THE

LORDS AND THE PEOPLE;

OR THE PRINCIPLES OF

CIVIL GOVERNMENT ILLUSTRATED,

UNDER THE

CONNEXION OF RELIGION WITH THE STATE,

AND NOBILITY IN BRITAIN:

WHEREIN THE

CAUSES WHICH LED TO THE DISSOLUTION OF THE GRECIAN INDEPENDENCE,

AND THE FALL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE,

ARE APPLIED TO THE POLICY OF THE PRESENT TIMES;

AND THE FOUNDATION OF THE ENGLISH CONSTITUTION DISPLAYED

UNDER THE CHRISTIAN COVENANT.

WITH A VINDICATION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

BY

WILLIAM HENRY C. GREY, Esq.

Ιδμεν ψευδεα πολλα λεγειν ετυμοισιν ὁμοια·
Ιδμεν δ', ευτ' εθελωμεν, αληθεα μυθησασθαι.

HESIOD.

LONDON:

W. EDWARDS, 12, AVE MARIA LANE;

PARKER, OXFORD; STEVENSON, CAMBRIDGE; OLIVER & BOYD, EDINBURGH; CURRY & CO., DUBLIN.

1835.

TO

HIS MOST GRACIOUS MAJESTY

THE KING.

SIRE,

IMPELLED by a due sense of deferential respect and loyalty to your Majesty's Royal Person, and to the high dignity and grave importance of your official station, and kingly prerogatives, as the Monarch of this powerful and intelligent Christian Kingdom, I have presumed to dedicate the accompanying pages to your Majesty as the supreme head of the State; and I feel, on public grounds, that I should have been wanting in the duty I owed your Majesty, as an Englishman and a subject, had I permitted myself to withhold the frank expression of my conscientious opinions, in sustenance of the import-

ant premises adduced, at this, the most eventful, and interesting epoch of English history.

The fundamental interests of the British constitutional monarchy,—its Church and State connexion—the safety of your Majesty's *Crown*—the integrity of the Protestant Faith—the independence of the hereditary Peerage—the honour of the Commons, and the continuation of the happiness of all classes of your people, and their posterity, are subjects for discussion, which admit of no fastidious reserve, in the needful declaration of principles, founded on the sacred immutability of *Truth*, at a crisis so momentous; and, when the maintenance of that constitutional authority and those very principles, under which the religion, true liberties, and protective immunities of the inhabitants of these Protestant realms, call so loudly for the united energies of the great, the loyal, and the good, by one combined effort, for one mighty purpose, to arrest the levelling career of evil—to preserve the choice inheritance, which has been transmitted to us by our Christian forefathers!

The present position, and marked hostility of political parties, on questions affecting the temporal interests, and

the religious faith, of *Millions* of your Majesty's subjects connected with civil and ecclesiastical legislation, cannc be otherwise than truly distressing to your Majesty but, I trust it may please God, that your Majest will, ere long, behold that combined Christian Institu tion, at once the work of ages, and the object of you deep solicitude, and warm affection, sustained wit becoming piety and devotion of purpose, both withi the *Senate* and without, triumphant over *infidelity*, an rising from envy and from persecution, armed wit improved power, and shining in increased splendour!

The individual, Sire, who has the boldness to declar the *truth*, in the present state of public feeling, events, an opinion, may, by the candid avowal of that very trutl become liable to the charge of sinister motives—c illiberal views, or arrogant pretensions,—thus, the tas may be rendered painful in its execution, yet, the cor viction of rectitude of purpose, should encourage th hope of success—give the assurance of utility, and ope the prospect of honourable reward, in the good opinio of virtuous and estimable men; whilst it should sustair with independent pride, the full and free performance c

a duty, sacred to religion, to justice, and to patriotism, —craving your Majesty's indulgence and protecting approbation,

I have the honour to subscribe myself,

SIRE,

Your dutiful and faithful subject,

And humble Servant,

W. H. C. GREY.

LONDON, *June* 25, 1835.

PREFACE.

