that is, out of the midst of the fire, as it were the resemblance of Amber, and in the midst thereof the likeness of four living creatures: and this was their appearance: there was the likeness of a man in them. Every one had four faces, and every one four wings. Their feet were straight feet, and the sole of their foot was like the sole of a calf's foot; and they sparkled like the appearance of glowing brass. And they had the hands of a man, under their wings, on their four sides: and they had faces, and wings on their sides. And I heard the noise of their wings, like the noise of many waters, as it were the voice of the most high God;—This was the vision of the likeness of the glory of the Lord." What will my friend

now say of his monster theory? These animals are taken to have been figures of the four Evangelists,—or of all the Apostles.

My second remark is, that whoever has read Hume's or Lingard's history of England, knows that the Ana-baptists when driven by armed soldiers out of the Parliament House, found in the famous Oliver Cromwell, a perfect fac-simile of the Anti-Christ.—[Time expired.]

Three o'clock, P. M.

MR. CAMPBELL rises—

There was one remark made by my opponent, in his last speech, and only one that had some appropriate reference to my remarks on symbols. Upon this remark, I will make one affirmation. Whatever else he has been pleased to say, may pass for what it is worth, tax free.

The gentleman asserts, that beasts of prey are not always symbolical of tyrants. Had I asserted that proposition, it would have been in point to have made such a remark: but unfortunately for him, that was not my proposition. It was, that *when* God depicts a tyranny, he selects some monster, or some savage wild beast to symbolize it. But is that identical with—"beasts of prey in symbolic language only represent tyrants?" Or follows it from my proposition, that a lion or an eagle must *always* and *uniformly* represent a tyrant?—I went farther and said, that some savage wild beast—some monster was God's image of a secular or ecclesiastic despotism. This was my explanation.

It is true that a "lion," as well as a "lamb," is applied to the Savior. He is the "Lion of the tribe of Judah:" but Daniel's lion had wings, and came from the sea. It was a monster.

The Romish spirit, in other words, the savage spirit of pagan and papal Rome, has been imparted even to Protestant states. In so much that England has for her symbol, or national device, a tawny lion; and her sons have chosen their own eagle, a ravenous bird of prey, for their device, that they may pounce upon their mother's lion and show themselves as full of war and stratagem and spoils, as the barbarous and uncivilized nations of the old pagan world.—Although I prefer the American Eagle to the British Lion, I would rather fight the battles of my king, under the device of a milk white dove, on an azure flag, as more consonant to the genius of the Reign of heaven. War, however, is wholly barbarous. Nations at war, are at best but partly civilized, and, therefore, they generally choose beasts of prey for their insignia. When we become more rational, more civilized, and more christian, we will find some other way of settling our national disputes, than with the sword, and with the confused noise of the warrior, and garments baptized in blood.

The gentleman asked, the other day, (and I know not whether in the crowd and curious and impertinent matters introduced, I paid any attention to it)—if God could make twelve men infallible, could he not make as many more infallible as he pleased; and continue them through all succeeding time?! Certainly he could, I answer; but there is no philosophy in this question. I might retort, could not God have made fourteen instead of seven primary planets? and as many satellites as he pleased? And the same answer would equally suit both questions. We therefore answer by saying, that neither the system of nature, nor the system of religion needs them. The inspired twelve made a full revelation of christian truth. They taught the whole religion: We need nothing more. If a full and explicit development, is once made, and carefully preserved; ten thousand apostles could not perfect the christian system, by adding a new idea.

My friend gave me a challenge the other day: I think I have accepted it: he now adds from some new source, or repeats, I know not which, "If the testimony of tradition be not infallible how can you know the Bible to be inspired?" This, together with his repeated assertion that Protestants believe in the bible on the same testimony he offers for the succession of Peter, &c.; I reserved for my sixth proposition, which, because of the advanced state of the discussion, as respects time, is likely to be crowded into a corner, I therefore beg permission to introduce it at this time.

"PROP. VI. Notwithstanding her pretensions to have given us the Bible, and faith in it, we are perfectly independent of her for our knowledge of that book, and its evidences of a divine original."

The Roman Catholic says, as the bishop has himself averred, "I believe in the Holy Catholic church:" but this phrase needs a general council to explain it. Does it mean, I believe *the* Catholic church; or, I believe *in* the Catholic church? Do they confide in it for salvation, or only believe what it believes; and because it believes it? It is ambiguous. The "*fides carbonaria*" is thus expressed: "I believe what the church believes; and the church believes what I believe; and we both believe the same thing." Or, as repeated the other day, the Roman Catholic believes the bible on the authority of the church, and the church on the authority of the bible! But the Christian is commanded and expected to be always ready to give a reason for the faith that is in him. God is reason; and every communication from him is rational; and as man is a reasonable being, he must have good reasons to offer for his believing the christian religion. When you ask a Roman Catholic the reason of his faith, what does he answer? His father told him that the Roman Catholic was the true church. The

same reason would justify any one for being a Jew, a Turk, or an infidel. He that is of the order of Ali or Omar, has then, as good a reason to give for his faith in the Koran, as any Romanist has to give for his faith in the bible, if his answer to the question, "*why do you believe?*" is, *Because my father, or the mosque, or the church told me it was so.* I would, indeed, be gratified to learn from my opponent, Dr. PURCELL, why he would not have had as good reason for believing in the Koran, as he has for being a Roman Catholic, on the ground of mere tradition, had he happened to have been born in Turkey? There must be an examination of the testimony, and perception of its truth, on its own intrinsic excellence; or, a conviction of its truth upon the evidence which it affords; else there is no reason in faith—it is mere credulity, or superstition.

The first, and characteristic difference, between the Protestant and the Roman Catholic, is this: the former believes the scriptures first, and the church afterwards; whereas, the latter believes the church first, and the scriptures afterwards. "But," says the bishop, "where does the Protestant get the bible to believe, but through the church?" And that first brings us to the proposition.

If any person hand me a book, and I read it, and believe it, does my faith in it necessarily rest upon him who hands it to me? And, yet, this is the gigantic strength of all that my opponent can say on this subject. It would be much more plausible, that the Protestants are indebted exclusively to the Roman Catholic church for the book, if Protestants believed all the Roman Catholic traditions, as well as the bible: but, while we reject the apocrypha, and the traditions of popery, and receive the bible only, this fact will answer a thousand volumes of sophistry, in proof that our faith in the bible, rests not upon the authority of the church of Rome. The fact, that we reject her apocryphal bible and testament, with all other traditions of Roman Catholics, ancient and modern, resting solely upon her authority, and that we retain the bible, (*one version of which she has,*) is incontestable proof, that we receive the bible on other authority than her traditions. Dispose of this fact who may, I affirm that my opponent never can! This illustrious and indisputable fact, places in bold relief the irrelevancy of his effort to show, that our faith in the bible, and his belief in Peter's Roman diocese, or in his being bishop of Rome, rest upon the same authority. That I must believe a letter on the authority of him who carries it, or a book on the authority of him who puts it in my hand, is another of the assumptions of the church of encroachments, resting upon Peter's having been bishop of Rome.

God created both the sun and the human eye, and he has adapted

them to each other. He created the human understanding and the bible, and adapted them to each other. The honest student of nature needs no tradition to prove that man made not the sun; neither does the humble and candid student of the bible, need any witness from the bishops or church of Rome, that they did not make the bible. She is, indeed, a witness for the bible, and the true church, somewhere else existing than in her own communion: for, had it not been for her rivals, who, like Argus, have ever watched the sacred text, how it would have been interpolated and corrupted, her edition of the primitive fathers, and other books of which she was the sole or chief depository, abundantly declare. But, having fixed the date, not merely of the first pope, but of the grand schism which originated the Roman Catholic church, I hasten, with all despatch, to show that we have copies of the bible more ancient than the grand schism, more ancient than the first pope: nay, that were written before the question of a supreme head began to be discussed; and which copies, in the form of transcription, have never been soiled by the fingers of a monk. I read but a few documents, as I have but little time for this subject; but I read them from a source of biblical authority, which, on these points, has not been, and, I presume, will not be, disputed; "Horne's Introduction:"

"Of the few manuscripts known to be extant, which contain the Greek Scriptures (that is, the Old Testament, according to the Septuagint version, and the New Testament) there are two which pre-eminently demand the attention of the Biblical student for their antiquity and intrinsic value, viz.: The Alexandrian manuscript, which is preserved in the British museum, and the Vatican manuscript, deposited in the library of the Vatican Palace at Rome.

I. The CODEX ALEXANDRINUS, or Alexandrian manuscripts, which is noted by the letter A in Wetstein's and Griesbach's critical editions of the New Testament, consists of four folio volumes; the three first contain the whole of the Old Testament, together with the Apocryphal books, and the fourth comprises the New Testament, the first epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, and the Apocryphal psalms ascribed to Solomon. In the New Testament there is wanting the beginning as far as Matth. xxv. 6. ο νυμφίος ερχεται; likewise from John vi. 50. to viii. 52. and from the 2 Cor. iv. 13. to xii. 7. [This manuscript is now preserved in the British museum, where it was deposited in 1753. It was sent as a present to king Charles I. from Cyrillus Lucaris, a native of Crete, and patriarch of Constantinople, by Sir Thomas Rowe, ambassador from England to the Grand Signior, in the year 1628. Cyrillus brought it with him from Alexandria, where, probably, it was written. In a schedule annexed to it, he gives this account; that it was written, as tradition informed them, by Thecla, a noble Egyptian lady, about thirteen hundred years ago, a little after the council of Nice. He adds that the name of Thecla at the end of the book was erased; but that this was the case with other books of the christians, after christianity was extinguished in Egypt by the Mohammedans: and that recent tradition records the fact of the laceration and erasure of Thecla's name. The proprietor of this manuscript, before it came into the hands of Cyrillus Lucaris, had written an Arabic subscription, expressing that this book was said to have been written

with the pen of Thecla the martyr." [Introduction to the critical study and knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, by Thomas Hartwell Horne. Vol. II, pp. 66, 67.

But, this is not the only *ante-papistical* manuscript of the scripture, now extant.

II. "THE CODEX VATICANUS, No. 1209, which Wetstein and Griesbach have both noted with the letter B, contests the palm of antiquity with the Alexandrian manuscript. No fac-simile of it has ever been published. The Roman edition of the Septuagint, printed in 1590, professes to exhibit the text of this manuscript; and in the preface to that edition it is stated to have been written before the year 387, i. e. towards the close of the 4th century: Montfaucon and Blanchini refer it to the 5th or 6th century, and Du Pin to the 7th century. Professor Hug has endeavored to shew that it was written in the early part of the fourth century; but, from the omission of the Eusebian κεφαλαια and τιτλοι, Bishop Marsh concludes with great probability, that it was written before the close of the fifth century. The Vatican manuscript is written on parchment or vellum in uncial or capital letters, in three columns on each page, all of which are of the same size, except at the beginning of a book, and without any division of chapters, verses, or words, but with accents and spirits. The shape of the letters, and color of the ink, prove that it was written throughout by one and the same careful copyist." Id. ib. p. 74.

There are also versions older than the papacy, older than the vulgate, which is itself evidently older than the church of Rome.

"Syria being visited at a very early period by the preachers of the christian faith, several translations of the sacred volume were made into the language of that country. The most celebrated of these is the *Peschito* or *Literal* (*Versio Simplex*), as it is usually called, on account of its very close adherence to the Hebrew text, from which it was immediately made. The most extravagant assertions have been advanced concerning its antiquity, some referring it to the time of Solomon and Hiram, while others ascribe it to Asa, the priest of Samaritans, and a third class, to the apostle Thaddeus. This last tradition is received by the Syrian churches; but a more recent date is ascribed to it by modern biblical philologers. Bishop Walton, Carpzov, Leusden, Bishop Lowth, and Dr. Kennicott, fix its date to the first century; Bauer, and some other German critics, to the second or third century: Jahn fixes it at the latest, to the second century; De Rossi pronounces it to be very ancient, but does not specify any precise date. The most probable opinion is that of Michaelis, who ascribes it to the close of the first or to the earlier part of the second century, at which time the Syrian churches flourished most, and the christians at Edessa had a temple for divine worship erected after the model of that at Jerusalem: and it is not to be supposed that they would be without a version of the Old Testament, the reading of which had been introduced by the apostles." Id. ib. pp. 187, 188.

"An important accession to biblical literature was made a few years since, by the late learned and excellent Dr. Buchanan, to whose assiduous labors the British church in India is most deeply indebted: and who, in his progress among the Syrian churches and Jews of India, discovered and obtained numerous ancient manuscripts of the scriptures, which are now deposited in the public library at Cambridge. One of these, which was discovered in a remote Syrian church near the mountains, is particularly valuable: it contains the old and new Testaments, engrossed with beautiful accuracy in the *Estrangelo* (or old Syriac,) character, on strong vellum, in large folio, and having three columns in a page.

The words of every book are numbered: and the volume illuminated, but not after the European manner, the initial letters having no ornament. Though somewhat injured by time or neglect, the ink being in certain places obliterated, still the letters can, in general, be distinctly traced from the impress of the pen, or from the partial corrosion of the ink. The Syrian church assigns a high date to this manuscript, which in the opinion of Mr. Yeates, who has published a collation of the Petateuch, was written about the seventh century. In looking over this manuscript, Dr. Buchanan found the very first emendation of the Hebrew text proposed by Dr. Kennicott which doubtless is the true reading. *Id. ib. p. 189.*

Now, if we of the west of Europe, did receive the bible first from our Roman Catholic ancestors, I ask, would that make us dependent on their traditions alone for that book; any more than A. B., who lived on one of the seven mouths of the Nile, from which he supplies himself with water, was, on that account, absolutely dependent on the branch nearest his dwelling. Tell him that he is absolutely and alone dependent on it for water; and he will say, "No; but it is more *convenient* to supply myself from this stream: there are six other branches, from which I could supply myself, were it necessary for my life or comfort." So say we. We have Jews, Greeks, Armenians, and Protestants, from the first schism, A. D. 250, down to the present day; to say nothing of the ancient sceptics, Celsus, Porphyry, Julian, and others; and the ancient heretics, from whose writings, together with those of the infidel pagans, we could almost compile a New Testament, containing every thing read, not only since, but before the council of Laodicea. Du Pin himself acknowledges, that before that council, even in the third century, the scriptures were read as they now are. But, as for our independence of all Roman Catholic tradition, on this subject, many other proofs may be offered. The notorious and glorious fact, however, that Protestants have rejected the Roman Catholic rule of faith, apocrypha, traditions, and all, and even her own vulgate, as authentic, will for ever frown out of countenance, the groundless imputations of my too credulous opponent. [Time expired.]

Half-past 3 o'clock, P. M.

BISHOP PURCELL rises—

My friends, have you ever seen the Anti-Christ? Look at him now (holding up a book.) This morning, I endeavored to shew that Mahommed was the fittest beast, to illustrate the mysterious prophecy, and I stated that many names (fourteen) could be found to correspond with the numbers 666. I now distinctly shew the page and book, where the computation is made and the last of these names is that of God himself. Cerdenus, a Greek writer, testifies that the name of Ma-

hommed, as it was written in his time, will exactly spell the beast. On this subject, the reader who is not content with the article, Anti-Christ, in Robinson's Calmet, may refer to Walmesley's General History of the Christian church, p. 250.

I do not give my own theory of the matter. There have been too many theories *already*, to need more. I believe the beast was neither Luther, nor Mahommed, nor the pope. This is not an article of faith with me, nor with any Catholic. I respect the prophecy, but I await to decide the question until "Revelations" be what the term imports. I have here a history of the popes, in French, published, as the title page says "at the expense of the holy Father." Of course it is to be understood to be a hoax, and it deserves to be so considered. It tells a heap of lies about him; among others he was to be destroyed for ever in 1745. We may *then* write his epitaph.

I do not know on what grounds my friend asserted yesterday, that the 2nd. commandment was not a part of the Catholic rule of morals. I have already exhibited various catechisms, in use in the United States, in all of which, every word of the commandments is found. I suppose my friend overlooked the fact. I was glad to hear the gentleman speak so highly of Michaelis. It showed his literary knowledge; and perhaps he may be interested in knowing that when but one edition of his works could be obtained in Paris, in 1824, I procured it. Here it happens by a singular coincidence, unknown to him, to be. I invite him to examine in it the commandments, and he will find them fully and faithfully rendered in every Catholic Bible and Testament. Will my friend tell the audience when the *mazoretic points*, without which the understanding of the Bible, if not impossible, is very difficult, were first introduced? and by whom?

Do all Bible readers know, as they ought to know, that in the old Hebrew Bible, there is no division of verses, much less of chapters? That a Roman Catholic cardinal had a good deal to do in making the division—and that they were not Protestants, but Rabbis, who suffixed the points which serve instead of vowels to Hebrew words, which have none but consonants alone; accordingly, as these vowels are placed, the Hebrew root may signify whatever the *pointer* pleases? The context of the oldest known meaning must be the only criterion. But I should like to know how one of our good, plain, homebred and industrious citizens can accomplish this task for himself. Even learned men made themselves ridiculous by their *mazoretic* fixtures and translations, and Luther, who was a good *Catholic* scholar—laughing at the absurdity of their versions of passages in the Bible—observed that "In the beginning the cuckoo ate the sparrow and the feathers," would

be just as good a translation of the first line of Genesis, as some of theirs. I will return to this subject.

It appears that Birds and Beasts of prey may represent peace, as well as cruelty. England then suffers no disparagement from her Lion, nor the United States, from her Eagle. The gentleman suggests a dove for the latter. I have not the slightest objection, and if the criticism I have heard be correct, the bird lately stamped on the new American coin resembles a chicken, more than a bird of prey. It looks as if it were more to be preyed upon than preying, and more sinned against than sinning.

Before I come to the very important point of the Bible, I must not forget to quote the testimony of the eloquent Southey, to shew what anti-Christ the popes were, and how they displayed their anti-christian spirit, in the conversion of Old England.

“That Gregory, who was afterwards raised to the popedom, and is distinguished from succeeding popes of the same name (one alone excepted,) by the rank of saint, and from him, by the appellation of the Great, was one day led into the market-place at Rome, with a great concourse of persons, to look at a large importation of foreign merchandise, which had just arrived. Among other articles, there were some boys exposed for sale like cattle. There was nothing remarkable in this, for it was the custom every where in that age, and had been so from time immemorial: but he was struck by the appearance of the boys, their fine clear skins, the beauty of their flaxen or golden hair, and their ingenuous countenances; so that he asked from what country they came; and when he was told from the island of Britain, where the inhabitants in general were of that complexion and comeliness, he inquired if the people were christians, and sighed for compassion at hearing that they were in a state of Pagan darkness. From that day the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons became a favorite object with Gregory. Accordingly he despatched thither forty missionaries from a *monastery*, which he had founded at Rome.

When, therefore, Augustine (who was their chief) and his companions landed in the isle of Thanet, they came not as obscure men, unprotected and unaccruited; but with recommendations from the kings of France, and as messengers from a potentate, whose spiritual authority was acknowledged and obeyed throughout that part of the world, to which the northern nations were accustomed to look as the seat of empire and superior civilization. They made their arrival known to Ethelbert, and requested an audience. They approached in procession, bearing a silver crucifix, and a portrait of our Savior, upon a banner adorned with gold, and chanting the litany. The king welcomed them courteously, and ordered them to be seated: after which, Augustine stood up, and, through an interpreter, whom he had brought from France, delivered the purport of his mission, in a brief, but well ordered and impressive discourse. He was come to the king, and to that kingdom, he said, for their eternal good, a messenger of good tidings; offering to their acceptance perpetual happiness, here and hereafter, if they would accept his words. The Creator and Redeemer had opened the kingdom of heaven to the human race: for God so loved the world that he had sent into it his only son, as that one himself testified, to become a man among the children of men, and suffered death upon the cross, in atonement for their sins. That incarnate divinity had been made manifest by innumerable

miracles. Christ had stilled the winds and waves, and walked upon the waters: he had healed diseases, and restored the dead to life: finally, he had risen from the dead himself, that we might rise again through him, and had ascended into heaven, that he might receive us there in his glory; and he would come again to judge both the quick and the dead. 'Think not,' he proceeded, 'O most excellent king, that we are superstitious, because we have come from Rome into thy dominion, for the sake of the salvation of thee and of thy people: we have done this, being constrained by great love: for that which we desire, above all the pomps and delights of this world, is to have our fellow-creatures partakers with ourselves in the kingdom of heaven, &c.'" [Southey's Book of the Church, chap. iii. p. 23. etc.

My friend proposed a question, which he thought difficult. Why do I believe the bible? He said my answer would be, because the church believes it; and this, he says, is like Peter giving a character to Paul, and Paul to Peter. I reciprocate the question of the gentleman, and he says he believes in the church, because he believes in the bible. Thus the bible and church testify to each other in his theory, and the difficulty is infinitely greater for a Protestant, than for a Catholic. In fact, for a Catholic the question is not susceptible of any difficulty, whatever. One word will shew that we are right. WHICH was prior? The bible or the church? Manifestly, the church was the older. The apostles did not wait to have thousands of bibles copied, and to freight vessels with them, and sail as supercargoes of the heavenly merchandise, to the distant nations of the earth. "*Faith*," says St. Paul, "*comes from hearing*." There were millions of converts to Christianity, whole nations were converted to the Savior, by *preaching*, before the different books composing the present bible, were determined to be genuine Scripture and collected into one volume. This was not done before the beginning of the fourth century. The church was therefore prior to the bible: and if the bible had never been written, the gospel could have been preached and believed, as it was in the early ages, without its aid. How did the apostles make converts without the bible? They addressed themselves to the reason of the unconverted nations. They convinced them, if necessary, of the existence of God, by the spectacle of the divine wisdom and power, displayed in the creation and preservation of the world. They appealed to the natural law, whose precepts were written by the finger of God, on tables of flesh, the hearts of men, before they were engraven on stone, amidst the thunder and lightnings of Sinai. Thus did they find the great primary truths of natural religion, with regard to both doctrine and morals, inculcated by the contemplation of the visible wonders of creation and the testimony of the human heart.

They next proceeded to convince their hearers of the unity of God, and the sinfulness and grossness of idolatry, of their having departed

from the moral law, of the darkness in which sin had involved the human race, of our incompetency for our own cure, of the divine commiseration of our misery, of the descent of Jesus Christ, his doctrine, his miracles, his charity, his establishment of his church, his sacraments and the various means of grace, his promises to be with his apostles, He and his Holy Spirit, for ever, his death, &c. The holiness of the apostles' lives, the cruel death with which they sealed the truth they had proclaimed, conciliated the belief and completed the conversion of their hearers. "*I willingly,*" says Paschal, "*believe the witnesses, who let their throats be cut to attest the truth of what they declare.*" The bible could not shed its blood to attest its divine origin. The ignorant, who are a large proportion of the human race, could not read it; the learned, and the pious, and the sincere, as every one knows, found it a task far above their strength, to distinguish genuine from spurious scripture. Before the invention of printing, men could not procure bibles: since the invention of printing, they read them to introduce a flood of new sects; so that there are now as many religions, almost, as there are different versions or different readers of the scriptures. If, on the contrary, there is anything clearly taught in the scriptures, it is the authority of the church, which, without aid from the bible, not all composed when the first apostles preached, had fully established her authority, and, independently of her miracles, proved, by the preternatural success of her preaching, that God was indeed with her, as he had promised, teaching all nations, and perpetually suggesting to her all truth. Hence, we believe in the church first; and on the faith of the evidences which I have enumerated, we believe in the bible, which the church presents to us, vouching for its purity and authenticity. The bible obtained, sanctions the authority of the church, and confirms our faith. Here, all is consistent, and our submission to the church is reasonable. The Protestant divines, Hooker and Chillingworth, allow that the bible cannot bear testimony to itself: even Luther was forced to acknowledge it. "We are obliged," says he, "to yield many things to the papists; that with them is the word of God, that we received from them; otherwise, we should have known nothing at all about it." (Comment on John, c. 16.) Hence the remarkable saying of St. Augustine: "I should not believe the gospel itself, if the Catholic church did not oblige me to do so." Will my friend inform me, why he rejects an authentic work, of great excellence, written by St. Barnabas; who is termed, in scripture, an apostle, and declared to be full of the holy Ghost, (Acts xiv. 24, xi. 24;) and receives, as canonical, parts of the New Testament, which were not written by apostles at all, viz., the gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke? The original text of Moses, and

the ancient prophets, was destroyed with the temple and city of Jerusalem, by the Assyrians under Nebuchadnezzar; and the authentic copies which replaced them, perished in the persecution of Antiochus. How were these books restored? Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans, and entrusted it to the deaconess Phœbe. His Epistle to the Ephesians, he confided to the disciple Tychicus. How can we be sure of these epistles, as they now stand in the Testament? Was it not the corruption of the bible by Queen Elizabeth's bishops, that caused James I. to have a new translation to be made? But, I should be endless, if I enumerated all the insurmountable difficulties, which a Protestant encounters at the very first step of his journey in quest of a religion. *He must turn Catholic at the very outset, and take the bible, as he gets it, on authority, or remain an unbeliever all his life. And he must believe that authority to be infallible, or he can never be sure that the bible it gives him is divine.* Catholics have faith by baptism, as Protestants have; but the latter lose it when they adopt, on arriving at mature age, the Protestant principle, that every man must find out his religion for himself, from the bible. Many Protestants are not admonished of the danger of their situation, and do not themselves reflect on these difficulties. As long as they are sincere, and do the best they can to obey God and conscience, the Catholic church excuses them, in the words of St. Augustine: "Let those treat you harshly, who know not how hard it is to get rid of old prejudices. Let those treat you harshly, who have not learned how very hard it is to purify the interior eye, and render it capable of contemplating the sun of the soul, truth. But, as to us: we are far from this disposition towards persons who are separated from us, not by errors of their own invention, but by their being entangled in those of others. We are so far from this disposition, that we pray to God, that in refuting the false opinions of those whom you follow, not from malice, but from imprudence, he would bestow upon us that spirit of peace, which feels no other sentiment than charity, no other interest than that of Jesus Christ, no other wish but for your salvation." Had we been born Mahommedans, we would, perhaps, live Mahommedans. Thank God, we are not. But, this does not require us to throw away our faith. It would be too long to notice all the gentleman says. I attend to the most important.

Now, I will venture to assert, that there is not a Protestant in this house, who can say, that he has found out all the tenets which he believes, by reading the bible alone. He believes them, because his parents, and teachers, and minister, his catechism, taught them; or a hundred other influences may have been brought to bear upon his mind and his affections, favorable to those peculiar tenets. It is not at all

the case with Protestant children, any more than with Catholic children, that reason is the *first* to lead them to their belief. Let each one candidly examine his own heart, and ask himself if he was not as much *educated* in those doctrines which he now professes, as the Catholics were in theirs.

How can he be sure, if he indeed possesses an authentic copy of the scriptures, that he *understands* them? "The word of God," says the Protestant bishop, Walton, "does not consist in mere letters, whether written or printed, but in the sense of it; which no one can better interpret than the true church, to which Christ committed this same pledge." (Polyglot. Proleg. ch. v.)

My opponent says, there was a copy of the scriptures found, which the fingers of a monk had never soiled. And how does he go about to establish this proposition? He quoted Horne. I will take up this very work, and prove, while I admit that Horne was a learned writer, that he fell into some very unlearned blunders. But how does Horne say that my friend is right? He says, that this very manuscript was found in one of the twenty-two monasteries of Mount Athos!! Lo! there was a monk at the bottom of it after all! [Time expired.]

Four o'clock, P. M.

MR. CAMPBELL rises—

My friends, there is any thing but order in our discussion—I mean logical order, as respects the duties of a respondent. Now, certainly, this will abundantly appear in the report of this debate.

The gentleman has not once, as yet, replied to my speeches in regular sequence; but, after the interval of a night, a day, and sometimes two days, he responds to some point or argument: and then his reply consists either in accusing me of misunderstanding, or misstating what he has said; or perhaps in denying my authorities, or by introducing some extract, or tradition, or opinion, from some great Protestant, or some good Catholic, or some excogitation of his own. His last speech was a happy illustration of Orvid's

"congestaque eodem—
Non bene junctarum discordia semina rerum."

[Metamor. lib. I.]

And, certainly, his mirthfulness and gravity were in unison with the dignity of his reply; and equally fallible as respects effect of any sort upon his audience. This rhetoric soon wears out. It is but an echo, a sound, a shadow; the crisis calls for something more solid. But if it cannot be found, I must submit to interruption, and turn aside to notice the gleanings of his last and best reflections upon the prophecies.

The gentleman has given us from his library some ridiculous puns upon the name of Mahomet. He does not, and under his hard destiny he cannot, always discriminate the precise point in debate. It is not about the name of an individual, such as Ludovicus, or Mahomet; but of a people—a community—a kingdom. His second mistake is, that if it were a personal name, the number of the name of Mahomet as given in his example only makes 502. His name properly written is equal to only 463. He ought also to have deciphered, or his author, whether his name should be taken as it is written in Arabic or in Greek. But whether he take it in Aarabic or in Greek, it will not in Grecian numerals, and certainly not in Arabic, equal 666. So fails his effort at both reason and ridicule to dispose of this morning's argument from prophecy. I again repeat, that on this point, as on every other, my argument appears unassailable.

Yesterday my opponent was asked, where infallibility resided; to-day he answers by asking, where shall we find *the mind*? In the head, stomach, hands, feet, or where? This is not a parallel case. The question is, as usual, mistaken, or misapplied. It is, where is the *mouth* of infallibility? when I desire an infallible response, where shall I hear it? Where is the *tongue* of infallibility? If the church possess infallibility and never decides a question by any organ—never can utter an answer, it is worth no more than a diamond in the depths of the Atlantic.

The alpha and omega of the proofs offered by the bishop for the existence of infallibility, which has been so often repeated, and which I promised sometime to notice, is this: "*I am with you.*" Now, logic asks, what means "I am with you?" as proving infallibility, unless "I am with you," is a phrase already incontrovertibly established to mean infallibility. But what says bible fact? There are, at least, four meanings of the phrase. I am with you, personally, providentially, graciously, or with miraculous power. It could not be the first: for he was leaving them personally. It could not be the second; because that was common to all good men. Thus God was with Joseph, with Jacob, with all the patriarchs, and with all good men. It could not be that God was to be with them graciously; for that too, is common to all christians. As the apostles said to all good christians, "The Lord be with you all," it could not be a special promise to the apostles. What remains then? Mark, the evangelist, explains: "These signs shall follow. In my name shall they cast out devils: they shall speak with new tongues, serpents shall they take away; and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them. They shall impose hands on the sick and they shall be whole." So the Rhemish Testament

reads Mark's account of the promise, "I am with you." Again: after the ascension of the Messiah, the evangelist relates, v. 20, "But they" (the apostles) "going forth preached every where: our Lord *working with all*, and confirming the word with signs that followed."

This, then, is the proof of infallibility, as interpreted by Mark in the canon Catholic Testament. Now, does not this confine the promise to the apostles? Can the popes work miracles? Can the bishops?—Such a miracle, forsooth, as the existence of the Roman Catholic church in the western empire, after the rise of Mahometanism in the east! A splendid miracle, truly! That proves 'as much for Mahometanism and Paganism, as for the popes of Rome: for all these systems rose upon the ruin, and also withstood the shocks of other systems!

When Peter said to the cripple, "Silver and gold I have none; but *such as I have* I give thee—In the name of Jesus take up your bed and walk," he felt that he possessed something in the promise "I am with you." Can any of his successors speak in this style: silver and gold I have none; but such as I have (the power of Christ) I give thee?

The gentleman's dissertation on the vicious circle, leaves him where it found him; believing the church first and the bible afterwards; and making the one prove the other: but he will never dispose of it. He is like the eccentric witness, whose veracity could only be proved by the principal: and yet the principal depends for his veracity upon the witness. The bishop for a little while turned Protestant, and then he affirmed that he believed in Christ on the evidence of his own miracles; and that evidence he found in the bible, and that bible he interpreted for himself. Thus he became a Protestant, when he attempted to solve that Gordian knot. But as soon as he had, by the Protestant rule, obtained faith in Christ, he instantly relapsed into the embrace of holy mother, and denounced the bridge over which he escaped from the island.

But the gentleman asked a question which has puzzled wise men to answer. A child however of four years old could have asked Newton a question that he could not have answered in a thousand years. "How can you prove the bible?" says the bishop. Does it prove itself? I will imitate him, this once, and ask, does *nature* prove itself? Does God prove his own existence without his works or by his works? Must there be another universe created to prove this?—This is a question no one will put, unless on the hypothesis that no man can prove a universe to exist but by other testimony than itself. So the bible proves itself to be the word of God, as nature proves itself to be the work of God. Thus has the supreme intelligence stamped the impress of himself both on nature and revelation. David says, "Lord, thou hast

magnified thy word above all thy name." I have other reasons, if necessary, to prove how the bible was put together. Many a christian has been made so by the single testimony of one evangelist; or by a single epistle of Paul. We have four gospels; but one would have been enough; and as much as many individuals had. The whole christian doctrine might be learned from Paul alone, from perhaps the half of his epistles. Paul and Peter wrote, and said much more by divine inspiration than is preserved or recorded. So did the ancient prophets. We need not to prove, in order to our faith, who collected the writings into one volume, any more, than who collected all the words of Christ, that are reported.

Cardinal Bellarmine says: "There is sure to be some doctor at the head of a schism." Heresiarchs are generally men of letters. Where then the pertinency of those remarks about the unlearned wresting the scriptures? The original means *untaught*, *untractable* persons rather than unlearned. Philosophers, as they love to be called, are generally the most unteachable, and the greatest wresters and perverters of the scriptures. Peter had those too wise to learn, in his eye, when he spoke of wresting the scriptures; and not the simple, honest and unassuming laity. Let a man sit down as Mary sat, at the feet of Christ, and humble himself as a pupil ought; he will then hear the voice of God, and understand it too. He will then discern how it is, that all God's children are taught by God, and that there is none that teacheth like him.

Rather wittily than logically, the gentleman gives the monks some credit, for handling the Alexandrine manuscript. Be it known however, than monkery began in St. Anthony's time; and that this said copy is older than the founder of monasteries. Because Tacitus, Livy, Horace, and Virgil passed through their hands, are we dependent on them for all our knowledge of Greek and Roman letters? The monks handled copies that they never wrote. But that gave those copies neither more nor less credit. I did not mean that one ought not to thumb the scriptures in reading them, when I spoke of them being soiled by the hands of a monk. I have then, so far as objection has been made, as I conceive, sustained the sixth proposition. Will the president moderator please have the 5th proposition read? [The 5th prop. was here read.]

PROP. V. Her notions of purgatory, indulgence, auricular confession, remission of sins, transubstantiation, supererogation, &c., essential elements of her system, are immoral in their tendency, and injurious to the well-being of society, religious and political.

Now, my friends, I want to strike a blow at the main root of the whole papal superstition: for that root is found in the proposition just

now read. I have but little time to do it, and shall, therefore, march right up to the point at once.

The capital, distinguishing doctrine of Protestantism, next to the bible alone as the rule and measure of christian faith and manners, and the right and duty of all to read and examine it is, that the death of Jesus Christ was not simply that of a martyr: but that "he died *for our sins*, according to the scriptures." *That the death or sacrifice of Christ is the great sin offering, and the only sin offering*, is a cardinal doctrine of Protestantism; and that there is now no priest, nor victim, nor sacrifice, nor altar, nor sin offering on earth follows, as a matter of course. Jesus was "the Lamb of God"—"Himself the sin offering and the priest." He expiated our sins in his own body on the cross." "His blood cleanses from all sin." Papal priests, penances, confessions, masses, remissions, purgatories, intercessions of saints, angels, and almost all their ceremonies, arise from the notion, the radical mistake that the sacrifice of Christ, as a sin offering, an atonement, a reconciliation was some way deficient. Although we can trace supererogation, purgatory, penances, lustrations, the intercessions of angels and dead men, &c., to the philosophers and dreamers of the east—their divine Platos, Pythagorases and Aristotles: still the immediate origin and cause of all these errors may be traced to ignorance of the bible doctrine of the priesthood of Christ, antitype of that of Aaron and Melchisedec. It was Dryden, a Roman Catholic poet, if I mistake not, who said that the *dos pou sto*, which Archimedes sought in vain by which to raise the globe, was found by the popes of Rome in the doctrine of purgatory. That was the philosopher's stone—the lever which lifts the world—which has brought more gold to Rome, than the discovery of America itself.

My friends, the doctrine of purgatory with all its correlates is based on two errors.

1st. *That man can do more than his duty:*

2d. *That something may be added to the sacrifice of Christ to give it more value or efficacy.*

Now, I affirm, that no created being, not a Gabriel, or Uriel, or Raphael, or the highest of the angelic hosts, can do an act of supererogation. No man can, by any thought, word, or action, make God his debtor. "Who," says Paul, "has first given to the Lord, and it shall be recompensed to him again? For, of him, and through him, and to him, are all things." Jesus told his disciples, that when they had done all that was commanded them, they had only done their duty, and were to him unprofitable servants. The greatest saint that ever lived is not more holy than he ought to be, on his own account. This

single thought evaporates that sea of merit which has performed such wonders in Roman story.

No human being has any thing to give to God; and therefore none can merit from him any thing. If a man's salvation depended on his shedding a single tear, where could he find it? The heart that feels and the tear that flows, clear as crystal down the cheek of the most devoted saint, are of God's creation. And, therefore, it is out of the question, to conceive how any work of merit, as respects God, is possible for angel or for man.

Were a saint to turn pilgrim and peregrinate on his naked knees the four quarters of the globe, were he to give his body to the flames, when God asks it, or duty requires it; he has deserved nothing from God, on the ground of merit. He has only employed the powers that God gave him, and used his faculties in a way consonant to the designs of him that gave them. And sooner will a man add new glories to the sun or create new luminaries in the heavens, than add one attribute of merit or of power to the sacrifice of Christ. "He finished transgression: made an end of sin offering, brought in an everlasting justification;" and left nothing to be done to make his sacrifice more meritorious or efficient.

Works of supererogation, auricular confession, masses for sins, transubstantiation, purgatory, with all the appurtenances thereto belonging, are the veriest ghosts of paganism—the phantoms of infatuated reason, attempts against the dignity of God and the supremacy, as well as the true and proper divinity and dignity of his Son.

This superstition, this man of sin, stands with his two feet upon the two greatest lies in human history. He places his right foot on the first and his left foot on the second. Need I say that the former affirms *that the sacrifice of God's own Son is insufficient as a sin offering*: and that the latter teaches *that man can do more than his duty to God*. Here then, I say to my opponent, I will measure swords with him. Let him meet me on these two points, then it will be an easy task to dispose of his imaginary purgatories, transubstantiation, penances, works of supererogation, &c., &c., and to show that so far from bringing glory to God or righteousness to men, they are positively, naturally, and necessarily opposed to both. Let him try his strength of scriptural argument and reason on these cardinal points, and it will, as our time is so far exhausted, save the tediousness of numerous details.—[Time expired.]

Half-past 4 o'clock, P. M.

