

THE
BIBLICAL REPERTORY
AND
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

APRIL, 1831.

ART. I.—REVIEW OF DR. MATTHEWS' LETTERS.

The Divine Purpose displayed in the works of Providence and Grace; in a series of Twenty Letters, addressed to an Inquiring Mind. By Rev. John Matthews, D. D., [late of] Shepherdstown, Virginia. Lexington, Ky. Printed and published by Thomas T. Skillman, 1828. pp. 221.

WE are so much accustomed to receive our literature from Great Britain, that we are prone to overlook valuable compositions produced in our own country; especially, if they proceed from a section of the United States not famous for book making; or from the pen of an author but little known. Notwithstanding the national pride, in relation to American literature, so disgustingly displayed in some of our popular journals, it is a fact, that our booksellers are in the habit of reprinting British works, on particular subjects, much inferior to writings of home-production, which lie in utter neglect. Perhaps the Eastern States ought to be considered as an exception from this remark; where, from the first settlement of the country, authorship has not been uncommon; and where almost every preacher, at some time in his life, has the pleasure of seeing something of his own composition, in print. Still it may be observed, that

and merit nothing but eternal condemnation. This, however, which is the only safe course, I fear your sinful hearts will not consent to pursue. I fear, that, however you may now feel, you will dismiss your serious thoughts, and banish the subject from your minds, almost as soon as you leave this house. This I cannot prevent. My arm is too weak to draw you out of that fatal current, which is rapidly sweeping you away to destruction. I can only sit on the bank and weep as I contemplate the increasing strength of the current, and breathe out, in agony, cries to that God, who alone can rescue you from its power, and prevent it from hurrying you into that bottomless gulf in which it terminates. And come, you my Christian hearers; come all, who have been rescued from this fatal current; all, who can feel compassion for the perishing immortals, come, and assist in crying to him for help. That you may be excited to this, look at the scene before you. Look around, and see how many of your children, acquaintance and friends, are swept away towards perdition, while they sleep and know it not, and no voice, but that of God, can rouse them. Do you know whither they are hastening? Do you know what hell is? Do you consider how improbable it is, that they will escape its condemnation? Do you consider, that, unless grace prevents, they will, in a few years, be lifting up their eyes in torment and despair? Surely, if you know and consider these things, one universal cry of, 'God have mercy upon them,' will burst from every Christian heart." pp. 305, 306, 307.

ART. VI.—REVIEW OF THE PEOPLE'S RIGHT
DEFENDED.

The People's Right Defended: being an Examination of the Romish Principle of withholding the Scriptures from the Laity. Together with a Discussion of some other points in the Romish Controversy. By "Wickliffe." To which is appended a Discourse on Transubstantiation, by the Right Rev. John Tillotson, D. D. Lord Archbishop of Canterbury. Philadelphia: Printed by W. F. Geddes, 1831, 12mo. pp. 228.

WE are not among the number of those who consider all opposition to the progress of Popery, in the United States, as either imprudent or unnecessary. That it is a system of deplorable error, we have no doubt. That it is as insidious as it is otherwise corrupt, we are very sure. That it is singularly adapted to captivate depraved human nature, cannot be questioned. That some Protestants have already been led astray by its plausible delusions, we have the best reason for believing; and that many more will be in danger of similar seduction, we cannot but fear. If, then, we are commanded to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints;"

VOL. III. No. II.—2 I

if it be the duty of the friends of truth to put the people on their guard against prevalent and popular errors, and if this duty can in no way be so well fulfilled as by preparing new manuals of instruction, when needed—manuals adapted to the exigencies and taste of the times; then we ought to rejoice when such works make their appearance. They can scarcely fail of exerting a useful influence, proportioned to the extent of their circulation.

It seems to be one of the principles of the Divine government that truth shall, for the most part, be propagated by conflict and discussion. The advocates of error are permitted to rise up, to scatter their poison, and to seduce many unwary souls. This rouses the friends of truth, who, perhaps, had sunk down into supineness and negligence. But awakened and excited by the trumpets of the hostile embattled hosts, they gird on their armour, and take the field of controversy. In this way, the truths called in question are examined, explained, elucidated, impressed on the public mind, and more firmly established than ever. Who can doubt that, in this manner, the Pelagian controversy was over-ruled for the illustration, defence, and extension of the doctrines of grace? And who is not prepared to admit, that, in a thousand cases, since that time, by the “running to and fro” of zealous polemics, even of angry polemics, “knowledge has been increased,” and truth brought forth to light with new splendour? Who is not familiar with the fact, that, after a long stagnation of the elements, even a furious tempest becomes useful in restoring action and salubrity to the atmosphere?

