

THE
BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

APRIL, 1833.

No. II.

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

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

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

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

ART. VII.—*Roman Catholicism.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The following is one of the prayers of this Rosary:

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

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

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

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

Another prayer from the same Rosary is this:

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

Another is the following:

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

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

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

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

In another part of this book we find this prayer:

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

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

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

Holy Mary, Holy Mother of God, Holy Virgin of Virgins, Mother of Christ, Mother of divine grace, Most pure Mother, Most chaste Mother, Undeified Mother, Untouched Mother, Amiable Mother, Admirable Mother, Mother of our Creator, Mother of our Redeemer, Most prudent Virgin, Venerable Virgin, Renowned Virgin, Powerful Virgin, Merciful Virgin, Faithful Virgin, Mirror of Justice, Seat of Wisdom, Cause of our Joy,	} Pray for us! }	Spiritual Vessel, Vessel of Honour, Vessel of singular devotion, Mystical Rose, Tower of David, Tower of Ivory, House of Gold, Ark of the Covenant, Gate of Heaven, Morning Star, Health of the weak, Refuge of sinners, Comforter of the afflicted, Help of Christians, Queen of Angels, Queen of Patriarchs, Queen of Prophets, Queen of Apostles, Queen of Martyrs, Queen of Confessors, Queen of Virgins, Queen of all Saints,	} Pray for us! }
--	------------------------------	---	------------------------------

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

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

The whole concludes with a short prayer to God.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* See note on opposite page.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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