BISHOP PURCELL rises—

My friends, it is imperative upon me to make one exposition before I proceed. Many of you were here when my friend would have led you into a gross mistake, respecting the Catholic church, by quoting a pretended extract from Liguori. I asserted then, that nothing could be found in that writer's works to substantiate the odious charge, to give it so much as a semblance of truth. I have now before me the entire works of Liguori, and I have placed them in the presence of my friend, Mr. Campbell. The 9th volume has an index, containing every word of any importance, and I repeat, that after a search through the whole nine volumes, *nothing like the quotation of last evening can be found*. I have now placed the book in the hands of Professor Biggs, of Lane seminary, one of the moderators, and a Protestant of the Presbyterian denomination, if I do not mistake, and I will leave it to him, or any other intelligent and candid man, to say to you whether the fact is as my friend has stated, or the very contrary of what he has stated.

MR. CAMPBELL. Be so good as to explain the matter fully.

BISHOP PURCELL. I will explain the exact state of the case. Mr. Smith, the author of the translation, from whom my friend read this, as well as many other things, *has given a false quotation*, and made Liguori say, what he never said. The facts are these: a canon of the council of Trent, and Liguori, according to the canon, say, "that if a priest falls by criminal intercourse, as specified, from the holy state of purity, to which he is bound by a voluntary, deliberate, and solemn vow, he shall be deprived of a large portion of his salary for the first offence. If he does not refrain after admonition and such punishment, he is again admonished, and deprived of his whole salary, and suspended from all his functions as a priest in the Catholic church. But after the third admonition, if he is still incorrigible, he is excommunicated, and cut off from the church, even as St. Paul cut off the incestuous man of Corinth." 1st. Ep. Corinth. ch. 5. v. 5. No where, in any part of these volumes, is it said that a priest may sin thus upon paying a fine, &c.

Thus, my friends, you see how the poisonous fountains of error and prejudice have been swelling over the land, and infecting the public mind, until many an honest and upright man has thought, when he denounced us for our (imputed) doctrines, he was doing God a service. Were he aware of the imposition practised on his credulity, he would, I have no doubt, have turned his indignation on more deserving victims.

olles, "*our people will soon leave us.*" "*We shall do no good with the people,*" said Shaftesbury, speaking of the Mocedo plot, "*if we cannot make them swallow greater nonsense than this.*"—"Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor," is a commandment which Maria Monk and her *reverend* protectors reckon not to belong to the "weightier things of the law." Their stale calumnies are paid for with the blood-money! Our doctrine, many of its ministerial adversaries know to be pure and holy; but, overwhelmed with confusion, whenever they attempt argument, they have no recourse but in addressing themselves to the prejudices of their *implicit* believers. These mock at Catholics for "hearing the church;" and whom do *they* hear?

As to the bible, the whole difficulty is to be gone over again and again. Every new translation, it seems, lies open to objections on grave and important grounds. I have here a paper, printed at Kanawha, in Cabell county, Virginia. In it a considerable class of Baptists, I think they are, quarrel with their brethren near Zoar, in Ohio, and quarrel with the bible. They insist that *all the existing translations* of it should be rejected, and a new one commenced for themselves from the original Hebrew and Greek scriptures—if they get them! They can never get a bible they are sure of. They cannot get the original Hebrew in which the gospel of St. Matthew was written. St. Jerome says he had seen it, and that is all we know of it since. They cannot in twelve months of the time that the getting up of their bible will require, determine, on grounds satisfactory to a biblical critic, and on Protestant principles, why they adopt or reject, as the event may be, the seventh verse, of the fifth chapter, of the 1st Epistle of St. John.

While this paper was being printed at Charleston, Virginia, the "Churchman," at New York, perhaps at the same hour, was printing the very proof I have read to you, in favor of the Catholic doctrine of confession. Let the Burmese and all others, Pagans or Christians, lie on their oars, till the new scripture appear. Then let printers, agents and missionaries, be well paid, and the cumbrous machinery set to work, and compass heaven and earth to make one proselyte, who surely cannot be more settled in his faith than they who thus despise the "inspired, authoritative, perpetual, catholic, perfect and intelligible rule."

He says the documents I have read are not pertinent. Now he certainly did not suspect that I thought *he* would so consider them. In his estimation, there is nothing pertinent, logical, relevant, in all this discussion but what he says himself. This he has neglected no oppor-

judge, and they can see through the attempts of either disputant to forestall their impartial and unbiased verdict. The printed report of this controversy, will shew the pertinency or impertinency of our respective arguments, and, for my own part, I have not the slightest fear of the result.

I am very far from believing that I *am worthy* of advocating the holy cause, in which my humble talents, and all my heart's affections are enlisted, but such is my confidence in the power of that truth, which I embraced on conviction as soon as I was able to judge for myself, and whose evidences have been, ever since, brightening to my understanding, the more I examine them, that I ask no more than that my unadorned arguments should fall into the hands of *thinking* men.

My opponent says that the whole structure of Catholicism is an assumption, and rests upon two *lies*. The gentleman pledged himself at the commencement of this debate, to use no opprobrious language, and I promised not to set him the example. How he has kept his word, as the terms in which his propositions are expressed are so very refined, let these, by which they are defended, decide. I will not bandy epithets with him, but I must say that the Catholic church has two sound legs to stand upon. The gentleman tenders her crutches which she modestly declines, with the suggestion that as his argument is lame he may have occasion for them himself! I will argue these various doctrines which he has enumerated and prove them all to be founded in the bible, and believed, in all past ages, from the time of Christ and his apostles. The gentleman has misrepresented, or he does not understand our doctrine. We believe that there is no other name under heaven, but the name of Jesus given to men, whereby they may be saved. Acts iv. 12. We believe that "*by one oblation Christ hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified,*" Heb. x. 14. That atonement by His vicarious sacrifice, if not the first, is one of the great cardinal doctrines of the Roman Catholic church, no man who pretends to any acquaintance with that doctrine, will, or can venture to deny. Christ has paid an all-sufficient price for our ransom. But do we arraign the sacrifice of Christ of insufficiency, when we sanctify the Sabbath, when we give alms to the poor, when we abstain from evil, when we hear preaching, or go to prayer? When St. Paul chastised his body and brought it under subjection, lest, while he preached to others he should himself become a reprobate, did he believe Christ's sacrifice incomplete? that it needed his supplementary austerities? Or that the other Apostles should command us, *to make sure our election and vocation by good works; to work out our salvation with fear and trembling?* No; God who made us without ourselves, will not save us

without ourselves. He requires our co-operation, and with his grace he aids our weak endeavor. This grace he communicates to us by divers channels, and in various ways. Of these the principal are the seven sacraments, which, if I may use the gentleman's figure in its proper application, like the seven mouths of the Nile convey the healing waters from the fountains of the Savior to every portion of the church. The will is made and recorded. The executors, the apostles and priests of the church, convey and apply an adequate portion to the wants of men. Wherever a captive may be presumed to groan in spiritual slavery, they seek him out, they proclaim to him the glad tidings of his deliverance, they pay, with the treasures of Christ, of which they are the depositaries, the price of his ransom; and this when they find the slave willing to accept the terms on which redemption is offered, do they carry into effect, in his behalf, for charitable intentions of the divine testator. Is this arraigning his bounty, or distributing it as he commanded? Is this robbing Christ of his glory, or calling all nations to bask in its rays and exult in its effulgence? The Catholic church, in all the institutions she venerates, the sacraments she administers, the truths she proclaims, the sacrifices she offers, the prayers she prefers, the charity she inculcates, the grace she dispenses, acts by the command of Christ, in the name of Christ. *This is the true and living way* by which she commands all to seek access to the Father, and by Him, with Him, and in Him, to give to God all honor and glory forever. He is the sun of the entire system, and all the ordinances of religion, are but the rays of that sun enlightening and vivifying the christian pilgrim at every step of his weary progress through this vale of tears.

Sacrifice, we consider indispensable to religion. It has been offered to God in every age, by every people, under every form of religion. Abel offered sacrifices in Eden, the purest firstlings of his flocks, for he was a shepherd. Cain sacrificed the fruits of the earth, for he was a husbandman. Noah, when the waters of the deluge had subsided, Solomon, when he dedicated the temple, offered sacrifices; even the Pagan nations of the earth, who changed the glory of the incorruptible God, into the likeness of the image of corruptible man, and of birds, and of four-footed beasts, paid homage to this dictate of nature, and continued the rite of sacrifice, however unworthy the objects of idolatry. From all this we rightly infer, that the only perfect religion should not be destitute of sacrifice. The scripture everywhere testifies to its necessity. Melchisedec, as we read in Genesis, offered bread and wine. He was a priest of the most high God. And David, in the 109th Psalm, says of Jesus Christ, King of Justice, King of Peace, "The Lord hath sworn, and it shall not repent him, thou art a priest forever according to the

order of Melchisedec." When God abrogates the Jewish dispensation, and substitutes a new and better in its stead, he says to the Jews, by the last of all the prophets, "*I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of hosts; and I will not receive a gift of your hand, for from the rising of the sun even to the going down, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is a sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean oblation; for my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of hosts.*" Malachias, ch. 11, 6. v. When Jesus Christ, as we read in three Evangelists, instituted the Blessed Eucharist, he said to his apostles, "*This is my body, which is offered for you. This is my blood, which is shed for you. Do this in commemoration of me.*"

Catholics obey the injunctions of the Savior, they do what he commanded them, they offer the memorial sacrifice, they continue and represent the sacrifice of Jesus Christ upon Calvary. They offer it under the forms of bread and wine as Melchisedec had done in figure. They offer it from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof, as Malachy had predicted. On Asia's distant plains, under the burning sun of Africa, in the tangled forests of the western world, as well as in its new and blooming cities, the sacrifice is offered and the prophecy obtains its glorious accomplishment. If Protestants say they have the sacrifice of the death of Christ, I answer with our divines, so had the servants of God, under the law of nature and the written law; for it is impossible that with the blood of oxen and goats, sin should be taken away; nevertheless they had perpetual sacrifices to represent the death of Christ, and to apply the fruits of it to their souls. In the same manner the Catholics have Christ himself really present, and mystically offered on their altars daily, for the same ends.

If time permitted, I might call up in review before you those venerable bishops and doctors whose blood sealed the doctrine, which their writings had defended. The saint Johns and the Polycarps of the east—the Irenæuses and the Hilaries of the west—those venerable men whose great age, like that of the patriarchs of old, enabled them to transmit to their children without fear of error, or multiplying too much the intermediate links—the traditionary chain of their own and their forefathers' belief—what they believed and taught themselves and what was daily practised in those old centurial churches which we have inherited from them, built many ages before any of the modern dissentient religions were known, and where the altar and the cross, the liturgy and the stone from the wall, bore testimony to the real presence in the Eucharist, to the divinity of the victim that was offered there in sacrifice!—[Time expired.]

FRIDAY, JANUARY 20. *Half-past 9 o'clock, A. M.*

MR. CAMPBELL rises—

I did not, in first taking up "The Synopsis of the Moral Theology of the Roman Church," say aught of its author, or of the causes which ushered it into existence. But since it has become a matter of so much debate, I shall state a few things concerning it and its author. Mr. Smith, the author, was a member of that community for seventeen years, several of which he officiated as a priest. Convinced of the errors of that superstition, he publicly renounced it, and is now a Protestant minister, greatly devoted to the cause of Protestantism. From his intimate acquaintance with the spirit and tendency of the Roman Catholic institution, he has recently translated a considerable portion of the works of Saint Ligori. The title of the book is:

"A synopsis of the moral theology of the church of Rome, taken from the works of St. Ligori and translated from the Latin into English by SAMUEL B. SMITH, late a popish priest." New York, 1836.

It is further explained in the preface:

"What we present before the public in this synopsis, is a compendious view of the doctrine of the church of Rome, now taught in all her schools. It is a fair and exact translation of selected portions of the voluminous MORAL THEOLOGY of St. Alphonsus de Ligori, published at Mechlin in Belgium, *superiorum permissu*, in the year 1828." [Preface. p. 5.

Of its author he speaks thus:

"He was enrolled among the *saints*, as the title page of his work declares, by pope Pius VII. on the 15th of September, in the year 1816." [Pref. p. 6.

It seems that this work is so popular, as to be found in almost every priest's library, and is quoted by them, as of the highest authority.

"Besides the above testimony in confirmation of the authority of St. Ligori, we have also that of the Rev. father Valera himself, the popish priest of the city of New York. This Rev. father Felix Valera, about a year and a half ago, in his attempt at a refutation of my "*renunciation of popery*," quotes this very same Ligori as overwhelming and decisive authority against something which he found advanced by me." [Pref. p. 9.

In some very important matters, he has given the original itself; and fearing, as the manner is, that his translation might be called in question, he says:

"If they deny that we have given a fair translation, we will then challenge them to come forward in a public assembly with the works of St. Ligori, when we promise to meet them, and submit our translation, and the original, to the inspection of a committee, one half of whom to be chosen by ourselves, and the

other half by the Roman clergy. Truth never shuns investigation. If we have not given a fair, genuine, and true translation, and if we have not exhibited the doctrines of Ligori and the church of Rome fairly and correctly, without garbling, or giving an erroneous construction, we will be willing to incur the consequences that we ought to expect, for having deceived the public." Synop. Pref. p. 12.

I have given but a sample of this work, though I have made numerous quotations; only one of which has been challenged by my antagonist. That point I touched as lightly as possible, because unsuited to a popular assembly. This the gentleman fully understands. I sjsurred it over, in terms the least intelligible which I could select at the moment: but he has no reason to object even to the comment, that Mr. Smith puts upon the article quoted. He well knows that marriage in the priesthood is instant excommunication; while concubinage is matter of forbearance. In the course of this discussion, I had occasion to observe, that I found very many canons of the church, even in the fifth and sixth centuries, on the subject of marriage and its abuses. This, from the modesty of my exposition, he took occasion to use in argument, as proof that the celibacy of the clergy was early introduced. This was a perversion of my observation, which the delicacy of my situation would not allow me to explain. Nor will I now sin against my own feelings, or those of my audience, by going fully into such details. I will only add, that I have a superfluity of evidence in proof of the allegation of Ligori. The casuistry, dissimulation, and immorality of the Jesuits, and the whole genius of the internal spirit of the papacy, are abundantly attested in the two works lying before me: "The Provincial Letters," of the accomplished Paschal, which I have not yet opened in this discussion; and "The *Secreta Monita* of the order of Jesus." This copy, in the original French, I am informed by the lady through whose kindness I have been furnished with it, was brought to this country by the secretary of the great and renowned La Fayette, on his last visit to the United States. This, our national benefactor, who, my opponent says, was a true Catholic, has declared, that if our liberty should be lost, it will be by the hands of priests. I saw this fact stated in two papers; one published in Richmond, the other in New York; and I have no doubt of its correctness.

The *Secreta Monita* has been a few years since, translated at Princeton N. J. and is now found in many book-stores in this country. From the perusal of these two volumes, we shall find that the moral theology of St. Ligori, the doctrine of Smith's Synopsis, is in perfect unison with the true spirit of the Roman clergy and institution.

The gentleman mentioned the disclosures of Maria Monk. I did not;

because I rely on no such documents. What she says, is private property; and there is no occasion for bringing it into this controversy. I have my own opinion of it however: but need not its aid on this occasion.

The gentleman speaks often of the imperfections and difficulties of Protestant translations of the bible. He says that we Protestants are in a deplorable state; always making new translations, and never, or not long satisfied with any of them: and seems to sympathize with us, as if we were without the scriptures. This pretended condolence, I only notice because it gives me an opportunity to repeat with emphasis, *that his church, with all her pretended infallibility, cannot produce a translation of any sort, in any living language on earth!* With all the riches, and learning, and infallibility of the Roman hierarchy; she owns not an English New Testament, authentic or authorized either by pope or council, or the church diffusive or responsive. How supremely ridiculous, therefore, for the gentleman to talk of Protestant translations, as imperfect! How does he infallibly know that any one of them is imperfect? Two infallible editions of the Latin vulgate have been made by the authority of two popes, not thirty years distant from each other; and yet they differ in more than 2000 places!!! Sixtus V. issued a bull, with an anathema, against any man that would change his authorized vulgate, even in the least particle, (in minima particula,) yet, Clement VIII. had the audacity, in despite of said bull, to order a new translation, and did accomplish it, changing it more than 2000 times, and sometimes very seriously, to the amount of clauses, and whole verses, as Dr. James in his *Bel-lum Papale* has amply testified. Thus the Clementine vulgate, under the solemn curse of the Sixtine bull, carries upon it the seal of infallibility!

I now invite attention to the subject of yesterday evening. I then endeavored to state, as briefly as I could, the two fundamental errors on which the Man of sin stands. The *first*,—That the sacrifice of Jesus Christ was not alone sufficient, to put away sin; and the *second*,—That persons can do more than their duty. To provoke discussion on these two great doctrinal lies, I stated that all the peculiar doctrines of the Roman Catholic church, viz., penance, purgatory, transubstantiation, and all this priestly sacrifice, confession, &c., were built upon these two doctrinal lies. I shall not further discuss that subject, till the gentleman agrees to meet me there.

Again, It is a doctrine of the Roman Catholic church, that the "*intention*" of the priest, in every act of worship and consecration, is essential to the validity of that act—that is, that unless the person

ordaining a priest *intend* to ordain him, all that is done, is of no validity, however exact the form; because he did not *intend in his heart*, to ordain him! So, in consecrating a wafer, without such intention, its nature is not changed; and the reception of it, of no value. Such intention is essential to every act of religion, in which a priest officiates. The efficacy of all ordinances, is therefore resolved into "the intention of the priest." He that denies the necessity of this intention, according to the council of Trent, "is to be anathema." This is therefore, one of the essential doctrines of the church as necessary to salvation, as the gospel itself; for the rejection of it incurs as solemn a curse as any one of the hundred anathemas which the council of Trent pronounced in confirmation of its decrees. The only time, the word *anathema* is used by Paul in the sense of a curse is in his letter to the Galatians, in respect of corrupting the gospel. This, then, is as essential as the gospel. Who then, let me ask, can have faith in any of the ceremonies or ordinances, or consecrations of Rome? Can any one know the *intention* in the heart of a priest or bishop? Nay, indeed, bishop PURCELL never can prove to any mortal, that he is truly ordained: nor can any one have any faith in his services as a bishop, unless he know all hearts, from Peter's time till now, and could show that the *intention* was never wanting from the apostolic age till now, in the ancestral official lines. This doctrine lays the axe at the root of all certainty in every part of the Roman Catholic religion: for in the judgment of that church multitudes of her clergy have proved hypocrites and impostors, in whose intentions at any previous time, there can therefore be no faith. So far as Protestants are concerned, their principles are perfectly free from this incertitude. Every Protestant feels the most perfect certainty in submitting to the ordinances of religion. The Protestant minister knows and teaches that the ordinance receives no saving or salutary efficacy from his intentions, or his hands. Persons, who in faith and piety receive them, know that they receive all the efficacy of the ordinance, independent of any special virtue in him that does administer them.

On the subject of indulgences I shall touch but lightly, for the want of time. The rich and profitable trade, which has been carried on by Rome in the sale of this single article of her merchandize is as public as her name. The conspicuity of this subject as connected with the Protestant Reformation is as familiar as the names of Luther and Tetzel. It is a sprout from the root of supererogation, from the doctrine of human merit—that immense bank of which the clergy are directors. The intolerable abuses of that board of directors was the *punctum saliens* of the Protestant Reformation. Pope Leo X.

president in that day, wanted to pay off some sixty million of dollars, incurred and being incurred for the splendid edifice of St. Peters at Rome. He published a plenary remission of past sins, and an indulgence to all contributing to this splendid undertaking. As a matter of curiosity and of edification, we shall here read the form of these indulgences.

“ May our Lord Jesus Christ have mercy upon thee, and absolve thee by the merits of his most holy passion. And I, by his authority, that of his blessed apostles, Peter and Paul, and that of the most holy pope, granted and committed to me in these parts, do absolve thee, first from all ecclesiastical censure, in whatever manner they have been incurred, then from all thy sins, transgressions, and excesses, how enormous soever they may be; even from such as are reserved for the cognizance of the holy see, and as far as the keys of the holy church extend. I remit to you all punishment which you deserve in purgatory on their account; and I restore you to the holy sacraments of the church, to the unity of the faithful, and to that innocence and purity which you possessed at baptism: so that when you die, the gates of punishment shall be shut, and the gates of paradise shall be opened; and if you shall not die at present, this grace shall remain in full force, when you are at the point of death. In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.” [Controversy between Messrs. Hughes and Breckenridge, p. 243.

All we have said with regard to the power and pretensions of Rome in granting indulgences, is substantiated, and more than substantiated by this document, for in anticipation of the future, even to death, and in death, the absolving power, or grace, was to continue. I will also add, the doctrine of the creed of pope Pius IV.

“ The council of Trent teaches that ‘ whoever shall affirm that when the grace of justification is received, the offence of the penitent sinner is so forgiven, and the sentence of eternal punishment so reversed, that there remains no temporal punishment to be endured, before his entrance into the kingdom of heaven, either in this world, or in the future state in purgatory: let him be accursed.’ ” Id. ib. same p.

Perhaps we should also hear, in this place, the council of Trent:

It is also an article of faith in the creed of Pius IV. “ that the power of indulgences was left by Christ to his church, and that the use of them is very helpful to christian people.” [Ground of Catholic Doc. p. 71, 72.

Once more:

Bellarmino, that great cardinal of the Roman Catholic church (to show that he died in the faith he willed half of his soul to the Virgin Mary and the other half to her son):--Bellarmino in his book on indulgences heads the second and third chapters thus: “ That there exists a certain treasury in the church, which is the foundation of indulgence; that the church has the power of applying this treasury of satisfactions, and thus of granting indulgences.”

I will not branch out on this subject farther, unless the gentleman

agrees to meet me on the facts and documents just now submitted. To prove the immoral tendency of such indulgences, would, indeed, be a work of supererogation, if such a work were at all possible.

On the subject of transubstantiation, the creed of pope Pius IV. decides as follows:

Article xvi. "I do also profess, that in the mass there is offered unto God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and the dead; and that, in the most holy sacrament of the holy eucharist, there is truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is a conversion made of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood; which conversion the holy Catholic church calls TRANSUBSTANTIATION."

"The church of Rome declares that, upon the priest's pronouncing these words, *hoc est corpus meum*, (this is my body,) the bread and wine in the eucharist are instantly transubstantiated into the natural body and blood of Christ; the species or accidents only of the bread and wine remaining. Christ is offered as often as the sacrifice of the mass is celebrated. Solitary masses, wherein the priest communicates alone, are approved and commended; and the council of Trent declares that whosoever saith they are unlawful and ought to be abrogated or abolished, is accursed." [View of All Religions, compiled and selected from the best authorities by *Thomas Robbins*, minister of the gospel in east Windsor, Conn. Hartford 1826, p. 25.

It is always right to attack a doctrine in the words of those who profess it. Every cardinal doctrine of the papacy can be traced to a certain period, when it became an element of the system.

Monachism began to be taught by St. Anthony in the 4th century.

Auricular confession in the 5th; but was finally established by Innocent III. early in the 13th century.

Theoretical purgatory began to be spoken of from the Pagans and Jews in the 6th century; but did not obtain a fixed residence till in the council of Florence, it became an integral part of infallibility A. D. 1430.

Early in the 7th century the idea of universal father, or pope obtained.

In the 8th century, after many and various fortunes, images began to be set up; and in the 9th became an integral part of Roman Catholicism.

In the year 730, a council summoned by Leo III. with only one dissenting vote, called the worship of images and relics idolatry.

Celibacy among the clergy began to be canonical in the 11th century.

In the 9th century, the doctrine of transubstantiation began to be talked of commonly; but was made infallible by pope Innocent III. 4th Lateran council.

Scotus, of Roman Catholic memory, affirmed that it was not an

article of faith before the Lateran council of 1215, and that it cannot be proved from scripture. Bellarmine, Book iii. chap. 23, on the Eucharist, quotes Scotus as saying so, and admits, "though the scriptures quoted last above, seems clear to us, and ought to convince any man that is not forward; yet, it may justly be doubted, whether it be so, (proved by scripture,) when *the most learned and acute men*, such as Scotus, in particular, held a contrary opinion." Cardinal Cajetan, Ochan, and bishop Fisher, *cum multis aliis*, held the same opinion.

Among Protestants, the reason and authority of religious belief and practice, is, "Thus saith the Lord." It is not important to ascertain when any opinion or practice began, nor who introduced it; but *if it be not in the BIBLE*, no matter how ancient it may be. It wants apostolic sanction, for the apostles sanction only what was written and ordained before their death. St. Clement, and St. Ignatius, and St. Irenæus, and all the other saints in the Roman calendar, were born too late to sanction any article of faith, or morals, by their vote.

But a few words on transubstantiation. "A *sacrament*," says the church, "is an outward and visible sign of some inward and spiritual grace." Now, it cannot be both the sign and the thing signified. If, then, the Eucharist be a sacrament, it cannot be true that it is the body and blood of Christ transubstantiated. Rome ought, then, to strike it from her list of sacraments.

But Jesus gave the eucharist for a *sign*, a keepsake, a memorial of his love. It is, then, a commemorative institution, as well as a sign of New Testament blessings: "Do this in remembrance of me." Like other tokens of love, it has inscribed upon it the name of the donor. As was said of the passover; it is *the Lord's passover*: so says Jesus, "*this is my body.*"

Now, as all words have a literal and figurative meaning, the only question here is, Are these words to be taken literally or figuratively? If literally, some good reason must be offered: and what is it? Because some father, pope, or council so decided? We must have the reason which authorised them, else their decision is a mere assumption.

Where shall that reason be found? Is it because Jesus always so speaks, that he must be thus understood? Then I contend, that when he said, "*I am the door*," he was literally transubstantiated into a *door*; and when he said, "*I am the bread* which came down from heaven," he was converted into *bread*; and when he said, "*I am the true vine*," he was literally changed into a real *vine*. And why not? Is it more irrational, marvelous, incredible, than that "this loaf is my body," should mean that this loaf was converted into his body, and changed into flesh; and that while the apostles were eating the

loaf, they were eating the living flesh of him that stood before them?! If, then, the bishop assumes a literal interpretation in the one case; I assume it in these and various other passages. For, if he may assume *ad libitum*, so may I; and so may every one else; and then what comes of the certainty of language? It is, then, without law, precedent, or authority, to assume the very point in debate; and to say, that because it reads *this is my body*, it means that bread is converted into flesh.

This style, of the passage in dispute, is very common in both the Old and New Testaments. So early as the time of Joseph, we read "the seven good kine are seven years,"—and "the seven good ears are seven years." What a transubstantiation! But change *are* into *represent*, which is its meaning, in a thousand places, and all is plain.

Again: says Jesus, "Destroy this temple," pointing to his body. "The field is the world—the reapers *are* the angels."—Are these, also, transubstantiations? Paul also speaks thus, when he says of the rock Horeb, "that rock *was* Christ." And John the apostle, "the seven stars *are* seven angels;" "the seven candlesticks *are* seven churches." And what is the difference between these phrases, and "this is my body?"—but finally on this part of the subject, Jesus said of the cup, "this cup is the New Testament." Does not that, on the bishop's premises, prove that the cup was changed into the New Testament?! But, if by pronouncing over a loaf the words of consecration a priest has power to change bread into flesh, and wine into blood, he has, indeed, a power truly miraculous and divine; and works as many miracles in the whole course of his life as he says masses. A claim to such a divine, supernatural, and extraordinary power, ought not to be claimed upon an arbitrary, capricious, and whimsical interpretation of a word! Good reasons ought to be offered by any man, who passes himself on the community, as possessing power equal to quickening the dead and suspending the laws of nature.

Once more, for the present: If, you believe the priest and receive the bread as flesh, you never after can with reason believe your own senses: for, when your eye declares it bread, and your senses of smelling, tasting, feeling, and I might add, your hearing—all declare that it is still bread and not flesh—If, I say, you can, contrary to your own senses, which God has given you as the means of knowledge and certainty, thus implicitly believe the declaration of a priest; you are disqualified for reasoning, for believing the christian religion, or your own senses on any subject of which they are witnesses. So that it may be truly said, he that believes in transubstantiation, can rationally believe in nothing else. All the christian miracles, were to

be believed—not because they were contrary to the evidence of sense; but because they were in accordance with that evidence.

I cannot argue this point with any sort of ability. I cannot feel in earnest. I seem to myself as if I were reasoning against a thing which no person believed; and I never could with any sort of spirit, discuss a matter, unless there was some little show of plausibility, or shadow of reason in it. The doctrine of transubstantiation is so absurd, that I do not know that I ever read a tract through against it in my life. But this subject gives such glory to the priests and has wrought such miracles upon the superstitious crowd, that it is worth more to sustain the priesthood, than all the other six Roman sacraments. And that which causes this most incredible of all things, to be devoured by such multitudes is, that it expiates sin. Hence the body of Christ is daily eaten by hundreds of thousands, as a sin offering together with “his *soul* and divinity,” as declared by the council of Trent! The Messiah is then always suffering, always bleeding, always dying, always expiating sin by the sacrifice of himself; and his people are always literally devouring his flesh! What a picture!! I shall turn away from it; for my soul sickens at the thought.

Protestants know that the sin of forgetfulness is the easily besetting sin of mortals; and that they need commemorative institutions. Hence, they highly appreciate the honor of having a Lord's table, a Lord's supper, a holy communion and fellowship, through these sacred emblems of a Savior's love. “The loaf, which we break,” says the apostle, “is it not the communion of the body of Christ? The cup over which we give thanks, is it not the communion, or the joint participation of his blood?”—Hence, the New Testament with its spiritual and heavenly blessings is always contemplated, realized, and remembered with holy thankfulness in the christian assemblies, while they partake of the sacred emblems of that great sacrifice “*once* offered for the sins of many. For by one offering up of himself, he has forever perfected them who are sanctified.”

Having yet remaining a few minutes, I shall prepare the way for the introduction of my seventh proposition. Having touched at the roots of all the principal corruptions, and having yet heard nothing in reply, I will anticipate that proposition with a few remarks on the papistical notion of a judge of controversy.

The council of Trent decreed “that the oral traditions of the Catholic church,” (meaning the Roman) “are to be received, *p̄ri pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit ac veneratur*,—with equal piety and reverence as the books of the Old and New Testament.”—Council of Trent 4th session.

Then she asserts: "It belongs to the church to judge of the true sense and interpretation of scripture; and that no person shall dare to interpret it in matters relating to faith and manners to any sense contrary to that which the church has held, or contrary to the unanimous consent of the fathers."—Ib. Id.

And according to the 23rd article of the creed of pope Pius IV., "I do acknowledge the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman church to be the mother and mistress of all churches; and I do promise and swear true obedience to the bishop of Rome, the successor of Peter, the prince of the apostles, and the vicar of Christ."

Here then, we have the essential elements of mental slavery and degradation: for, if no person *dare* to interpret the Scriptures contrary to what the church has already held, or to the unanimous consent of the Fathers; where is that liberty of thought and speech and action, on the most important of all subjects, our moral and religious relations, without which, liberty is without meaning, and mental independence but a name?

In all monarchies, save that of Rome and Mahomet, a judge is not constitutionally a judge of his own case. But the Roman judge of controversy is the whole church, says my learned opponent, and her councils affirm with him. The whole church judging then between what parties? Herself and the heretics!! What a righteous, infallible and republican judge, is the supreme judge of controversy in the Catholic church! The controversy is between two parties—the church, or the clergy, on one side; and the heretics or the reformers on the other, as they may happen to be called; say the church and the heretics. And who is umpire, who is supreme judge of both? One of the parties, indeed, the church herself! This is the archetype—the *bcau ideal*, of civil liberty, and republican government, in the supreme Roman hierarchy. It will not help it to place the ermine on the pope. He is that instant *exparte* judge. And besides, he is executive of the church. If the pope is to be judge, and executive, and lawgiver, in the case as he frequently is, what a splendid picture of a republican president or judge have we got in the Roman church!

This ghostly despotism is to be sustained and defended too, by the whole church, by vows, oaths, and pledges, the most solemn and binding that religion can suggest, or human ingenuity devise. It is true she governs by her bishops. The popes make bishops, on the recommendation of bishops, and these bishops serve the pope and govern the people. Their oath, which is the same in all countries, I will now read,—so far at least, as relates to this matter. I have the original, and different translations of it, and if it be disputed, I am prepared to

sustain it. To reconcile it to the genius of our institutions, and to the safety and happiness of our country, will require the explanations and reasonings of my friend.

"I, N. elect of the church of N. from henceforward will be faithful and obedient to St. Peter the Apostle, and to the holy Roman church, and to our lord, the lord N. Pope N. and his successors, canonically coming in. I will neither advise, consent, or do any thing that they may lose life or member, or that their persons may be seized, or hands any wise laid upon them, or any injuries offered to them, under any pretence whatsoever. The counsel which they shall intrust to me withal, by themselves, their messengers, or letters, I will not knowingly reveal to any to their prejudice. I will help them to defend and keep the Roman papacy, and the royalties of St. Peter, saving my order, against all men. The legate of the apostolic see, going and coming, I will honorably treat and help in his necessities. The rights, honors, privileges, and authority of the holy Roman church of our Lord the Pope, and his foresaid successors, I will endeavor to preserve, defend, increase, and advance. I will not be in any counsel, action, or treaty, in which shall be plotted against our said lord, and the said Roman church, any thing to the hurt or prejudice of their persons, right, honor, state, or power; and if I shall know any such thing to be treated or agitated by any whatsoever, I will signify it to our said lord, or to some other by whom it may come to his knowledge. The rules of the holy Fathers, the apostolic decrees, ordinances, or disposals, reservations, provisions, and mandates, I will observe with all my might, and cause to be observed by others. Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said lord, or his foresaid successors, I will to my utmost power persecute and oppose."

The Latin of the last sentence of which reads:

"Hereticos, schismaticos, et rebelles, eidem domino nostro vel successoribus prædictis pro posse persequar et impugnabo."—[Pontificale Roman. Edit. Antwerp. A. D. 1626.]

Here then is the most solemn pledge and vow given *by every bishop of Rome*, that he will to the utmost of his power *persecute and destroy heretics and schismatics!* Does not this indisputable fact, alone, sustain my seventh proposition, and prove that the genius of the Latin church is anti-American and essentially opposed to the existence of all free institutions? [Time expired.]

Half-past 10 o'clock, A. M.

BISHOP PURCELL rises—

You perceive, my friends, that there is scarcely a single tenet of the Roman Catholic faith, which my friend has not brought into view this morning. How then am I to escape the charge of desultoriness, in following such an argument? The whole category, from Alpha to Omega, shoots up before me; shifting with the rapidity of lightning. It is the necessary effect of the confusion of my learned friend's ideas, and of the order in which he arranged the propositions whose discus-

sion was to call them forth. The very first of these propositions—the first word in it—Holy—would have called up for discussion all we have heard on the immorality of the church. As my friend thought fit to commence as he has done, order and method continue to be excluded from this debate. He selected the points of attack and the plan of campaign; let him not charge on me his own blunders, which he sees now, too late. There was one great question which he should have determined, *a limine*; it would have cut off all this desultory argumentation. It is this. Did Jesus Christ establish an infallible tribunal to determine the meaning of scripture? If so, we are bound by its decisions. If not, the whole Catholic religion falls to the ground. Now, my friends, I endeavored to prove that Christ *did* establish such a tribunal, and I defy any one to bring from the Bible proof to the contrary. One text alone is sufficient to put this matter at rest for ever. "The church is the pillar and ground of the truth." I began to enforce my argument, when my time expired, and my friend seemed unwilling to let slip the opportunity, but got up immediately, and said that my last observations of yesterday were unworthy of notice.

He brought as a parallel to the words, "I am with you all days even to the end of the world," the customary ancient salutation, "the Lord be with you;" and argued from this, that Christ's words mean no more than that! But, my friends, what point of comparison is there between the words, "God be with you," which one frail man addresses to another, and the words, the solemn promises of the Savior, commissioning his apostles to preach his gospel, and cheering their despondency by the divine assurance, "Behold, I am with you all days even to the end of the world?" Are the two cases the same? Are we not more sure that Christ is with his church forever, than we are of the effect of the salutation of a poor fallible man? What Christ does is infallible; what he says will come to pass. If his church was to fail, we should have had an assurance to that effect in the Bible. There is none. If his church was to fail, we should have had miraculous displays like that of Sinai, and of the descent of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost, marking the commencement of a new era. Or Christ would have come again upon earth, rebuked and banished error, and restored the primitive lustre and beauty of truth. This has not been done, nor has such a prophecy been any where made. As Christ, by one oblation, has perfected those that were to be sanctified for ever; so has he by one revelation, assured us of divine truth in religion for ever. The work of God then, needed no reformation. If men's morals were bad, they should have been corrected, but religion should not have been changed. In a word, as Bishop Smith of Kentucky, has so well said, "Reforma-

tion should have taken place in the church, not out of it." Let my friend twist the words of Christ as he pleases, he can find nothing like them in human language. Christ was God and his word is what it purports to be. He is with his church all days, until the consummation of ages. The heavens and the earth may pass away, but his word will never pass away. The worse we become, the more refractory and insubordinate, the farther from apostolic times and fervor and purity, the more need have we of authority to control us. So that the power of the church to maintain unity of faith, which Christ so much desired for his disciples, is, at least, as necessary now as it has ever been. The necessity of submitting to the church does not destroy liberty, while, on the contrary, the sources of error and contentions, among sects which undertake to judge for themselves, are endlessly multiplied. Christ foresaw the time when even the apostles would dispute. He knew the itching of the Greeks for novelty, and their proneness to disputation—always learning and never coming to the truth—tearing down to-day, and building up to-morrow: one wave of error and doubt following another, and washing away every doctrine, and creed, and sect, in its turn; and he therefore said: "Hear the church."

My friend argued in the commencement of this controversy, that since there were as good men among Protestants as among Catholics, why should there be any argument? Let him answer that question since he is the challenger. I cheerfully admit the fact, but what is the inference? Why that those Protestants were better than their principles. Every man who follows out the Protestant principles may be bad. He may find *his own* code of morals as well as his doctrinal code, in the Bible. Because if he choose to interpret the Bible for himself, in morals as well as in faith, he may argue from it in favor of the lawfulness of any thing he pleases. And is it not true that certain vicious acts are done by some men on the pretence of their being allowed by scripture? I could adduce hundreds of instances of the strong and terrible delusions and crimes, for which their victims persuaded themselves they found a sanction in the Bible. And if the sincerely pious, the humane and charitable of Protestant communions ask themselves the question: "are the virtues I strive to practice, the fruits of my religion?" they would find that their peculiar tenets have no influence on their conduct. Their piety and the purity of their morals are the effects of naturally good dispositions, of virtuous associations, of principles, which they hold in common with Catholics, a reverence for the divinity and a desire for future happiness, a sense of honor, decorum, propriety, &c.