There is a peculiar state of things among us, with regard to the Popish controversy. It has been long out of date in this country. Multitudes of very good people have been in the habit of feeling as if the whole subject, though deeply interesting in other lands, and in former times, had become, on this side of the Atlantic, in a great measure obsolete, and, therefore, not deserving any particular attention. They have felt as if the number of Romanists in our country was so small; their influence so inconsiderable; the popular sentiment so adverse to their superstitions and claims; a competent amount of light with regard to these claims so generally diffused, that the whole subject might be very safely dismissed from their attention. The consequence is, that a degree of apathy in reference to this matter prevails, which certainly bodes no good to the great interests of truth and righteous-

ness. Meanwhile, the advocates of Romanism, more, however, from importation than conversion, are growing in numbers in almost every part of the United States; and are manifesting a very marked increase of confidence and of zeal. When their preachers have an opportunity of speaking in the presence of Protestants, they seldom fail to gloss over all the principal errors imputed to them with a degree of art and plausibility which would seem to render all opposition unnecessary, and even uncandid. They make no scruple of positively denying the serious charges brought against them, founded on the acts of the council of *Trent*, and the works of their own *Bellarmino*; and endeavouring to persuade their credulous hearers that these charges have never had any other origin than ignorance or malice. Many believe their representations, and wonder why it is that Protestants are so much *prejudiced* against the Romanists. From this state of mind, the transition is easy to an adoption of their splendidly dazzling and plausible system, and a union with their body.

We verily think, then, that the religious public of our country, ought to be instructed and warned on this subject; and that he is really a benefactor to the church of God, who conveys this instruction and warning in a clear, forcible and judicious manner. This, in our opinion, has been done by "Wickliffe," in the publication before us. He wisely judged it best not to attempt an exposure of *all* the corrupt tenets and practices of Romanism; which could not have been done without swelling his work from a convenient manual to several *octavos*, or a ponderous *quarto*. He has made the withholding the Scriptures from the laity the prominent object of animadversion, as the title of the book indicates. But he has not confined his attention to this object. "Some other points in the Romish controversy" have been brought profitably under review. And the whole forms a volume well adapted to engage and reward the attention of those into whose hands it may come.

The substance of this volume was originally published, in numbers, in the "Southern Religious Telegraph," a respectable weekly paper, edited at Richmond, Virginia. Those numbers we read, in their original form, and thought them well adapted to be useful. We are glad that the public voice has called for their collection, enlargement, and republication. We hope the book will be read by many who stand in need of

the instruction which it gives, and that it will do much good many days hence.

The Introduction and Appendix are the principal things which have been added to the original work. The former is well adapted to answer its purpose. It is enriched with some luminous and powerful remarks, from the pen of the Rev. Dr. *Green*, extracted from his Review of the well-known publication of the Rev. *J. Blanco White*; and very ably showing the seasonableness, and great importance of enlightened and judicious publications on the subject of Romanism.

The body of the work contains nine chapters. In the first the *Supremacy of the Pope* is examined in an able and satisfactory manner. The following is a specimen of the author's reasoning and style, in treating this radical claim of the Romanists:—

The supremacy of the Pope is argued from his being the successor of Peter. Here two difficulties present themselves, the one is—that there is no good evidence that Peter ever was at Rome. It certainly does not appear from scripture; indeed, there is nothing in scripture which would lead to such a supposition. Paul wrote one Epistle to Rome, and five from Rome, yet he makes no mention of Peter being there, and in his Epistle to the Col. iv. 11, after naming several, adds “these only are my fellow workers, unto the kingdom of God, which have been a comfort unto me.” Peter was not at Rome when Paul said “at my first answer no man stood with me, but all men forsook me.” He was not there just before Paul's death, who writes to Timothy that all the brethren did salute him, and naming many of them he omits Peter. There is no evidence from scripture that he ever was at Rome; and it is far from being probable, that he would have visited heathen Rome and have said nothing about it, and have given no account of his labours there; and as the evidence of scripture is negatively against his being there, the burden of proof is upon the shoulders of those who assert the fact. But admitting he was there, still there is no good evidence of his ever having been Bishop of Rome. Here then you will perceive, are two points to be *proved*. It is not enough that it be shown that he was there, but it must be incontestably *proved* that he was *Bishop of Rome*.