In this kind of virtue even pagans have been eminent, but their

virtue is no proof of the goodness of their religion. Aristides was just, Scipio chaste, Regulus patriotic, Plato sober, Cincinnatus unambitious, Titus, the delight of the human race, and Antoninus, pious—and yet they were all idolaters! There are, thank heaven, conservative principles in man's bosom, which correct in conduct, what is wrong in principle. But if we sincerely desire to know the fruits of the reformation, we have only to ask its authors. Hear, then, what Luther was compelled to acknowledge upon this subject. "We see," says he, in his sermon the 2nd Sunday in Advent, "that through the malice of the Devil, men are now more avaricious, more cruel, more disorderly, more insolent, and much more wicked, than they were under popery." "If any one wish, says Musculus, to see a multitude of knaves, disturbers of the public peace, &c., let him go to a city, where the gospel is preached in its purity, (he means a reformed city) for it is clearer than the light of day, that there never were pagans more vicious and disorderly, than those professors of the gospel." "The thing," says Melancthon, "speaks for itself in this country among the reformed; their whole time is devoted to intemperance and drunkenness, (immanibus poculis). So deeply are the people sunk into barbarity and ignorance, that many of them would imagine they should die in the night, if they should chance to fast in the day." Ad capt. vi. Mat. Neither was the growth of vice and ignorance confined to Germany. They grew wherever the seeds of the reformation were permitted to take root. "*In this nation,*" (England) says Stubbs, after he had made the tour of the island, "*I found a general decay of good works, or rather a plain defection, or falling away from God.*" (Motives to good works, An. 1596.) But hear how the eloquent Erasmus describes the fruits of the reformation. He was indeed a Catholic, but a Catholic whom the Protestants allow to have been impartial. He was an eye and ear witness to the introduction and progress of the reformation, observed its workings with the eye of a philosopher, and has marked them down with the accuracy of a candid and correct historian. "And who," he says, "are the gospel people? Look around you and shew me any who has become a better man. Shew me one who, once a glutton, is now turned sober, one who, before violent, is now meek; one who, before avaricious, is now generous; one who, before impure, is now chaste;—I can point out multitudes, who have become far worse than they were before. In their assemblies, you never see any of them heave a sigh; shed a tear; or strike his breast, even on the days that are sacred to affliction. Their discourses are little else, but calumnies against the priesthood. They have abolished confession, and few of them confess their sins

even to God. They have abrogated fasting; and they wallow in sensuality. They have become Epicureans, for fear of being Jews. They have cast off the yoke of human institutions; and along with it, they have shaken off the Lord. So far from being submissive to bishops, they are disobedient to the civil magistrates. What tumults and seditions mark their conduct! For what trifles do they fly to arms! St. Paul commanded the first christians to shun the society of the wicked; and behold! the reformers seek most the society of the most corrupted. These are their delight. The gospel now flourishes forsooth! because priests and monks take wives in opposition to human laws and despite of their sacred vows. Own it is folly to exchange evils for evils, and madness to exchange small evils for great ones." Ep. 47. Lib. 31. John Wesley says, speaking of his own time not one hundred and fifty years ago, "*A dissipated age* (such as is the present perhaps beyond all that ever were, at least that are recorded in history) is an age wherein God is generally forgotten. And a *dissipated nation*, (such as England is at present, in a superlative degree) is a nation, a vast majority of which has not God 'in all their thoughts.' We therefore speak an unquestionable truth, when we say, there is not on the face of the earth another nation (at least that we have ever heard of) so perfectly *dissipated and ungodly*; not only so totally without God in the world, but so openly setting him at defiance. There never was an *age*, that we read of in history, since Julius Cæsar, since Noah, since Adam, wherein dissipation or ungodliness did so generally prevail, both among high and low, rich and poor." Neither would it be well in a Protestant, in order to apologize for the disorders, which I have mentioned, to say—"that they were only the accidental evils of a moment, evils of a period of change and fermentation." What! the first fruits of a reformation disorder!—the first fruits of a system of piety licentiousness!—the first fruits of the re-establishment of the law of truth, impiety! Surely such an apology, and yet it is often made, is absolutely weak! There are multiplied attestations of it. "*Miserable*," says Neal, speaking of the time of Elizabeth, and when the fermentation of the revolutionary violence of the reformation had subsided, "*miserable and heathenish was the condition of the country in regard to religion.*" That you may form some notion of their condition, hear in what manner the inhabitants of London, in a petition presented to the parliament during this reign, express themselves. "In one half our churches," they say, "we have watchmen that have no eyes; and clouds that have no water; and in the other half, there is scarcely one tenth man that takes conscience to wait on his charge. Whereby, the Lord's day is often to

tally neglected; ignorance increaseth, and wickedness cometh upon us like an armed man." "In the county of Cornwall," Neal says, "there were at this period a hundred and forty clergymen, not one of whom could preach a sermon." The situation of other counties was nearly similar. Judge of the consequences. I have here the authentic documents, Luther's and Wesley's works, to prove what I have cited. Here is the great father of the reformation; with Melancthon at his side, both very *unghostly* looking personages, *on their knees, before an image* of the crucifix!! (Holds up a large and old volume, and describes a circle, with his person, exhibiting the pictured title page, at which there was a continued laughter.) This edition was published by Lawrence Schenck at Wittenberg, in 1561. Here is image worship by Martin Luther and his co-reformer! and beasts, and monsters all around them. Mr. C. says that the popes might have been much worse men than he has described them. That bad acts are soon forgotten, and good ones more apt to be chronicled. This is, unfortunately, not the case, as history but too well attests. The virtues are too unobtrusive to attract public notice, and Shakespeare, who was a close observer of human nature, says: If I can quote him correctly:

"The evil, that men do, lives after them;
The good is oft interred with their bones."

I am sorry to say, my friends, Professor Biggs informs me, that want of time has prevented him from examining the works of Liguori, in reference to my opponent's accusation, based upon this book. There is a gentleman of learning and integrity, in this city, who is not a Catholic, Mr. Alexander Kinmont, who will devote some time to it, and who will be here at half-past four, P. M., and give us the requisite information. I again say, I hope a large audience will be present at the *denouement*. My friend told us he slurred over what was worst in the charges against Catholics. He has taken a new mode of doing this. He has, indeed, said *the worst*, and helps it by a vague, but not a slurring insinuation, that there is more. *His translation would make the fallen priests' sin as bad as that of the Corinthian that afflicted by his scandalous crime the fervent christians of antiquity, instead of being of a different and less heinous kind.* I appreciate his motives. The charge is, as I have already stated—the church punishes *severely* for the slightest fault, and excommunicates the impenitent offender, giving him up to the civil tribunal, for the punishment, in such cases, inflicted in some countries by the law of the land.

He says, we find from the decrees of councils, that scandal has existed in the church. It is true; and it is also true that Christ pre-

dicted its existence. What is the world but the theatre of falsehood and truth? a field of tares and wheat?

As for the other volume which the gentleman has brought up, the *Secreta Monita* of the Jesuits, I pronounce it an infamous forgery. It has been proved a hundred times, that no priest had any hand in that document. "The *Monita Secreta*, or private instructions, a publication sometimes brought forward against the Jesuits," says the learned Charles Butler, of Lincoln's Inn, "is a most infamous work, and wholly beneath notice. Neither the original, nor any certified copy of this work, was ever produced; no circumstances respecting its discovery, ever proved; no collateral fact, to establish its authenticity, ever published. There does not live the Jesuit, or the scholar of a Jesuit, who, if any one of the doctrines which it inculcates, or any one practice which it recommends, were proposed to him, would not spurn it with indignation." Francis Xavier was a Jesuit; our first archbishop, Carroll, was a Jesuit; they were both worthy of being numbered among the best of men, and it was *true*, not *forged*, instructions that made them so. The copy of this notorious slander, on one of the most virtuous, learned, and apostolic societies that have ever existed, the gentleman informs us, was brought to this country from France by the secretary of La Fayette! and what was the religion of this secretary? A Jacobin, an infidel, one of the antichristian conspirators, that would have blotted all denominations of the followers of Jesus, as well as the Catholic, from the whole world? By *priests*, it is well known, that such men meant ministers of every creed; and against all, but chiefly against those best able by learning and virtue to confound them, was their hostility directed.

A greater than La Fayette, as a statesman, I mean Thomas Jefferson, said of the Presbyterians: "Their ambition and tyranny would tolerate no rival if they had power. The Presbyterian clergy are the loudest, the most intolerant, of all sects, the most tyrannical and ambitious; ready at the word of the lawgiver, if such a word could now be obtained, to put the torch to the pile, and to rekindle in this virgin hemisphere the flames in which their oracle, Calvin, consumed the poor Servetus, because he could not subscribe the proposition of Calvin, that magistrates have a right to exterminate all heretics to the Calvinistic creed. They pant to reestablish by law, that Holy Inquisition, which they can now only infuse into public opinion." (Page 322, letter to William Short.) Will my friend take this testimony to the letter? Jefferson had more opportunities for *judging* than La Fayette, and he knew this country better. But, sir, I agree with La Fayette, that all priests are to be dreaded in this sense; that none of them

should be allowed a particle of political ascendancy in this country. Our main danger is from ambitious priests of various denominations. When they confine themselves to their only sphere of usefulness, they are the best friends of mankind; when they depart from it, the worst tyrants of the darkest ages of Paganism were not more intolerant than they. A hyena is a lamb, to a minister of Christ, who casts off the livery and the peaceful spirit of his master, and turns round to denounce and abuse his fellow-men for obeying the sacred dictates of conscience, and adhering to a religion, which, no matter how much persecuted and calumniated, they believe to be divine. I could say much more on this subject, but it is not the most suitable time.

The charge has been made against all denominations, but my opponent has singled from among them the Catholic, and made it the scapegoat, to bear the sins of all to oblivion. I must, however, remind the audience that the Methodist conference, held, not so many years ago, at Baltimore, denounced the Episcopalians, for contemplating an alliance with England, to subvert the liberties of this country; and alleged what they conceived to be no mean proof of treasonable designs on the part of the, then, obnoxious Episcopalians. This proscriptive spirit is as old as Christianity. History informs us that the inoffensive disciples of Jesus Christ, even in the golden age of the apostles, were accused, *convicted*, and put to the most horrible death, precisely on the charge of *hating all mankind*," *odio humani generis convicti sunt*. Tacitus Annal. lib. xv. This celebrated historian terms the christians "*sontes, reos, novissima exempla meritos—perflagitia invisos*," and calls their religion itself "*exitialis superstitio*." They were, consequently, dressed in the skins of wild beasts, and thus caricatured, the Pagans set their dogs upon them. Jesus Christ, himself, when the Jews could convict him of no crime, was charged by them with *not being a friend to Caesar*.—Pilate, who '*found no fault*' in Christ, was willing to release him, but the Jews cried out, "*if thou release this man, thou art not Cæsar's friend*;" that moment the just one sank, oppressed beneath the malice and slander of his enemies! We, as his disciples, can expect no better fate than our master's. He foretold all that now befalls us. "*Blessed are you*," says he, "*when men shall revile you and persecute you, and speak all manner of evil against you, untruly, for my sake: be glad and rejoice, for your reward is very great in heaven*." St. Matth. V. 11, 12.

We have, the gentleman says, no authentic translation of the scriptures. This is not true. We have a Latin translation, the vulgate. That is one authentic translation. We have, moreover, an approved translation in the vernacular, sanctioned by all the bishops in the

United States, and for sale in every city in the union. But if, by an authentic bible, we mean one perfectly immaculate, in point of typographical execution and mechanical neatness, I ask the gentleman, can he pretend that any Protestant denomination has such a one? Yet my friend says, notwithstanding the facts I quoted yesterday morning, respecting a new bible, that they have a bible that is sufficient. If that is the case, where is the use of a new translation! He speaks of Sixtus' and Clement's bible. That only shews that the popes never taught that their personal opinions were to be received, as articles of faith, as my friend would persuade us they did. Private authority should not presume to alter the authorized version. This was the amount of the prohibition.

Now to post the books with my friend on the subject of the bible. I ask him if he was not infatuated, for I really cannot call it by any other name, when he said he could show us a bible never soiled by the thumb of a monk, and took us right into the midst of twenty-two monasteries, on mount Athos, *for the proof?* Horne in his Introduction to the study of the Bible, vol. 1. p. 222, quotes Oudin and Michællis, for the opinion that it was written by an Aecmet—and written, too, say Burber and Wetstein, for a church or a monastery. Horne says the Aecmets were a class of monks in the ancient church, who flourished particularly in the east in the fifth century. They were so called, because they had divine service performed without interruption, in their churches. They divided themselves into three bodies, each of which officiated in turn, and relieved the other so that their churches were never silent either night or day. This very Mss. Codex Alexandrinus, in the British Museum, contains a list of the Psalms sung by these monks!

My friend says that our getting the bible from monks, does not leave us beholden to them for its spirit. This is a disingenuous evasion. I did not say that it did, but this last question belongs to quite another category. My opponent says that the bible, like the universe, must testify to its own divine origin—it is the work of God. In this he is completely at issue with one of the most enlightened Protestants of the day, bishop Smith, of Kentucky. "These christians," says the bishop, in his review of Van Dyck on christian union, "have done well in agreeing upon those sound principles of investigation which lead them to substantial, and sufficient agreement, what the canon of scripture is. The principle is correct, and therefore all honest minds rest satisfied, in the same results. Abandon the question of the oneness of the bible, to be agitated and kept afloat on the perturbed ocean of expedience, as the question is, respecting the oneness of the

church, and very soon we should have amongst us almost as many books claiming to be bibles, as we have sects claiming to be churches. And what are the laws of evidence, guided by which, all christians come to such a desirable agreement as to the canon of the scripture? Do we settle that grave point by appeals to the scripture alone? Do we require a "thus saith the Lord," for the admission of any book within the compass of the bible?" Ay, this is the question, do we take up the bible from the shelf, and putting it to our ear, ask it what it has to say for itself? If we do, we shall lay it aside without receiving the desired answer, pretty much as the Indian chief did, when the Spanish missionary handed him the good book.—"It says nothing," said the Indian. How then shall we proceed in this investigation? "We select," says bishop Smith, "some period of christian antiquity by universal consent anterior to great corruptions, and that we may be safe, anterior to great causes tending to corruption; the year 300 for example, prior to the conversion of Constantine; or the year 250, when the documents of the then existing christianity were abundant; or the year 200, when men were living who had conversed with the disciples of John, and we ask, what books were received by christians, every where, and with one consent, as sacred books; and these, and no others, we admit into our canon. Then with the utmost care we look into every previous writer, for concurring or for opposing evidence. Finding everything nearly clear and satisfactory, we repair to the books of the New Testament themselves for accidental and internal evidence, to endorse for and confirm the whole. And here we rest satisfied that we *have grasped the TRUTH.*"

How will the champion of Protestantism extricate himself from this dilemma? Does he confess his ignorance of the leading doctrines of eminent Protestant divines? They find a unanimous consent.

He talks of two great lies! I like strong language, but this is such as Milton's Satan would have better used, than a professing christian. How Jews and Infidels will triumph, when assured by my opponent that Christ's preaching and miracles, so signally failed, that the largest body of christians in the entire world, have been based upon two great lies, since the year 250, or about that period! Take away the 2,000,000 Catholic and Greek christians that believe in these two great *truths*, and think it blasphemy to call them lies, and what becomes of the few stragglers that remain in the valleys of the Alps, or where you please—the "*rari nantes in gurgite vasto?*" Did Christ expend all his labor, all his blood, to give mankind, one kind of idolatry for another? *Credat Judæus.*

Now, my friends, dispossess your minds of prejudice; forget your

religious education, if possible; take up the Bible, and see if it be wholly silent upon these two great *truths*, not *lies*. For 2, or 300,000,000 who have not all lost their reason, adhere to these divine doctrines, which they find in this blessed volume. I speak unto you as wise and pious men. Judge you, *yourselves*, and do not let others judge for you, what I say. I quote the Bible which you all admit, as I have hitherto quoted Protestant authority, which you admit on all cases, to be not over friendly to Roman Catholic doctrines. I disdained to avail myself of the *weeds which you threw over your garden walls*, I mean immoral and degraded ministers as my opponent has done with discarded priests, to cast your doctrine with them. With such, we hold no fellowship. The pure of life, the men of honor and of learning, whom we receive from your ranks, we cherish. From the Bible, then, the fathers, the most eminent Protestants, I shall select my proofs, that, on these two *imputed lies*, the Catholic church, like St. Paul, so Christ is her witness, speaks the truth in righteousness.

To begin from the Bible. If there is a single tenet of christian faith, clearly established in the Bible, I contend that it is the real presence of Jesus Christ, in the adorable sacrament of the Eucharist. And if we cannot take in the literal sense, the words of Christ. "This is my body; This is my blood," the plainest that God or man could utter, but must adopt, instead of this, some one of the *two thousand meanings*, invented by the sacramentarians, and the anti-sacramentarians, for this text, we may bid adieu to the doctrine of the intelligibility of scripture. I distinguish two principal epochs in the Gospel narrative; the first, when Jesus Christ promises to give us his body and blood in the Eucharist; the second, when he *gives* them to us. Before announcing his desire of bequeathing to the world this divine legacy, as we read in the 6th chapter of the Gospel of St. John, he wrought a splendid miracle, even the feeding of 5,000, with a few loaves, in the wilderness, to prove himself the God whom the heavens and the earth obey, and thus conciliate the faith of the multitude in the divinity of his mission, and the truth of his doctrines. He speaks of the absolute necessity of this faith—of its scarcity, and expressly declares that the sight of his miracles, or the testimony of the sense, cannot beget faith. In a word, *that no man can come to him, unless his father draw him*. He then continues his divine instructions, by alluding to the miracle which he had wrought, in which was a most striking resemblance to the greater miracle which he designed to work, *viz.* the multiplication of his own body and blood, for the daily, the super-substantial bread, or food, of men, with whom, as he else

where assures us, in scripture, *it is his delight to dwell*. He reminds his hearers of all the wonders wrought in their favor, in the old Law, shews them all the wisdom, the power, the love of Heaven, displayed in their behoof, from the commencement of their history; how dear they were to God, and further and better gifts, which, if want of faith opposed no obstacle, so many divine pledges gave them a right to anticipate. The greatest of Kings, even Solomon, in all his glory, had nothing better to give them than gold and silver, a city, a tract of land. No earthly king can compete with God, in conferring benefits. This the history of the Jews sufficiently attested; and the miracle of the loaves brought affectingly to their minds, what their fathers had told them, what they, themselves, had read in the testimony, of the manna or miraculous bread, which, for so many years had been showered down from heaven, to feed their ancestors in the desert. They were thus prepared for all that God could accomplish to show his EXCESS OF LOVE. They whom *his father called, who are taught of God*, hear with faith; they whom his father called *not*, hear with incredulousness, while he thus announces *his own* intended benefactions.

“This is the bread which came down from heaven. If any eat of this bread, he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, ‘how can this man give us his flesh to eat?’ Then Jesus said to them, ‘Amen, amen, I say to you, except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed; and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him. As the living Father sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me. This is the bread that came down from Heaven. Not as your fathers did eat manna and are dead; he that eateth this bread shall live forever.’ These things he said, teaching in the synagogue at Capernaum. Many, therefore, of his disciples, hearing it, said, this is a hard saying, and who can hear it? But Jesus knowing, in himself, that his disciples murmured at this, said to them, ‘doth this scandalize you? If then, you shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before? It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing. But there are some of you that believe not.’ For Jesus knew from the beginning, who they were that did not believe, and who he was that would betray him. And he said, ‘therefore no man can come to me unless it be given him by my Father.’ After this many of his disciples went back, and walked no

more with him. Then Jesus said to the twelve, will you, also go away? And Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life, and we have believed, and know that thou art the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus answered them, have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil.' Now he meant Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon, for this same was about to betray him, whereas he was one of the twelve."

We have here a continuous argument, and faith and infidelity, pictured to the life; murmuring at impossibilities then, as well as now, rebuked by the Savior, and acquiescence in his word and his love, by Peter, as the first believer of the divinity of the SON of GOD—of HIS REAL PRESENCE in the Eucharist. If he spoke figuratively, would he have suffered his disciples, who understood the *reality*, to leave him—he who came to save the lost sheep of the house of Israel? Would he have suffered all his disciples to perish, rather than tell them this *single fact*, that they misunderstood him? If he spoke of a figurative presence, the words, "*how can you believe when you see the Son of man, ascending up to Heaven, where he was before,*" would have had no sense. In the Catholic view of the Eucharist, it is divinely strong. If you cannot believe, now, that my flesh and blood are visible, palpable objects of every sense, that I can give them to you for food, how much less can you believe it, when you see the Son of Man ascending up to Heaven, &c.? The flesh surely profiteth nothing to understand this mystery—it requires the faith and the spirit of faith, to impose silence on the senses, and say, with St. Peter, "Lord, to whom should we go—Thou hast the words of eternal life." This is the bread which strengthens us to live out successive ages. This is not an immoral doctrine. It elevates man to know that he is *thus* loved. That he is of a holy race, a purchased people, a royal priesthood, the especial object of incessant wonders. That he beholds *God with him*, Immanuel, in Bethlehem, *house of bread*, hid beneath the sacramental veil, but destined, and prepared by this nourishment, to enjoy him hereafter, without a veil, in the rich effulgence of the beatific vision. [Time expired.]

Half past 11 o'clock, A. M.

MR. CAMPBELL rises—

My opponent in commencing observed, that almost the whole circle of Catholic tenets came in review in my last speech. If such be an error, whose fault is it? I have no respondent. How many hours has the gentleman spent in reading against time, without any relevancy to the questions at issue, or to the proposition before us! And when he does reply, it is frequently to something said a day or two ago.

I selected two points yesterday afternoon as comprehending the substance of the error opposed in my fifth proposition, and even to the present moment he has not presumed to meet me on these vital matters to discuss them. In my last speech, I therefore not only recapitulated some important items; but argued one or two specifications, in proof of the proposition legally before us. I also introduced in part my seventh proposition, and so far discussed its bearings as to show the anti-American, and anti-Republican theories of the Latin church.

The bishop has, indeed, this time, selected the doctrine of transubstantiation: but has he adverted to the various points of argument I have made? Ought he not, at least, to have glanced at these points, in order?

1. The incongruity of the idea of a sacrament with that of transubstantiation.

2. The unreasonableness of preferring the literal to the figurative, in the interpretation of a phrase common in scripture, which in no other case is so interpreted by the party themselves.

3. The arrogance of the priests in assuming the power of working miracles, for the sake of a forced interpretation of a phrase without precedent or analogy.

4. The belief of such a transubstantiation destroys the credibility of all testimony, human and divine, and necessarily tends to atheism.

5. That the institution of the supper is commemorative and not expiatory, having nothing of the nature of a sacrifice for sin.

To which of these important considerations has the gentleman replied in his last speech? Has he formally and specifically met any one of them?

It was also alleged, that the admission of such a pretension, on the part of any priest, was debasing and paralyzing to the human understanding, and subjected to imposture and fraud those who implicitly acquiesced in it. There are few persons, who so observantly trace moral effects to their causes, as to be able duly to appreciate how much influence in the formation of human character may philosophically be ascribed to such idle, absurd, and irrational pretensions. We sometimes see with what little power, reason, philosophy, and experience combat the belief in witches, ghosts, apparitions, and other legendary tales, the effect of the nursery and early impressions. When the imagination is once filled with such tales and delusions, it requires a power equal to the dispossession of demons to rectify it, and elevate it above such a tormenting infatuation.

The gentleman, indeed, with a show of respect for scripture, seemed to appeal to the 6th chapter of John, as though it spoke of the same

thing. Now, unless this discourse relates to the last supper, and was delivered with respect to it, how idle to seek to prove from it what was never said in it! It was a discourse upon loaves and manna, delivered to the people of Capernaum in their synagogues, on the occasion of our Lord having fed five thousand men in the desert, upon a few loaves and fishes. And as at the well of Jacob he spoke of the *water of life*; so here, when the miracle of loaves is the topic, he speaks of the *bread of life*: and of *eating* that bread, as to the woman of Samaria, he spoke of *drinking* that water. He goes on to speak figuratively of *coming* to him, *eating* him, never *hungering*, never *thirsting* again, &c., and in the most figurative style, continues his discourse, till at last, after he had spoken of their eating his flesh and drinking his blood, he told them that the words he spoke "were *spirit and life*," not literal *flesh and blood*—that flesh and blood could not profit the soul. And so the apostle Peter understood him when he said, "Lord, thou hast the words of eternal life." In metaphorical language, it is usual to say "one *hungers* and *thirsts* after knowledge, righteousness," &c.; and to say that one *eats* what he believes and receives into his mind. Thus says David: "I found thy word, and I did *eat* it." The transubstantiation of John vi. is the very opposite of the transubstantiation before us. It was flesh into bread, as the figure given in John; and bread into flesh, as the figure given in the Eucharist. "I am the living bread." "My flesh is meat, indeed." "My blood is drink, indeed." "The bread which I give is my flesh."

But the gentleman relies upon the Savior's leaving them in error, suffering them to go away in a mistake. If this were true, I can find a similar case. To the proud and captious, he often deigned no reply. Hence, when some went away from his discourse, alleging that he was born in Nazareth, he took no pains to correct the error, though it would seem that a single word would have decided the case. He knew what manner of spirit they were of, and never said once; I was not born in Nazareth; but in Bethlehem. But to conclude, the subject of discussion in John vi. is about receiving him—*coming* to him, believing him to be the Messiah, &c., and was addressed to ambitious, obstinate Jews. The subject in Matth. xxvi. and 1 Cor. xi. is his Savior's death, sacrifice and the commemoration of it, addressed to his disciples. It is, then, every way illogical to reason from the one to the other, as parallel cases.

But I would ask, how is a man to believe the same sense at one time, and disbelieve it at another, when in reading Paul or Matthew he sees the words "*this is my body*," and when looking on the table, he sees not flesh, but bread, why should he believe what he sees in

the former case, and disbelieve what he sees in the latter case? That he sees bread is certain; why not then believe his eyes? Or, if he rejects them here, why not reject them there, on the words, "This is my body?" and believe that it reads, "this represents my body!" But even after the consecration, and after Jesus had said, "This is my blood," he clearly teaches, that he spoke in a figure: for, adds he, "I will not drink again of this *fruit of the vine* with you," &c. And Paul, after consecration says, "He that eateth *this bread*, and drinketh *this cup* unworthily"—&c.

Were it, however, converted into flesh, we would have to ask, what sanctifying power is *flesh*? or, what spiritual food would there be in the human flesh of the Son of God? And were it omnipresent, how would the eating of it as a sin offering, take away sin from the conscience?! The virtue was in the altar, on which the sacrifice was offered: for "it is the altar that sanctifies the gift." And had it not been for the true and proper divinity of the Son of God, his flesh as a sin offering, could in no sense profit any person. But the priest can bring down the divine Savior from heaven, and offer him, body, soul, and divinity, as often as he pleases; and have the people adore both him and the miracle in his hand!! He that can believe all this, is not to be reasoned with.

The gentleman's remarks on, "*I am with you*," even after so many hours' reflection since I expounded them, have not the slightest reference to any thing I have said. I could not have thought it possible for a child to have so misunderstood and misapplied them. I need not again repeat them. They are wholly misrepresented. He has "defied heaven and earth." What a daring logician! Yes; he "defied heaven and earth," on what? To weaken his argument on infallibility! It would be hard indeed, to weaken that, which has no strength. Perhaps he might defy Omnipotence to weaken what does not exist. But the bishop is just as fallible as your humble servant; and his church (I may with confidence say) is even more fallible than the Protestant church: for, our rule of faith is perfect and complete: his rule, as I have shown, is imperfect and immoral.

"But Protestants are better than their principles!" Indeed! Their principles are the bible alone. Their acknowledged principles, certainly, are those to which my friend refers! A good argument! I read the other day something like this—"Bad as human nature is, there is no man on earth bad enough to make a good papist." "The system cannot be carried out fully by any person." Would my learned antagonist call this a good argument against his system? and is it not as logical as that which he has just alleged!

The bishop accuses Mr. Smith of ingratitude. I have something more to do than to defend Mr. Smith from such groundless imputations. Every one who abjures Catholicism, is a wretch: for Protestants are all heretics! The best return Mr. Smith or any person can make for favors received, is to disabuse the minds of his benefactors from error, if they happen to entertain it. The best and most grateful return that I could make to a Roman Catholic benefactor, for any benefit conferred, would be, if possible, to convince and save him from the most ruinous and destructive heresy that time records, or ever will record.

Next comes the *Secreta Monita*; for we must circumnavigate another circle in this speech also. The *Secreta Monita*, then, is just as accurate and fair a view of the spirit, design, and policies, of that order, as can be given. Such is our faith: and that on no mean testimony either.

We shall give some account of the discovery of this said book:

-----“ We are indebted for this ‘terrible book’ of Jesuits’ secrets, to the parliament of Paris. They passed the act to abolish the Jesuit society: and the execution came on the Jesuit college like a thunder stroke. Their palace was surrounded by troops, and their papers and books, and these ‘*Secret Instructions*’ were seized before they had heard that the parliament had taken up their cause!”

The reasons which the parliament of France, in 1762, gave for extirpating this order, which has *thirty-nine* times been proscribed, speak volumes:

“ The consequences of their doctrines destroy the law of nature: break all the bonds of civil society: authorizing lying, theft, perjury, the utmost uncleanness, murder, and all sins! Their doctrines root out all sentiments of humanity: excite rebellion: root out all religion: and substitute all sorts of superstition, blasphemy, irreligion, idolatry.”

Other reasons for the suppression of this order, will be found in the following extract from their oath:

-----“ In the presence of Almighty God and of all the saints, to you, my ghostly father, I do declare that his holiness, pope -----, is Christ’s vicar-general, and the only head of the universal church throughout the earth: and that by virtue of the keys given him by my Savior, Jesus Christ, he hath power to depose heretical kings, princes, states, commonwealths, and governments: all being illegal, without his sacred confirmation; and that they may safely be destroyed. Therefore I, to the utmost of my power, shall and will defend his doctrine, and his holiness’ rights and customs against all usurpers,” &c.

“ I do renounce and disown any allegiance as due to any heretical king, prince, state, named Protestant, or obedience to any of their inferior magistrates, or officers.”

“ I do further promise and declare and notwithstanding I am dispensed with,

to assume any religion heretical for the propagation of the mother church's interest,—to keep secret and private, all her agent's counsels," &c.

"All which I, A. B. do swear by the blessed Trinity, and the blessed sacrament, which I am now to receive. And I call all the heavenly and glorious hosts above, to witness these *my real intentions*, to keep this my oath. In testimony hereof, I take this most blessed sacrament of the eucharist, and set my hand and seal."

Such is the order of men restored by *Saint Pius VII.*, who, for restoring them and the inquisition, ("the vice of the dark ages!!") has been beatified, and enrolled in the Roman heavens, as a saint of the first order? Is it not in striking and thrilling harmony with the genius of our institutions, to have priests of this order, all over the land, in charge of the souls and consciences of American citizens?! So much for Jesuitism.

I ought not to have called *errors* "lies," as the apostle John, and the other apostles have done. Why? All errors are lies; and all who propagate them are, by the same apostle, *John*, called liars. "All liars," says he, (teachers of error,) shall have their part in a certain lake. Was it not impolite for the apostle, thus to use such a vulgar style? I must, then, have fallen into bad company, when I said, the man of sin stands upon two cardinal lies!

Next comes the doctrine of majorities; and these are every thing with a Romanist. They are the root, and reason, and illustration, and proof of infallibility. The man who seeks the truth by the tests of sincerity, majority, and antiquity, will never find it on earth. This is amply true of the present and all past ages. There are sincere Turks, Jews, pagans, infidels. There are very ancient errors, heresies, and sects. And, as for majorities, from Enoch till now, they have generally, if not always, been wrong in religion. Where was the majority, when Noah was building his ark? when Abraham forsook Urr of the Chaldees? when Lot abandoned Sodom? when Moses forsook Egypt? when Elijah witnessed against Ahab? when Daniel and his companions were captives in Babylon? when Malachi wrote? when the Baptist preached? when Christ was crucified? when the apostles and many of the first Christians, were persecuted?!

And, compared with paganism, when had Roman Catholicism the majority? Strange, indeed, that infallibility, after all this, should come to be the attribute of majorities! But the bishop, in his speech against Luther, delivered here in October last, said there were one hundred and fifty million Roman Catholics. I cannot find them on the earth, unless I count many millions of atheists and pagans along with them. But, after a more accurate search, I find there are in all, but one hundred and ten millions of professed Roman Catholics, and

amongst these, millions of sceptics: of Protestants, there are seventy-five millions; and of the Greek church, above forty millions; making at least one hundred and fifteen millions of Protesters against the man of sin. If, then, there be anything in majorities, the Romanists have it not. Infallibility is somewhere else. The time comes, (and may heaven speed its flight!) when the kingdom, and the greatness of the kingdom, under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, when all dominions shall serve and obey him. But Babylon will never see that day; for she will be buried in her own ruins before it comes. And when the angel, with the trumpet of everlasting good news, shall sound the hour of her judgment as come, and announce the triumph of the gospel; then, but not till then, will the majority be on the side of God, and Christ, and heaven.

I am only now at the place where I left off in my former speech, and my half hour is almost expired. I cannot again condescend to such a sacrifice of time to so many points.

I was showing, when I sat down, that the theory of spiritual despotism always precedes the practical display of it; and that the theory of the terrific and appalling despotism of papal Rome, is to be found in principles and theories promulged, and believed, and taught, before the reign of darkness and terror began.

The fact of putting the bible under a bushel, of forbidding the reading of it, of swearing for ever to interpret it as it *has been* interpreted, of not permitting men to think or speak for themselves on religion, of teaching them the power of the priests to work miracles, to create a god out of bread, that the people might adore it and them, of making a supreme judge of controversy out of one of the parties, or combining the legislative, executive, and judicial powers in one person, (the model of the most cruel despotism,) is the paragon of supreme tyranny, never surpassed, never equaled on earth.

How any person can, from such a system, elaborate a single element of free government, or of civil liberty, I cannot imagine. Indeed, the radical ideas of papal supremacy, are as antipodal to republican doctrine and American institutions, as are the zenith and the nadir! But my time has fled.

Twelve o'clock, M.

BISHOP PURCELL rises—

I have only to stand here for half a minute, and to open the bible, to reduce to dust the arguments which it costs my opponent such a waste of time and labor to construct. Was not Civil and Ecclesiastical power united in the high priest, by the Almighty God, himself? Is not this

recorded in Deuteronomy, and admitted by my worthy antagonist? What says the scripture:

“If you perceive, that there be among you, a hard and doubtful matter in judgment, between blood and blood, cause and cause, leprosy and leprosy; and thou see that the words of judgment within the gates, do vary; arise and go up to the place which the Lord thy God shall choose. And thou shalt come to the priest of the Levitical race, and to the judge that shall be at that time; and thou shalt ask of them, and they shall shew thee the truth of the judgment. And thou shalt do whatsoever they shall say, that preside in the place, which the Lord shall choose, and what they shall teach thee according to this law: and thou shalt follow their sentence, neither shalt thou decline to the right hand nor to the left hand. But he that will be proud, and refuse to obey the commandment of the priest, who mainistereth at that time to the Lord God, and the decree of the judge, that man shall die, and thou shalt take away the evil from Israel.” —Deut. xvii. 8, et seq.

Here is civil power, and ecclesiastical authority blended in one tribunal, of the presiding priest and of the Levitical ministry, and the penalty of death ordained by God, against him who contends for private judgment and refuses to obey.

Now, my friends, if Mr. C. seriously intends to employ reason and argument, instead of the calumny and abuse too often employed in religious discussions heretofore, why does he rake up from a pile of rubbish, sad memorial of the havoc made by the enemies of the Jesuits, and exhibit the tattered, and sordid, documents found there, for proof? I expected “*honor bright*” from my friend, when we began this debate, and I still expect it. Have I not dealt fairly myself? Have I gone to the sewers and streets, as he has done to those of Cracow and Paris for the *Secreta Monita* for evidence against the Protestants? No! I have quoted their most respectable authorities—I have taken up Southey, and Waddington, and such writers. I do not think it honorable to stoop down, and pick up from the gutter, all the vile trash, that Protestants have written against one another; much less that, which the enemies of Protestants may have invented; and I do not expect this course from my friend, in his attempt to fasten upon Catholics, the sins which they abhor. “Why did the parliament of Paris destroy the society of the Jesuits?” I will tell the gentleman. Because they had become the disciples of the man, who boasted that “he was tired of hearing it said, that *twelve* men had been able to convert the world from paganism to christianity, for that he would let it be seen that one man was able to unchristianize it.” This was the boast of Voltaire, who, at the head of his letters to the infidel conspirators leagued with him against revelation, was accustomed to write the words; “*Ecrasons l’infame,*” *Let us crush the wretch,* meaning Jesus Christ and his holy religion. These anti-christian machinations could

never succeed, and their authors were too wide awake in their hostility to the christian faith, not to be aware of the fact, as long as religion commanded the services of so learned and exemplary a body of men as the Jesuits. In all the entire world, in China and in France, in America and in Europe, society, as well as pure religion was their debtor. In every language they wrote the most admirable treatises on the mathematics, on medicine, on geography. Their historians, orators, poets, missionaries, have never been surpassed. Mr. Secretary Cass and Richard Peters of Philadelphia, recorder of the Supreme Court, will inform you, for they have examined it, how perfectly accurate is their map of Lake Superior with its 1,500 miles of coast, which one or two of these fathers, while seeking the red man, for Jesus Christ, in their frail canoe, found time to survey. In a word, the Jesuits were ornaments to human nature, but they had, at the same time, the *misfortune* to be the ornaments and the pillars of Religion. This Voltaire knew. His infidel colleagues knew it. And as they were conscious that the lives of the Jesuits defied their malice, and the learning of the Jesuits would continue to confound their sophistry, they had no resource but to oppress them by calumny. Hence they spared no pains to render them obnoxious to the Parliament of Paris, and reproduced the *Secreta Monita*, fabricated by some anonymous calumniator in 1612. The spuriousness of this paper has been every where admitted by the critics. Let not any one who reads this controversy on the theatre of its exposure, learn from it that erudition and honor are at so low an ebb in the United States, as to admit as argument, an appeal to so contemptible a slander.