The only shadow of proof is that from Eusebius, who states that he presided at Rome twenty-five years. But Eusebius professedly gives the whole of his statement on the authority of Irenæus, who flourished in the second century. It is ultimately from Irenæus that we learn any thing of the early history of the Roman See, and he gives no such statement that Peter ever was Bishop of Rome, or that he handed down his divine prerogative (whatever that might be) to his successors in that diocese. On the contrary, he tells us that the two apostles, Peter and Paul, jointly founded the church at Rome; and, when thus founded, they *jointly* delivered the Episcopate of it to Linus. “Fundentes igitur et instruentes beati Apostoli (Petrus et Paulus) Ecclesiam (Romanam), Lino episcopatum administrandæ ecclesiæ tradiderunt. Succedit autem ei Anacletus, etc.” Peter and Paul are certainly represented here as both and equally engaged in the performance of certain acts, viz: found-

ing a church and delivering the episcopate of it to another, and if so, they did it *jointly*. The word *jointly*, therefore, as used in the free translation given above, does not refer to the manner in which the authority passed from them to Linus; but to the manner in which the Apostles acted in delivering that authority; namely, they did not deliver it *singly*, but *jointly*, for surely the conjunction which connects Paul with Peter in the performance of this work, is a copulative, and expresses a joint action. Faber says that, with respect to either of the two co-founders ever having been Bishop of Rome, Irenæus is totally silent: And he understands Irenæus as saying that these Apostles acted in this matter in virtue of their *joint* authority. pp. 19, 20, 21.

The second chapter discusses the Papal claim, that salvation is confined to those who are in communion with the Bishop of Rome. This chapter is the shortest and least satisfactory in the volume. It contains enough, however, to convince every impartial reader, that the claim which it exposes is really made, notwithstanding every insidious protestation to the contrary; and that it is equally presumptuous and unscriptural. Indeed, the respectable author might have said, and proved, that those denominations of professed Christians who are most exclusive and confident in confining salvation to such as are within their own pale, are precisely those, all the world over, in whose communion, in the estimation of all serious Christians, it is peculiarly hazardous to men's eternal interests to be found.

The *third* and *fourth* chapters are employed in exhibiting the **FACT**, that the Church of Rome prohibits the reading the Scriptures by the Laity. This charge against the Romanists is well stated, and ably supported; and the various subterfuges to which individual writers or preachers, among them, have resorted to gloss it over, and try to make it appear a false allegation, faithfully exposed. The following extract is to the point, and decisive.

That what we have stated to be a principle of the Romish Church, we shall now endeavour to make appear from their own words. The decrees of the Councils, especially of that of Trent, every priest on his admission to holy orders, binds himself to believe and defend. Now, what says the infallible church on the subject before us? The fourth rule of the index libr. prohibit. made in pursuance of the order of the Council of Trent, and published by Pius IV., runs thus: "Since it is manifest by experience, that if the Holy Bible be promiscuously permitted in the vulgar tongue, by reason of the rashness of men, more loss than profit will thence arise. In this matter let the judgment of the Bishop or Inquisition be stood to, that with the advice of the parish priest or confessor, they may grant the reading of the Bible in the vulgar tongue, translated by Catholic authors, to such as they shall understand, can receive no hurt by such reading, but increase of faith and piety; which faculty let them have in writing. But he that without such faculty shall presume

to read, or to have the Bible, he may not receive absolution of his sins, except he first deliver up his Bible to the ordinary." Here we have the church's own words; we care not what a Romish priest may say on this subject. We have the words of the church, and we can judge of their meaning as well as he can, though he denies it, yet these very words of the church contradict him.

Monsieur de Maire, Counsellor, Almoner, and Preacher, to the King of France, in a book published by authority, says: "this rule is founded in ecclesiastical right, and no man can transgress it, without contradicting that obedience which he owes to the church and the Holy See, from which it hath received its confirmation. For as much as this rule was not made but in prosecution of the decree of the Council of Trent, &c. no man can deny but that it has been approved by the Holy See, and authorized by the bulls of Pius IV. and Clement VIII, who, after they had viewed and diligently examined it, published it to the world, with order that it should be obeyed." "If there be any thing," continues de Maire, "that can hinder this rule from having the force of a law, it must be either, because it has not been published, or, being published, has not been received, but neither the one nor the other can be said, since it is evident that this is the old quarrel we have with our heretics; this is that which our church has always been upbraided with by the enemies of the faith; this is that which is the subject of their most outrageous calumnies; this is that which has been acknowledged by all wise men; that which has been earnestly maintained by all the defenders of Catholic truth; that which no person is ignorant of; that which the whole world publishes; there being no point of belief more common, nor more general among the faithful, than this of the *prohibition to read the Bible without permission*: and this belief (says he), so common, is a certain proof, not only of the publication, but of the reception of this rule." This prohibition, then, to read the Bible without permission, is in force now. It is an infallible decree, and must for ever be in force: who has repealed it? what council of equal authority has set it aside? The Spanish Expurgatory Index goes still farther. It prohibits the Bible in the vulgar tongue, not only printed, but in MS. without any provision for permission. pp. 41, 2, 3.