As to the oath of the Jesuits, it is taken from the same book! There is no Jesuit that ever takes such an oath. Every Jesuit in the United States, who is not a native of the country, and intends to reside in it, has taken the oath of allegiance to our government. And in Georgetown, in the District of Columbia, in Virginia, Maryland, Kentucky, are native American Jesuits, some of the most whole-souled and thorough-going republicans in the world, prepared, at any moment, to imitate the patriotic example of the first of their order in the United States, Arch-bishop Carroll, the friend and associate of Washington. In this spirit they are rivaled by the rest of our clergy. That venerable old priest, now before you, has done for half a century, and specially in those perilous times that tried men's souls, when a formidable enemy was on our frontier, within our borders—nay in our very capital, and committing our noblest monuments to the flames, more for freedom, happiness and THE UNION, than any other living man, perhaps, of the clerical profession. The Latin poems, which he published dur-

ing the war, breathing the energy and spirit of the songs of the Greeks, when they struck down the tyrants, were translated into English, and widely circulated. General Harrison, if he were here to-day, would inform you, as he has informed me, by my fire-side, what loyal men and true were the Catholic missionaries of Indiana and Missouri, in *auld lang syne*. How they exerted all their influence, and it was not inconsiderable, to keep the Indians faithful to the cause of free government. My friends, if I must have an opponent, let me have an honorable one: let me have facts and proofs, instead of slanders and insinuations. And, to say all in one word, in answer to the charges against the Jesuits, Why did the parliament of Paris restore the order of France? Ay, that is the question. I will tell the gentleman. Because they discovered their blunder, and the injustice they had committed in suppressing them, and the prostrate state of *education*, after the Jesuits had been expelled the colleges. Then, with the magnanimity of the corporation of London, a few years ago, who honorably chipped off the inscription from the pillar, which, *like a tall bully, raised its head and lied*, by attributing the conflagration of 1666 to the Roman Catholics, did the parliament of Paris make partial atonement for the wrong done to the Jesuits. These are examples worthy of our imitation in a free and happy republic, where the iron heel of religious bigots should not be allowed to bend so much as a blade of grass!

I continue my argument for the real presence. I shall first produce the sequel of the scripture evidence, and then reply to the objections of my friend. The institution of the eucharist is related by three evangelists, and by St. Paul; by St. Matthew, who wrote his gospel, in India, seven years after the death of Christ; by St. Mark, who wrote his gospel in Rome, two years later, under the direction of St. Peter; by St. Luke, whose gospel was written in the nineteenth year of the Christian era, in Asia; and by St. Paul, from Macedonia, in Greece, fifty years later than St. Matthew, and who had learned what he teaches, not from the other evangelists, but from the revelations made to himself by Jesus Christ in person; all writing at different times, and in different places, and yet all using the self-same words, the plainest in the language in which they wrote, or in any other, and the best adapted to the poor and illiterate, who had the gospel preached to them. All these tell us, with one accord, in the Holy Ghost, that the Lord, the night before he suffered, took bread into his venerable and creating hands; and lifting up his eyes to heaven, (to heaven, to show us whence that power was derived, that goodness emanated,) he blessed and brake, and gave it to his disciples, to whom he had made the promise of his body, saying: "Take, and eat. This

is my body." In like manner, the chalice, saying: "Drink you all of this. This is my blood of the New Testament." Now, these words are so intelligible, and so clear, that if ever the principle, that every one can interpret the bible for himself, should be admitted, and enforced, and insisted on, it is surely here; for there is scarcely a possibility that words so plain, and so frequently repeated in their plainness, should lead us into error. We may even safely ask, in the hypothesis that Jesus Christ had really wished to leave us his body and blood in the eucharist, what other words he could have used, to signify more clearly the real presence in the sacrament? He has, however, in his incomprehensible wisdom and love, found something plainer still; for he not only said, "This is my body," but, as he was then making a law, a will, where nothing should be left, in the slightest manner, ambiguous, he added, "This is my body, which is GIVEN FOR YOU, this is my blood, which SHALL BE SHED FOR YOU." Was it a figurative body, that was delivered for us? Was it by figurative blood, that we were redeemed? Then are we yet in our sins, and Jesus Christ has deceived us. This it were, in the last degree, impious to suppose; and, therefore, *steadfast* in the truth of what the Son of God has done for us, we may say, as Tertullian said, on a different occasion, to the innovators of his time: Under what pretence do you come? and why do you remove the landmarks? The estate is ours: we have the ancient, the prior possession of it: we are the heirs of Jesus Christ: he made his will in our favor; and, eternal praise be given to him, he himself, the original proprietor, has delivered to us the title deeds (laying our hands on the bible.) Here is the pillar, the fast anchor of our faith in the eucharist. But it is not yet expedient to lay aside these texts, without conferring on them one mark of attention more. In the twenty-second chapter of St. Luke, 18th, 19th, and 20th verses, we read of the institution of the eucharist as a sacrament, and as a sacrifice, in a manner more and more explicit. "This," says the benefactor of the world, taking leave of it, "this is my body, which is given for you;" and in the Greek text of the Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, "which is broken for you:" "this is the chalice, the New Testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you;" and in the Greek text, "which is shed for you, for the remission of sins: do this in commemoration of me." Here, then, is every thing essential to a true sacrifice, clearly prescribed. The bread and wine are changed into the body and blood of Jesus Christ, and offered, and ordered to be offered to his heavenly Father, for the remission of sins. Now, hear how St. Paul, whose authority, upon what I have already remarked of the circumstances in which he was

called to the apostleship, is entitled to special respect, speaks on this subject, in his Epistle to the Corinthians: "Wherefore," says he, "my dearly beloved, I speak to you as to wise men; judge ye yourselves what I say. The chalice of benediction which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? And the bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord? Behold Israel according to the flesh: are not they who eat of the (Pagan) sacrifices, partakers of the altar. But the things which the heathens sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God. And I would not that you should be made partakers with devils. You cannot drink of the chalice of the Lord, and the chalice of devils: you cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord, and the table of devils." Who does not see, in a text so plain, that St. Paul contrasts the table of Christ with the altar of the Jews, and the table of devils, which the Gentiles frequented? So that, in the same manner as the Jews partook of what was offered on the altar, and the Gentiles of what was placed on the table after having been first sacrificed to the idols, so do the Christians partake of the table of the Lord, eating of that flesh which had been offered for them, and with whose blood they had been sprinkled and purified.

But this argument would be weak and utterly inconclusive, if the faithful, like the Jews and the Heathens, were not partakers of something really offered by them in sacrifice. Again, St. Paul, not only here, but also in the Ep. to the Hebrews, speaks of an altar, "of an altar, whereof they have no power to eat who serve the Tabernacle." Now it is altogether an abuse of terms, a wilful leading of others into error, to call that an altar on which sacrifice is never offered; and when St. Paul said we have an altar, whereof they cannot eat, who remain attached to the Jewish religion, he meant, no doubt what was then understood by every one, that there was a victim offered by christians at that day, 36 years after Christ, and eaten by priest and people. This is the victim of the eucharist, of which Matthew, Mark, Luke and Paul speak so clearly, and so forcibly, and which we must either now admit on the evidence of scripture, or fling the sacred volume into the flames. My opponent may talk of Christ's saying: "I am the vine;" "I am the door;" "destroy the temple;" the ten lean kine, and the ten years of famine; but, my friends, does not the scripture explain its meaning, so as to leave no doubt as to the sense of these, and twenty such texts besides? The dream of Pharaoh, and his butler's were most minutely interpreted and perfectly explained. The evangelist expressly informs us, Christ spoke of the temple of his body; lest this expression should leave any doubt on

the mind of the reader as to the Savior's meaning. But where is the *parity* between these passages and the words of Christ: "this is my body—this is my blood?" "My flesh is meat indeed—my blood is drink indeed." Our Lord does not say of the vine, "this vine shall be hung up for you," he does not say of the door, this door shall be hung up for you, he does not say of the temple, or of the vine, "they shall be offered for you;" but he says all this as I shall shew, when I come to speak of the institution when speaking of the divine food which he gives us in the Eucharist. "This is my body *which is offered* for you, this is my blood, which is shed for you"—and as he was then at the last hour of his life, and speaking heart to heart to his friends, it was no time for parables and figures. The traitor was nigh; the hour was at hand, when he was to pass out of this world to the Father. He knew how this doctrine would be contested, that the VAST MAJORITY of christians would believe in it, as they do at this day, according to the obvious and literal meaning of the text, and yet he speaks not *one word* to induce us to believe in a figurative presence. Why? Because he meant it to be understood literally, with faith in his almighty power and his infinite love. Because as God, he operates his greatest wonders, by the simplest words. "*Let there be light;*" "*Thy son liveth;*" "*Lazarus, come forth;*" "*I will, be thou cleansed;*" "*Take up thy bed and walk;*" "*Peace! be still;*" "*This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise;*" "*This is my body, this is my blood.*" This Luther himself was forced to admit. He tells us how very desirous he was, and how much he labored to overthrow this doctrine, knowing how much he could, thereby, annoy the pope: "but," says he, "I found myself caught, without any way of escaping; for the text of the gospel, was too plain for me." Epist. ad Argintenses, t. 4. fol. 502. Ed. Wittemberg. In another place, he says, condemning those who denied the corporal presence: "The devil seems to have mocked those to whom he has suggested a heresy so ridiculous, and contrary to scripture, as that of the Zuinglians who explained away the words of the institution in a figurative way." He elsewhere compares these glosses with the following translation of the first words of the scripture: *In principio Deus creavit caelum et terram.*—In the beginning the Cuckoo ate the sparrow and his feathers. Def. verb. Dom. On one occasion he calls those who deny the real and corporal presence; "a damned sect, lying heretics, bread-breakers, wine-drinkers, and soul-destroyers." In parv. catech. On other occasions he says, "They are endevilized, and superdevilized." Finally he devotes them to everlasting flames, and builds his own hopes of mercy at the tribunal of Christ, on his having with all his

soul condemned Carlostad, Zuinglius, and other believers in the symbolical presence. Bishop Bramhall thus writes: "No genuine son of the church (of England) did ever deny a true, real presence. Christ said—*This is my body*,—and what he said we steadfastly believe. He said neither CON, nor SUB, nor TRANS: therefore we place those among the opinions of schools, not among articles of faith." Ans. to Militiare, p. 74. Bishop Cosin is not less explicit, in favor of the Catholic doctrine. He says, "It is a monstrous error to deny that Christ is to be adored in the Eucharist. We confess the necessity of a supernatural and heavenly change; and that the signs cannot become sacraments, but by the infinite power of God. If any one make a bare figure of the sacrament, we ought not to suffer him in our churches." Hist. de Transub. Lastly the profound Hooker expresses himself thus; I wish men would give themselves more to meditate in silence, on what we have in the sacrament, and less to dispute of the manner how; since we all agree that Christ, by the sacrament, doth really and truly perform in us his promise, why do we vainly trouble ourselves with so fierce contentions whether by consubstantiation or else by transubstantiation?" Eccles. Polit. B. v. 67.

My opponent says that when we meditate any doctrine, we eat it. So, then, when we meditate on hell we eat it and all its contents! He says we eat it spiritually, but this is nonsense. I want not the stomach or the mind, such orthodoxy requires.

My friend observes, that the doctrine of transubstantiation is contrary to the testimony of our senses. We have nothing but our senses to guide us. This is the scepticism of Thomas Tanew: "*Unless I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my fingers into the place of the nails, and put my hand into his side, I will not believe.*" The Savior condescended to give the requisite proof of the senses, to the doubting apostle, but he replied to the confession, "My Lord and my God," "Because thou hast seen me, Thomas, thou hast believed. BLESSED ARE THEY THAT HAVE NOT SEEN, AND HAVE BELIEVED." The consequences of the doctrine of the real presence are not unworthy of God. Every pretended absurdity is as justly chargeable on the *Incarnation* as on the Eucharist. In Pope and McGuire's discussion, one of these is to be found, where my friend was the foregoing. It is that of a mouse, that is said to have once run away with the sacrament, while the priest had his eyes shut saying his prayers. But is this ridiculous story an argument? Then deny that sin could be committed, for sin is a greater insult than this, to Jesus Christ. Deny that his sacred person was outraged with blows and spittle; that he was dragged through the streets of Jerusalem, with the halter of ig-

nominy around his neck; that he was scourged, crowned with thorns, crucified; that his blood trickled to the ground; that his executioners trampled upon it; that insects and quadrupeds partook of it! all these adorable scandals are the consequences of the infinite love with which Jesus Christ loved us. The more he is humbled for our sakes, the dearer should he be to us. But if the scandal of his humiliations shake our faith, let the wisdom and the power of the Godhead, displayed in the midst of these humiliations, sustain and animate it. Behold! the earth that receives that falling blood, trembles to her very centre; the sun, unable to behold the bloody tragedy, withdraws his light, and leaves the world in darkness and mourning and terror, for its author's dissolution; the rocks are rent asunder; the graves give up their dead; the pagan centurion strikes his breast and exclaims, "Truly this man was the Son of God." Let us also believe and adore! [Time expired.]

Three o'clock, P. M.

MR. CAMPBELL rises—

Knowing, my fellow-citizens, how much depends in such a discussion, as that now in progress, on having authentic documents, I determined from the beginning to rely on none which could, on proper evidence, or with justice be repudiated. I knew that in all debates so far back as the very era of the Reformation this party have been accustomed to deny authorities, to dispute versions, translations, &c., even of their own writers who were so candid as to give a tolerably fair representation of themselves. And as all their historians, good and bad, frequently tell the truth, they are all occasionally to be censured, when that truth is quoted by a Protestant and turned to its proper account. I have not then, to my knowledge or belief, introduced an unworthy author. And so long as my opponent can disprove nothing which I have quoted, either from Du Pin, or Ligori, his frequent allusions to them, with such unqualified censures, only shows how much he feels the truth of their testimony.

The Jesuits, that standing army of the pope, are revived, and are inundating our country. Other fraternities are but the militia: but these are the trained band life-guards of the papacy. Their oath is full proof of the spirit of the corps. My worthy opponent says, that they are a very learned body of men, and that he is not *now* a Jesuit. So much the worse. How then can he defend the order from the doctrines of the *Secreta Monita*; and affirm that they do not *now* take the oath which I read to you?—He would represent me as picking out of the streets, or out of the ruins of some fallen edifice the oaths and

books of the Jesuits. If that were the fact, would it disprove the contents of these documents? It would not. Truth is truth, wherever found, in the street or in a temple—in a cellar, or in a mountain. But I did not so seek or find them. They are public and authentic documents, and my opponent can only deny or dispute, but he cannot disprove them.

Here is another document, not from the ashes of a monastery. I do not know the writer of this article: but it is from an Encyclopedia.

BISHOP PURCELL. Is it the book of Fessenden & Co.?

MR. CAMPBELL. It is from their press.

BISHOP PURCELL. Ah! I know it!

Mr. Campbell reads:

"In 1801 the society was restored in Russia by the emperor Paul; and in 1804 by king Ferdinand, in Sardinia. In August, 1814, a bull was issued by pope Pius VII. restoring the order to all their former privileges, and calling upon all Catholics to afford them protection and encouragement. This act of their revival is expressed in all the solemnity of the papal authority; and even affirmed to be above the recall or revision of any judge, with whatever power he may be clothed; but to every enlightened mind it cannot fail to appear as a measure altogether incapable of justification, from any thing either in the history of Jesuitism, or in the character of the present times.

"The essential principles of this institution namely, that their order is to be maintained at the expense of society at large, and that the end sanctifies the means, are utterly incompatible with the welfare of any community of men. Their system of lax and phant morality, justifying every vice, and authorizing every atrocity has left deep and lasting ravages on the face of the moral world. Their zeal to extend the jurisdiction of the court of Rome over every civil government, gave currency to tenets respecting the duty of opposing princes who were hostile to the Catholic faith, which shook the basis of all political allegiance, and loosened the obligations of every human law. Their indefatigable industry, and countless artifices in resisting the progress of the reformed religion, perpetuated the most pernicious errors of popery, and postponed the triumph of tolerant and christian principles. Whence, then, it may well be asked, whence the recent restoration? What long-latent proof has been discovered of the excellence, or even the expedience, of such an institution? The sentence of their abolition was passed by the senates and monarchs, and statesmen, and divines, of all religions, and of almost every civilized country in the world.

"Almost every land has been stained and torn by their crimes: and almost every land bears on its public record the most solemn protests against their existence. The evils of Jesuitism arise not from the violation of the principles of the order; on the contrary, they are the natural and necessary fruits of the system; they are confined to no age, place, or person; they follow like the tail of the comet, the same disastrous course with the luminary itself; and, in consequence, not this or that nation, but humanity, is startled at the re-appearance of this common enemy of man." [Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge, p. 685.

Remember, my friends, that one of the cardinal principles of Jesuitism is, that "*the end justifies the means.*" This maxim justifies every

crime in our criminal code! if the cause of the Roman church can be thereby promoted.

The gentleman asked, "Why has this order been so often restored, if it be not good?" I answer, For the same reason that the Inquisition has been restored, and by the same persons too. Whenever the power of the papacy and the state of the community would tolerate it, it has been revived; and I presume so long as the papacy lives, it will, being infallible, pursue the same course. Does the restoration of the Inquisition prove it to be good?

The gentleman would trace to the hatred of Christianity, the opposition of Voltaire and other sceptics in France, to the order of the Jesuits. This is a *non causa*. The infidels hated the Jesuits, not for Christ's sake, for no one could hate them on that account: but because they supported the political despotism of this pretended vicar of Rome. This was the true reason of that mortal hatred of the Jesuits by all the republicanism of France, and throughout the world.

The bishop has confessed that he would have the legislature, judicial, and executive powers in the same hands, and quotes Deuteronomy xvii. to prove that it is right, even now. What an admirer of American institutions! Certainly, he has forgotten himself: and the Jewish institution too! It was a theocracy. God himself was law-giver—the priests kept and expounded the law—the judges and kings executed it. Where, then, were all these powers accumulated in one and the same dynasty? It is a mistake of the case, as well as of the nature of the government. The very elements of a just and pure government will be found in separating these powers; the very essence of a despotism in uniting them in one and the same person.

The gentleman, I am glad to observe, understands my discovery of the elements of all tyranny in the supreme judge of controversy, or, councils of the Roman church. But he fails in vindicating it. The council is "the church *representative*;" consequently, it is the church judging for herself against the heretics or reformers. She is always a party in the case of which she is judge. Most controversies are on points affecting the priesthood. All disputes, more or less affect the standing or temporal interest of the clergy. Now the councils are composed only of clergy. Is it not then the clergy judging in their own case? And such is the model of a Roman Catholic Republic!

A word or two more on transubstantiation. Will the bishop please inform us *whether the bread and wine are transubstantiated into the natural body of Christ, or into his glorified body?* If into the natural body, in which he said "*this is my body,*" "*this is my blood;*" of what profit to eat it? and how dare christians to eat it, according to the de-

crees of the apostles? and if it be his glorified body, how can there be flesh and blood in it? for flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven!

The allusions of my opponent to the Episcopalians and Unitarians, in vindication of his gross interpretations of the eucharistical words, is unworthy of a serious reply. Besides, their opinions are not the subject of controversy here. It is transubstantiation, and not consubstantiation, or any other theory of the presence of the Lord in this ordinance, which I assert, and which he is bound to defend, if he can. The Episcopalians would abhor the comments and interpretations which the bishop dares append to their words. He treats them as he treated Luther!

One of the most unfortunate references I recollect to have heard in debate, was that of the bishop to the unbelief of Thomas. The Saviour's answer to Thomas fully expresses his sophistry on transubstantiation: for Jesus said, "reach hither thy finger,"—"handle me,"—"thrust thy hand into my side." So we reason: "Take this loaf into your hands, feel it, taste it, smell it,—Is it flesh, or is it bread? Test it by your senses. Believe not, contrary to your senses. Jesus made his appeal to the senses. So do we. Why has my opponent quoted this passage? Is he turning Protestant?"

I wish the Roman Catholics would hear Paul in this case. He has positively said, that it is bread that is eaten in the act of celebrating the supper. "As often," says he, "as you eat this *bread*, and drink this *cup*, you do show forth the Lord's death till he come." To "drink a cup" is certainly a figure as much as "this is my body;" and goes to show that words are not to be taken literally in this passage. If then, Jesus called it *the fruit of the vine*, after consecration, and Paul, the *bread* and the *cup*, in the very act of communicating, I ask, What foundation is there for the miracle of the mass?!

My learned opponent tells you a story about a mouse. It may, indeed, have a good argument in it; but I do not use such arguments, on so grave a subject. He did it, he said, to anticipate me. He did not however anticipate me: for I had no intention of telling such a story, or any other of the same type. I think it would be more apposite for him to show how a person can believe against his five senses, that a priest can, by a few words create the body, soul and divinity of the Son of God out of a little "*paste*;" than to relate such mouse stories, how true soever they may be. Surely, before they kneel down and adore a wafer, they ought to be fully assured that the priest has converted it into a divinity!

I must return to my last proposition. This concerns him and his

party more, than any other one of the seven. We will soon be able to judge, whether he is determined to evade or canvass it. I would emphatically tell him, the community expect him to discuss this subject above all others. They are much excited and interested on this point. Many who have no antipathy against Roman Catholics have some fears of them. I belong to that class. I have no antipathy: but I have my fears. I do honestly think, (and I avow it here, that I may give my ingenious opponent an opportunity to remove the impression if he can,) I say, I do sincerely believe and think, that Roman Catholicism, in any country is detrimental to its interests and prosperity: and in a republic, directly and positively tending every moment to its subversion. Such is my conviction. I avow it, that if possible, it may be removed. I always distinguish between a system and those who profess it,—between a creed, and the people. And therefore I war against *principles* and not *men*. I am not singular in these sentiments. They are possessed by a large portion of the most intelligent of this community. I have, indeed, been asked, perhaps, a hundred times, since October last, in different places, and by different persons, of all religious parties and by persons of no sect: “Are you not afraid to meet the Catholics in debate?”—“Afraid of what?”—“Of your life—of being killed,” was the reply. “Are you not afraid that they will lay violent hands on you?” No; was my answer. I met the infidel Owen and feared nothing; and certainly I have no more to fear from “the Mother and Mistress of all christians” than from infidels!

It gives me pleasure to say, that there are some Roman Catholics, to whom I could trust my life and my all as confidently, as to any Protestant. To such men, as Fenelon, as Paschal, as Rollin, as Du Pin, as St. Pierre, as Thomas à Kempis, I could commit my life, as freely and as cheerfully as to any Protestants. In such cases the *man* rises above the system. I state this fact to interest my opponent in discussing my *seventh* proposition; and to assure him that it will give me pleasure, and I have no doubt the whole community, to learn that all such fears are perfectly groundless; and to see that he is able satisfactorily to remove them. Let the public mind be disabused: for as present advised, Protestants generally think that civil liberty and the papacy are wholly incompatible with each other: and that the introduction of large numbers of Roman Catholics into this community, would inevitably subvert this government; and place us under a spiritual and political despotism, intolerant and cruel as those, which the see of Rome has established in every country on earth, where she has obtained a majority.

Let the gentleman, then, turn his attention to this subject, and im-

prove the opportunity in wiping from his escutcheons those foul stains that I have associated with the name Roman Catholic every thing that is intolerant, inhuman and tyrannical. Let him show us here in what manner the decrees of councils, the bulls of popes, the oaths of the clergy, and the infallibility of the church are to be disposed of, if we could promise ourselves that the prevalence of his party in this country would not be an end of all those free and equitable institutions, which have made these United States the wonder and the admiration of the world.

Is it of the essence of this superstition to root out and destroy every antagonist, principle, tenet, and party; or is it merely accidental, that Rome can endure no living rival? Has not the Roman see even when a foreign empire always sought to be above all gods or magistrates: and does it not now bind every bishop on earth under the most heart-searching and conscience-binding oaths and anathemas, to defend and keep the Roman papacy, and the *royalties of St. Peter*, saving his own order against all men? Is not my opponent thus sworn? Has he not bound himself as he shall answer to God in the great day, by the most solemn imprecations to preserve, defend, *increase* and *advance* the authority of his lord the pope, and his successors canonically coming in?—He has so sworn—just as certainly, as he has sworn “to *persecute and oppose* all heretics and schismatics,” as we read from an oath which he has not yet had the courage to deny. It is, indeed, a part of the same oath.

It will require the ingenuity of a Jesuit to show how these duties to the pope can consist with the obligations of the oath of naturalization, or the duties which a citizen of this country owes to its government. But before I comment further on the oath, we will hear it to the end:

“I will come to a council when I am called, unless I be hindered by a canonical impediment. I will by myself in person visit the threshold of the apostles every three years; and give an account to our Lord and his aforesaid successors of all my pastoral office, and of all things any wise belonging to the state of my church, to the discipline of my clergy and people, and lastly to the salvation of souls committed to my trust; and will diligently execute the apostolic commands. And if I be detained by a lawful impediment I will perform all things aforesaid by a certain messenger hereto specially empowered, a member of my chapter, or some other ecclesiastical dignity, or else having a parsonage; or in default of these, by a priest of the diocese; or in default of one of the clergy, [of the diocese] by some other secular or regular priest of approved integrity and religion, fully instructed in all things above mentioned. And such impediment I will make out by lawful proofs to be transmitted by the aforesaid messenger to the cardinal proponent of the holy Roman church in the congregation of the sacred council. The possession belonging to my table, I will neither sell, nor give away, nor mortgage, nor grant anew in fee, nor any wise alienate, no, not even with the consent of the chapter of my church, without consulting the Ro-

man Pontiff. And if I shall make any alienation, I will thereby incur the penalties contained in a certain constitution put forth about this matter. So help me God and these holy Gospels of God." *Pöntif. Rom. Antwerp, Anno 1626*—pp. 59, 86. [Time expired.]

Half past 3 o'clock, P. M.

BISHOP PURCELL rises—

Mr. Campbell begs me to follow him, I am following him; but the truth is that my learned friend runs away so fast from his own reason, that it is not surprising if he gets ahead of mine. My friends, I promise to satisfy you on the vital question of civil liberty. He will not be able to draw me off from my argument. He is a foreigner, an Irishman, as well as I, and I am sorry to see, that while he breathes, he would infect, the atmosphere of freedom. We are both indebted to America for the liberty which we enjoy, which he as a dissenter, and I, as a Catholic, would not have enjoyed under the *Protestant Government* of Great Britain, in our native land: For myself, I am an adopted American citizen, having renounced, by oath, all foreign allegiance. It is my only desire to live and act as an American freeman should, and escape the charge which rests on foreigners like my worthy opponent, and those Scotch fanatics in New York, who volunteer to teach Americans how to understand their own constitution. These, and their like, are the men who cause all the excitement about religion. They, and not the Catholics, are the real mischief makers. This, I say, more in sorrow than in anger, and exclusively with the view of doing justice to the truth. Let us appreciate the blessings we here enjoy, and not withhold, or mar them. We have not here imbibed the spirit of controversy, which may be called the spirit of the world, but the spirit of charity which is the spirit of God. The former is predicated for another meridian.

I will now finish my arguments on the real presence. St. Paul, speaking of the dispositions with which the Eucharist was to be received, seals the proof deduced from the words of the institution and the promise. His words are these: "When you come therefore together into one place, it is not now to eat the Lord's supper." The apostle condemns their partaking of this, as of ordinary food. "What," says he, "have you not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the church of God; and put them to shame that have not? What shall I say to you? Do I praise you? In this I praise you not. For I have received of the Lord, that which also, I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread. And giving thanks, broke, and said: 'Take ye and eat; this is my body which shall be delivered for you; this do for a commemo-

ration of me.' In like manner, also, the chalice, after he had supped, saying: 'This chalice is the New Testament in my blood; this do ye as often as you shall drink it,' for the commemoration of me.' For as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink the chalice, you shall shew the death of the Lord, until he come. Therefore whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body, and blood of the Lord. But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that chalice. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself, not discerning the body of the Lord." 1st. Ep. Cor. ch. xi. Here the most virtuous and pious dispositions under the dread penalty, of receiving the body and blood of the Lord unworthily, and thus incorporating, and making our condemnation a portion of our flesh and blood and being, are required of the Catholic communicant, and yet my worthy opponent quotes this sanctifying doctrine among the immoralities of the Catholic church!

But my friend objects to transubstantiation. Then let him differ from Luther and the Episcopallians, for the real presence, without transubstantiation, which they teach, is a greater difficulty. If the bible be our guide, let us adhere to it. What was the first miracle which our Savior wrought? Was it not the changing of water into wine? transubstantiation? My friend says that he has never read on this subject, nor studied it. I do not wonder that he says it is so absurd, if he never gave it serious consideration. (MR. CAMPBELL here explained that he had said that he had never read a controversial treatise on the subject, but affirmed that he had reflected on it, and studied it.) Not only the first miracle, but every thing in nature confirms the doctrine. The bread and meat that my friend ate, a week ago, is, this day, flesh and blood and bone of his body. So of trees,—the juices they draw from the soil, are converted into branches and verdure. Nature, in fact, is replete with evidences illustrative of the possibility of transubstantiation. If you wish for a human testimony, interrogate christian antiquity. St. Ignatius, the disciple of the apostles, in his Epistle to the church of Smyrna, speaking of heretics, says, "They do not admit of Eucharists and oblations, because they do not believe the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Savior, Jesus Christ, who suffered for our sins."

Origen says; "Manna was formerly given, as a figure; but now the flesh and blood of the Son of God are specifically given, and are real food."

St. Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, says:

"Since Christ himself affirms thus of the bread, *This is my body; who is so daring* as to doubt of it? and since he affirms, *this is my blood*; who will deny that it is his blood? At Cana in Galilee, he, by an act of his will, turned water into wine, which resembles blood, and is he then not to be credited when he changes wine into blood? Therefore, full of certainty, let us receive the body and blood of Christ; for under the form of bread, is given to thee his body, and under the form of wine, his blood."

St. Ambrose thus argues with his spiritual children:

"You will say, why do you tell me that I receive the body of Christ, when I see quite another thing? We have this point therefore to prove. How many examples do we produce to show you, that this is not what nature made it; but what the benediction has consecrated it; and that the benediction is of greater force than nature, because by the benediction, nature itself is changed! Moses cast his rod upon the ground, and it became a serpent; he caught hold of the serpent's tail, and it recovered the nature of a rod. The rivers of Egypt, &c. Thou hast read of the creation of the world: If Christ, by his word, was able to make something out of nothing, shall he not be thought able to change one thing into another?"

My friend spoke of the period at which this doctrine was introduced, and quoted Scotus. I venture my life, that he does not know who Scotus was, or when he lived. I ask my friend to tell me, who is this Scotus, to whom he referred.

MR. CAMPBELL.—I presume he was a father of the church.

BISHOP PURCELL.—I do not speak disrespectfully of my friend, but I do not like this index learning:

"Which turns no student pale,
Yet holds the eel of science by the tail."

There were two individuals whom he has confounded. The first, called Scotus Evigena, lived in the ninth century, and wrote a treatise against the real presence, which was condemned in many councils. The second flourished in the fourteenth century, and taught theology in Oxford and Paris. Or, instead of either of the foregoing, does the gentleman quote Soto, the theologian, sent by Charles V. of Germany, to the council of Trent? Of which of them does the gentleman speak? I pause for a reply. (Pauses.)

MR. CAMPBELL.—You may proceed.

BISHOP PURCELL.—I will proceed to settle this point.

MR. CAMPBELL.—That is not the question before us.

BISHOP PURCELL.—Well, then, my friends, I will take up the subject of indulgences, against which my friend had directed his batteries. An indulgence is no license to commit sin. The Catholic church anathematizes the doctrine that any man, or set of men, can grant a li-

cense to commit sin. She teaches that an indulgence is nothing more nor less than a remission of the temporal punishment, which often remains attached to sin, after the eternal guilt has been forgiven to the sinner, on his sincere repentance. Before proving this doctrine both scriptural and rational, and that the church is guilty of encouraging no immorality by the power which she exercises in the granting of indulgences, I must shew that the charge of immorality presses heavily on my opponent's doctrine, and not on mine, for he teaches that the distinction between greater and lesser sins is not found in scripture. He has advocated the monstrous, and insupportable doctrine, that the child who tells an untruth, to save itself from punishment, is as guilty as the parricide who cuts his father's throat! and accuses Catholics of being immoral, because they do not subscribe to such a doctrine as this! What is the effect of this doctrine, that all sins are equal? Why, it is this: that the man who has committed the slightest sin, is as guilty in the sight of God, and as deserving of being damned, as if his sins were ever so enormous. "If this be my lot," is his spontaneous reasoning, "I see no cause why my passions should not have all the advantage of this doctrine. I will, therefore, continue to sin. No natural law, no divine legislation, no civil convention, or moral restraint shall debar me of my pleasures." This is revolting; it is horrible. Scripture, reason, and Catholicism, anathematize it. I now resume the proof of my position, touching indulgences, and maintain that after the eternal guilt is remitted, a temporal pain is often inflicted for the satisfaction of divine justice. Thus, when Adam and Eve had sinned in paradise, when they had incurred the Divine displeasure, and heard the dread sentence pronounced against them and their posterity, even in his wrath the Almighty remembered mercy. They were driven from Eden, but not into hell. In other words, the eternal guilt of their sin was forgiven, but the temporal punishment still remained to be endured. (There is some doubt whether Eve partakes of her consort's happiness in heaven, or not: but Adam, we are assured by scripture, is in heaven.) "In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat thy bread," said the Lord, "the earth shall be accursed in thy toil, briars and thorns," &c. We are bearing a part of their punishment. We feel the effects of this primeval prevarication. The whole earth is a hospital. Poverty, crime, disease, war, pestilence, and famine; physical, moral, and mental afflictions, and evils; all the quarrelling; all the differences of opinion; this very controversy; all this is a part of the temporal punishment of our first parents' transgression. This shews the difference between the temporal and eternal punishment of sin. Behold another illustration. David takes Uriah's wife—he orders

Uriah into the front of the battle that he might be killed. The Almighty, incensed at his double crime, sends his prophet to rebuke him, and David trembles before his wrath. God is moved, and pardons him. He remits the eternal guilt of his sin, but not its temporal punishment. "The child that is born for thee shall die." We know all the evils that followed; Absalom, &c. The doctrine of indulgences is this: WHEN A HUMAN BEING DOES EVERY THING IN HIS POWER TO ATONE FOR SIN, God has left a power in the church, to remit a part or the entire of the temporal punishment due to it. It is always understood, that no matter what the church does, the indulgence is of no effect, if the repentance be not sincere. I will give you a striking example from scripture. It is the case where St. Paul absolved the incestuous man of Corinth, 2d Cor. ii. 6, 8, who had been guilty, even in the early age of the church, of a crime which struck the hearts of all the church with dismay. St. Paul wrote to Corinth and said, when he heard that the man was overwhelmed with contrition, and shunned by all the people, "To him that is such a one this rebuke is sufficient, that is given by many. And to whom you have pardoned any thing, I also. For what I have pardoned, if I have pardoned any thing, for your sakes have I done it IN THE PERSON OF CHRIST." One text is worth twenty arguments. The obedience rendered to St. Paul on this occasion, by the church of Corinth, my friend denounces. But the early christians were more humble, and Paul was guilty of no assumption in demanding it. "In the person of Christ," mark those words—that he, in the person of Christ, forgave—what?—not the eternal guilt of the incestuous man—God alone could forgive that; but the temporal punishment; to restore him to the privileges of the church and of christian society. Nothing is more frequent in the ecclesiastical history of the early ages, than the narrative of the acts of the martyrs; and this, among others, of their being visited in prison, or met in their way to execution, by persons condemned to perform public penances, according to the discipline of the church in those days, and supplicated for a ticket, or other intimation of intercession in their behalf, with the pastors of the church, that the term of these penances might be abridged, in consideration of the martyr's generous sacrifices. One drop of Christ's precious blood was sufficient to ransom a thousand worlds. He left this treasure and its keys to the church, saying, "Whatever you shall loose on earth, it shall be loosed in heaven," &c. But I will give you other examples to illustrate the doctrine of indulgences. The English church grants indulgences. Luther granted them, of an extraordinary kind too. Our government grants indulgences. An insolvent debtor hangs his head with shame; there is nothing he would not

do to pay his debts. The law takes him to jail—he gives a schedule of his property, and upon surrendering all he possesses in the world, upon oath, he is allowed to take the benefit of the act. This is what the church does to sinners, who sincerely repent and do all they can, first, to pay the spiritual debts that stand against them. Shew me that there is any thing wrong in the insolvent laws, and then you may find fault with the practice of the church. As for the pope, or bishop, giving a license to sin, I will repeat as often as it is repeated, that the Catholic church reprobates it. If all the bishops in the world, and the pope were to sign such a license, the sinner would not be forgiven, if he remained in sin. God himself does not pardon sin upon these terms. But I cannot consent that the gentleman should force down our throats doctrines that we abominate.—[Time expired.]

Four o'clock, P. M.

MR. CAMPBELL rises—

Really, my friends, it would seem as if I ought to go back some two or three days to help my opponent forward to the subject now before us. But I will not. There is no person in this house, with the exception of my ingenious opponent, who believes that I represent all sins as equal as respects man. Though as respects the divine law, as already observed, they are equally transgressions of it. Hence, as James the apostle avers: "He that offends in *one point*," though he should keep every other, "*is guilty of all!*" The gentleman, then, may defend his "white lies," and other violations of God's law, as he pleases; but God will show the universe that, as respects his character, as Lawgiver and King, the least infraction, as respects man, is the highest insult that can be rendered to the Lawgiver. Eve's "little sin," as the infidels call it, is the best exposition of the logic of Roman theology. Though it differs much in the estimation of man from the treachery of Judas: yet, does not every page and letter in man's sad history, bear witness, that even the pulling off an apple against the law of God, is an offense that justifies the Governor or the Universe for having suffered the whole creation on our planet to groan and travail together in pain and death for thousands of years.

To the unpropitious destiny of my opponent I attribute all his remarks on my saying that I read no tracts in confutation of transubstantiation. Does that prove that I cannot refute—or that I have not refuted his defense of it. The bible alone qualifies me to expose all his sophistry, or that of any man, on that grossest and most unfeasible of all the impostures that have, in any age or nation, been obtruded on mankind.

The gentleman has spoken of various natural transubstantiations. Astonishing! Who ever thought any thing else, but that all organized bodies, all earthly substances, nay, indeed, that all matter was susceptible of real changes, and new combinations and transubstantiations? But where is the analogy? They are real and apparent, visible and sensible transubstantiations. But the universe affords no transubstantiation, similar to that for which the Bishop contends—Nothing transubstantiated, and yet the same to all our sense and reason.

But in the name of reason itself, what distress or pressure of misfortune has induced this learned gentleman to appeal to the miracle in Cana of Galilee—to the transubstantiation of water into wine? That was really a transubstantiation. It did not look like water—taste like water, smell like water, nor operate like water. It was real wine, in color, taste, smell, and all its sensible properties. What a refutation has the gentleman found in his own illustration!!

The Bishop's remarks upon "*eating the word*," &c., &c., are equally unhappy, and extravagant. He has not done himself any honor on this occasion. Jesus said, "it is my meat and my drink to do the will of him that sent me." Truth is an aliment of the soul, and doing the will of heaven is a *feast* to every christian. But can the soul feast on literal flesh and blood?! 'Tis an outrage on common sense!

I was glad to hear him even quote the words, "Judge you what I say:" any appeal to reason, any word favorable to examination, coming from that quarter, falls on my ear like the sound of the dulcimer. Jesus says, "Why do you not of yourselves judge what is right;" and Paul says, "Judge what I say;" and John commands, "Believe not every spirit; but try the spirits, for many false prophets are gone forth into the world." Now all these commands are addressed to the common mass of christians. Well, then, says Paul, "The *loaf* for which we give thanks, is it not the communion of the body of Christ," &c.; "and the cup which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood?" &c.; and the whole is called the Lord's table, the Lord's supper—an institution in remembrance of one that is absent, "TILL HE COME:"—not the eating of one present, but the memorial of one absent. "You then," says Paul, "do show forth the Lord's death *till he come*."