THE PROPRIETY OF WITHHOLDING THE SCRIPTURES, is the subject of the *fifth* and *sixth* chapters. Here, again, "Wickliffe" has done himself honour by the clear and forcible manner in which he has conducted his argument. The following brief specimens will serve to show the general character of this part of the work.

In the New Testament, Christians are exhorted to let the words of Christ dwell in them richly, and in all wisdom. We are commanded to search the Scriptures. Timothy, from a child, had known the Holy Scriptures. It is required that the commandment be made known to all nations for the obedience of faith. And in looking over our Saviour's discourses as recorded by the Evangelists, we find a constant reference to scripture in this form, "ye have read" so and so, "have ye not read?" and the like. After reading these passages, can any one believe that the scriptures were not read by the people? Josephus, the learned Jewish historian, speaking of the ignorance of some people of their laws, says, "but for our people, if any body do but ask any one of them about

our laws, he will more readily tell them all, than he will tell his own name, and this in consequence of our having learned them immediately as soon as ever we became sensible of any thing, and of our having them, as it were, engraven on our souls." In Acts xvii. 11, we are told that the Bereans were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and *searched the scriptures daily, whether* those things were so. Here we see that the Bereans not only received the word from the Apostles as they preached it, but they searched the scriptures for themselves, and for what? to yield an implicit and blind belief in what was taught them? No, but to see whether or not, it was according to scripture. The great force and excellency of the apostle's preaching was, that it condemned the Jews out of their own scriptures. He referred them constantly to the law and to the testimony, and thus showed from their own scriptures that Jesus was the Christ. The comment of the Rhemish translators on this passage is strangely absurd, as we have before seen; they say that this text is used by heretics (Protestants), to prove that the hearers must try and judge by the scriptures, whether their teachers and preachers doctrine be true, which they think were the most foolish doctrine in the world. They contend that the people did not read the scriptures to dispute with the apostle, and to try and judge of his doctrine. Now, if this be not a flat contradiction of the text, it is not good English. The apostle says they searched whether what he taught was true or not: the Romanists say *they did no such thing: whom shall we believe?*

There is a text which papists frequently adduce to show that the scriptures should not be read by all, which proves directly the contrary. This may seem strange, but it is true. The text is 2 Peter, 3. 16. "In which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are *unlearned and unstable* wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction." Here the papist triumphantly asserts, that the apostle discountenances the reading of the scriptures by the unlearned and unstable; but does not this text manifestly prove that in those days they did read them? How else could they possibly have wrested them to their destruction? Could they do it without ever having read them? And, besides, does the apostle, on this account, or because there were many things hard to be understood, say one word discountenancing the reading of the scriptures? No, neither of these reasons induced him to hint such an idea: and yet these reasons operate very powerfully with papists in not only *hinting*, but also *decreeing*, the prohibition of the practice. In the verse preceding, the apostle says that "his beloved brother Paul, according to the wisdom given unto him, hath written unto you:" then he states that many things he said were hard to be understood, and that the unlearned, &c. wrested them to their destruction; and in the succeeding verse, still addressing those to whom he said Paul had written, he says, "*ye, therefore, beloved, seeing ye know these things before, beware lest ye, also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness.*" Now here is an important thing to be noticed. It is plain that those to whom Paul had written, are here warned by the example of those who had wrested the scriptures to their own destruction, and are cautioned against doing the same thing. Now, to whom was Paul's epistle, here spoken of, addressed? to the *clergy*? Then *they* are placed upon a level with the people, and cautioned, as equally liable to be so led away by the wicked as to wrest the scriptures to their own destruction, (which I verily believe they often do.) They should be withheld, therefore, from the *clergy*, for the same

reason they are now withheld from the *people!* But will papists admit that their *clergy* are thus warned by the example of the unlearned and unstable? If not, it must be the *people* that are thus cautioned and exhorted to take warning by the example just stated. If so, two inferences follow, both equally destructive to the papal cause: the first is, that, as those cautioned are the same as those to whom Paul addressed his epistle here spoken of, they must also have been the *people*; and, if so, what right have the clergy to withhold from them what Paul expressly addressed to them? The next inference is, that the *people*, thus cautioned, *must have had the scriptures*, and must have been in the *habit of reading them*, else what meaning is there in the caution to *beware*, and to take warning by the example of the unlearned? If the scriptures had been withheld from them as they are now from the people, they would have needed no such caution, neither would the unlearned and unstable have had an opportunity of wresting them to their destruction. So much for that famous passage, so confidently relied on by papists in support of their prohibition. pp. 64, 5, 6, 7.