The Corinthian abuses show, that they had no notion of a wafer and no wine—of a mass, a transubstantiation. Paul reproved them for their irregularities, and said this was not to eat the *Lord's supper*, (not to partake of a mass): for some had eaten and even drunk to excess. The rich had brought a large supper, and put the poor to shame,

who had no supper to bring. These were abuses which could never have arisen out of the doctrine of transubstantiation. In one word, there was as much transubstantiation in the passover, because it is called the "Lord's passover," as there is in the institution of the supper, because it is called the "Lord's body;" and he that cannot thus "discern the Lord's body," in this institution, is not to be reasoned with on any religious question.

Next comes the gentleman's splendid episode on the identification of the unfortunate *Scotus*, whose peculiar age and country I am no more bound to remember, or to tell here, than I am to relate the personal or family history of every individual I quote. How many authors are daily quoted, whose age and country, not one in a hundred, may be able to relate with historic accuracy? Are those who cite Copernicus, Zoroaster, Euclid, or even Newton, obliged to tell when or where they were born, lived and died? It is, however, on the authority of Bellarmine I quoted this celebrated Roman Catholic author, and ought I not, on such an endorsement, to regard *Scotus* as of high authority in the Roman church?

Time is becoming very precious, and as I have only two speeches after to-day, I shall not go farther into the details of the proposition, now under discussion, especially as I have not been met by the Bishop on the two grand errors which nourish and sustain the baseless dream of purgatory and the sacraments of penance, auricular confession, the mass, &c., &c.

Indulgence is not identical with absolution, as my opponent seems to argue. Indulgence, as the term imports, is a license to sin: absolution is the forgiveness of sin. An indulgence gives license to sin, because it promises the person prospectively an exemption from the punishment; and even to remain, in full force, in the moment of death!

My seventh proposition says:

"The Roman Catholic religion, if infallible and insusceptible of reformation, as alleged, is essentially anti-American, being opposed to the genius of all free institutions, and positively subversive of them, opposing the general reading of the scriptures, and the diffusion of useful knowledge among the whole community, so essential to liberty and the permanency of good government."

"Essentially anti-American."—This I have so far proved, as reference has already been made to those doctrines, which make the Roman Catholic population abject slaves to their priests, bishops, and popes—to that hierarchy, which has always opposed freedom of thought, of speech, and of action, whether in literature, politics, or religion. Such are the laws of mind—such the intellectual and moral constitution of man, that if in religion the mind be enslaved to any superstition, espe-

cially in youth, it rarely or ever can be emancipated and invigorated. The benumbing and paralyzing influence of Romanism is such, as to disqualify a person for the relish and enjoyment of political liberty. For in all history, civil liberty follows in the wake of religious liberty; insomuch, that it is almost an oracle of philosophy, that religious liberty is the cause, and political liberty an effect of that cause, without which it never has been found. Compare not Protestant America with the republics of Greece or Rome; for there is scarcely any point of coincidence in this respect. There never was on earth so free and so equitable an institution as the Protestant institutions of these United States.

We shall now exemplify the spirit and tendency of Romanism, taken from the five hundred years in which it was most triumphant.

As a specimen of that abject slavery of Romanists to their superiors, and of the humility of the popes, of which my friend has so often spoken, take the following example:

"According to this doctrine then current at Rome, in the last Lateran great synod, under the Pope's nose, and in his ear, one bishop styled him *Prince of the world*; another orator called him *King of kings*, and Monarch of the earth; another great prelate said of him, that *he had all power above all powers, both of heaven and earth*. And the same roused up Pope Leo X. in these brave terms: 'Snatch up therefore the two-edged sword of divine power, committed to thee; and enjoin, command, and charge, that an universal peace and alliance be made among christians for at least ten years; and to that bind kings in fetters of the great king, and constrain nobles by the iron manacles of censures: for to thee is given all power in heaven and in earth.'

"This is the doctrine which Barronius, with a Roman confidence, doth so often assert and drive forward, saying, 'that there can be no doubt of it, but that the *civil principality* is subject to *the sacerdotal*: and that God hath made the political government subject to the dominion of the spiritual church.'" Epis. Patrac. Sess. 10, p. 133. Barronius, Annals, 57. 23.

It is Barronius, and not Du Pin, says, "that *God has made the political government subject to the spiritual*." This is the true doctrine of popery. But we shall hear another great cardinal:

Again Bellarmine says: "By reason of the spiritual power, the pope, at least, indirectly, hath a supreme power even in temporal matters."

Concerning which, Dr. Barrow rightly observes, "If the pope may strike princes, it matters not much whether it be by a downright blow or slantingly."

We shall now very hastily run back from A. D. 1585 to 730, and give a few specimens of the true spirit, and tone, and action, of this institution, during its ascendancy:

A. D. 1585. "The bull of Pope Sixtus V. against *the two sons of wrath*, Henry, King of Navarre, and the Prince of Condé, beginneth thus: 'The au-

thority given to St. Peter and his successors, by the immense power of the eternal king, excels all the powers of earthly kings and princes.—It passes uncontrollable sentence upon them all—and if it find any of them resisting God's ordinance, it takes more severe vengeance of them, casting them down from their thrones, though never so puissant, and tumbling them down to the lowest parts of the earth, as the ministers of aspiring Lucifer.' And then he proceeds to thunder against them, 'We deprive them and their posterity forever of their dominions, and kingdoms;' and accordingly he depriveth those princes of their kingdoms and dominions, absolveth their subjects from their oaths of allegiance, and forbiddeth them to pay any obedience to them. 'By the authority of these presents, we do absolve and set free all persons, as well jointly as severally, from any such oath, and from all duty whatsoever in regard of dominion, fealty and obedience, and do charge and forbid all and every of them that they do not dare to obey them, or any of their admonitions, laws, and commands.'" Bulls Sixti V. Contra Henr. Navarre, R. &c.

Is this the genius of our government? Are these the doctrines of the United States? Here you have kings hurled from their thrones, and subjects released from their allegiance, without ceremony, by the vicars of Christ and the head of the church! Who is this that sets aside oaths, and religious obligations, in the name of the Lord? "Why," says the modern Roman Catholic, "do you bring up these old things?" Not so very old! But will the bishop mention the council that ever repudiated this doctrine?

The bishop says, "they have been repudiated." I thank him for conceding that they once existed! But now for the proof of their repudiation. Nothing is infallible but a general council; and what general council has set since the days of pope Sixtus V.?! The council of Trent convened Dec. 13, 1545, and all its decrees were confirmed by the pope Jan. 26, 1564; consequently, the bull of pope Sixtus V. is the bull of the Reformed Infallible Roman church after the council of Trent!! If it were orthodox then, it is orthodox now.

We shall now hear pope Pius V. (almost canonized,) excommunicate the queen of England, and for aught I know, we Protestants were all excommunicated at the same time:

A. D. 1570. "He that reigneth on high, to whom is given all power in heaven and in earth, hath committed the one holy, Catholic and Apostolic church, out of which there is no salvation, to one alone on earth, namely, to Peter, prince of the apostles, and to the Roman pontiff, successor of Peter, to be governed with a plenitude of power; this one he hath constituted prince over all nations, and all kingdoms, that he might pluck up, destroy, dissipate, ruin, plant, and build."—And in the same bull he declares, that "he thereby deprives the queen of her pretended right to the kingdom, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever; and absolve all the nobles, subjects, and people of the kingdom, and whoever else have sworn to her, from their oath and all duty whatsoever, in regard of dominion, fidelity and obedience." [Camp. Hist. anno. 1570.]

That this was not peculiar to one individual, but of the spirit of the system, appears from the following facts:

Pope Clement VI. did pretend to depose the Emperor Lewis IV.

Pope Clement V. in the great synod of Vienna, declared the emperor subject to him, or standing obliged to him by a proper oath of fealty. [Clem. lib. ii. tit. 9.

Pope Boniface VIII. hath a decree extant in the canon law running thus: "We declare, say, define, pronounce it to be of necessity to salvation, for every human creature to be subject to the Roman pontiff."

A. D. 1294. "For one sword, saith he, must be under another, and the temporal authority must be subject to the spiritual power;—whence, if the earthly sower doth go astray, it must be judged by the spiritual power." Ibid.

This definition says Dr. Barrow, at the foot of whose pages we have the Latin original of all these decrees, might pass for rant of that boisterous pope (a man above measure, ambitious and arrogant) vented in his passion against king Philip of France, if it had not the advantage (of a greater than which no papal decree is capable) of being expressly confirmed by one of their general councils; for, "We (saith Pope Leo X. in his bull read and passed in the Lateran council) do renew and approve that holy constitution, with approbation of the present holy council." Accordingly Mech Cauns saith, that "the Lateran council did renew and approve that extravagant (indeed extravagant) constitution:" and Baronius saith of it, that "all do assent to it, so that none dissenteth who do not by discord fall from the church."

The truth is, pope Boniface did not invent that proposition, but borrowed it from the school; for Thomas Aquinas in his work against the Greeks, pretendeth to show, that *it is of necessity to salvation to be subject to the Roman Pontiff.*

The appendix to Mart Pol saith of pope Boniface VIII., "*Regem se Regum, Mundi Monarcham, unicum in spiritualibus et temporalibus Dominum promulgavit,*" that he openly declared himself to be the king of kings, monarch of the world, and sole lord and governor both in spirituals and temporals.

Before him, pope Innocent IV. did hold and exemplify the same notion; declaring the emperor Frederick II. his vassal, and denouncing in his general council of Lyons, a sentence of deprivation against him in these terms: "We having, about the foregoing and many other his wicked miscarriages, had before a careful deliberation with our brethren and the holy council, seeing that we, although unworthy, do hold the place of Jesus Christ on earth, and that it was said unto us in the person of St. Peter the apostle, whatever thou shalt bind on earth—the said prince (who hath rendered himself unworthy of empire and kingdoms, and of all honor and dignity, and who for his iniquities is cast away by God, and that he should not reign or command, being bound by his sins and cast away, and deprived by the Lord of all honor and dignity) do show, denounce, and accordingly, by sentence, deprive; absolving all who are held bound by oath of allegiance from such oath forever; by apostolical authority firmly prohibiting, that no man henceforth do obey or regard him as emperor or king; and decreeing, that whoever shall hereafter yield advice, or aid, or favor to him as emperor or king, shall immediately lie under the band of excommunication."

Before him, pope Innocent the third, (that true wonder of the world, and changer of the age,) did affirm the pontifical authority so much to exceed the royal power, as the sun doth the moon; "and ap[er]eth to the former that of the prophet Jeremlah: *Ecoe, constitui te super gentes et regna*;—see, I have set

thee over the nations and over the kingdoms to root out and to pull down, and to destroy and throw down," &c.

ARTICLE xxiii. Pope Pius IV.: "I do acknowledge the holy Catholic and apostolic Roman church to be the mother and mistress of all churches; and I do promise and swear true obedience to the bishop of Rome, the successor of Peter, the prince of apostles, and the vicar of Jesus Christ." [Time expired.]

Half past 4 o'clock, P. M.

BISHOP PURCELL rises—

My friends, Mr. Kinmont will read, before I close, what Liguori says on the subject of Mr. Smith's charges against the Catholic church. It affords me more pleasure than I can express, to have an opportunity of proving, by a gentleman, who is not a Catholic, and therefore is a disinterested witness, as far as I and my religion are concerned, that it is all a base slander.

We have heard a great deal about the pope's deposing kings, and absolving subjects from their oaths of allegiance, and so on. In your presence and hearing therefore, I am going to put my friend into one of the most terrible dilemmas in which he has ever been placed in his life. Now, sir, (addressing Mr. C.) suppose you had been living at the time of the American Revolution, and were witness to the tyranny, which these colonies had to endure on the part of his most gracious majesty, king George III. of England: when the spirit of a mighty and a numerous people was roused by excess of wrong to make one vast effort for freedom. Under these circumstances, the General in chief, the officers, and the army, the revenue department, and postmasters, all of whom had taken an oath of allegiance to that king, appeal to you, inquiring, what is to be done? Asking you if the oath was binding. What would be your reply?

MR. CAMPBELL.— If they had taken a solemn oath, they should not break it.

BISHOP PURCELL. Then was George Washington a perjurer, and all the officers of the army and navy, all the signers of the Declaration of Independence, and all the subjects of the king of Great Britain were perjurers!!

MR. CAMPBELL. That does not follow from my answer to your question.

BISHOP PURCELL. And what would you have persons to do, who had taken the oath of allegiance?

MR. CAMPBELL. "It is better not to vow, than to vow and not pay"—as saith the good Book.

Mr. Campbell rose and said, that for his part, we should always do our duty, and leave consequences to God. When he intends the deliv-

erance of a people, he will effect for them redemption, as he did for his people out of Egypt.

BISHOP PURCELL. There is no oath of artificial contrivance, stronger than the natural tie between the subject and the king, the governed and the government; of whatever form it may be. This is an oath, prior and superior to all other oaths. But if those of the colonists, who had not taken a conventional oath, or an oath of office, to the king of England, had alone rebelled, what could they have done? Were not the army and the civil and military officers bound by their oath to resist rebellion? How then could human rights have been vindicated, or human wrongs redressed? You have repeatedly said, "*vox populi, vox Dei*," in the course of this discussion; in other words that the people's will was the most authentic interpretation of the will of God, that it could give a call to the ministry and give to its choice a right to exercise spiritual powers!! Thus, my friends, you see the dilemma to which the gentleman has been reduced, and that, while Catholics are reproached for their slavish tenets, he himself teaches the whole doctrine of passive obedience, and condemns the very principle of the American Revolution. I leave you to reflect on what the gentleman has uttered. Now mark the difference. Had my friend decided my question, as the Father of his country did similar ones, he would have been sustained by the voice and the spirit of the American people—and of all denominations thereof, both Catholics and Protestants, the contemporaries of a struggle in which, they, who engaged at this side the water, "periled EVERY THING BUT THEIR SACRED HONOR." Whereas, the pope, when he absolved from their oath the English Catholics, whose were the lands, and the houses, the churches and the schools, the hospitals and the glory of England; whose sufferings exceeded those of the American colonists as much as the Alleghanies do a grain of sand, decided upon far better grounds than did the sages of our Revolution, that passive obedience, under such circumstances, ceased to be a virtue. Yet one word more—the absolution was considered by those very Catholics, an exceeding of his powers, and they did not act upon it. His decision was, for them, no article of faith.

My friend's next resort, in the way of documentary evidence, is to the Encyclopædia of religious knowledge, just published. He does not know the author, or the entire title of the work, nor the history of its "getting up." Fessenden is the author of the volume.

MR. CAMPBELL. I do know the author, but bishop Purcell does not.

BISHOP PURCELL. That is Protestant jesuitism. He is the publisher. In the New York Churchman of a recent date, there is a story told of a most egregious imposture practiced on the patrons of this

same volume. The editors professed to give the views of the different sects, in the very words of their respective standards, or accredited writers, and carefully disguised the fact, that it was to be subservient to the interests of one particular sect, the Baptists. They applied to an Episcopal minister, to write an article on Episcopacy, and to patronize the publication. This looked like fair play—the poor minister was caught in the snare and signed his name recommending the *Encyclopædia*. But lo! when the work appeared, it was wholly opposed to Episcopalianism; and this flagrant violation of the faith due to the public from the publishers, elicited a most cutting, but at the same time, most merited castigation from the (Episcopal) Churchman. I hope the article will be read, by every sincere enquirer after truth, that he may be able to appreciate, according to its value, this new humbug.

We come back to the Jesuits. It was so notorious to Frederick, the Great, of Prussia, that the Jesuits had been calumniated, and most foully dealt with, that, Protestant, as he was, he received them in his dominions, and placed them in many of his colleges. He told the other kings of Europe that they would soon be sorry for the expulsion of an order that had done so much for literature and science. "The day will come," said he, "when you will be offering me, 300 pounds for a procurator, 400, for a professor, 600, for a Rector, and a *per valorem*, for inferior officers of the Jesuits, but depend upon it, I will fleece you well. I will make you pay dearly for your folly." Frederick was a great judge of human nature, my friends, and he had a keen sense of the superior claims of the Jesuits, for good scholarship, and morality. Hence his kingdom and his palace were given them, with his own confidence. The celebrated preacher, Bourdaloue, was a Jesuit, and who ever preached a sounder, or a purer morality?

My worthy friend said, the Jesuits supported kings and monarchs, and were for crushing the people; and most grossly did he contradict himself, by stating almost at the same moment, that they were the most formidable enemies of kings, and it was for their opposition to their measures, that kings banished them from several of the kingdoms of Europe. Thus they were, according to his account, the supporters of kings and the enemies of kings! The infamous Pombal of Portugal began the crusade against the Jesuits. Read his history, and it will be their best vindication—or see them among the savages of PARAGUAY! This word alone reveals to the intelligent reader, a series of wonders performed for God, humanity and virtue, such as the world, perhaps, has never witnessed since the establishment of Christianity.

Next comes the theocracy of the Jews. And is not Jehovah *our*

king also? Is he not ever Lord over all? Do we not acknowledge that there is no power but from him? My argument was this. If it be essentially incompatible with liberty, to obey the same ruler in temporal and ecclesiastical things, God could not have established such a government on earth. But, God did establish such an authority; therefore, it is not incompatible with liberty. I do not wish to see it now, unless God should vouchsafe to be as manifestly our king, as he was the king of the Jews; which is not to happen under the Christian dispensation, as it did under the old law. Christ has declared, that his kingdom is not of this world. My worthy opponent said, that the fleshly body and the heavenly body of Christ, were not the same. I ask, then, what became of his fleshly body? Did it rot in the ground? I call on him to answer this question. "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell," says David, "nor wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption." (Ps. xv. 10.) It was spiritualized, but still the same body, according to what he said to his disciples, frightened at this apparition, supposing they had seen a spirit: "*See my hands and my feet: it is myself: handle and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see me to have.*" (Luke xxiv. 39.) He is "ever living," (Heb. vii. 25,) to make intercession for us, by the eloquent mouths of his wounds, which he exhibits, for us, to his Father in heaven. He gave them, as he had previously done to Thomas, the signs they asked; while he reprehended them, as he did that apostle, "*for slowness of belief.*" It was thus that, when the Jews murmured for meat in the wilderness, loathing as light food the manna of heaven, God gave them meat to satiety; and afterwards, for their unbelief, not only excluded them from the land of promise, but scattered their carcasses in the desert.

My friend told you, how much afraid he was of Catholics. My friends, what a pretty tale he made of it: I was really going to say: "Poor baby, do not be so afraid: do not be such a coward: shake off those old woman's fears about raw head and bloody bones, and be more manly." Washington, though he lived in a less enlightened age than this, was not afraid of Catholics. They stood by his side in the battles for freedom. They never flinched, even at the cannon's mouth. When he drew his sword for this republic, they followed its beaming to victory or to death. La Fayette, and hosts of others, whose chaplains had said mass for them in the morning before the engagement, bled or conquered in the trenches of liberty. And never was greeting more cordial, or triumph more glorious, than theirs, when they mingled their salutations and tears with those of their American companions in arms, at the surrender of Lord Cornwallis,

in York-Town. Witness, too, those noble poles, (Kosciusko! may his shade rise up, and rebuke this spirit of intolerance!) the Irish, the South Americans, all fighting for liberty, all Catholics. Look at William Tell, a Roman Catholic. Go to Venice, for five hundred years a republic, though surrounded by absolute governments. Look at the little republic of San Marino, of which John Adams has related the remarkable history. There is not such a people for liberty, on the globe, as the Roman Catholics. Look nearer home, at Maryland, where the CATHOLICS WERE THE FIRST THAT PROCLAIMED FREEDOM OF CONSCIENCE IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE!! LET THIS BE OUR ANSWER TO A THOUSAND SLANDERS.

I come now to the oath of bishops. I have taken the oath of allegiance to the United States. It was the first I ever took. So have all my brethren in the episcopacy taken it. The head of the Catholic church in the United States, is an American; so is a large number of our clergy. The rest preferred this country, believing there was here, what their own country denies, what our constitution guarantees, liberty of conscience. The oath that the bishops take, is not a recognition of any temporal power of the pope, out of his own territory, called the States of the Church, in Italy. We would never take the oath in the odious sense, which my opponent would force upon it. This solemn and authentic abjuration should, alone, be sufficient to settle this account; for I surely know what I swear to, and that what I here state will be seen and read by those, whom no human fear could deter from denouncing me for error, if I could be guilty of any, on a point with which I ought to be so well informed. The arms of our warfare are not carnal, but spiritual. He that takes the sword, we believe with Jesus Christ, will die by the sword. Hence, we assume no obligations by that oath, but such as God imposes; and those to be discharged in his own divine spirit of meekness, charity, and good will. It is cruel to impute to us crimes, and to insist that we hold doctrines, which we disavow. Suppose I were so base, as to suborn two or three wicked men, to calumniate my friend Mr. Campbell, and to pretend that he was in active correspondence, for treasonable purposes, with some foreign king, ought my opponent to be condemned unheard? and, in the absence of proof, should we, in spite of all his protestations to the contrary, condemn him on suspicion? And, if any family had their reputation blasted by some base miscreant, ought this to destroy their estimation in society, where his baseness is known? All the ministers in the world may exert their talents and influence, to preserve and promote peace and love among mankind; but as long as differences in religion are suffered to create jealousy, distrust, and ha-

ted between brethren; and certain men make it their trade, to go from town to town, for the express purpose of fanning these embers of discord, fomenting this hatred; so long will the purest and best men continue to be the victims of the malevolent, and our religion, and our constitution, prove to be no more than the idlest day-dream. All the kings and states of Europe, Protestant and Catholic, know that the bishops take that oath, and yet, in none of them is a bishop looked upon with distrust. In Prussia, Sweden, Denmark, England, the government never molests a bishop about an oath, which is known to contain nothing at which the most captious statesman could justly take exception. Is not this sufficient proof, that there is in that oath nothing of what my friend attributes to it? I assure him, Catholic bishops are not the enemies that this republic needs to fear.

Every argument my friend employs against the Eucharist, only proves him an inconsistent reasoner, or a deist, as far as the argument goes. The paschal lamb was a figure of the eucharist, and the figure was surely nobler than the reality, if we have nothing better than a bit of bread in the eucharist. But the apostle tells us that the weak and beggarly elements of the Jewish rites, were to obtain their glorious fulfillment in the land of grace—and only in the Catholic church is this verified. We eat the paschal lamb sprinkled with, or in other words, veiled beneath the appearance of bread; and every objection urged against the real presence is equally strong, or weak against the incarnation. Can this paste, says Mr. C., be God? I answer by another question: can this informal embryo in a virgin's womb be God?

We come now to Scotus. The gentleman says he heard or saw him quoted by the Catholics. He says many people quote Zoroaster and Confucius without knowing anything about them. There is no parallel between them. If a man quotes, as evidence, a writer, like Scotus, he ought to know who he was. I do not blame him for knowing nothing of Chinese theology. But of Christian theology, it is a shame for a man, who pretends to be, himself, a teacher in Israel, and a polemic, who challenges Catholic bishops, to be so grossly ignorant.

My friend says we bow to the pope. In England, Protestants bow to the foot-stool of the throne. I bow to any friend I meet—I do not pay him, nor the pope divine honor. We know the meaning of our own bows, and words, and oaths, and would not pledge them insincerely, much less blasphemously. No wonder that the pope *let himself be persuaded to do good*, in the case cited by my friend. Should he have preferred a contrary course? Have done evil?

Temporal power is inferior to spiritual power, as human power is

inferior to divine; just as heaven is superior to earth, in dignity and value, and God superior to creatures, in every divine excellence, but not in the sense that he who has been invested with spiritual power by God, has also been invested by him, in a kingdom which is not of this world, with temporal power. Thomas Aquinas, the greatest scholar of the 13th century, and eminent scholar in the dark ages, read his works, with those of à Kempis, for proofs of Catholic piety, instead of garbled extracts from forgeries, and the works of apostates, whom we discarded from our communion for immoralities, which no Protestant communion would tolerate. They breathe the spirit of devotion, the spirit of God.

My friends, Mr. Kinmont will now tell you whether the pretended quotation of Mr. Smith from Liguori, is correct. You will recollect that Mr. Smith said, that, according to Liguori, the Catholic church allows priests to keep concubines upon a fine. Upon hearing this I at once said that the charge was an infamous falsehood; and I will now show that Liguori said no such thing; that Liguori says the contrary. If I tell a falsehood, Mr. Kinmont will confound me; if I do not, somebody does. Thus truth will triumph and falsehood be confounded.

MR. KINMONT. I am called on in my professional character simply, and have no part or lot in this debate, (Mr. K. is understood to be a Swedenborgian) I sincerely believe they are disputing about shadows, and that both parties are equally in the wrong; but I will do what I can to assist in clearing up the difficulty *of fact*. I find it stated in Samuel Smith's work, and marked as a quotation from Liguori under the article headed "concubines of clergy."

CONCUBINES OF THE CLERGY.—"A bishop however poor he may be, cannot appropriate to himself pecuniary fines without the license of the Apostolical See. But he ought to apply them to pious uses. Much less can he apply those fines to any thing else but pious uses, which the *Council of Trent* has laid upon non-resident clergymen, or upon those *clergymen who keep concubines*."—Ligor. Ep. Doc. Mor. p. 444.

And the following is Smith's commentary.—

How shameful a thing, that the *Apostolical See*, as they call it, that is, that the pope of Rome, should enrich his coffers by the fines which he receives from the profligacy of his Clergy! If they keep *concubines*, they must pay a *fine* for it; but if they *marry*, they must be *excommunicated!* This accounts, at once, for the custom in Spain, and other countries, and especially on the island of Cuba, and in South America; where almost every priest has *concubines*, who are known by the name of *nieces*. These abandoned men are willing to pay the fine rather than forego the gratification of their lustful appetites. The "NARRATIVE OF ROSAMOND," who was once herself one of these concubines, in the island of Cuba, portrays the general licentiousness of the popish clergy, in

colors so shocking, that the picture cannot be looked at without a blush. Here we see the doctrine fully exemplified by practice. This keeping of concubines, is a thing so common in the popish West India islands, and in South America, that it is rarely noticed. The offspring of this priestly intercourse are numerous. They are known to be the children of the priests: but, because it is the *general custom, it is lawful*; and it passes off merely with a joke or sarcasm.

This is the text and commentary as I find it in Mr. Smith's book. This is marked as Liguori, p. 444. If taken from Liguori at all, it is taken from a different edition. The present purports to be a complete copy of the works of Liguori. It bears no mark of being an expurgated edition. It is said to be an *edition of what was said and written before with additions*. On turning to the place where he treats of fines and punishments inflicted for concubinage, he says that priests guilty of this offence, were, after two ineffectual reprimands, to be degraded from their functions. He refers to the council of Trent, and states what that council decreed, Smith throws us on Liguori, and Liguori on the council of Trent. There is nothing in Liguori relating to that subject but this. The council was called about the year 1542. This edition of the decrees of the council was edited by the council itself. I have had an abstract taken which I will read. It would take some time to read the original, and I have a translation made by one of my scholars. I will read this.

In the records of the decrees of the council of Trent, Session 25th, chap. 14th, there is described the method of proceeding in the cases of clergy, who are guilty of concubinage.

After shewing the scandal and enormity of this sin, especially in clergy, whose integrity of life, should recommend and impress the precepts of religion and of the church; the sacred synod forbids that any individual holding the clerical office shall keep at his house or elsewhere, any mistress or unchaste woman or cohabit with any such, under the penalty of having enforced against him the sacred canons, and ecclesiastical statutes regarding that matter. It is, then, especially enacted that if when admonished by their superiors they shall not desist from all such unlawful and forbidden acts, they shall be deprived of the *third part* of all their revenues and ecclesiastical dues: and if still persevering in their course, they shall not even heed a *second* admonition, they shall be deprived of *all* their ecclesiastical revenue and suspended from the administration of ecclesiastical functions; and if, during this suspension, they shall continue obstinate and *incorrigible*, they shall be declared altogether unfit and incompetent to exercise any spiritual office whatever belonging to the church: unless after a clear and unequivocal amendment of life, the church should think proper to withdraw the disqualification, and allow them to resume their former station of honor and trust. But if after the resumption of the duties of their office, they should resort to those impure practices which they had abandoned, besides the infliction of the above named penalties, an act of excommunication with its sword of justice shall cut them off, as dead branches from the body of the faithful and church of the living God. And it is further enacted that no appeal, or exemption shall hinder the execution of any of these decrees, but that they shall

be summarily executed, at the will of the bishop, after he has ascertained the existence of the enormities. A similar provision in its effects and spirit is made with relation to bishops themselves, but the order of proceeding is different.

This is in substance the provision of the decree of the council of Trent. Ses. 25, cap. 14. [Time expired.]

SATURDAY, JANUARY 21ST, *Half past 9 o'clock, A. M.*

MR. CAMPBELL rises—

Under any other circumstances than the present, I should have insisted on being allowed the same number of minutes over my stipulated hour, which my friend has taken with Mr. Kinmont's exposition, over his usual time.

BISHOP PURCELL.—I have no objection to MR. CAMPBELL'S occupying that much more time. It is right that he should.

MR. CAMPBELL. I feel obliged to the gentleman for his courtesy, and will therefore proceed. My friends, you will doubtless have observed, that of all the extracts read from Ligor, found on the pages of Smith, but one was challenged by the Bishop, on the ground that it is not found in the page of St. Ligor in the edition now before us. The case is simply this. According to the moral theology of the church of Rome, marriage is a greater sin than concubinage: for, if a priest marry, he is forthwith excommunicated; but if he keep a concubine, he only pays a fine. This is the statement that Mr. Smith makes, and translates the passage in Ligor as follows:

“A bishop, however poor he may be, cannot appropriate to himself pecuniary fines without the license of the Apostolical see. But he ought to apply them to pious uses. Much less can he apply those fines to any thing else but pious uses, which the council of Trent has laid upon non-resident clergymen, or upon *those clergymen who keep concubines.*” Ligor. Ep. Doc. Mor. p. 444.

Now, Bishop PURCELL denies that there is such a passage in Ligor, or that there is in the council of Trent any such arrangement; and in proof of it, he has brought us an edition of St. Ligor, and the decrees of the council of Trent. But the edition which he has produced, has not, upon the page referred to, the passage quoted. In the passage quoted, the reference to Ligor is to a decree of Trent. But there are always two ways of quoting a passage: the one *verbatim*; and the other, *substantially*. Whether Ligor quotes the decree of Trent literally, or only quotes the substance, we cannot affirm. The bishop referred this matter to Mr. Kinmont, without consulting me. It was an *exparte* reference; and therefore, comes not fairly before us. Although I have no objection to Mr. Kinmont; but on the contrary, I think him very competent to decide a matter of this kind, if

he had time to examine all these volumes: and perhaps, had I been consulted, I should have agreed in selecting him: yet as the reference is wholly one sided; it can have no authority here. However, so far as the decrees of Trent have been read, they do speak of fines or forfeitures of those who have concubines, and these do substantially sustain all that I have alleged.

I have this morning received a paper of Mr. Smith's, in which I find an article "*on the authority of Ligori,*" which I will now read:

"Alphonsus de Ligori was canonized by Pope Pius VII. on the 15th of September, A. D. 1815, under the title of the Most Illustrious and Most Reverend Lord Alphonsus de Ligorio. He has written the Modern Theology of the church of Rome, in nine large volumes, containing 4701 pages, which was published at Mechlin, *Superiarum Permissu*, A. D. 1828.

"His Theology is called, in the preface of the work, 'The Light.' His doctrine after having been explored, was approved of by Pope Pius VII. on the 18th May, 1803, after the Sacred Congregation of Rites had given it their sanction, and had declared that there was NOTHING IN IT WORTHY OF CENSURE. Ligori was spoken of by the sacred Pontiff, Leo XII., in the highest terms; and his eminence the Serene Cardinal of Castile, the Major Penitentiary, in his letters to the Bishop of Massillen, says, that Saint Ligori is not only an ornament to the Episcopal character by the illustrious splendor of his virtues; but he shines resplendent by his SOUND DOCTRINE, *which is according to God.* Doctrinam sanctam, ac secundum Deum." (Pref. Editoris.)

In his preface to his Synopsis Mr. Smith observes:

"If they deny that we have given a fair translation, we shall then challenge them to come forward in a public assembly with the works of St. Ligori, when we promise to meet them, and submit our translation, and the original, to the inspection of a committee, one half of whom to be chosen by ourselves, and the other half by the Roman clergy. Truth never shuns investigation. If we have not given a fair, genuine, and true translation, and if we have not exhibited the doctrines of Ligori, and the church of Rome fairly and correctly, without garbling, or giving an erroneous construction, we will be willing to incur the consequences that we ought to expect, for having deceived the public." Synop. Pref. p. 12.

I will thank the Bishop to inform me the date of his edition of the works of Ligori.

BISHOP PURCELL.—What is the date of Mr. Smith's edition?

MR. CAMPBELL.—1828.

BISHOP PURCELL.—This edition [pointing to his own] was also published in 1828: so that it appears both are the same.

MR. CAMPBELL [here taking up a volume of the Bishop's copy of Ligori read] "*Editio Nova Emendata.*" It hence appears that the Bishop's is a *new amended edition*; so that, probably, this and the one used by Mr. Smith are not the same. Be this, however as it may, nothing is lost by the examination: nothing is proved against Mr.

Smith as a translator, and I shall write forthwith to New York to Mr. Smith for the original Latin of this passage in his edition, and have it certified and published among this community.

But were it lawful to read in this assembly, I have before me the decrees of councils, and the words of bishops and cardinals, teaching the very doctrine which the Bishop would represent as a reproach or calumny on his clergy and church. Here is the decree of a council at Toledo, and here are references to various councils, such as *Bl-vii Concilia*, Tom. I. pp. 737, 739. *Crabb. Concil.* Tom. I. p. 449. Edition of 1551, and *Pithou Corp. Ju. Canon.* p. 47, as quoted by Dr. Brownlee, which go to prohibit priests "*from keeping more than one concubine,*" and declare marriage in a priest to be "a mortal sin." And here is Costerus and cardinal Campygio who taught what I dare not read here; but I will reserve all this for a more convenient season.

[Mr. Campbell here called for the reading again of the seventh proposition, which being read by Mr. Piatt, one of the Moderators, he proceeded.]

About the year 1088, Urban II. decrees:

"That subjects are by no authority constrained to pay the fidelity which they have shown to a christian prince, who opposeth God and his saints, or violateth their precepts. An instance whereof we have in his granting a privilege to the canons of Tours; 'which,' saith he, 'if any emperor, king, prince, &c., shall wilfully attempt to thwart, let him be deprived of the dignity of his honor and power.'" [Barrow. p. 22.

Again, the council of Toledo still more fully expresses the spirit of the age:

"We the holy council promulge this sentence or decree, pleasing to God, that whosoever hereafter shall succeed to the kingdom, shall not mount the throne, till he has sworn among other oaths, to permit no man to live in his kingdom, who is not a Catholic. And if after he has taken the reins of government, he shall violate his promise, let him be anathema maranatha, in the sight of the eternal God, and become fuel of eternal fire—*pabulum ignis aeterni.*" [Caransa. p. 404.

Innocent III. (that true wonder of the world and changer of the age) affirms:

"Under Pope Innocent III. it was ordained, that if any temporal lord, being required and admonished by the church, should neglect to purge his territory from heretical filth, he should by the metropolitan and the other comprovincial bishops, be noosed in the band of excommunication; and that if he should slight to make satisfaction within a year, it should be signified to the Pope, that he might from that time denounce the subjects absolved from their fealty to him, and expose the territory to be seized on by Catholics." Barrow, p. 22.

Adrian I. A. D. 772, thus decrees:

"We do by general decree constitute, that whatever king, or bishop, or potentate, shall hereafter believe, or permit, that the censure of the Roman pontiffs may be violated in any case, he shall be an execrable anathema, and shall be guilty before God, as a betrayer of the Catholic faith." P. Had. I. Capit apud Grat. Caus. xxv. qu. I. c. 11.

Leo IX. says, that Constantine M. "did think it very unbecoming that they should be subject to an earthly empire, whom the Divine Majesty had set over an heavenly." Of Gregory II. who lived A. D. 730, Barronius says, "He effectually caused both the Romans and Italians to recede from obedience to the emperor." "So," continues this authentic historian,— "he did leave to posterity a worthy example that heretical princes should not be suffered to reign in the church of Christ, if being warned they should be found pertinacious in error." To consummate the whole, Gregory II. did say to the emperor Isauros: "All the kingdoms of the west did hold St. Peter as an earthly God."

Wishing to crowd as much into this speech as I possibly can in one hour, I shall, with as much rapidity as is consistent with distinctness of enunciation, hasten through many documents. Thus we have seen, that for at least five centuries, the heads of the Roman church clearly and unambiguously taught, that the spiritual sword was above the temporal, and that the vicar of Christ is by a divine right Lord of thrones and all earthly things. This, I have no doubt, is the true doctrine of the immutable and infallible church of Rome! and certain it is, that it has never been disowned, or renounced, by a general council, the organ of infallibility. If the church of Rome be insusceptible of reformation, or infallible; it is proved to be essentially anti-American, and opposed to the genius of our institutions.

To resume the bishop's oath. The gentleman at length admitted that he had taken the bishop's oath, by saying, that he took the oath of naturalization *first!!* There is but one oath for Roman bishops in all countries, therefore, the Bishop is sworn to "*increase and advance the authority of the pope,*" and *persecute and oppose* (fight against) heretics and schismatics. If he have not taken this oath, he will please refer us to the oath he has sworn, and specify its peculiarities.

The defence is a very singular one. He *first* swore allegiance to the United States, and *then* to that foreign prince the pope. Does he mean, contrary to common usage, that the first oath is more binding than the second; or, that it neutralizes the anti-American attributes of the second? But his explanation is but half given in the first point, that he took the oath of American allegiance *before* he took the oath of Roman allegiance. The other ground of defence was in the query,

which, with such a triumphant air, he put to me yesterday evening—viz. whether I would not have been justified in breaking my oath to England, had I been an American colonist or soldier at the time of the revolution, when the king tyrannized over the Americans? I have already answered this question, and have affirmed that in Protestant doctrine, no circumstance or contingency, can ever absolve a person from the obligation of an oath, into which he has intelligently and voluntarily entered. It is in the estimation of christians most impious and daring for any prince or pope to presume to absolve men from the obligations of an oath solemnly taken. If, indeed, an oath has in it the nature of a covenant, then one of the parties failing, so far vacates the covenant as to set the other free from his oath: but this is not absolution for breaking it; it is a simple annulling of its conditions. Now, in the case supposed, the king of England was generally allowed to have receded from the conditions on which that oath was taken by the persons who renounced allegiance to him; he having failed to protect and cherish his American subjects, according to the tenor of the charter given, they were freed from the obligations of allegiance. But I beg my audience to remember that the bishop attempts to defend himself for breaking his oath in certain contingencies; else, why ask me such a question? The bishop's plea is, therefore, that oaths may be broken, and that the pope can absolve men from allegiance on a justifiable emergency, when the church, or some other great interest may demand it! Of what use then is the oath of naturalization?—

That the incompatibility of the bishop's oath with our oath of allegiance may be obvious, I shall quote the oath of naturalization, as proposed to every foreigner by the laws of the United States:

The laws of the U. S. provide; That any alien, being a free white person, may be admitted to become a citizen of the U. S. or any of them, on the following condition, and not otherwise: That he shall have declared on oath, or affirmation, before the supreme superior, district, or circuit court, of some one of the states, or a court of record having a clerk and seal—3 years at least before admission.

1st. Oath of Intention.

That it was *bona fide*, his intention to become a citizen of the U. S. and to renounce forever, all allegiance and fidelity, to any foreign Prince, Potentate, State or Sovereignty, whatsoever; and particularly, by name, the Prince, Potentate, State or Sovereignty, whereof he may, at the time be a *citizen* or *subject*.

That he shall, at the time of his application to be admitted, declare, on oath or affirmation, before a court as above.

2d. Oath of Renunciation, Abjuration, &c., and of Fidelity on Admission.

That he will support the constitution of the U. S. and that he doth absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to every foreign

Prince, Potentate, State or Sovereignty whatsoever, and particularly by name the Prince, Potentate, State, Sovereignty whereof he was before a citizen or subject.

The court admitting the alien to be satisfied that he has resided five years within the U. S., one year in the state, and that he has behaved as a man of good moral character, attached to the principles of the constitution of the U. S. and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same. The residence to be proved by a witness, not by oath of the applicant.

Where a person coming into the United States 3 years before 21 years of age, proving same character, and continued residence 5 years, admitted as before stated on the first application, on taking final oath of abjuration, renunciation, fidelity, &c., without the first oath of intention.

Further provided; That in case the alien applying to be admitted to citizenship, shall have borne any hereditary title, or been of any of the orders of Nobility, in the kingdom or state from which he came, he shall in addition to the above requisites, make an express renunciation of his title or order of Nobility at the time to be recorded, &c.

Further provided.—That no alien who shall be a native citizen, denizen, or subject of any country, state or sovereignty, with whom the U. S. shall be at war at the time of his application, shall be then admitted to be a citizen of the U. S., &c., &c.

Such are the oaths and laws of naturalization. Now, as the pope of Rome is a foreign prince—at this very moment a prince temporal as well as spiritual, *exercising political authority over the states of Rome*, and claiming allegiance in temporals as well as spirituals, throughout the whole Roman Catholic world; I ask, can any one who has sworn “to increase and advance his authority,” or feeling himself so bound, as he shall answer for it to the supreme judge of the universe, *take or keep* the oath of citizenship in this country without perjury?! In my most deliberate judgment, it is impossible.

The case is simply this: The oath of naturalization requires the candidate for citizenship to swear that *he does absolutely and entirely renounce all allegiance and fidelity to every foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty*. Now, the pope of Rome is a *sovereign* of Europe—a *foreign potentate*, issuing bulls, laws, or briefs, throughout the world: often to secure, augment and advance his authority, in temporals, as well as spirituals; as the testimony of 500 years now before you, amply demonstrates; and every Roman Catholic layman feeling a paramount obligation to his bishop, and through him to the pope; and all the rulers of the Roman Catholic church, being sworn to the pope absolutely and forever, I ask, can such persons in good faith solemnly swear allegiance to this government? If a person can be sworn to support two antagonist constitutions, governments, powers, —two masters, as opposite as the poles: then may he, without perjury, swear to our government, and to that of papal Rome!

But bishops are sworn "to persecute and oppose (*persequar et impugnabo*) heretics and schismatics." Papal Rome is and always has been, a persecuting government. She is essentially so. I intend not now to dwell much on this theme. But I will sustain my proposition. And first, I admit that Protestants have persecuted,—that they have persecuted even to death. I deny it not; and therefore my opponent need not prove it. It is a matter of record indisputable however, that their persecutions have not been as a drop to the ocean, in comparison of papal persecutions. Still they have persecuted, and we frankly own it. But we have an excuse for them. The first Protestants after the Lutheran Reformation, came out from a bloody and cruel mother, who had accustomed them to blood and slaughter, and taught them that the blood of heretics was a sacrifice, most acceptable to God. They were taught that it was just to destroy thieves, robbers, and murderers; and that heretics were the worst of thieves, robbers, and murderers, and ought when incorrigible to be slain: for so the good of society did imperiously demand.—As soon as they got out of the great city, they began to contend among themselves, whether persecution was right. They soon saw it was of the manners and customs of Babylon; and that "all who take the sword must perish by the sword;" therefore they laid it down. They have abjured it in their creeds and remonstrances against the papacy; and we rejoice to state the fact, that there is not in Protestant christendom a single creed that does not repudiate persecution and assert the great principle of christian and religious liberty.

But I have said that papal Rome is essentially a persecuting power—still a persecuting monarchy; because she has it yet written in her infallible and immutable decrees of councils, in the bulls and anathemas of her popes; and in the constitution of her inquisitions, which as a church she still acknowledges and maintains. A few of her infallible decrees must be accepted as a specimen:

"In the fifth council of Toledo, Can. 3rd, the holy fathers say, 'We the holy council promulge this sentence, or decree pleasing to God. That whosoever hereafter shall succeed to the Kingdom, shall not mount the throne till he has sworn among other oaths, to permit no man to live in his kingdom who is not a Catholic. (Nullum non Catholicum.) And if after he has taken the reins of government, he shall violate this promise, let him be anathema maranatha in the sight of the eternal God, and become fuel for the eternal fire, (Pabulum ignis æterni.)'" Caranza Sum. Conciliorum, p. 404.

The great Lateran council under Innocent III. who instituted the inquisition and transubstantiation, has still more expressly decreed:

We excommunicate, and anathematize all heresy, condemning all heretics, by what names soever they are called. * * * * *

These being condemned, must be left to the secular power to be punished. And those who are only suspected of heresy, if they purge not themselves in the appointed way, are to be excommunicated, and if within a year satisfaction is not given, they are to be condemned as heretics.

They must take this oath.—That they will endeavor, bona fide, and with all their might, to exterminate from every part of their dominion all heretical subjects, universally, that are marked out to them by the church. So that from this time forward, when any one is promoted to any power, temporal or spiritual, he shall be obliged to confirm this. But if any temporal lord, being required and admonished by the church, shall neglect to purge his land from this heretical filthiness, he shall be tied up in the band of excommunication by the metropolitan and his comprovisional bishops. And if he should neglect to make satisfaction within a year, it should be signified to the pope, that he might from that time pronounce the subjects absolved from allegiance to him, and expose his territories to be seized on by Catholics, who expelling heretics, shall possess them without contradiction.

But Catholics, who having taken the badge of the cross, shall set themselves to extirpate heretics, shall enjoy the same indulgence and be fortified with the same privilege as is granted to those who go to the recovery of the holy land.

And, to save time, be it emphatically observed, that the council of Trent fully established, adopted, and re-promulged these decrees, and they are, at this moment, in full force at Rome. Until, then, a general council is called, and makes fallible the decisions of the great Lateran council; such is, and must be the dictum and belief of the Roman church; and, as I judge, there never will be another general council, this will ever be the doctrine of papal Rome, till the day of her death. Is this, I emphatically ask, the genius and spirit of republican America?

But edicts, canons, and decrees, are not a dead letter. They have been all personified, and acted out to the letter. Who has not heard of that personification of every thing that is diabolically cruel—the HOLY OFFICE OF THE INQUISITION? What abuse of language! Think not, my friends, that I will rake up its ashes; that I will rehearse its horrible racks, and engines, and instruments of torture; that I will describe a single *auto da fe*, one of the horrid tragedies of the acts of faith, whose fragrance language fails to speak. "It was the vice of the age," my opponent has said. Of what age? Of Innocent III.? Of the era of transubstantiation? No, indeed; but of the age of Napoleon; of the age of pope Pius, the saint of 1814! Yes, of the present age! It was got up, indeed, by Innocent (inapposite name!) III., and was fully in operation in Italy, A.D. 1251. Its first officer, Dominic, was afterwards made a *saint*! In Spain and Portugal it was perfected; and its reign of terror, in unfigurative truth, transcends all

description. My soul sickens at the thought. In Spain alone, from 1481 to 1814, about half a million suffered by it. Lorente (Paris edit. tom. iv. p. 271,) sets down the victims of one department of torment, those burnt, at 33,912; and of other rigorous punishments, at 291,450. He is, by other historians, supposed to be far below the full amount. From the records of the inquisition, the manuscripts taken from the inquisitorial palace at Barcelona, when taken by siege in 1828, one may reckon, that in all Spain, in a little over three centuries, half a million suffered all manner of cruelties from this infernal tribunal.

It was even employed as a means of converting the heathen, in pagan lands. It is said, that 800 persons have been condemned at one session, by one of its tribunals. And, still worse, in Seville, in the year 1481, 2,000 persons were condemned to the flames, and 20,000 more to inferior punishments. Such were the tender mercies of these Roman gospel arguments to save men's souls from hell! It was the vice of a dark age, and yet restored by Pius VII. in 1826!! What!

But, this is only one of the tribunals of persecution: it was only one of the means of persecuting and destroying heretics and schismatics. Shall I relate the persecutions of the Waldenses and Albigenes, and other Protestants, sometimes called Lollards, Wickliffites, Huguenots, &c., &c.? Shall I tell of the millions in France, Spain, Portugal, Holland, England, Ireland, and elsewhere? Shall I tell of the massacre of St. Bartholomew's day? of the persecutions consequent upon the revocation of the edict of Nantz? or the Irish massacre? and of all the other deeds of horror? I shall not attempt it. I cannot describe the slaughter of two millions, in the early crusades against Jews and infidels; nor of fifteen millions of Indians and pagans; nor of a million Waldenses, murdered and banished in a single generation. I say, again, I cannot relate these heart-stirring scenes; and I shall only say, that historians and martyrologists variously give the aggregate from *fifty to sixty-eight millions of human beings, that have been sacrificed* and devoured by this Moloch; this insatiable demon of persecution, as taught in theory and carried out in practice, by her who calls herself HOLY MOTHER!!! What a *scarlet, crimsoned, cruel mother* she is! On her will be avenged the blood of all martyrs. Even the persecutions of those whom she taught to persecute, lie justly chargeable against her. What guarantee, then, have we that this being the native spirit of the system, it would not again repeat the same tragic scenes, in any country where it obtains an ascendancy? 'Tis true, indeed, that the Protestant powers in Europe hold it now in check. But, were these removed, from what premises would we infer, that the same

means would not be resorted to in this and every Protestant country, so soon as this kind mother should feel it a duty, "to extirpate heresy" out of the land!

The doctrine is actually taught in her New Testament, in the notes appended to the Romanist version. I will give you a passage or two:

"And when his disciples James and John had seen it, they said, Lord, wilt thou we say that fire come down from heaven, and consume them? And turning, he rebuked them, saying, you know not of what spirit you are." Luke ix. 54, 55.

"Ver. 55. *He rebuked them.* Not justice nor all rigorous punishment of sinners is here forbidden, Elias' fact reprehended, nor the church or christian princes blamed for putting heretics to death: but that none of these should be done for desire of our particular revenge, or without discretion, and regard to their amendment, and example to others. Therefore, Peter used his power upon Ananias and Sapphira, when he struck them both down to death for *defrauding* the church." Rhem. N. Test. p. 109.

This is a mistake. Peter struck not Ananias and Sapphira for *defrauding* the church, (as these purblind commentators say;) but the Lord himself struck them dead, for *lying* against the Holy Spirit. Christian princes, thus, in reading the Roman Testament, are taught to put heretics in death.

"And many of them that had followed curious things, brought together their books and burnt them before all: and counting the prices of them, they found the money to be fifty thousand pence." Acts xix. 19.

"Ver. 19 *Books.* A christian man is bound to burn or deface all wicked books of what sort soever, especially heretical books. Which though they infect not him always that keepeth them, yet being forth coming, they may be noisome and pernicious to other that shall have them and read them after his death, or otherwise. Therefore hath the church taken order for condemning all such books, and against the reading of them where danger may ensue: and the christian emperors, Constantius, Magnus, Valentinian, Theodosius, Marcian, Justinian, made penal laws for the burning or defacing them." Ib. p. 207.

This proscription of heretical books is of the same spirit, a part of the same system, and explains the march of papistical uniformity and unity!

"As we have said before, so now I say again, if any evangelize to you, beside that which you have received, be he anathema." Gal. i. 9.

—"Hierome useth this place, wherein the apostle giveth the curse, or anathema to all false teachers, not once, but twice, to prove that the zeal of Catholic men ought to be so great toward all heretics, and their doctrine, that they should give them the anathema, though they were never so dear unto them. In which case, saith this holy Doctor, I would not spare mine own parents." Id. p. 292.

This is stronger still. "I WOULD NOT SPARE MINE OWN PARENTS!" This is the spirit, the naked spirit of the system, pure and unmixed. Remember, then, my friends, that children ought to inform against

their own parents, and brother against brother, for the extirpation of heresy!

"And I saw the woman drunken of the blood of the Saints and of the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." Rev. xvii. 6.

"Ver 6. *Drunken of the blood.* It is plain that this woman signifieth the whole corps of all the persecutors that have and shall shed so much blood of the just: of the prophets, apostles, and other martyrs, from the beginning of the world to the end. The Protestants possibly expound it of Rome, for that they put heretics to death, and allow of their punishment in other countries. But their blood is not called the blood of saints, no more than the blood of thieves, mankillers, and other malefactors: for the shedding of which by order of justice, *no commonwealth shall answer.*" Id. p. 430.

No commonwealth, consequently no member of it, shall suffer for killing heretics. If I have not sustained this proposition, I can prove nothing. If these facts and documents can be set aside by rhetorical declamation, or reckless denial; then are history, and testimony, and fact, of no value in controversy.

Another specification comes under this proposition. I have too many of them for the occasion. I must be brief. This is the divorcing, repelling, disorganizing, and demoralizing dogma, that "*no faith should be kept with heretics.*"

Gregory VII., in a council at Rome, declares:

"We following the statutes of our predecessors, do, by our *apostolic* authority, *absolve* all those from their *oath* of fidelity, who are bound to *excommunicated persons*, either by duty or oath; and we unloose them from every tie of obedience, till the excommunicated persons have made proper satisfaction." Decret. 2 part. caus. 15. quest. 8.

Urban II. teaches the same doctrine:

"You are to discharge the soldiers who have *sworn fidelity* to count Hugo, from paying any obedience while he is *excommunicated*: for they are not obliged to keep that fidelity inviolate, which they have *sworn to a christian prince, who opposes God, and his saints*, and despises their precepts." Ibid.

Gregory IX. has laid down the general principle, with the greatest care and precision:

"Be it known to all who are under the dominion of *heretics*, that they are set free from every *tie of fidelity and duty to them*; all *oaths or solemn agreement to the contrary notwithstanding.*" Decret. Greg. lib. 5, tit. 7.

Hear now the decree of the council of Constance, in the case of John Huss, and Jerome of Prague; who appeared there under the solemn pledge of the imperial protection:

"Council of Constance, 1414, did solemnly decree that no faith is to be kept with an heretic. The person who has given them the safe conduct to come thither, shall not *in this case* be obliged to keep his promise by whatever tie he

may have been engaged, when he has done all that has been in his power to do." Bruce. Free Thought, p. 120.

The council of Constance then, not only so decided; but caused those men, who appeared before them under an imperial pledge, to be taken and burned. Thus faith was not to be kept with heretics according to said decree, and the practice under it by these "*holy fathers?*"

To confirm the whole with the utmost brevity I would add, the holy, infallible, and last council of Trent formally recognized this decree of the council of Constance. It is then the standing and unrepealed doctrine of the Roman Catholic church, which must be as immutable and infallible as the council of Trent.

Next we must notice the proscription of books as another specification.

The council of Trent in its 25th session, decreed that a council under the pope should draw up and publish an index of books which were to be prohibited in the church. Thus commenced and keeping pace with the introduction of liberal, or Protestant, or anti-Roman Catholic volumes it has grown into a respectable volume; so that one of the finest libraries might be collected out of these proscribed books. Among these is the bible, which is said to have been the first prohibited in the council of Toloso. In the 4th of the 10 rules concerning prohibited books established by the Holy Fathers of the council of Trent, a license to read the bible is put into the control of bishops and inquisitors. But he that presumes to "read without such license cannot receive absolution of sins." Among these prohibited books also are those of Locke, Milton, Bacon, Grotius, Galileo, Claude, Saurin, Sir Matthew Hale, Jeremy Taylor, Luther, Calvin, Melancthon,—and, indeed, all the standard Protestant authors.

Touching the liberty of the press, a decree of the 10th session of the Lateran council A. D. 1215, even Leo X. presiding expresses the Roman Catholic views of that chief root of the tree of liberty. The decree of the Lateran council was sanctioned by Trent and is now the orthodox faith of Rome.

"By order of the holy council, we, in fine, ordain and decree, that no person shall presume to print, or cause to be printed, any book or other writing whatsoever, either in our city (Rome) or in any other cities and dioceses, unless it shall first have been carefully examined, if in this city, by our Vicar and the master of the holy palace, or if in other cities and dioceses, by the bishop or his deputy, with the inquisitor of heretical pravity for the diocese, in which the said impression is about to be made; and unless also it shall have received, under their own hand, their written approval, given without price and without delay. Whosoever shall presume to do otherwise, besides the loss of the books, which shall be

publicly burned, shall be bound by the sentence of excommunication." Caranza, p. 670.

The council of Trent has also confirmed the doctrine of Leo X. and his Lateran council of 1515. Their first rule concerning proscribed books is: *All books condemned by the supreme pontiffs or general councils before the year 1515 and not comprised in the present index are condemned.*" The creed of this said council of Trent moreover compels every Roman Catholic "to receive undoubtedly, *all things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons, and general councils and particularly by the Holy council of Trent.*"

The church is as much opposed to the freedom of the press and free discussion, and the circulation of the bible, as ever she was; but she has to yield a little to that irresistible innovator, called custom. Still however a Roman bishop cannot, as a good and liege subject of the pope, but oppose, freedom of thought, speech and action in all matters religious. Listen to the following little bull of the bishop of New York, published the other day against free discussion:

In this document the bishop writes, in his address to the editor of the "Truth Teller,"—"Sir, I consider it my duty to request you to publish the following copy of my letter to the editor of the 'Catholic Diary,' in order to obviate as soon as possible, the *mischief* which such a Society, if countenanced, might produce. You know my opposition to controversial disputes on religion, particularly in debating societies or newspapers."

From the letter alluded to, we extract the following:

"To the Editor of the Catholic Diary:—

"In the Catholic Diary of Saturday last, October 1, I find a notice from you, of a Society, calling itself the New-York Catholic Society, for the promotion of religious knowledge. Of the existence of that Society, I was utterly ignorant, and feel surprised that you, who ought to know better, would think of encouraging and drawing public attention to such a society, without first ascertaining the sentiments of your Ordinary on so important a subject. The Church wisely ordains that nothing of the nature of this society can be established without the approbation of the Bishop of the Diocese, where it is meant to introduce it, and that permitted, it should be governed by such rules and regulations as to him may seem proper, for it obviously partakes of the nature of a Theological school. Far be it from me to impede the progress of religious knowledge; nothing could be more dear to my heart than to encourage whatever contributes effectually to its promotion; but placed as I am, as a sentinel over the sacred ark of religion, it is my imperative duty to prevent it from being touched by profane or unpractised hands.

"So far from viewing this society in the light you see it, it is my decided conviction that it ought not to be sanctioned by me; how can it be supposed that young men, whose education is chiefly mercantile or mechanical, can come with sufficient preparation to the discussion of a question that requires vast erudition, with a degree of research, which they cannot possess; you cannot be ignorant of the severe mental discipline to which students are subjected in our Theological Seminaries, before they are allowed to commence the study of theology.

You know also that this study is regulated by experienced and able professors, that young men are not allowed to grope their way with only their own feeble light, through the dark mazes of deceitful cavil, and infidel sophistry.

"The members of this society, who thirst so much for religious knowledge, can read our elementary works, and also, the masterly productions of Milner, Fletcher, Bossuet's history of the Variations, lately printed, and others, where they are sure to find the tenets of our faith explained with a precision and elegance that cannot fail to satisfy the sincere inquirer after truth. The precision of ideas, and elegance of expression in the imparting of religious knowledge, their preamble sets forth to be the main objects of this society, and it covers the desire and intention of acquiring that species of tact and dexterity in theological debate, which would enable them to follow into the arena the fanatics of the day. All this I must condemn as well as a publication of the crude essays of tyros among us. Let us dispute less and practice more.

"The Church in the most positive manner prohibits all laymen from entering into dispute on points of religion with sectarians, 'inhibemus,' says Pope Alexander IV., 'ne unquam Laicæ Personæ liceat publice del private de fide Catholica disputare; qui vere contradixerit, Excommunicationis laqueo innodetur.*' Had you recollected this sentence, I am sure you would be far from calling on the Catholic young men of this city to become members of a debating society on religious subjects, open to so many serious objections.

"†JOHN, Bishop of New-York."

After having read you a *bishop's bull* against "The New York Catholic society for the promotion of religious knowledge," I will, while on this subject, read you also a *bishop's curse* against a refractory priest in Philadelphia. I quote it from one of the News-papers of that day. It happened some twelve or fifteen years ago. I have several such cases in the books around me: but they are some two or three centuries old, and in foreign countries; and therefore, I select this modern one which is almost a copy of them, because a little acclimated.

[From a *Philadelphia Paper*.] We have at length obtained a correct copy of the excommunication of William Hogan, Pastor of St. Mary's Church, of this city. It is as follows:

By the authority of God Almighty, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and the undefiled Virgin Mary, mother and patroness of our Savior, and of all celestial virtues, Angels, Archangels, Thrones, Dominions, Powers, Cherubims and Seraphims; and of all the Holy Patriarchs, Prophets, and of all the Apostles and Evangelists of the Holy Innocents, who, in the sight of the Holy Lamb are found worthy to sing the new song of the Holy Martyrs and Holy Confessors, and of all the Holy Virgins, and of all Saints, together with the Holy Elect of God—may he, William Hogan, be damned.

We excommunicate and anathematize him, and from the threshold of the Holy Church of God Almighty, we sequester him, that he may be tormented, disposed and be delivered over with Athan and Abiram, and with those who say unto the Lord, "depart from us, for we desire none of thy ways;" as a fire is quenched

*The English of which *Bull* is:—"The Church prohibits laymen, either publicly or privately, from arguing on subjects appertaining to the Catholic faith, and whosoever shall violate this prohibition, let him be bound with the cord of Excommunication."

with water, so let the light of him be put out forevermore, unless it shall repent him, and make satisfaction. Amen!

May the Father, who created man, curse him! May the Son, who suffered for us, curse him! May the Holy Ghost, who suffered for us in baptism, curse him! May the Holy Cross which Christ for our salvation, triumphing over his enemies, ascended, curse him!

May the Holy and Eternal Virgin Mary, mother of God, curse him! May St. Michael, the Advocate of the Holy Souls, curse him! May all the angels, principalities, and powers, and all heavenly armies, curse him!

May the praiseworthy multitude of Patriarchs, and Prophets, curse him!

May St. John the Precursor, and St. John the Baptist, and St. Peter, and St. Paul, and St. Andrew, and all other of Christ's Apostles together, curse him; and may the rest of our Disciples and Evangelists, who by their preaching converted the universe, and the holy and wonderful company of Martyrs and Confessors, who by their holy works are found pleasing to God Almighty. May the holy choir of the Holy Virgins, who for the honor of Christ have despised the things of the world, damn him! May all the saints from the beginning of the world to everlasting ages, who are found to be beloved of God, damn him!

May he be damned wherever he be, whether in the house or in the stable, the garden or the field, or the highways; or in the woods, or in the waters, or in the church; may he be cursed in living and in dying!

May he be cursed in eating and in drinking, in being hungry, in being thirsty, in fasting, in sleeping, in slumbering, and in sitting, in living, in working, in resting and blood letting!

May he be cursed in all the faculties of his body.

May he be cursed inwardly and outwardly; may he be cursed in his brains and in his vertex, in his temples, in his eye-brows, in his cheeks, in his jaw bones, in his nostrils, in his teeth and grinders, in his lips, in his throat, in his shoulders, in his arms, in his fingers.

May he be damned in his mouth, in his breasts, in his heart and purtenance, down to the very stomach!

May he be cursed in his reins and in his groins; in his thighs, in his genitals and in his hips, and his knees, his legs and feet, and toe nails!

May he be cursed in all his joints, and articulation of the members; from the crown of his head to the sole of his feet, may there be no soundness.

May the Son of the living God, with all the glory of his majesty, curse him! And may heaven with all the powers that move therein, rise up against him and curse and damn him; unless he repent and make satisfaction!

Amen. So be it. Be it so. Amen.

Ridiculous as this may appear—laughable or profane; it is nevertheless, but the echo of one of the one hundred anathemas commanded in the council of Trent—one of the greater excommunications due to an obstinate heretic.

As still more indicative of the present views and feelings of the Roman see, on the subject of civil and religious liberty, I shall give you a few more extracts. I had laid off several modern documents of much point, and bearing on this proposition; but unfortunately, they were misplaced in my library, and I find them missing among the books I have brought with me. I hold in my hand, however, a little

work in which I find some of them. This little volume containing "Dr. Beecher's Plea for the West," ought to be in every family, and read by every adult in the great valley, who feels any interest in the preservation of our free and happy institutions. I wish I had time to read much of it. I can only read a few passages of the documentary *data* which it contains:

I am about to read from Gregory XVI. the present successor of Peter, under date of 1832, the present faith of Roman Catholics on the subject of conscience, and liberty of the press.

"From this polluted fountain of indifference, flows that absurd and erroneous doctrine, or rather raving, in favor and defence of 'liberty of conscience,' for which most pestilential error, the course is opened for that entire and wild liberty of opinion, which is every where attempting the overthrow of religious and civil institutions; and which the unblushing impudence of some has held forth as an advantage to religion. Hence *that pest, of all others most to be dreaded in a state, unbridled liberty of opinion*, licentiousness of speech, and lust of novelty, which, according to the experience of all ages, portend the downfall of the most powerful and flourishing empires. Hither tends that worst and never sufficiently to be execrated and detested LIBERTY OF THE PRESS for the diffusion of all manner of writings, which some so loudly contend for, and so actively promote." p. 121.

This so fresh from Rome, stamped with the seal of infallibility, without another word, sustains that specification in my proposition relating to the anti-American spirit and genius of the grand elements of popery.

But continues he on the subject of unlicensed books:

"No means must be here omitted, says *Clement XIII.*, our predecessor of happy memory, in the Encyclical Letter on the proscription of bad books—'*no means must be here omitted*,' as the extremity of the case calls for all our exertions, to *exterminate the fatal pest* which spreads through so many works; nor can the materials of error be *otherwise destroyed than by the flames*, which consume the depraved elements of the evil."

The secretary of the court of Vienna and counsellor of legation—I mean Frederick Schlegel, who, in 1828, lectured on the philosophy of history in favor of monarchy and popery—one supreme bishop, and one supreme monarch—who was one of the Austrian cabinet, *the confidential counsellor of Prince Metternich*—whose policy and opinions opened the way for Austrian efforts on the foundation of St. Leopold, to add America to the pope's dominions—I say, of this great man and his opinions, the author of a foreign conspiracy, as quoted by Doctor Beecher, thus speaks:

"In the year 1828 the celebrated Frederick Schlegel, one of the most distinguished literary men of Europe, delivered lectures at Vienna, on the philosophy of history, (which have not been translated into English) a great object of

which is to show *the mutual support which popery and monarchy* derive from each other. He commends the two systems in connexion as deserving of universal reception. He attempts to prove that the sciences, and arts, and all the pursuits of man, as an intellectual being, are best promoted under this perfect system of church and state: a pope at the head of the former; an emperor at the head of the latter. He contrasts with this, the system of Protestantism: represents Protestantism as the enemy of good government, as the ally of republicanism, as the parent of the distresses of Europe, as the cause of all the disorders with which legitimate governments are afflicted. In the close of lecture 17th, Vol. II., p. 286, he thus speaks of this country: *The TRUE NURSERY of all these destructive principles, the revolutionary school for France and the rest of Europe, has been North America. Thence the evil has spread over many other lands, either by natural contagion, or by arbitrary communication.*" Ib. p. 122, 123.

Such are the popular views of our institutions in the best and purest church district in the world: and the emigrants of that country with those opinions are daily crowding to our shores, and filling up this immense valley. These are they who are taught to execrate the liberty of the press, and to consider liberty of conscience pestilential error, and that a spiritual monarch, and a political emperor are the very paragon of all excellence in church and state. Is this compatible with the genius of our institutions? Are not such views and reasonings, *positively subversive of them?*

Let me observe from that book of Fessenden's of which my opponent seemed to know so much yesterday: but the author of which he cannot now name, as I believe, (if he can, however, he may tell us something about him)—I say from the Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, and from some other documents before me, I would wish to read a few statements, to show that this said Roman Catholic Institution, chameleon like, first accommodates itself to the customs of every country, and seems to inhale and exhale the popular atmosphere until it reaches its end; (for well the Jesuit knows the means may be infinitely various, while the end is one and immutable,) and so soon as it gains the fulcrum of opinion and the lever of the majority, it builds up an empire, after the model of the Prince Metternich. This has hitherto been its history, in every climate, and country, and age. A single example of this policy, taken from the Encyclopedia, must suffice:

"Various attempts have been made to bring this church under the papal yoke; but without success. The Portuguese having opened a passage into Abyssinia in the fifteenth century, an emissary was sent to extend the influence and authority of the Roman pontiff, clothed with the title of patriarch of the Abyssinians. The same important commission was afterwards given to several Jesuits, when some circumstances seemed to promise them a successful and happy ministry; but the Abyssinians stood so firm to the faith of their ancestors, that towards the close of the sixteenth century the Jesuits had lost nearly all hope in that quarter.

"About the beginning of the seventeenth century the Portuguese Jesuits renewed the mission to Abyssinia, when the emperor created one of them patriarch, and not only swore allegiance to the Roman pontiff, but also obliged his subjects to forsake the rites and tenets of their ancestors, and to embrace the doctrine and worship of the Romish church. At length the emperor became so exasperated at the arrogant and violent proceedings of the patriarch in subverting the established customs of the empire, for the purpose of confirming the pope's authority, especially in imposing celibacy on some, and requiring divorce of others, who had married more than one wife, that he annulled the orders formerly given in favor of popery, banished the missionaries out of his dominions, and treated with the utmost severity all who had any connexion with the undertaking. From this period the very name of Rome, its religion, and its pontiff, have all along been objects of peculiar aversion among the Abyssinians."—Encyc. Relig. Knowl. p. 22.

Thus have the Jesuits done in every country, and this will they do—first ingratiate themselves with the people, and when they think they are sure of their object, they will proceed to subvert the government: for they are sworn and sold to the pope forever.

The gentleman says, We are both foreigners; indicating that we have equal rights and privileges. I did not use that term in an invidious sense, when speaking of my willingness to receive foreigners. Nor do I oppose the principles of my opponent, because of their hostility to Protestants only: but because of their hostility to Roman Catholics. It is from my views of the political and religious bearings, the temporal and the eternal consequences of the system, that I expose and oppose it. As a philanthropist, I am opposed to the papal empire, whether at home or abroad—in Europe or America.

But although politically considered, in one sense, we both may be called foreigners; yet, we are not foreigners in the same sense. I claim a very intimate relation with the Protestant family. I am one of that family. It was then my family, that first settled this country. The bishop's family settled Roman Catholic America. He is a foreigner here, as I would be a foreigner in Mexico or South America. I belong to the persecuted—he to the persecutors of that family.

In the next place, I never took but one oath of allegiance. I never vowed to support but one political constitution. My opponent first swore to America and then to Rome. He is bound to a foreign prince; I am not. If that prince should reward him for any service with a Cardinal's cap, he might be commanded away to Rome next week.

BISHOP PURCELL. No, I will not leave this country.

MR. CAMPBELL. The gentleman is under the "Holy Lord the pope." I am not a foreigner in this sense.

But still better, I am the father of a family: my children are native

Americans: and through these I am more a kin to the great American family than he ever can be. Without perjury or apostacy from his office, he can never have a wife, nor family. He is a stranger to those near and holy relations. He has no country—no home. He lives and he must die under the command of foreign superiors; and they may, by authority or promotion, remove him to Europe or Asia at pleasure. For these and other reasons I am identified with Protestant America, and claim a relation here to which his heart shall ever be a stranger.—[Time expired.]

Half past 10 o'clock. A. M.

BISHOP PURCELL rises—

Another instance of the unfairness with which Catholic principles are represented: another occasion for a holy triumph!

That Rhemish Testament, from which the gentleman has just now read, was never sanctioned by the Catholic church. It was published by a caucus of parsons in New York, (whose names are prefixed to it,) for the express purpose of vilifying the faith, and outraging the feelings of Catholics! And this is called a Catholic bible! Good God! whither has justice fled? Archbishop Murray, of Dublin, has lately, in the most solemn manner, condemned these notes. They are not to be found in the Catholic bible, used in this or in any other country. I am laboring to inspire my opponent with sentiments of self-respect; and assure him anew, that "*evil communication corrupts good manners.*" The occasion called for original documents, candid statements, and reputable authorities; but, instead of these, the public are mocked by my friend with spurious, garbled extracts, which a dignified controversialist would have treated with contempt. We repudiate the notes, which Protestants have appended, *for us*, to this bible.

MR. CAMPBELL.—Produce another.

BISHOP PURCELL.—I will. Behold it. Here is the bible to be found in every book-store, where Catholic works are for sale. Here is Luke, chap. ix. 55! Not a word of it there! (Holds it opened, towards the audience, and towards MR. CAMPBELL.)

You perceive, that I have granted my opponent, all the extra time he chose to occupy, to explain away, if he could, the *mis-translation* (to call it by the very mildest name) of Liguori; and he has just left it where he found it, in the mire of infamy! The edition which I exhibit, was published in the very year and the very place with the edition, from which Mr. Smith pretends to have quoted. You have heard Mr. Kinmont.

The gentleman has cited the words of Christ, "Do this in commem-

oration of me," against the real presence. This is all I wanted, to complete my argument. Here is the answer:

"After having proposed the sentiments of the church upon these words, '*this is my body,*' we must tell what she thinks of these others, which Christ added: '*do this in memory of me.*' It is clear that the intention of the Son of God is to oblige us by these words to remember the death which he suffered for our sakes; and St. Paul concludes, from these same words, that we announce, in this mystery, the death of the Lord. But it must not be imagined that this remembrance of his death, excludes the *real presence* of his body: on the contrary, by only considering what has been just now explained, it will fully appear that this commemoration is founded upon the real presence. For as the Jews, in eating their peace offerings, remembered that they had been sacrificed for them, so we, in eating the flesh of Jesus Christ, our victim, should remember that he had been immolated for us. It is therefore this same flesh eaten by the faithful, which not only awakes in us the memory of his immolation, but which confirms to us the truth of it. And far from being able to say that this solemn commemoration which Jesus Christ orders us to make, excludes the presence of the flesh, it is visible, on the contrary, that this tender recollection, which he wills we should have of him, in the holy communion, as immolated for us, is founded upon the real receiving of this same flesh; it being surely impossible to forget, that it is for us he hath given his body in sacrifice, when we see that he gives us still every day this victim for our food."

I now come to the subject of purgatory, which my friend calls the lever of the pope, to raise the world. I should be glad to see the pope *raise* the world in any way. If he has not the power to raise mortals to the skies, he, at least, wants the will to pull men or angels down. The doctrine of purgatory can be proved by a few plain texts. The first is from 2d Machabees, xii. 42; where we read, that the valiant Machabeus sent twelve thousand drachmas of silver to Jerusalem, for sacrifice, to be offered for the souls of the dead. "*It is, therefore, says the scripture, a holy and a wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins.*"

My friend will say, the book of Machabees is not canonical. But, is it not, as Du Pin would say, very ill done of him, to reject a book of scripture, because it pinches him? This is a fine way of confuting Catholics: to mutilate the scripture when it favors our doctrine; to believe our enemies, when they misrepresent it; and to attribute to, and force upon us, doctrines which we do not profess.

The books of the Machabees are to be found in the Codex Alexandrinus, and in all the approved bibles of the Catholic church, from the beginning. Why tear them, at this late day, from the canons? Besides, they are, at least, authentic history, and, as such, faithful records of the belief of the only people who, at the time when they were written, professed the true faith.

Jesus Christ says, that there is a blasphemy against the Spirit;

which is a sin that will not be forgiven, neither in this world, nor in that which is to come. (Matt. xii. 32.) These words clearly imply that some sins *will* be forgiven in the world to come. Where? Not in heaven, which "nothing defiled can enter;" not in hell, for out of hell there is no redemption. What is that place, called *Abraham's bosom*, on which Lazarus reposed, until heaven was opened to the souls of men, by the death of Jesus Christ? Was it heaven, or hell, or that intermediate place or state, which Catholics call by the name of purgatory? It is necessarily the latter: apart from the suffering of sense by purifying fire, it would be a state of mental or spiritual suffering: as it was one of separation from God, whose beauty the soul, released from the prison of the body, and the darkness of sin and ignorance, so clearly discerns, and so ardently desires to enjoy. The Savior tells us to be reconciled quickly with our adversary, while we are in the way: lest we be delivered over to the judge, and cast into prison, whence we shall not be released, until we shall have paid the last farthing. (Matt. v. 26.) What prison is this? What place of sorrowful detention *on the way to heavenly glory*? Neither heaven, nor the abode of everlasting torments: consequently, purgatory.

"*Christ died for our sins,*" says St. Peter, (1st Epist. iii. 18,) "*being put to death in the flesh, but enlivened in the spirit: in which also coming, he preached to those spirits that were in prison.*" This is the place, of which it is said, in the apostles' creed, "*He descended into hell;*" which was surely not the hell of the damned, but that temporary hell, or hades, or purgatory, to whose inmates he announced the joyful things of their deliverance, where the first and the second Adam met, the type and reality. What is the meaning of the universally prevalent practice, of which St. Paul speaks, of performing pious works, called baptisms for the dead: "*Else what shall they do who are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for them?*" (1st Cor. xv. 29.)

Hence, the council of Trent teaches: "That there is a purgatory, and that the souls detained there, are helped by the prayers of the faithful, and particularly by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar."

St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Eusebius, St. Epiphanius, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, and several other ancient fathers and writers, demonstrate, that the doctrine of the church was always, and is now the same, as that which was defined by the council of Trent, with respect both to prayers for the dead, and an intermediate state, which we call purgatory. How express is the authority of the last named father, where he says: "through the prayers and sacrifices of the church and alms-deeds, God deals more mercifully with the departed than their sins deserve." Serm. 172. Enchirid. cap. 109, 110.