A little further on, the following apposite and pointed passages occur.

The Bishops assembled at Bononia advised Julius III. not to permit a mortal to read more of the gospel than is contained in the mass, and that he labour with all his might that as little as possible be read in the cities under his dominion: And they assigned this reason, "that, as long as the people were satisfied with that little, affairs succeeded according to his (the Pope's) wish, but the contrary, when men began to read more. "In brief," continue the Bishops, "this is the book which hath raised the tempests and storms with which we are tossed, and the truth is, if any man shall diligently consider that book, and shall take a view of those things which are done in our churches, he will see that there is a vast disagreement between them, and that our doctrine is not only altogether different from that, but which is more, is often contrary to it." Of this same opinion was Peter Sutor, the Carthusian doctor; "since many things" says he, "are delivered to be observed, which are not expressly [*taught*] in the Holy Scriptures, will not the *unlearned*, observing these things, be ready to murmur, complaining that so great burdens are laid upon them, by which their gospel liberty is sorely abridged! And will they *not be easily withdrawn* from observing the constitutions of the (Romish) church, when they shall see that they *are not contained in the law of Christ?*" This same Peter Sutor says, "the translating of the scriptures into the vulgar tongue is a rash, useless, and dangerous thing," and gives this reason for it, that "the people will be apt to murmur when they see things required as from the apostles, *which they can not find a word of in scripture.*"

Andradius, who was the interpreter of the Council of Trent, speaking of the prohibition by the Synod of Tholouse, says, the taking of it away would be destructive to faith. We are now able to understand Bellarmine when he says, "the people would not only receive no benefit, but would also receive *hurt* by the scriptures." We confess that we are unable to answer the objection now under consideration. It is, we admit, strictly true, that the general reading of the scriptures would induce many, very many, to leave the communion of the Romish church, and would prevent any from ever joining it. But for all that, we cannot think that the scriptures should be withheld from the common people;

for the fault belongs not to the scriptures, but to the Romish church. Two cannot walk together except they be agreed. Now, the Pope and the Bible have long been at variance, and I think they will never be reconciled; and this is confessed by the Bishops of Bononia, abovementioned, in their advice to Julius III. They say, "But to confess the truth, (which must be kept as a secret) in the time of the apostles, and for some years after the apostles, there *was no mention of the papacy*, or the cardinalship, much *less were these their doctrines, their laws, their customs*, no, *nor the empire over the nations* that we now obtain. But all ministers of all churches (of the Roman no less than of others) did voluntarily obey kings and princes and magistrates." And a little further on, they say, "certainly we scarce retain in our churches so much as a *shadow of the doctrine and discipline* which flourished in the times of the apostles, but have brought in *another quite different from it.*" These confessions of the Bononia Bishops were intended only for the Pope's ear, but were afterwards divulged to the world by a distinguished Bishop of that church, who was sent a short time before by the Pope as his legate to reduce the heretics in Germany.

We shall conclude this chapter with the following extract from a sermon, by the Rev. Mr. Fowler, of England, on 1 Thess. v. 27, which represents the opposition of the Church of Rome to Christ in a very striking light. "The Lord Jesus Christ commands the people to search the scriptures, the Pope commands not. Christ commands them to search Moses and the prophets, the Old Testament; the Pope forbids them to search either Old or New. Christ says, "in them ye think ye have eternal life;" the Pope says there is more danger of eternal death. Christ gives this reason, they testify of me; the Pope saith no, they are very dark and obscure, very short and defective, therefore no competent witness. Christ saith, let my word dwell in you richly; the Pope saith no, not dwell, not even in your houses. Christ saith teaching and admonishing one another; the Pope saith brabbling and perverting one another. Christ saith whatever you do in word or deed, do it according to my word; the Pope saith, do my word: observe our decrees, or else I will burn you. Christ commands, in my text, that this epistle *be read*; the Pope commands the contrary. Christ saith, *to all the brethren*; the Pope saith no, not to any lord, duke, or prince. (Franciscus Encœnas, a learned Spaniard, was near being put to death for presenting the New Testament to the Emperor, Charles V.) Christ saith, *I charge you to read*; the Pope saith, *I charge you not to read*. Christ saith, *I charge you under my curse*; the Pope saith, *I charge you not to do it* under the curse of the church. Christ saith *I charge you under the pain of hell fire*; the Pope saith, *I charge you do not*, under the pain of hell and the stake too." pp. 95, 6, 7, 8.

The *seventh* and *eighth* chapters are on the INFALLIBILITY of the Church of Rome. This part of the discussion is, we think, one of the best portions of the volume. The following passages are spirited and conclusive.

There is another difficulty connected with the claim to infallibility, which has never yet been fairly and openly met, and one which we call upon papists to clear up. A church that is infallible *must be unchangeable*. Now the difficulty lies here; as the doctrine and spirit of the church of Rome is unchangeable, they must admit that the doctrine and spirit of the church in the dark ages (the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centu-

ries), is the doctrine and spirit of the church *now*, and was the doctrine and spirit of the *apostolic church*. They must admit that what the church now is in Spain and South America, and what it ever has been in Italy, is not only the same as in the days of the apostles, but also the same as she now is in this country. Are the advocates of infallibility prepared to admit this? But we will not stop here. An infallible church is bound, and if consistent, is willing to sanction and make herself now responsible for all her regularly authorised acts and decrees, from the earliest periods of her existence to the present time.—They are bound to say that when the council of Constance condemned to the stake John Huss and Jerome of Prague, they did what the apostles would have done in similar circumstances: and what a Romish council would now do in similar circumstances: They must make the act their own, or else they must condemn it, and say they did wrong. Let them publicly and formally condemn that act of the council of Constance, and all the decrees of condemnation to the stake, of all the councils; or their silence must be construed into a sanction of such conduct, and of the principles which prompted it. Here, then, they are in this dilemma: either they must sanction and confirm these decrees, or else give up her claim to infallibility. Bellarmine, who is of the highest authority in the church of Rome, says that “heretics ought to be exterminated root and branch from the earth; but where the number of papists is so small that they cannot safely attempt it, there they are to be quiet,” and on this principle the church has acted. Look at their treatment of the poor, unoffending, and pious Waldenses; look at the massacre in Paris in the time of Gregory 13th. Look at the horrible and bloody persecution which followed the revocation of the Edict of Nantz. Look at the Inquisition and all its tortures. Read the narrations of Romish cruelty in Limborch’s history; narrations that chill the blood and sicken the heart of him who can feel a pang of sympathy for the sorrows and woes of others. Look at all these, and ask the church to sanction them; call upon papists to confirm or condemn them; bring them to the point; let the church acknowledge she did wrong; let her condemn these transactions, and we will no longer make use of them as arguments against her infallibility, for then none will be needed. Is the church prepared *now* to sanction and mother all the abominations, and corruptions, and superstitions, and massacres; which she once sanctioned? If so, let her do it; if not, where is her infallibility? pp. 102, 3.

If we were Papists, we should certainly feel no small difficulty in meeting the following appeal.

We remarked, in the former part of this discussion, that it was demonstrably impossible for the Romish Church to make out her claim to infallibility from the scriptures. When the church is asked, how is it known that you are infallible? her reply is, the scriptures say so: but how am I to know that your interpretation of scripture is correct, seeing there are so many learned and good men of quite a different opinion? The answer is, that the interpretation of the church is infallible. Here then, we see the scriptures prove the church, and the church proves the meaning of the scriptures; which is reasoning in a circle. So, also, when they are asked, how do you know infallibly that the scriptures are from God? They reply, that the infallible church says so; which is the circle again. This circle argument is an old one, but it is none the worse for that: for if it has stood so long unanswered, it has a far better claim to infallibility than the Romish Church. The only way in which most

of the Romish writers attempt to answer this argument, is to throw it upon private reason, and then stand upon the broad ground of Deism. A learned Archbishop of our country, (Carroll's Address to Rom. Cath. in America), however, attempts to answer it in another way; but, in getting out of one circle he falls into another. His argument is, that the Catholic church has ever, from the days of the apostles, down to the present time, decided on matters of controversy, and exercised the right of excommunicating; and the exercise of such prerogative, unless the church was infallible, would be vain and nugatory: therefore, *the church is infallible!!* Now, in the first place, the learned Archbishop very illogically argues from matter of fact to matter of right; that because the church did so and so, therefore she had the right to do it. But, in the next place, even this does not mend the matter, for he proves she is infallible because she always exercised the right of deciding controversies, and excommunicating; and then turns about and proves that she possessed that right because she is infallible; "for," says he, "the exercise of such prerogative, without she was infallible, would be vain and nugatory." He then triumphantly, though, I think, very *unseasonably*, asks, "where now is the circle of false reasoning?" Had I been at his elbow, I might have replied, "there it is, just warm from your own pen." He then boastingly adds, "Is not infallibility first demonstrated from other considerations, before it is demonstrated from scripture?" Here then we see, that in supporting this claim, the ground of scripture is entirely abandoned. The claim must be first established from *other considerations* before scripture is resorted to: Scripture is but secondary evidence, and may be cited merely to confirm other testimony! Now, then, we see how it is they get out of the circle: they break through and plunge into another. We charge them with proving infallibility from scripture, and scripture from infallibility. But they say, no: we do not prove infallibility from scripture, but "from other considerations," after which we infallibly pronounce on scripture; then, and not till then, is it infallible proof of our infallibility. Such reasoning as this, shows that they have been whirled round in this circle, till their heads have become dizzy. pp. 121. 2, 3.