St. Chrysostom, who flourished within three hundred years of the age of the apostles, and must be admitted as an unexceptionable witness of their doctrine

and practice, writes as follows: "It was not without good reason *ordained by the apostles*, that mention should be made of the dead in the tremendous mysteries, because they knew well that these would receive great benefit from it." In Cap. 1. Phillip. Hom. 3. Tertullian, who lived in the age next to that of the apostles, speaking of a pious widow, says: "She prays for the soul of her husband, and begs refreshment for him." L. De Monogam. c. 10. St. Cyprian, who lived in the following age, says: "It is one thing to be waiting for pardon; another to attain to glory: one thing to be sent to prison, not to go from thence till the last farthing is paid; another to receive immediately the reward of faith and virtue: one thing to suffer lengthened torments for sin, and to be chastised and purified for a long time in that fire; another to have cleansed away all sin by suffering." S. Cypr. L. 4. Ep. 2.

The doctrine of the oriental churches agrees with that of the Catholic church. in the only two points defined by her, namely, as to there being a middle state, which we call purgatory, and as to the souls, detained in it, being helped by the prayers of the living faithful. True it is, they do not generally believe, that these souls are punished by a material fire; but neither does the Catholic church require a belief of this opinion. On some occasions, Luther admits of purgatory, as an article founded on scripture. Melancthon confesses that the ancients prayed for the dead, and says that the Lutherans do not find fault with it. Calvin intimates, that the souls of all the just are detained in Abraham's bosom until the day of judgment. In the first liturgy of the church of England, there is an express prayer for the departed, that "God would grant them mercy and everlasting peace." Collier's Eccl. Hist. Vol. II. p. 257.

Bishops Andrews, Usher, Montague, Taylor, Forbes, Sheldon, Barrow of St. Asaph's, and Blandford, all believed that the dead ought to be prayed for. To these, I may add, the religious Dr. Johnson, whose published Meditations prove, that he constantly prayed for his deceased wife."

The Universalists make hell a purgatory.

The notion, that this doctrine fills the pope's coffers with gold, is too ridiculous to be refuted! Every Catholic knows its absurdity. As to the intention of the priest, about which the gentleman has found so much to say, that is no difficulty. How do we judge of the intention? Simply, by the act, the surest evidence of its existence. Can we ask if a man has any intention to eat his dinner, when we see him, sit down to table, take his knife and fork, use them, and eat till he is filled; so when we see the priest does what every priest does, and the faithful people know that he ought to do, we have the best evidence of his intention. Besides, what motive could he have for such a gratuitous violation of the law of God and profanation of a sacrament? *Nemo repente pessimus* is an old and a true maxim. He would fall into other excesses, first, and be suspended—God will not abandon his church; and the sincere christian will always be rewarded by him, according to his deserts. No man goes suddenly, &c., see *Secreta Monita*. It was placed invidiously among the rubbish by the enemies of the Jesuits, if found amid the ruins of their house, as the whole society repudiated it.

Every learned and sound critic, who is at all honorable, denounces the imposition—It is an old trick.

Ovid in his 13th book, verse 59, 60, suggests the idea, in speaking of Ulysses' treachery, when he first had gold hid in the tent of Palamedes and then denounced him for having been bribed by the enemies of Greece.

"Fictumque probavit
"Crimen, et ostendit quod jam præfoderat aurum."

Shall I invent calumnies, when run out of proof of any man's dishonesty? God forbid! What virtuous and immaculate family may not be thus assailed? And the more virtuous and honorable they are, the more will they be disconcerted and overwhelmed, for the moment; but the more complete will be their own vindication and their slanderers' disgrace in the end.

The gentleman cannot get over what he said of Washington and our Revolutionary heroes, "the *fatal* shaft is sticking in his side."

God has given to the people, neither too much, nor too little power. He has given them no spiritual authority; for as Jesus Christ said to his apostles, so may the priest say to his flock: "*You have not chosen me.*" "*No one durst assume the office of priest, but he that is called to it, as Aaron was*"—and he was not called by the people. In the Catholic church we solemnly appeal to the people for *testimony* for or against, a candidate for holy orders. God has given the people *reasonable* power, in temporal matters, and revolutions have too often shown their evils and calamities, in the most horrid and brutal excesses and the loss of innumerable lives. This is an awful penalty for the rash exercise of temporal power on the part of the people. Our own revolution was, perhaps, the calmest, the most temperate, the least abused for evil purposes by wicked man, because we had a Washington and kindred spirits to direct the storm. These, my worthy friend calls perjurers! As God has restricted the people, he has also restricted their rulers, in their exercise of power. How many terrible lessons have not kings been taught, for its abuse. Why cannot nations unite to select a common umpire; to whom all disputes should be referred, and thus the crimes of kings, and revolution, with all its accompanying horrors, by the people, extinguished in the bud?

I do not undertake to defend the popes in their use of the deposing power—and were my voice, at this moment, ringing in the Vatican, instead of the Baptist church, Sycamore street, Cincinnati, I should not be reproved. There are in the religious, as well as in the spiritual world, two forces, the centripetal, and the centrifugal. The see of Rome is as the sun and centre of the system, to which all the plan-

ets, revolving in beauteous harmony, tend. We bless, we love, we seek with ardor, by a kind of religious instinct, strong as the laws of gravitation, this common centre, which gives us all, our proper impetus and coherency. But like the planets, we are not absorbed by it. We know its excellence, its usefulness, its destination, its limits.

Now, to show you what our sentiments are, with regard to the temporal power of the pope, here is a standard work, the identical textbook of theology, which I studied in Paris many years ago. The author is still living, and instead of being rebuked for what I am going to say, he has, on the contrary, been made bishop of Maus, in France. His name is Bouvier, and he is as pious a christian as he is a sound divine. I read you evidence from scripture, tradition and reason, in favor of the doctrine which is the burden of the proposition, viz., that "the pope has no right, direct, or indirect, by any divine commission, to the temporalities of kings or other Christians." When was the deposing power first claimed by the pope? Ecclesiastical history answers, in the 10th century. Then by the rule which I have already laid down, it is no part of Catholic doctrine. It came a thousand years too late.

"Proposition. That the Roman Pontiff does not possess, by divine right, any power, either direct or indirect, over the temporalities of kings, or other christians." This proposition is proved 1st, from the sacred scripture: "*As the Father sent me I also send you.* (John xx. 21.) *The Son of man hath not where to lay his head.* (Mat. viii. 20.) *Who hath made me a judge, or a divider over you?*" (Luke xii. 14.) Hence we may reason thus. The sovereign Pontiff can have no authority over the temporal goods of men by divine right, unless it be granted to him by Christ, but he has received no such power from Christ, for Christ gave to no man a power, which, he himself, when on earth, did not possess; but Christ when on earth possessed no such power, relating to temporal matters, as appears both from his poverty, and from these words of his, "*who hath made me a judge or a divider over you?*" Therefore the Roman Pontiff does not possess, by divine authority, any power, &c.

Besides, Christ expressly declared that he was a king, but at the same time, he positively denied that his kingdom was of this world, (John xviii. 36.) *For this purpose I came into the world, he says, that I might bear testimony to the truth: in another place he ordered to give to Caesar the things that belong to Caesar.* (Mat. xxii. 21.) By a miracle, he caused the stater to be found in the mouth of a fish, that the tribute might be paid for himself and Peter, (Matt. xvii. 27;) and surely he could not shew, in more express terms, that he did not wish to exercise any temporal authority. Furthermore, when he sent his apostles, he by no means, spoke to them, concerning temporal affairs, or any political authority, but only of *the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the power of binding and loosing*; he ordered that, going through the entire world, they would *teach these things which he commanded them; he announced to them many tribulations of every sort, and even death; he commanded them, to advise and reprove those who transgress, but that they should not punish them, unless by spiritual pains: If he will not hear the church, says he, let him be to thee, as the heathen*

and the publican, (Matt. xviii. 17.) : *he that believeth not, shall be condemned,* (Mark xvi. 16.) The apostles, in like manner, far from exercising any temporal power, on the contrary, strongly recommended obedience and respect to all Pagan princes and persecutors, and rulers sent by them.

It can be proved, 2nd. from tradition. We would be tedious, were we to rehearse all the testimonies of Fathers, Doctors and chief bishops, who by their word and example clearly taught, that the civil power was entirely independent of the ecclesiastical.

Tertullian in his Apologetic, chap. 30, says: "They, (the christians,) know who hath given power to emperors.....they know that it was God, alone, in whose power they are, to whom, they are second, and after whom they are firstan emperor has his authority, from him by whom he was created man, before being emperor. He receives power from him, from whom also he received the breath of life.....*We pray for all emperors.*" All christians, imbued with this doctrine, opposed the arms of patience alone, to the most unjust and most cruel tortures, for more than three hundred years.

Osius, bishop of Cordova, writes thus to the emperor Constantius, who favored the Arians: "Do you not interfere with ecclesiastical matters," as already quoted.

Pope Gelasius, in his epistle 8th to Anastasius, a violent enemy of Catholics, says, "There are two things, O emperor Augustus, by which principally, this world is governed, the sacred authority of the popes, and the authority of kings." (Labbe tom. 4. page 1122.) This pope, therefore, considered that each power was independent of the other.

It can be proved, 3d. By theological reasoning. 1. That opinion ought to be rejected, which was entirely unheard of during the ten first ages; but that opinion which holds that the chief bishop has any just right even indirect, over the temporal possessions of princes, or other christians, was, by no means, heard of during the ten first ages, to wit, down to the time of Gregory VII. who in the year 1080, attempted to depose Henry IV. and disturbed the peace of the entire world, by the assertion of this novel right. Therefore that opinion should be rejected, &c.

2. That opinion should be entirely rejected which would occasion most grievous evils, but the opinion which we oppose, gives, &c. 1. It renders harmony between the priesthood, and the sovereign power, impossible. 2. It would prevent infidel princes from embracing the christian religion, and heretics from returning to the true church. 3. It would afford a necessary occasion for continual wars, if it were practised, which, experience has already too clearly shewn. Therefore, it should be entirely rejected, &c., &c., &c.

Now see here the scholastic method of proving propositions, and an admirable one it is. We say 1st, scripture teaches it,—2nd, antiquity corroborates it,—3d, reason confirms it. That is the method we follow, in all our schools. This is the solid, and irrefutable manner in which this proposition is laid down and established. Does this look like submitting to the dictation of the pope in temporal matters? Did the English Catholics obey the pretended absolution bull? Did not Catholics under arms, and with arms, as in the case of Julius II., resist their acknowledged, and in his proper sphere, respected Pontiff? Did they not tie his hands while they kissed his feet?

Waddington tells us that when Louis XII. of France quarreled with

the pope, he called a council of bishops at Tours, and proposed the question, whether he could detain the pope, as his prisoner, on an occasion, which he described. They gave an affirmative answer. This, in addition to what I have said, shows how the distinction of power, and of rights, was understood at that period, and every epoch, back to the apostolic ages.

My friend asks for a disclaimer of these pretensions, on the part of the pope.

MR. CAMPBELL.—Not by the pope, but by the councils.

BISHOP PURCELL.—The general councils never made the recognition of this power, an article of faith; why, then, should they disclaim it?

Here is what pope Innocent III. said. His account of this affair is very curious. It is, indeed, a strong disclaimer, and every word deserves to be maturely weighed.

Cum rex superiorem in temporalibus minime recognoscat, sine juris alterius læsione in eo se jurisdictioni nostræ subicere potuit, in quo videretur aliquibus, quod per seipsum, non tanquam pater cum filiis, sed tanquam princeps cum subditis potuit dispensare. Regi igitur gratiam facimus requisiti:—quod non solum in Ecclesiæ patrimonio, super quo plenam in temporalibus gerimus potestatem, verum etiam in aliis regionibus, certis causis inspectis, temporalem jurisdictionem *casualiter* exercemus. Non quod alieno juri præjudicare velimus, vel potestatem nobis indebitam usurpare, cum non ignoramus Christum in evangelio respondisse: redite, quæ sunt Cæsaris, Cæsari, et quæ sunt Dei, Deo. Propter quod postulatus ut hæreditatem divideret inter duos: quis, inquit, constituit me judicem inter vos? Sed quia in Deuteronomio continetur, si difficile et ambiguum apud te judicium esse perspexeris, Surge et ascende ad locum, quem eligit Dominus Deus tuus, &c. Liber V. Epist. 12. Innocent III.

Since the King by no means recognizes a superior in temporal authority, he could submit to our jurisdiction without infringing upon the right of another, in which it seems to some, that he could dispense, not as a father with his children, but as a prince with his subjects; therefore we granted the King what was requisite, because we not only exercise a temporal power, *in certain cases*, in the patrimony of the church, over which we act with full authority in temporalities, but also in other districts, certain matters being considered on: Not that we wish to determine prematurely of another's right, or usurp a power not due to us: since we are not ignorant of what Christ has said in the gospel. On account of which he was asked to divide an inheritance between two, who, says he, has appointed me judge between ye? But that is written in Deuteronomy, if you find a difficult and doubtful case, rise and repair to the place, which the Lord your God has chosen, &c. B. V. E. 12. Innocent III.

Here the pope, himself, quotes scripture and precedent, against the assumption of such power. Next—behold the testimony of a particular council, the doctrine of the ancient Fathers, of an eminent divine, the celebrated Arthur O'Leary, on the matter before us, and on persecution for conscience sake.

The Council of Toledo forbids the use of violence to enforce belief: "Because," add the fathers, "God shows mercy to whom he thinks fit; and hardens whom he pleases." "Præcipit sancta synodus nemini deinceps ad credendum vim inferre. Cui enim Deus vult, miseretur; et quem vult, indurat."* And the council of Lateran, under Pope Alexander the third, acknowledges, that the church rejects bloody executions on the score of religion, which proves to demonstration, that the canon charged to the fourth council of Lateran, under Innocent the third, in which canon, "the secular powers are addressed to take an oath, to exterminate all heretics out of their territories, and in case of refusal, to have their subjects absolved from their allegiance, and the lands of the heretics to be seized by the Catholics," &c. —is spurious. Collyer, the Protestant historian, in his fifth volume of Ecclesiastical History, acknowledges that it is not found in any copy, coeval with the council. Some hundred years after the council, it was produced to light by a German. And we know full well, that at that time, several spurious pieces were produced, to serve the purposes of rancor.

Were even such a decree, or any other of a similar nature, genuine, the Catholics would reject them, without any breach of faith; because the church has no power over life, limb, the rights of sovereigns, the property of individuals, or any temporal concern whatsoever. Her bishops, then, whether separately, or in a collective body, cannot graft any such power into their spiritual commission. They would act in an extrajudicial manner, and beyond the limit of their sphere. This I have proved in my remarks on Mr. Wesley's letter, and elsewhere.

Far from countenancing cruelty, death, and oppression, "the spirit of the church was, in such a manner, the spirit of meekness and charity, that she prevented, as much as in her power, the death, of criminals, and even of her most cruel enemies," says Fleury. You have seen how the lives of the murderers of the martyrs of Armenia were saved; and St. Austin's effort to preserve the Donatists, (who had exercised such cruelties against the Catholics) from the rigor of the imperial laws. You have seen how much the church detested the indiscreet zeal of those bishops, who prosecuted the heresiarch Priscillian to death.

In general, the church saved the lives of all criminals, as far as she had power. St. Augustine accounts for this conduct, in his letter to Macedonius, where we read that the church wished there were no pains in this life, but of the healing kind, to destroy, not man, but sin, and to preserve the sinner from eternal torments.* If, in after ages, some popes and bishops deviated from this plan of meekness and moderation, their conduct should not involve a consequence injurious to the principles of the Catholic church, which condemns such proceedings. The religion of Catholics and Protestants condemns frauds, fornications, drunkenness, revenge, duelling, perjury, &c. Some of their relaxed and implous writers have even attempted, not only to palliate, but even to apologize for such disorders. The children of the christian religion daily practise them,—is the christian religion accountable for the breach of her own laws?

My friend made some *display*, on the persecuting canon of the council of Lateran, and yet Collyer, a Protestant historian, in the 5th volume of his ecclesiastical history, pronounces it spurious! He acknowledges that it is not found in the copy of the decrees coeval with the council; that it was manufactured by the Germans, hundreds of

*Cap. de Judæis, dist. 45.

*Fleury, Discours. 2, No. 9.

years afterwards; and that there were several spurious documents manufactured about the same time. Now hear a distinguished prelate of our church, Dr. England, in his speech before congress, in which he leaves nothing important unsaid on this topic. I am happy to incorporate his eloquent remarks in this debate.

A political difficulty has been sometimes raised here. If this infallible tribunal which you profess yourselves bound to obey, should command you to overturn our government, and tell you that it is the will of God to have it new modeled, will you be bound to obey? And how then can we consider those men to be good citizens, who profess to owe obedience to a foreign authority, to an authority not recognized in our constitution: to an authority which has excommunicated and deposed sovereigns, and which has absolved subjects and citizens from their bond of allegiance.

Our answer to this is extremely simple and very plain, it is, that we would not be bound to obey it; that we recognize no such authority. I would not allow to the pope or to any bishop of our church, outside this Union, the smallest interference with the humblest vote at our most insignificant balloting box. He has no right to such interference. You must, from the view which I have taken, see the plain distinction between spiritual authority, and a right to interfere in the regulation of human government or *civil concerns*. You have in your constitution wisely kept them distinct and separate. It will be wisdom and prudence and safety to continue the separation. Your constitution says that Congress shall have no power to restrict the free exercise of religion. Suppose your dignified body to-morrow attempted to restrict me in the exercise of that right; though the law, as it would be called, should pass your two houses and obtain the signature of the president, I would not obey it, because it would be no law, it would be an usurpation: for you cannot make a law in violation of your constitution: you have no power in such a case. So, if that tribunal which is established by the Creator to testify to me what he has revealed, and to make the necessary regulations of discipline for the government of the church, shall presume to go beyond that boundary which circumscribes its power, its acts are invalid, my rights are not to be destroyed by its usurpation, and there is no principle of my creed which prevents my using my natural right of proper resistance to any tyrannical usurpation. You have no power to interfere with my religious rights, the tribunal of the church has no power to interfere with my civil rights. It is a duty which every good man ought to discharge for his own, and for the public benefit, to resist any encroachment upon either. We do not believe, that God gave to the church any power to interfere with our civil rights or our *civil concerns*. Christ our Lord refused to interfere in the division of the inheritance between two brothers, one of whom requested that interference. The civil tribunals of Judea were vested with sufficient authority for that purpose, and he did not transfer it to his apostles. It must hence be apparent that any idea of the Roman Catholics of those republics being in any way under the influence of any foreign ecclesiastical power, or indeed of any church authority in the exercise of their civil rights, is a serious mistake. There is no class of our fellow citizens more free to think, and to act for themselves on the subject of our rights than we are, and I believe there is not any portion of the American family more jealous of foreign influence, or more ready to resist it. We have brethren of our church in every part of the globe, under every form of government. This is a subject upon which each of us is free to act as he thinks proper. We know of no

tribunal in our church which can interfere in our proceedings as citizens. Our ecclesiastical authority existed before our constitution, is not affected by it; there is not in the world a constitution which it does not precede, with which it could not co-exist; it has seen nations perish, dynasties decay, empires prostrate; it has co-existed with all, it has survived them all, it is not dependent upon any one of them; they may still change, and it will still continue.

We now come to examine what are called the persecuting laws of our church. In the year 1215, at the council of Lateran, certain heresies were condemned by the first canon; and amongst other things this canon recites as Catholic faith, in opposition to the errors of those whom it condemned, that there was but one God the Creator of all things, of spirits as well as bodies; the author of the Old Testament and of the Mosaic dispensation, equally as of the New Testament and of the Christian dispensation; that he created not only the good angels, but also the devil and the bad angels, originally coming good from his hand, and becoming wicked by their own malice, &c. In its third canon it excommunicates those heretics, and declares them to be separated from the body of the church. Then follows a direction, that the heretics so condemned, are to be given up to the secular powers, or to their bailiffs, to be duly punished. This direction continues to require of all bishops and others having authority, to make due search within their several districts for those heretics, and if they will not be induced to retract their errors, desires that they should be delivered over to be punished. There is an injunction then to all temporal lords to cleanse their dominions by exterminating those heretics; and if they will not, within a year from having been so admonished by the church, cleanse their lands of *this heretical filth*, they shall be deprived if they have superior lords, and if they be superior lords and be negligent, it shall be the duty of the metropolitan and his provincial bishops to excommunicate them, and if any one of those lords paramount so excommunicated for this negligence shall continue during twelve months under the excommunication, the metropolitan shall certify the same to the pope, who, finding admonition useless, shall depose this prince, and absolve his subjects from their oaths of fealty, and deliver the territory over to Catholics, who having exterminated the heretics shall remain in peaceable possession.

This is the most formidable evidence adduced against the position which I have laid down, that it is not a doctrine of our church, that we are bound to persecute those who differ from us in belief. I trust that I shall not occupy very much of your time in showing, that this enactment does not in any way weaken that assertion. I shall do so, by satisfying you that this is a special law for a particular case; and also by convincing you that it is not a canon of the church respecting any of those points in which we admit her infallibility; nor is it a canon of the church.

The doctrines condemned in this first canon originated in Syria, touched lightly at the Islands of the Archipelago, settled down in Bulgaria, and spread into the south of Europe, but were principally received in the vicinity of Albi, in France. The persons condemned held the Manichean principle of there being two creators of the universe; one a good being, the author of the New Testament, the creator of good angels, and generally of spiritual essence; the other an evil being, the creator of bodies, the author of the Mosaic dispensation, and generally of the Old Testament. They stated that marriage was unlawful, and co-operation with the principle of evil was criminal. The consequences to society were of the very worst description, immoral, dismal, and desolating. The church examined the doctrine, condemned it as heretical, and cut off those who held or abetted it, from her communion. Here, according to the principles which I have

maintained before you, her power ended. Beyond this we claim no authority: the church, by divine right, we say, infallibly testifies what doctrines Christ has revealed, and by the same right, in the same manner, decides that what contradicts this revelation is erroneous; but she has no divine authority to make a law which shall strip of their property, or consign to the executioner, those whom she convicts of error. The doctrine of our obligation to submit does not extend to force us to submit to an usurpation; and if the church made a law upon a subject beyond her commission for legislation it would be invalid, there would be no proper claim for our obedience: usurpation does not create a right. The council could by right make the doctrinal decision; but it had no right to make the temporal enactment: and where there exists no right to legislate on one side, there is no obligation of obedience on the other. If this was then a canon of the church, it was not one in making which she was acting within her constitutional jurisdiction, it was an usurpation of temporal government, and the doctrine of infallibility does not bear upon it.

Every document respecting this council, the entire of the evidence respecting it, as well as the very mode of framing the enactments, prove that it was a special law regarding a particular case. The only persons whose errors were condemned at that council were those whom I have described. The general principle of legal exposition restraining the application of penal enactments must here have full weight, and will restrain the application of the penalty to the only criminals brought within its view. But the evidence is still more confirmed, by the special words of definite meaning, *this*, and *all*, which were specially descriptive of only those persons; the first by its very nature, the second by the nature of their crime; and the continued exposition of the enactment restrained its application to the special case, though frequently attempts had been made by individuals to extend its application, not in virtue of the statute, but in virtue of analogy. It would then be improperly forcing its construction to say that its operation was to be general, as it evidently was made only for a particular case.

In viewing the preamble to this council, as well as from our knowledge of history, we discover that this was not merely a council of the church, but it was also a congress of the civilized world. The state of the times rendered such assemblages not only usual, but necessary: and each legislative body did its own business by its own authority; and very generally the subjects which were decided upon by one body in one point of view, came under the consideration of the other assembly in a different point of view, and their separate decisions were engrossed upon a joint record.

Sometimes they were preserved distinct and separate, but copyists, for their own convenience, brought together all the articles regarding the same subject, from what source soever they were obtained. Such was precisely the case in the instance before us. There were present on this occasion, by themselves or by their legates, the king of Sicily, emperor elect of the Romans, the emperor of the east, the king of France, the king of England, the king of Arragon, the king of Jerusalem, the king of Cyprus, several other kings, and lords paramount, sovereign states, and princes. Several of the bishops were princes or barons. In the ecclesiastical council, the third canon terminated exactly in one sentence, which was that of the excommunication or separation from the church, of those whom the first canon had condemned, whatever name or names they might assume; because they had in several places several appellations, and were continually dividing off and changing names as they separated. The duty and the jurisdiction of the council came to this; and the ancient records give no more as the portion of its enactments. But the congress of the temporal powers then

made the subsequent part as their enactment: and thus this penal and civil regulation was not an act of the council, but an act of the congress: and it is not a canon concerning the doctrine of the church, nor indeed is it by any means a canon, though the copyists have added it to the canon as regarding the very same subject; and as confessedly the excommunication in the third canon regarded only the special case of those particular heretics, the addition of the penal enactment to this particular canon is confirmatory evidence that those who added it knew that the penalty in the one case was only co-extensive with the excommunication in the other.

Having thus seen that this canon of the Council of Lateran was not a doctrinal decision of our church establishing the doctrine of persecution, and commanding to persecute, but that it was a civil enactment by the temporal power against persons whom they looked upon as criminals, it is more the province of the politician or of the jurist than of the divine to decide upon its propriety. I may, however, be permitted to say that in my opinion the existence of civilized society required its enactment, though no good man can approve of several abuses which were committed under the pretext of its execution, nor can any rational man pretend that because of the existence of a special law for a particular purpose, every case which may be thought analogous to that for which provision was made is to be illegally subjected to those provisions.

We are now arrived at the place where we may easily find the origin and the extent of the papal power of deposing sovereigns, and of absolving subjects from their oaths of allegiance. To judge properly of facts, we must know their special circumstances, not their mere outline. The circumstances of Christendom were then widely different from those in which we now are placed. Europe was then under the feudal system. I have seldom found a writer, not a Catholic, who, in treating of that age and that system, has been accurate, and who has not done us very serious injustice. But a friend of mine, who is a respectable member of your honorable body, has led me to read Hallam's account of it, and I must say that I have seldom met with so much candor, and, what I call, so much truth. From reading his statement of that system it will be plainly seen that there existed amongst the Christian potentates a sort of federation, in which they bound themselves by certain regulations, and to the observance of those they were held not merely by their oaths, but by various penalties, sometimes they consented the penalty should be the loss of their station. It was of course necessary to ascertain that the fact existed before its consequences should be declared to follow; it was also necessary to establish some tribunal to examine and to decide as to the existence of the fact itself, and to proclaim that existence. Amongst independent sovereigns there was no superior, and it was natural to fear that mutual jealousy would create great difficulty in selecting a chief; and that what originated in concession might afterwards be claimed as a right. They were however all members of one church, of which the Pope was the head, and, in this respect, their common father: and by universal consent it was regulated that he should examine, ascertain the fact, proclaim it, and declare its consequences. Thus he did in reality possess the power of deposing monarchs, and of absolving their subjects from oaths of fealty, but only those monarchs who were members of that federation, and in the cases legally provided for, and by their concession, not by divine right, and during the term of that federation and the existence of his commission. He governed the church by divine right, he deposed kings and absolved subjects from their allegiance by human concession. I preach the doctrines of my church by divine right, but I preach from this spot not by that right, but by the permission of others.

It is not then a doctrine of our church that the pope has been divinely commissioned either to depose kings or to interfere with republics, or to absolve the subjects of the former from their allegiance, or interfere with the civil concerns of the latter. When the persecuted English Catholics, under Elizabeth, found the pope making an unfounded claim to this right, and upon the shadow of that unfounded right making inroads upon their national independence, by declaring who should or who should not be their temporal ruler, they well showed how little they regarded his absolving them from their allegiance, for they volunteered their services to protect their liberties, which their Catholic ancestors had labored to establish. And she well knew that a Catholic might safely be entrusted with the admiralty of her fleet, and that her person was secure amongst her disgraced Catholic nobility and gentry, and their persecuted adherents; although the Court of Rome had issued its bull of absolution, and some divines were found who endeavored to prove that what originated in voluntary concession of states and monarchs was derived from divine institution. If then Elizabeth, of whose character I would not wish in this place to express my opinion, was safe amidst those whom she persecuted for their faith, even when the head of their church absolved them from allegiance, and if at such a moment they flocked round her standard to repel Catholic invaders who came with consecrated banners, and that it is admitted on all hands that in so doing they violated no principle of doctrine or of discipline of their church, as we all avow; surely America need not fear for the fidelity of her Catholic citizens, whom she cherishes and whom she receives to her bosom with affection and shelters from the persecution of others. Neither will any person attempt to establish an analogy between our federation and that of feudalism, to argue that the pope can do amongst us what he did amongst European potentates under circumstances widely different.

My worthy opponent said, that he would only *touch* on persecution. My friends, persecution had marked me for a victim in my native land, and forced me to seek an Asylum in America, when I was young and friendless! Persecution is there, in full operation at this very hour. Scarcely a breeze comes across the ocean, without bringing on its wings, fresh tidings, of blood, shed under Protestant persecution—by ministers of the Protestant faith.

Widows there kneel in the blood of their own children; and, because excess of grief has made them maniacs, they drink that blood, and curse the authors of their misery. Is not this true? Does not the universe know and shudder at it? And having been compelled to flee from intolerance, having fought against it, must we still see the green-eyed monster, trampling upon the vine and fig tree, here, where we had hoped to sit down under their shade, in safety, and in peace, with our brethren of every denomination? Must we still fear the midnight knock at the door, and the domiciliary visit, by a brutal soldiery? Must the perishing orphans see the bread taken out of their mouths by rapacious parsons, and their mother's cloak (their only covering of a wintry night) *distraigned*, to pay the tithe proctor? Where will you find tyranny like this? Would this be a better state of things.

than what we, in this free country enjoy? Bigots would blast this glorious prospect. They would proscribe one sect after another. The appetite for blood, they have, even now, evinced, and we know, when once indulged, how hard it is to sate it! But I must call upon Protestant testimony for the wrongs of Ireland—and I will *only touch upon the persecution*. Taylor, a graduate of Trinity College, in his history of Ireland, says:

“It would be a mere waste of words to reprobate this iniquitous law, or rather this violation of all law, human and divine. No Irish Protestant can peruse its enactments without a blush for the shame thus brought on his religion, when it was thus virtually declared that the reformed system should owe its strength and security, not to the purity of its principles, not to the excellence of its doctrines, but to robbery and opposition, to dissention between father and child, to stimulating one neighbor to seize the fruits of another's industry, to the desecration of a solemn sacrament, by making it a test for office. How can we be surprised that the reformed religion is unpopular in Ireland, when by this and similar laws, a Protestant legislature virtually declared that Protestantism could not be secure unless it entered into alliance with Bellal, Mammon and Moloch?” *Hist. of Ireland*. By W. C. Taylor, Esq. A. B. of Trinity college, Dublin, page 108. Vol. 2nd. New York edit. 1833.

Now tell me if the annals of Catholicism can produce any thing like a parallel to this! After enumerating the most tyrannical laws that Draco, or Diocleian ever enacted, can we discover more proscription—more cruelty?

My friends, I do not blame the Protestant *religion* for this. It is the spirit of the country and government; and the shame is, that when Catholic governments have ceased to persecute, Protestant ones continue to do so.

My friends, were I to consult my own feelings, I should be better pleased to draw a veil over these horrors; but my opponent made allusions to the inquisition, as an argument that, if ever the Catholics became the most numerous, they would make it a part of their system to persecute: as if the same argument, if argument it can be called, would not be equally strong against all leading churches of Protestantism; and if the gentleman makes any further extracts, I will meet them just in the same way, and condemn both Catholics and Protestants, for that by which they are alike disgraced. Now, as he brings the account of the inquisition before us, and proves it to be the most bloody tyranny, setting aside all forms of legal procedure, &c., I will refer you to Hume's history of England, for an inquisition equally terrible, and more unjust, under Protestant England—the famous Star-Chamber, where, upon the least suspicion, without proof, the officer was sent to the houses of the most distinguished men, nay even to their beds, and forced them in the dead of night to a prison. Sir

Thomas Moore, bishop Fisher, the aged countess of Salisbury, &c., are instances with which I could fill up some horrible pages.

As to oaths; the gentleman says that I have taken two which are incompatible with each other. This is not so. My ecclesiastical oath is of a purely spiritual nature. The only oath of allegiance, of a temporal character, which I have ever taken, was to the United States. These two oaths cannot be incompatible. The heavens and the earth are not more different from one another, than they are. They cannot possibly interfere with each other. Therefore the bishop's oath is, *by no means*, what the gentleman has represented it. The pope has abjured the odious sense which the document is made to bear. It is no sin surely, to swear that we will not kill the pope. Would my friend make it such? "*Saving my order*" is a clause which the gentleman should have expatiated upon, and our order is forbidden, under the most awful penalties, to shed any one's blood, but our own, if we are called upon to suffer martyrdom, and that of the mystic victim of the altar, as a propitiation for our own sins, and those of the entire world. *Persequar* was never intended to mean persecute. It alludes to moral, not brute force. The weapons of our warfare are spiritual, not carnal. The Latin word means only to follow up with persevering argument, and persuasion, as I am doing this day. Before I took that oath, I read it again and again, and took the decisions of the bishops of America upon it. We all agreed that there was nothing in it contrary to the allegiance due to the United States.

My friend spoke of Catholics violating their oaths. I would ask if there is a nation that has given such splendid testimony of respect for oaths, as Catholic Ireland? For 300 years of the bloodiest persecution that was ever inflicted, they have steadily refused to take an oath which every thing but conscience urged them to take.

My friends, all this ought to be remembered, not for the gratification of hostile feelings, but for justice, and as a fair offset, to balance the Spanish Inquisition, which is all the while not Catholic.—[Time expired.]

Half past 11 o'clock, A. M.

MR. CAMPBELL RISES—

We have, my friends, had matter of debate thrown before us during the last hour, that would require seven days more to discuss. An ocean instead of a harbor opens to our view. Good policy, however! Instead of concentrating on the main points, which, above all others, it behooved the bishop to clear up, if, indeed, he had any hopes of being able to defend himself, he gives us a little of every thing, great and

small; present, past, and future. Thirty minutes would not be enough for me to single out, arrange, and state the contrary propositions, to cover all his last premises. As the gentleman knows what he can best defend, and what he cannot, and as his time is at his own disposal, I have no right to complain. I proceed, therefore, not to recapitulate my argument, as I expected we both would have done in our last speeches: but to brush the dust off a few of the prominent points, crowded together in his last effort.

The bishop's denial of the genuineness of this Rhemish Testament, at this time, is exceedingly unfair; and still worse, from whatever motive it may proceed, it is wholly reckless of history and fact. I say it is *unfair*, because, when near the beginning of the debate, I showed him the Testament, and challenged him to object to it if he had anything against it, that it might be settled forthwith, he was silent. I went even farther—I asked him for another copy, or edition of it more correct, if he had one: he was still silent. And now, at the close, he has held up the Douay Bible, without these notes, published long since, not pretending to be the same work, either as to time, place, or circumstance, as proof that this edition of the New Testament is not authentic! But my audience, and the public, will appreciate all this. I do assert, then, and my assertion has as much logic in it as his, that the gentleman has misrepresented this affair—that this book is truly what its title page declares it; and that both the text and the notes are as truly Roman Catholic as the Douay Bible. Hear the title:

“The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; translated out of the Latin Vulgate, diligently compared with the original Greek, and first published by the English college of Rheims, Anno 1582; with the Original Preface, Arguments, and Tables, Marginal Notes and Annotations.”

Again: hear the recommendation of this work by “ministers of the gospel, and other learned persons of various denominations.” They say, “This edition contains *all the notes* of the original edition as published at Rheims, A. D. 1582.” Not a new and amended impression suppressing the more offensive comments, but the original itself. This recommendation is signed by more than a hundred gentlemen of as much literary and religious reputation as can be found in the U. States

Once more:

CERTIFICATE.—We have compared this New York edition of the Rhemish Testament and Annotations with the first publication of that volume, which was issued at Rheims in 1582; and after examination, we do hereby certify, that the present re-print is an exact and faithful copy of the original work, without abridgment or addition, except that the Latin of a few phrases which were trans-

lated by the annotators, and some unimportant expletive words were undesignedly omitted. The orthography also has been modernized.

JOHN BRECKINRIDGE.
WILLIAM C. BROWNLEE, D. D.
THOMAS DE WITT, D. D.
DUNCAN DUNBAR.
ARCHIBALD MACLAY.
WILLIAM PATTON.

To all these certificates there are not less than *one hundred and thirty names*. But the gentleman's calling this authority in question, is in good keeping with his whole course. There is no authority against the church of Rome—neither Protestant nor Catholic to be believed, if they say any thing against her. But infidels, and such Protestants as flatter her in her assumptions, are canonical as holy writ! If the bishop is to be believed, all Protestant historians, theologians, authors, &c., opposed to the Roman assumptions, are *liars*. In proof and demonstration of the super-excellency of Protestant principles, and of the debasing, degrading, and enslaving principles of the papacy, I intended to have drawn a full comparison between the Protestant and Catholic parts of Ireland; the Protestant and Catholic countries of Switzerland—between Spain, Italy, Portugal, and Protestant England—between the United States and the South American States—between Protestant and Roman Catholic America. But I cannot now attempt it; and much do I regret it: for such a comparison fairly drawn, would amount to the most satisfactory demonstration of the political, literary, and moral tendencies of the two systems. Plain, as proof from holy writ, it would thus have appeared, that this superstition, like the touch of the torpedo, lays a benumbing, paralyzing, and blighting hand on all within its grasp.

The gentleman is yet on indulgences and purgatory, when he ought, in reply to my last speech, to have endeavored, if possible, to relieve his cause from imputations the most serious and the most revolting to American ears. I have not thought it important to descant upon the tariff of sins, or to give a tabular view of the prices at which certain sins were rated in gold and silver in the market of indulgences. Nor have I at all inquired why, in this tax-book, for killing a layman a less sum is asked than for simply striking a priest, without breaking the skin. These questions, though capable of solution from authentic documents, are the dreams of purgatory I deem so inferior, and so unblushingly barefaced impositions, that I prefer matters of more grave concern to this community for the time allotted us. That indulgences are bona fide licenses to commit sin, and not simple absolution for past

sins, is as susceptible of proof as that Martin Luther began the Protestant reformation.

The gentleman will not defend the popes, he says, in their attempts to exercise supreme political power; but asks, "Did the kings of the nations ever acquiesce in it?" That kings for centuries received and held their crowns at the sovereign pleasure of the popes, is just as obvious a historic fact, as that there were popes at all. Sometimes, indeed, the kings fought against these assumptions, and sometimes they acquiesced. But the ready subordination of the state to the church: evinced in the magistrates executing the anathemas of the church, in putting to death those denoted as heretics by the church, shows in what a state of subserviency and pliancy political princes were held by the popes. That is just the very *terror* of church and state—the very supremacy which we fear, and which is so antipodal to our institutions.

It is putting heretics or reformers to death, and supporting a human priesthood by the state according to the dictation of the church, which makes that union, or subserviency, so wicked and odious in our estimation. And will the gentleman ask, what Roman Catholic state, nation, or prince, ever did such a thing?!

In his counter displays of Roman Catholic doctrine, my friend has not given you the trans-Alpine doctrine. The Cis-Alpine, or Gallican doctors, are not of the old Roman Catholic school. They are almost semi-protestant on those very points on which he has introduced them. They are no evidence against the standard doctrines of that church on these questions. The French Catholics began to stand aloof from the high and haughty pretensions of their trans-montane brethren. They are the most liberal portion of the Roman church, and have, consequently, done more for the promotion of science than all the rest of the Catholic world put together. Bishop England gives their views.

I asked for an authentic disclaimer of the attributes of the Roman church, and of those acts and deeds indicative of her tyrannical, oppressive and persecuting spirit which I have detailed. I ask this still; and while I do it in a tone indicative of that earnestness which the occasion requires, I do it in the same benevolence to my opponent and his party which I felt and expressed at the beginning of this discussion. The times and the occasion peremptorily demand it. We know what individual priests and bishops have said against popes and councils, and their proceedings, and against other parts of that system: but these are said for effect *ad captandum vulgus*, and will be unsaid by the same individuals, or by others, when occasion requires. I have brought very serious allegations against the Roman Catholic institution, and authorities for them—all of them authentic, and most of them

never disputed by my opponent. He disclaims these principles, acts, and movements: but he disproves not one of them. Nor would the disclaiming of them by all the bishops in America, disprove one of them. The council of Trent has ordained and enjoined all these principles of implicit and blind obedience, intolerance, proscription, and persecution. No council has since met, and no power but a general council can define a single article of faith, or rule of manners, according to the declarations of my antagonist. Indeed, the doctrine of the council of Trent must remain immutable and infallible while time endures, according to him: for no other general council can possibly contravene it; and, therefore, while the Roman church exists, she must be, what I have shown she was, before and since the council of Trent.

This council met in a boisterous time. They met to oppose and put down Protestantism. They knew the allegations of Protestants against their doctrine. If then, they could have abandoned those principles for the sake of either reclaiming or defeating the Lutherans, that was the time to do it. They sat long enough, and debated with zeal enough; and yet they dare not discuss the papal authority. The pope forbade them to debate his office, jurisdiction, or authority, and they did not attempt it. The pope signed their decrees, and all that was done there was done irrevocably and forever. The disavowal or the disclaiming of any priest or bishop in the Roman Catholic church, is not worth more, and has no more authority, than mine. It is, therefore, of no value for my learned opponent, or any American prelate to say that he does not approve this or that; or, agree to this or that. They must all submit to, and they will all inculcate on all suitable occasions, every decree of the council of Trent. Thus did the Jesuits in Abyssinia. They first explained away every thing: but finally explained it back again, and had almost saddled the pope and the council of Trent forever on those unfortunate Abyssinians.

I could, had I the time now, from that very history of Ireland from which the gentleman read you an extract, a copy of which I too have lying on the table,—I say, I can from this book show that the ancient christian church of Ireland was subjugated to the church of Rome, by this very species of rhetoric, and that finally the whole island was enslaved to the pope by the same means: for in England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland, there were Christian churches, ages before the popes of Rome were born. But by this chamelion attribute of becoming all things to all men, for a while, she has made all men become what she pleases.

Thus by degrees under this system, the human spirit is broken, degraded and debased, **night ensues, and finally, gross darkness covers**

the people. Even in Canada since the papacy has gained the ascendancy, laws have been passed in the provincial assemblies, giving to school commissioners and grand juries the privilege of "*making their mark, instead of writing their names!*" Nothing can preserve our republican institutions but a system of intellectual and moral culture, accessible to every child born upon our soil or brought to our shores. Unless we thus benevolently co-operate in this great cause of humanity, this last and best hope of the oppressed of all nations will vanish from the earth, and a new and ghostly despotism shall arise and extend its iron sceptre over this our beloved land. Nothing but intelligence and virtue universally diffused, can save us from this dread catastrophe. In Protestant Prussia, with a Roman Catholic minority, they understand so well the importance and utility of education, and its power to dissipate the darkness of superstition, always tyrannical, that every child is by law compelled to be educated, and that morally as well as intellectually.

There remains an important point or two yet to be noticed. The gentleman is exceedingly squeamish in his avowals of this oath, which forever binds the Roman priesthood to the court of Rome. He admits, however, that after due consultation or meditation had he took the oath, clauses of which constrain him to "increase and advance the authority of the pope," and to "persecute and oppose heretics and schismatics." He says *persequor* means not to persecute.

BISHOP PURCELL. It means to follow, and nothing more.

MR. CAMPBELL. It is a generic term, and means to follow with the sword or faggot, or the head or foot, only in the way of opposition, however. *Sequor* is to follow, but *persequor* is to follow with vengeance.

I have learned this morning that it can be proved under oath that all the bishops in America have taken this oath; and that without equivocation or mental reservation; of which fact, however, I was before apprised; but the gentleman himself has admitted it, and I pursue it no further. I am, however, disappointed to observe that he has been at no pains to reconcile his allegiance to two governments so singularly repugnant to each other in all their elements and tendencies.

My friend fled from persecution in Ireland! From paying *tithes*. I suppose, according to the Levitical law! Well, this tithe system is a falling concern, and will soon pass away. But is not this, his persecution, an ingenious off-set to fifty millions of martyrs sacrificed by the papal power?! Some are whispering that this Roman persecuting spirit is dying away as the tithe system. Let those, however, who think so, in addition to what I have already read from various sources,

accept a few words from the "Plea for the West"—from the 2d ed. of M. Aignan, of the French Academy in Paris, A. D. 1818:

"Passing to the 10th article of the *Concordat*, in which it is said that his Most Christian Majesty shall employ, in concert with the Holy Father, all the means in his power to cause to cease, as soon as possible, all the disorders and obstacles which obstruct the welfare of religion and the execution of the laws of the church—were [the Protestants] to ask (although the profuse shedding of their blood might have informed them), What are the laws of the church? The acts of Pius VII. himself, and the writings on which the church rests her authority, would answer, THE EXTERMINATION OF HERETICS, THE CONFISCATION OF THEIR GOODS, AND THEIR PRIVATION OF EVERY CIVIL PRIVILEGE."

To this the author subjoins a note: "Certain portions of real estate which had belonged to ecclesiastics, had passed into the hands of Protestant princes. Pius VII. in 1805, complained of it to his nuncio residing at Vienna; and reminded him that, according to the laws of the church, not only could not heretics possess ecclesiastical property, but that also they could not possess any property whatever, since the crime of heresy ought to be punished by the confiscation of goods. He added that the subjects of a prince, who is a heretic, should be released from every duty to him, freed from all obligation and all homage. 'In truth,' said he, 'we have fallen on times so calamitous, and so humiliating to the spouse of Jesus Christ, that it is not possible for her to practice, nor expedient to recall so holy maxims; and she is forced to interrupt the course of her just severities against the enemies of the faith. But if she cannot exercise her right to depose the partizans of heresy from their principalities, and declare that they have forfeited all their goods; can she ever permit that, to enrich themselves, they should despoil her of her own proper dominions? What a subject of derision—would she not present to these very heretics and unbelievers, who, while they insulted her grief, would say they had discovered the method of rendering her tolerant?"

"The same pontiff in his instructions to his agents in Poland, given in 1808, professes this doctrine, that the laws of the church do not recognize any civil privileges as belonging to persons not Catholic; that their marriages are not valid; that they can live only in concubinage; that their children, being bastards, are incapacitated to inherit; that the Catholics themselves are not validly married, except they are united according to the rules prescribed by the court of Rome; and that, when they are married according to these rules, their marriage is valid, had they in other respects infringed all the laws of their country."—Quarterly Register, vol. 3. p. 89.

Remember then, that according to the acts of Pius VII. the laws of the church *still command the extermination of heretics—the confiscation of their goods, and their deprivation of every privilege—that Protestants have no privileges*; and that the present calm is owing, not to a change of spirit, but of times: for says the pope: "*the times are so calamitous—that the church is forced to interrupt the course of her just severities against the enemies of the faith!*" These are truly calamitous times!! Alas for prosperous days!

I am indeed sorry that our debate has been so much out of logical order. An issue has never been fairly and fully formed on one of my propositions. My friend occupied the ground which he chose. He

was respondent. How he has responded, it remains for others to judge. He has been positive and declamatory enough, and very scrupulous about "mint, anise and cummin:" but how have the great topics been met? I rejoice, however, that it will go to the public, as it was spoken, and that the public will read and judge.

I have heard a hint that the gentleman is about to disprove the fact of the anathema or bishop's curse by introducing Sterne, turning into ridicule the curse pronounced centuries before he was born. The humor of Sterne found the reality of the curse, or he would not have laughed at it.

The gentleman has now to close the debate. The usages of discussion forbid the introduction of new matter in the last speech. He will probably again tell you of Catholic devotion to American liberty, and of his brother soldiers, that fought in the Revolutionary war. For, by such arguments he has generally met the decrees of councils, the bulls of popes, the records of history, and the precepts of the apostles. But before the devotion of a few Roman Catholic soldiers to the cause of the Revolution can be accepted as proof of Roman Catholic love of either civil or religious liberty, it must be ascertained, whether the hatred of *Protestant England*, rather than the love of rational liberty, instigated those soldiers that served during that war. For my part, I incline to the opinion that the hatred of England was at least as strong an impulse to their efforts as the love of liberty.—But—[Time expired.]

Twelve o'clock, M.

BISHOP PURCELL rises—

My friends, in order to meet one of the last allegations of the gentleman, namely, that the Catholic church has a law, making Protestant children illegitimate; I know of no law to that effect, which admits of the least practical difficulty; but I will tell you where it is still in force, and imposes civil disabilities and disqualifications of the most odious character. It is in a Protestant country. And, here, let me say, once for all, that I judge too highly of the character of Scotsmen and Englishmen, and know too well that they detest these laws as much as I do, to mean anything disrespectful to them, when I allude to the acts of the British government, or the malpractices of individuals. Scotland has done much for science. Eagle-like she has soared to its sunniest heights. May she battle, like the Bruce, by the side of O'Connell, for human rights. But, facts are facts. Now, a Unitarian minister, Mr. Dewey, whom I have already quoted, says:

"The dissenters are demanding to be relieved from their burdens. Petitions to parliament, either for an entire abolition of the union between church and

state, or for an essential modification of that union, have, it is well known, become matters of almost every day occurrence. There is a determination on this point, which must at length succeed; and I must say, indeed, from my own impressions about the *hardships* of the case, that if the dissenters—if those whose *consciences* and *property* and *personal respectability* are alike invaded by the church establishment, will not cause their voice, and the voice of justice to be heard, they deserve to be oppressed.....If the church endowments were a bequest for the benefit of any particular class of christians, it was for the Catholics. The largest portion of them were actually Catholic endowments. If it is proper that they should be diverted from that original design at all, it ought at least to be done in aid and furtherance of the whole religion of the country.....No man I think, can travel through this country without knowing that the dissenters are frequently treated in a manner amounting to absolute indignity! As to the *injustices* of the system, it is well known. The dissenter is excluded from the universities. In fact, he can neither be born, nor baptized, nor married, nor buried, but under the opprobrium of the law. That is to say, there can be no legal registration of his birth; his baptismal certificate does not entitle him to legal marriage; and he can receive neither marriage, nor burial from the hands of his own pastor.

"And now what is alleged in defence of this state of things? No principle or pretence of justice that I have ever heard, but only the principle of expediency. It is said that monopoly and exclusion here are necessary. It is said that religion cannot be supported in dignity and honor, without ample endowments and rich benefices." Vol. I. p. 143.

Such is the state of England in the enlightened nineteenth century, and a pretty state it certainly is! Thus, on incontrovertible testimony, that of the nation at large, are monopoly and exclusion necessary to the support of a system which Mr. Campbell has solemnly declared to be the only bulwark of the Protestant religion!!

My friends, for those tremendous curses which you have heard, and at which you have laughed so heartily! I must spoil or heighten the fun by telling you that they are not Catholic curses, nor yet Protestant curses exactly, but that they are the *jeu d'esprit* of a Protestant minister, Lawrence Sterne, all found in this book (exhibiting it,) which I have had brought me, this moment, from a book store, written by that worthy parson himself, and one of the most grossly obscene in the English language!! Verily, my opponent has given me, in this finale, a measure of revenge which I would not, myself, have asked for. And he had these curses, stowed away for years, on that bit of soiled paper, to be reproduced as the *coup de grace* to the Catholics, at the close of this debate. I saw these curses, when some waggish wight had them published, in Philadelphia; and the moment he mentioned them, I wrote on my notes, "Sterne," "Tristram Shandy," and sent for the book! Dr. Slop cuts his finger, untying a certain case of instruments: he whistles *Lillebulero*, to ease the pain; and Uncle Toby, or his nephew, with Cervantic gravity, swears by Juno's beard to the

genuineness of these curses, and hands them to Dr. Slop, to read by way of an anodyne! But, seriously, in the 28th chapter of Deuteronomy, are to be found curses, as awful as these here pronounced. Must we mock God that inspired, or the scripture that records them? Now the bible itself is turned into ridicule by the gentleman.

Christian charity and common sense, truth and justice, require imperatively, that no one should be condemned without a hearing, or charged with holding sentiments which he disavows. Here is the fullest, the clearest, the most unequivocal disavowal, of the doctrine of the pope's deposing power. The Catholics do not believe that he has any such power. We would be among the first to oppose him in its exercise; and we would be neither heretics nor bad Catholics; and we each of us bishops swear the very words of the oath: "*Persequar et impugnabo, salvo meo ordine.*" in the sense specified, which is the only true sense, the assumption of any such power by the pope, or the pope for the assumption of any such power. FOR TEN CENTURIES THIS POWER WAS NEVER CLAIMED BY ANY POPE. IT CAN, THEREFORE, BE NO PART OF CATHOLIC DOCTRINE. IT HAS NOT GAINED ONE FOOT OF LAND FOR THE POPE. IT IS NOT ANY WHERE BELIEVED, OR ACTED UPON, IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. NOR CAN IT BE, AT THIS LATE DAY, ESTABLISHED, IF ANY MAN COULD BE FOUND MAD ENOUGH TO MAKE THE ATTEMPT. Let these go before the American people, as the real principles of Catholics concerning the power of the pope. And if we must pronounce a judgment on the past, let it be remembered, that when the pope did use this power, it was *when appealed to as a common father*, and in favor of the oppressed! We should go back, in spirit to former times, when we undertake to judge them. We should understand the condition of society at the period; we should know the circumstances, general and particular, which controlled or influenced the great events recorded in history. We should not quarrel with our ancestors, because they did not possess knowledge which we possess; nor flatter ourselves that we are vastly their betters, because of these adventitious advantages; while they manifestly surpass us in others of greater value, to the Christian, the moralist, the artist. They had the substance of good things: we seem to be content with the shadow of them. The very efforts now made by fanatical preachers, and petitioners to congress, to proscribe Roman Catholics, clearly show that we are far behind them in the regard for truth, and the exercise of toleration. Let it never be forgotten, *what the sect was, of what religion the men were, who first petitioned congress, in this free country, to restrict*, or, to use a more appropriate word, *to abolish liberty of con-*

science, and to form a Christian party in politics. They were not Roman Catholics.

The Bull of Gregory XVI. censures bad books. He condemns not the liberty, but the licentiousness of the press. And is he not right! Can there be a greater corrupter of morals than bad books? Did not St. Paul burn bad books to the amount of 5,000 pieces of silver, as we read in Acts xix. 19? Is it not actionable in England and the United States to publish books against the existence of God? You see what one-sided views, some *would be* great men can take, of the doings of popes. The gentleman blew up the bible, and all the mysteries of christianity, and himself with them, when he tried to blast the rock of Peter; is it wonderful that he should implicate St. Paul, and English and American common and statute law, when he would blow up the good old pope, Gregory XVI.?

In a rescript addressed by his holiness Pius VII. to the vicars apostolic of Great Britain, dated the 8th of April, 1820, his holiness exhorts them to take care that:

“*The faithful abstain from reading the wicked books, in which in these calamitous times, our religion is assailed from all sides; and that they should be strengthened in faith and good works, by the reading of pious books, and particularly the holy scriptures, in editions approved by the church—you preceding them by word and example.*” “*Ut a perversorum librorum lectione, quibus, calamitosissimis hinc temporibus sancta nostra Religio undique impetitur, ab stineant; ut piorum librorum, præsertim scripturarum sacrarum lectione, in editionibus ab Ecclesia approbatis in fide et in bonis operibus, vobis verbo et exemplo præuntibus, confortentur.*”

“*In the reign of Louis XIV. of France, at the suggestion of Bossuet, bishop of Meaux, 50,000 copies of the new Testament in the vernacular tongue, were distributed in the provinces.*” See *vindication of religious Orders*, No. 40. 3d. vol.

The Index is a book of which I have never had a copy; and no Catholic, that I know of, in the United States, has ever seen it. The law of nature is as much of an “Index” as that volume, for it forbids us to read bad books which the index-finger of conscience points to us as evil, with the word—BEWARE! The gentleman greatly mistakes the Catholic doctrine, the morals of Catholics, the politics, the intellects of Catholics. I trust, as he becomes more enlightened, he will think better of them. I am sure this audience, and the public, will. All see by the crowds of Catholics thronging, to the very last moment, to this debate, how free and fearless of the investigation of their faith they are, and feel. They have had the full benefit of all the gentleman’s sophistry and extracts; and the effect is infinitely better for Catholicism than any sermon that I, or any Catholic bishop in the union, has ever preached to them. They see that, with all the gen-

tleman's learning and talents, he has utterly failed to establish a single one of his propositions. Hence they will be more attached to their faith than ever.

As to the deposing power, I may recall to your recollection the fact that five great universities of Europe were consulted by William Pitt, and they all, in the most solemn language, reprobated such a doctrine. Their decisions may appear in an appendix, if we publish one. I have not time to read them now. In Millner's End of controversy, and Charles Butler's memoirs of English, Irish and Scottish Catholics, we'll find these matters fairly stated and discussed.

There is more liberty in Rome than the gentleman gives it credit for. There is a Protestant church, even in Rome, where service is regularly performed according to the Episcopalian rite. The Jews are not any where more charitably treated, than in the eternal city. Last year, they presented a splendid copy of the Holy Bible, or some other sacred book, to the pope, as a token of their gratitude.

The gentleman calls the system of tithes a dying system. It has indeed been a dying system. It has slain its thousands, and made the condition of the living worse than that of the dead.

Judge Hall, of this place, has treated the question discussed, more learnedly and eloquently than my worthy opponent or myself. I will give his remarks the place to which they are so well entitled for candor and liberality:

"This question has become so important in the United States, that it is time to begin to inquire into its bearings, and to know whether the public are really interested in the excitement which has been gotten up with unusual industry, and has been kept alive with a pertinacity that has seldom been equaled. For several years past the religious protestant papers of our country, with but few exceptions, have teemed with virulent attacks against the Catholics, and especially with paragraphs charging them substantially with designs hostile to our free institutions, and with a systematic opposition to the spread of all free inquiry and liberal knowledge. These are grave charges, involving consequences of serious import, and such as should not be believed or disbelieved upon mere rumor, or permitted to rest upon any vague hypothesis; because they are of a nature which renders them susceptible of proof. The spirit of our institutions requires that these questions should be thus examined. We profess to guaranty to every inhabitant of our country, *certain rights, in the enjoyment of which he shall not be molested, except through the instrumentality of a process of law which is clearly indicated.* Life, liberty, property, reputation, are thus guarded—and equally sacred is the right secured to every man, to 'worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience.'

"But it is idle to talk of these inestimable rights, as having any efficacious existence, if the various checks and sanctions, thrown around them by our constitution and laws, may be evaded, and a lawless majority, with a high hand, ravish them by force from a few individuals who may be effectually outlawed by a perverted public opinion, produced by calumny and clamor. It is worse than idle,

It is wicked, to talk of liberty, while a majority, having no other right than that of the strongest, persist in blasting the character of unoffending individuals by calumny, and in oppressing them by direct violence upon their persons and property, not only without evidence of their delinquency, but against evidence; not only without law, but in violation of law—and merely because they belong to an unpopular denomination.

“The very fact that the Roman Catholics are, and can be with impunity, thus trampled upon. In a country like ours, affords in itself the most conclusive evidence of the groundlessness of the fears, which are entertained by some respecting them. Without the power to protect themselves, in the enjoyment of the ordinary rights of citizenship, and with a current of prejudice setting so strongly against them, that they find safety only in bending meekly to the storm, how idle, how puerile, how disingenuous is it, to rave as some have done, of the danger of Catholic influence!

“We repeat that this is a question which must rest upon testimony. The American people are too intelligent, too just, too magnanimous, to suffer the temporary delusion by which so many have been blinded, to settle down into a permanent national prejudice, and to oppress one christian denomination at the bidding of others without some proof, or some reasonable argument.

“We have not yet seen any evidence in the various publications that have reached us, of any unfairness on the part of the Catholics, in the propagation of their religious doctrines. If they are active, persevering, and ingenious in their attempts to gain converts, and if they are successful in securing the countenance and support of those who maintain the same form of belief in other countries, these we imagine, are the legitimate proofs of christian zeal and sincerity. In relation to protestant sects, they are certainly so estimated: and we are yet to learn, why the ordinary laws of evidence are to be set aside in reference to this denomination, and why the missionary spirit which is so praiseworthy in others, should be thought so wicked and so dangerous in them.

“Let us inquire into this matter calmly. Why is it that the Catholics are pursued with such pertinacity, with such vindictiveness, with such ruthless malevolence? Why cannot their peculiar opinions be opposed by argument, by persuasion, by remonstrance, as one christian sect should oppose each other? We speak kindly of the Jew, and even of the heathen; there are those that love a Negro or a Cherokee even better than their own flesh and blood; but a Catholic is an abomination, for whom there is no law, no charity, no bond of christian fraternity.

“These reflections rise naturally out of the recent proceedings in relation to the Roman Catholics. A nunnery has been demolished by an infuriated mob—a small community of refined and unprotected females, lawfully and usefully engaged in the tuition of children, whose parents have voluntarily committed them to their care, have been driven from their home—yet the perpetrators have escaped punishment, and the act, if not openly excused, is winked at, by protestant christians. The outrage was public, extensive, and undeniable; and a most respectable committee, who investigated all the facts, have shown that it was unprovoked—a mere wanton ebullition of savage malignity. Yet the sympathies of a large portion of the protestant community are untouched.

“Is another instance required, of the pervading character of this prejudice? How common has been the expedient, employed by missionaries from the west, in the eastern states, of raising money for education or for religion upon the allegation that it was necessary to prevent the ascendancy of the catholics. How often has it been asserted, throughout the last ten years, that this was the chosen

field on which the papists had erected their standard, and where the battle must be fought for civil and religious liberty. What tales or horror have been poured into the ears of the confiding children of the pilgrims—of young men emigrating to the west, marrying catholic ladies, and collapsing without a struggle into the arms of Romanism—of splendid edifices undermined by profound dungeons, prepared for the reception of heretic republicans—of boxes of firearms secretly transported into hidden receptacles, in the very bosom of our flourishing cities, of vast and widely ramified European conspiracies by which Irish catholics are suddenly converted into lovers of monarchy, and obedient instruments of kings!

“A prejudice so indomitable and so blind, could not fail, in an ingenious and enterprising land like ours, to be made the subject of pecuniary speculation: accordingly we find such works as the ‘Master Key of Popery,’ ‘Secrets of Female Convents,’ and ‘Six Months of a Convent,’ manufactured with a distinct view to making a profit out of this diseased state of the public mind. The abuse of the catholics therefore is not merely matter of party rancor, but, is a regular trade, and the compilation of anti-catholic books of the character alluded to, has become a part of the regular industry of the country, as much as the making of nutmegs, or the construction of clocks.

“Philosophy sanctions the belief, that power held by any set of men without restraint or competition, is liable to abuse: and history teaches the humiliating fact that power thus held has always been abused. To inquire who has been the greatest aggressor against the rights of human nature, when all who have been tempted have evinced a common propensity to trample upon the laws of justice and benevolence, would be an unprofitable procedure. The reformers punished heresy by death as well as the catholics; and the murders perpetrated by intolerance, in the reign of Elizabeth, were not less atrocious than those which occurred under ‘the bloody Mary.’ We might even come nearer home, and point to colonies on our own continent, planted by men professing to have fled from religious persecution, who not only excluded from all civil and political rights those who were separated from them by only slight shades of religious belief, but persecuted many even to death, for heresy and witchcraft. Yet these things are not taken into the calculation, and the catholics are assumed, without examination, to be exclusively and especially prone to the sins of oppression and cruelty.

“The French catholics, at a very early period, commenced a system of missions for the conversion of the Indians, and were remarkably successful in gaining converts, and conciliating the confidence and affections of the tribes. While the Pequods and other northern tribes were becoming exterminated, or sold into slavery, the more fortunate savage of the Mississippi was listening to the pious counsels of the catholic missionary.—This is another fact, which deserves to be remembered, and which should be weighed in the examination of the testimony. It shews that the catholic appetite for cruelty is not quite so keen as is usually imagined, and that they exercised, of choice, an expansive benevolence, at a period when protestants, similarly situated, were blood-thirsty and rapacious.

“Advancing a little further in point of time, we find a number of colonies advancing rapidly towards prosperity, on our Atlantic sea board. In point of civil government they were somewhat detached, each making its own municipal laws, and there being in each a predominance of the influence of one religious denomination. We might therefore expect to see the political bias of each sect carried out into practice, and it is curious to examine how far such was the fact. It is the more curious, because the writers and orators of one branch of this family of republics, are in the habit of attributing to their own fathers, the prin-

ciples of religious and political toleration, which became established throughout the whole, and are now the boast and pride of our nation. The impartial record of history affords on this subject a proof alike honorable to all, but which rebukes alike the sectional or sectarian vanity of each. New-England was settled by English puritans, New-York by Dutch protestants, Pennsylvania by Quakers, Maryland by Catholics, Virginia by the Episcopalian adherents of the Stuarts, and South Carolina by a mingled population of roundheads and cavaliers from England and of French huguenots—yet the same broad foundations of civil and political liberty were laid simultaneously in them all, and the same spirit of resistance animated each community, when the oppressions of the mother country became intolerable. Religious intolerance prevailed in early times only in the eastern colonies, but the witchcraft superstition, though most strongly developed there, pervaded some other portions of the new settlements. We shall not amplify our remarks on this topic; it is enough to say, that if the love of monarchy was a component principle of the catholic faith, it was not developed in our country when a fair opportunity was offered for its exercise; and that in the glorious struggle for liberty, for civil and religious emancipation—when our fathers arrayed themselves in defence of the sacred principles involving the whole broad ground of contest between liberty and despotism, the catholic and the protestant stood side by side on the battle field, and in the council, and pledged to their common country, with equal devotedness, their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. Nor should it be forgotten, that in a conflict thus peculiarly marked, a catholic king was our ally, when the most powerful of protestant governments was our enemy."

Now, my friends and fellow citizens, let me have permission to close this debate by the language of the illustrious Washington, in his answer to the patriotic address of the U. S. Catholics. I disclaim all unkind feelings towards Mr. Campbell or any of his friends, and acknowledge my gratitude to him for enabling me to place my religion, in its proper light, before the public. I also beg leave respectfully to tender to this audience my thanks for the dignity of their deportment during this debate. Instead of quarreling about religion we ought to be engaged in our vocation of love and peace, as its faithful ministers, and sincere professors. We have all, a great deal to do to improve the morals of the age, to elevate the standard of literature, to promote by such means as all christians approve, the welfare of our common country, and to obtain for our green state, the fertile and flourishing, Ohio, a distinguished rank for knowledge, virtue and patriotism, among her elder and her younger sisters in this fair republic. These are legitimate pursuits, alike pleasing to God, and useful to man. The world is large enough for us all. Some can, in the Abraham and Lot way of settling their difficulties, feed their flocks in one field, and some in another; and, as Joseph said to his brethren going home to their father, from Egypt, as we are going to one heavenly Father, "see that ye fall not out by the way." (Reads from Washington's letter as follows:)

TO THE ROMAN CATHOLICS IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

Gentlemen:—While I now receive with much satisfaction your congratulations on my being called by an unanimous vote, to the first station of my country, I cannot but duly notice your politeness, in offering an apology for the unavoidable delay. And as that delay has given you an opportunity of realizing, instead of anticipating, the benefits of the general government, you will do me the justice to believe, that your testimony of the increase of the public prosperity, enhances the pleasure, which I should otherwise have experienced from your affectionate address.

“I feel that my conduct, in war and in peace, has met with more general approbation than could have reasonably been expected; and I find myself disposed to consider that fortunate circumstance, in a great degree, resulting from the able support, and extraordinary candor, of my fellow-citizens of all denominations.

The prospect of national prosperity now before us, is truly animating, and ought to excite the exertions of all good men, to establish and secure the happiness of their country, in the permanent duration of its freedom and independence. America, under the smiles of divine providence, the protection of a good government, and the cultivation of manners, morals, and piety, cannot fail of attaining an uncommon degree of eminence in literature, commerce, agriculture, improvements at home, and respectability abroad.

As mankind become more liberal, they will be more apt to allow, that *all those who conduct themselves as worthy members of the community, are equally entitled to the protection of civil government.* I hope ever to see America among the foremost nations in examples of justice and liberality. And I presume that your fellow citizens *will not forget the patriotic part which you took in the accomplishment of their revolution, and the establishment of their government, or the important assistance which they received from a nation in which the Roman Catholic faith is professed.*

I thank you, gentlemen, for your kind concern for me. While my life and my health shall continue, in whatever situation I may be, it shall be my constant endeavor to justify the favorable sentiments which you are pleased to express of my conduct. And may the members of your society in America, animated alone by the pure spirit of Christianity, and still conducting themselves as the faithful subjects of our government, enjoy every temporal and spiritual felicity.

March, 1790.

GEORGE WASHINGTON.

[END OF THE DEBATE.]

The following are the extracts referred to on page 224:—

ENGLISH DIVINES.

“*Confession to a priest, the minister of pardon and reconciliation, the curate of souls, and the guide of consciences, is of so great use and benefit, to all that are heavy laden with their sins, that they who carelessly and carelessly neglect it, are neither lovers of the peace of consciences, nor careful for the advantage of their souls.*” (Bp. Jer. Taylor, of the doctrine and practice of repentance, chap. x. sec. 4.) “*For the publication of our sins to the minister of holy things, τούτων έχει τὸν λόγον ὃν έχει ἡ ἐπιδείξις τῶν σωματικῶν παθῶν, said Basil, (Regul. Brev. 229,) is just like the manifestation of the diseases of our body to the physician, for God hath appointed them, as spiritual physicians.*” (Taylor, ut supra.)

P. S. It has startled many an honest independent, who by chance has got hold of an original work of sturdy John Calvin, or Martin Luther, when in some well-prized "commentarie;" some latent passage of "The Institutions," he has encountered sly admissions, well guarded by cautious "ifs," and left to their own fate without defence or apology, yet savoring much of ancient heresy. And in the honesty of his ignorance he has exclaimed, as he returned the dusty volume to its shelf.—Great Calvin! much learning hath made thee mad. The bible, and the bible alone, is the religion of Protestants. Where have been Protestants as consistent as the Covenanters and the Puritans? Assigning to Rome the whole body of christian testimony, experience, and wisdom; outspreading, in one hand, the broad banner of private opinion; coolly hanging and burning their brother democrats with the other; extolling Protestantism as the religion of the enlightened; fairly proving it the religion of the ignorant.....And who are they that the bigoted "no bigot" points at, "Romanists," "Papishers," "near neighbors to the Babylon of abominations!" They are men who have devoted their lives to the study of the legitimate authorities of doctrine and rite.

This was exhibited and the names read at the close of debate on apostolic succession.

Tabular view of the order of the Episcopal succession in the prominent (Gentile) Dioceses mentioned by Eusebius.

BISHOPS OF ROME.

Peter and Paul, according to Eusebius, died as martyrs at Rome; after these followed,

1 Linus,	11 Soter,	21 Lucius,
2 Anencletus,	12 Eleutherus,	22 Stephanus,
3 Clement,	13 Victor,	23 Xystus or Sixtus II.
4 Euarestus,	14 Zephyrinus,	24 Dionysius,
5 Alexander,	15 Callistus,	25 Felix,
6 Xystus or Sixtus,	16 Urbanus,	26 Eutychianus,
7 Telesphorus,	17 Pontianus,	27 Calus,
8 Hyginus,	18 Anteros,	28 Marcellinus.
9 Pius,	19 Fabianus,	29 Miltiades.
10 Anicetus,	20 Cornelius,	

BISHOPS OF ANTIOCH.

1 Evodius,	8 Serapion,	15 Paul of Samosata,
2 Ignatius,	9 Asclepiades,	16 Domnus,
3 Heron,	10 Philetus,	17 Timæus,
4 Cornelius,	11 Zebinas,	18 Cyrillus,
5 Eros,	12 Babylas,	19 Tyrannus.
6 Theophilus,	13 Fabius,	
7 Maximinus,	14 Demetrianus,	

BISHOPS OF ALEXANDRIA.

The evangelist Mark, established the church there, and after him came,

1 Annianus,	7 Marcus,	13 Dionysius,
2 Avilius,	8 Celadion,	14 Maximus,
3 Cerdo,	9 Agrippinus,	15 Theonas,
4 Primus,	10 Julianus,	16 Peter,
5 Justus,	11 Demetrius,	17 Achillas
6 Eumenes,	12 Heraclas,	18 Alexander.

BISHOPS OF LAODICEA.

Thelymedres,	Eusebius of Alexandria,	Stephen,
Hellodorus,	Anatolius,	Theodotus.
Socrates,		

BISHOPS OF CESAREA.

Theophilus,	Domnus,	Agapius,
Theoctistus,	Theotecnus,	Eusebius.

Having revised some three hundred pages of *proof* of this debate, before I left Cincinnati for New Orleans, on the 2nd of March, 1837, I am willing to consider and approve the report, as being substantially correct. I have the utmost confidence in the honor and honesty of the publishers, Messrs. J. A. James & Co., that the balance of the discussion will be fairly presented to the public.

†JOHN B. PURCELL, Bishop of Cincinnati.

THE DISPUTED PASSAGE OF ST. LIGORI.—MR. CAMPBELL'S
DOCUMENTARY SUBSTANTIATION.

The reader, who looks back to pages 219, 253, will there see with what solemn and strong asseverations the Bishop declared that no such passage as that quoted from page 294 was ever written by Saint Ligori.*

MR. SMITH, in reply to my letter per Mr. Emmons, wrote as follows—

The obnoxious passage, then, which the Romish Bishop of Cincinnati calls heaven and earth to witness is not to be found in the works of Ligori, is the following:

"A Bishop, however poor he may be, cannot appropriate to himself pecuniary fines, without the licence of the Apostolical See. But he ought to apply them to pious uses. Much less can he apply those fines to any thing else but pious uses, which the *Council of Trent* has laid upon non-resident Clergymen, or upon those *Clergymen who keep Concubines*."—Ligor. Ep. Doc. Mor. p. 444.

This passage, I will now give in the Latin, as it stands on the 444th page of the 8th volume of the "MORAL THEOLOGY OF ALPHONSUS DE LIGORIO," from whose Work the extract was made. The words are as follows:

"Multas pecuniarías Episcopus sibi addicere non potest, quantumvis pauper sit, sine licentia Sedis Apostolicæ. [ut ex pluribus argumentis S. Congregat. evincitur in Tract. De Syn. Dioc. L. 10. C. 10. N. 2.] Sed debent in usus pios expendi. Multo magis non possunt nisi in pios usus applicari illæ mulctæ, quas Tridentinum infixit Clericis non residentibus, aut concubinariis."—Ligor. Epit. Doc. Mor. p. 444.

The words included in the brackets, were not translated, merely because I did not wish to encumber the "SYNOPSIS," (as I have observed in the "PREFACE OF THE SYNOPSIS,") with too many of the authorities quoted by Ligori. I shall now, however, translate the above words in the brackets, much, I know, to the discomfiture of his Reverence the Romish Bishop of Cincinnati. The words in the brackets, therefore, translated, are as follows: ["as is evident from many arguments of the Holy Congregation, in the Treatise respecting the Diocesan Synods, Book 10, Chapter 10, Number 2."]

Here we have, not only the authority of St. Ligori, but also that of the "*Holy Congregation of Rites*."

*See pages 269, 319, 320.

Since this subject is now to be probed to the bottom, we will also translate the contracted words which I transferred into the "*Synopsis*," as I found them in the original. The words to which I allude are the terminating ones of the disputed passage, as follows:—"Ligor. Ep. Doc. Mor. p. 444."—which, translated, stand thus:—"From the Work of Ligori, under the head of 'An Epitome of the Moral Doctrine,' page 444."

In order to render the testimony still more striking, it is important to observe that this "Epitome of the Moral Doctrine," to which Ligori alludes, is an Epitome compiled by no less a personage than Pope Benedict XIV., as we are informed by Ligori himself, in the 301st page of the 8th volume of his "*MORAL THEOLOGY*."

That the previous Latin words are truly and faithfully the words of St. Ligori and fairly extracted from 8th volume, p. 444, is duly certified by the following learned gentlemen.

We, the undersigned, have carefully examined the foregoing extracts from the Moral Theology of St. Ligori; and having compared them with the original Latin copy of that Work, now before us, we do hereby certify that the said extracts are *verbatim*, truly and correctly given by Mr. Smith.

In this certificate, we include, particularly, the passage disputed by Bishop Purcell, which is contained in Mr. Smith's "*SYNOPSIS*," p. 294, par. 7, headed "*CONCUBINES OF THE CLERGY*."

DUNCAN DUNBAR, *Pastor of the M'Dougal-st. Bapt. Church.*

JNO. KENNADAY, *Pastor of the Methodist Episcopal Church.*

SPENCER H. CONE, *Pastor of the Oliver-strect Baptist Church.*

SAM'L F. B. MORSE, *Prof. &c. in the University of the City of New York.*

WM. GREEN, JR., *Deacon in the 6th Free Cong. Church, N. Y.*

C. G. FINNEY, *Pastor of the Church in the Broadway Tabernacle.*

New-York, Feb'y 23, 1837.

On receiving the above communication from Mr. Smith, I asked from bishop Purcell the loan of the works of St. Ligori. He politely complied with my request. Turning to the page, 444, volume 8, I found every word in his own edition as above reported. I carried it and the Synopsis of Mr. Smith to our mutual friend, Mr. Kinmont, to whom it was now my time to appeal. Mr. Kinmont read both the original and the translation: and then certified as follows:

The above (version of Smith, p. 294) I regard to be a *faithful* translation of the passage as it stands in the 8th volume of Ligori, page 444.

Cincinnati, Feb'y 3, 1837.

ALEXANDER KINMONT.

Having read all the proofs of this discussion, I certify, that the reader has substantially, as correctly, as under all the circumstances could have been expected, a fair representation of the whole discussion.

MARCH 7, 1837.

A. CAMPBELL.

THE END.