The *ninth* chapter is on the doctrine of TRANSUBSTANTIATION, in which the usual arguments against that doctrine are well stated, and in which its absurd, contradictory, and unscriptural character, is sufficiently established.

The author has annexed to this volume "A Discourse against Transubstantiation," by Archbishop TILLOTSON. This is generally considered as one of the best pieces that ever proceeded from the pen of that justly celebrated man. "Wickliffe" has rendered a good service to the cause of truth by thus contributing to its popular circulation.

On the whole, we can cordially recommend this volume to the attention of our readers. They will be well rewarded for its purchase and perusal. The author has drawn his materials from some of the best sources; but he is more than a mere compiler. He has thought and spoken for himself; and has proved himself a well informed and able advocate of the truth.

The style of the work is, in a few cases, faulty, and typographical imperfections occur more frequently than we could wish: but, amidst so much general excellence, we feel no disposition to descend to verbal criticism. We have no doubt that our vigorous youthful champion will improve every successive edition of his work; and we hope, for the sake of that holy cause which he espouses, that the public favour will call for a number of them.

Having paid our cordial respects to this volume, and given a brief view of its contents and its merits, we feel inclined to take this opportunity of expressing a thought or two on what appear to us the best means of resisting Papal claims and influence.

We have no doubt that, among these means, the circulation of *good books*, is demanded and important. The Romanists circulate *their* books. They must be met in a corresponding manner. And an instructive Manual, such as that before us, or a pointed, judicious Tract, may find its way to persons and places from which the living teacher would be excluded. No plan, therefore, we think, ought to be adopted which should supersede the use, and the constant use, of such books as tend to bring instruction and conviction on the points in controversy between the Protestants and Papists.

We are free to confess, however, that our principal reliance, under the Divine blessing, is on other means, which, unless we are deceived, the holy Providence of God is directing and guiding to the most salutary results. When, therefore, we have heard alarming apprehensions expressed of the growing strength and influence of the Papacy in the United States, and still more alarming predictions of what they will probably realize in future; we have not been able to make the views of these gloomy prophets our own. When we see the Bible sent to every part of our beloved country; finding its way to every hamlet and hovel; and the Sabbath-school and Tract systems, scattering their benign influences from Maine to Louisiana, and from the Atlantic to Missouri;—we cannot believe that, amidst such light, the darkness and thralldom of Romanism are about to settle extensively over this land. Our main hope, then, under God, is in a continuance and extension of these noble efforts. The Bible and Romanism cannot live together. As well might light and darkness, Christ and Belial try to maintain fellowship. Put a Bible in every family; establish an efficient Sabbath-school in every neighbourhood in the United

States in which there are children enough to form it; in every one of them let Biblical instruction, in all its simplicity and richness, be constantly imparted; and teach all the rising generation, from their mother's lap, that the BIBLE, the BIBLE, is the only infallible rule of faith and practice; the common legacy of all Christians; the common charter of our hopes; and the best pledge and safeguard of our rights, civil and religious. Let our whole population be brought, as far as possible, under the power of such instruction, and Romanists will be able to prevail but little with their blinding and perverting arts. The man, then, who contributes to the circulation of the Bible, to the enlightened and faithful instruction of the rising generation, and to the diffusion, in every form, of simple, pure, scriptural truth, contributes just so much to resist the progress of Romanism.

It were greatly to be wished, in the mean time, that Protestants, of all denominations, were more aware than we fear they are, of the insidious plans of Romanists, and more careful to guard against their success. Among other artifices, of which they will understand and calculate the influence, they are fond of establishing *seminaries* in every part of the country, and of inviting all denominations, either gratuitously, or on very easy terms, to come in and partake of their advantages. And this is generally done under a solemn pledge, that no efforts whatever, will be made to detach any who may become their pupils, from the religious principles and connexions of their parents. It is not many weeks since we saw a public notification, from a body of Papists in the city of Philadelphia, announcing to the community, that they were about to erect a large and commodious place of worship, in a growing part of the city; and that, with this new erection, there would be connected two *seminaries*, one, probably, for male, and the other for female children, INTO WHICH ALL DENOMINATIONS OF CHRISTIANS WOULD BE FREELY ADMITTED. And, although we do not remember to have seen in the annunciation of this plan, any *pledge* of the kind just alluded to, yet we suppose that such a pledge is either to be considered as understood, or will hereafter be given. On the faith of such plausible statements, it is not improbable that Protestants may be called upon to subscribe towards the erection of their new place of worship, and may actually do so, under the impression that they are promoting a project truly catholic, liberal and benevolent in its whole design; and may afterwards think it right to send their children to these sem-

inaries. Now it is against such delusive impressions, that we wish Protestants to be upon their guard. It is certain that pledges of total non-interference with the religious principles and connexions of children committed for education to the care of Papists, however absolute and solemn, are seldom, nay almost never redeemed. Of the truth of this assertion, it has fallen to our lot not only to *hear*, but to *know* of the most flagrant and distressing examples. Indeed it is due to candour, and to the veracity of those who make them, to say, that it is almost impossible they should be really and *bona fide* redeemed. The spirit of the Papacy is a spirit of *proselytism* to the very core. The whole tendency of its rites is to dazzle and to allure. It cannot be expected, or even requested, of the conductors of such seminaries as we have alluded to, that they should hide from the eyes of their pupils the rites and ceremonies of their own worship. Yet it is almost impossible that they should be witnessed, from day to day, for a long time together, without mischief. The instructors, indeed, may so far keep their promise, as never to say a word to their pupils which, if heard even by their parents themselves, could be construed into a direct violation of their engagement. But they can, systematically, pursue a course of treatment peculiarly affectionate and attractive toward those whom they wish to win. They can flatter, cajole, and draw them, in ten thousand nameless and covert ways. They can manage so as to present some of their most peculiar rites and practices under very alluring aspects. They can contrive to give hints, innuendoes, and various practical suggestions, in favour of what they wish to impress, not only without words, but perhaps more powerfully without than with them. Of these artifices, pious, simple-hearted Protestants are not sufficiently aware; but Jesuits, and those who have imbibed Jesuitical maxims and principles, which, without injustice may be said essentially to belong to the general system of Romanism,—understand them perfectly.

We have no desire to hold up to unmerited odium any portion of our fellow-citizens. Romanists have the same perfect right with others to hold and propagate, by all fair means, their theological opinions. And all others have an equal right to understand, appreciate, expose to public view, and resist, by fair means, the progress of those opinions, so far as they think them wrong; and especially when they see, or think they see, any thing insidious or deceptive in the methods employed to propagate them. We take no liberties with our Popish neighbours, which we are

not perfectly willing they should take with us. It is for "the faith once delivered to the saints" that we feel bound to contend. It is for the eternal well-being of immortal souls, that we consider it our duty to plead and provide, as far as in us lies; to keep back no known truth; and to conceal no known danger. In regard to such great and vital interests, we cannot, knowingly, admit of either compromise or accommodation.

ART. VII.—THE ANNUNCIATION OF MESSIAH TO OUR FIRST PARENTS.

*From the German of Hengstenberg.**

IF we take up the predictions of Messiah, as they lie before us in the book of Genesis, and attend to those revelations of the future which, during the period of the history here comprised, were granted in moments of high inspiration to certain individuals, *for themselves*; (John 8: 56.) we shall observe in them a remarkable gradation towards greater definiteness and clearness.

The first promise of Messiah which occurs after the fall, is also the most indefinite. Over against the dreadful threatening, stands the rich and consolatory promise, that the dominion of sin, and the evils consequent upon it, should not be everlasting, but that the posterity of the woman should one day conquer the fearful conqueror. All except the *event* itself is here left undetermined; the kind or manner of the victory is not revealed—whether it is to be gained by means of an entire and highly gifted race of the woman's posterity, or by a single individual.

When Noah and his three sons are left after the destruction of the whole sinful world, the general promise is again more

* *Christologie des Alten Testaments und Commentar ueber die Messianischen Weissagungen der Propheten.* "The doctrine of the Old Testament concerning Christ, including a Commentary upon those passages of the Prophets, which refer to the Messiah. By E. W. Hengstenberg D. D. Ordinary Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin." 8vo. 1829, 1830. Berlin.—Without intending to subscribe to every sentiment of this work, or even of this extract, we are desirous to afford a specimen of interpretation and theology, which may attract attention to this learned and valuable production. It may be doubted whether any man in Germany approaches more nearly to the orthodoxy of the Reformation, than Professor Hengstenberg. We have, for the sake of compression, omitted a few paragraphs of the original.