TRUTH is not a Libel, when addressed to public Bodies, or the community at large; and its censures are justifiable, unless where Individuals are the selected objects of exposure. This short preamble, to the succeeding undertaking, conveys at once the design of a general reflection, or moral satire, on the whole elective and representative body of the British People, who are held responsible for all the social troubles and state difficulties, which have progressively come upon them, to the present hour of their political thraldom, whether considered as Statesmen or as Citizens.

" History," says Dionysius of Halicarnassus,—" is philosophy teaching by example." If men, under the exercise of reflecting reason, do not compare existing circumstances with past events of history, and deduce therefrom the knowledge of objects they wish to attain or avoid, for the establishment or extension of their social happiness, and their moral independence—their usefulness in this transitory life, they either possess not, or neglect the faculty of discrimination, and those incidental or contingent advantages, which a beneficent Providence has abundantly furnished to the intellectual portion of his creatures, as guides for their earthly progression, from the foundation of the world!

It may fairly be inferred in human undertakings, that judgment is the true result of reasoning power, when properly applied; and no moral lesson of social policy, or of civil government, is equal to that, which may be drawn from a comparative analysis of the political information, which is furnished in the historical records of those ancient states and kingdoms, that have risen from small beginnings to opulence and power,—have flourished, decayed, and sunk into oblivion, proportionately with their adoption, and adherence to virtuous principles, or their desertion. And for the moral government of man, the history of the world itself, affords no practical lesson equal to that furnished, in the prophetic and political portions of the sacred writings.

In a strictly moral sense, the fine satire of *Juvenal*, is equally applicable to the nations of modern history and power, as it was to those, which drew forth a sentiment so replete with painful conviction of the vanity of human ambition; and the contracted nature of human philosophy, in a heathen age:—

> "Omnibus in terris quæ sunt à Gadibus usque
> Auroram et Gangem, pauci dignoscere possunt
> Vera bona, atque illis multùm diversa, remotâ
> Erroris nebulâ."

With equal force and equal truth may it be said, in the nineteenth century of the Christian era,—no Nation, from *Britain* to *Hindostan*, has the clouds of *prejudice* sufficiently removed from its eyes, to enable it to discern those things which are really for its benefit or its injury,—and none less than Britain herself, evidenced by her present career of rash, inconsiderate speculation—of reckless, downward innovation!

Infatuated with the plausible principles of political science, introduced by the liberal French writers, and urged on by *pseudo* philosophers, an un-English spirit has obtained; and "England and the English," appear no longer what they were,—they have embraced the shadow, and trodden under foot the substance, in the vain hope of attaining *perfection* in the art and science of government; and of extending civil liberty, by sapping the very foundation of freedom itself!

In former times, when English Noblemen and English Gentlemen returned from their travels, they found inexpressible pleasure in descanting on the privileges—the general happiness—the independent liberal Institutions, and the tolerant, unexceptionable Religion of their native land! Alas! the taste of modern days, with few exceptions, is to return, but to despoil—to demoralize—to dissatisfy—to deprave—to destroy! Thus, England, like ancient Rome, in the day of her decadence, no longer "*stands upon her ancient morals.*" The writings of *Byron*, however original and highly imaginative his genius, and captivating his *style*, have essentially contributed to the encouragement of a vitiated taste, a decided *penchant* for immorality in *letters*—a disrelish for things truly *recherchées;* and those simple, but sublime truths, which convey to the human mind the attributes—the benefits, and the necessity for Religion, or even high moral feeling in the State, extending to the reading world, and to what is figuratively termed "the circles of fashionable life"—*mais, nous verrons la suite,*—folly will have its end; and national *irreligion* bring with it, as it has ever done, its own punishment! The occasional beauties and popular fame of the refined Freethinker, have encouraged a host of aspiring

adventurers for literary fame, and for political purposes, to follow in his *wake;* and although they may fairly be put in comparison with the satellites of Jupiter to their Planet, they attract the notice of the giddy, the weak-minded, and the *mediocre,* in mental cultivation; and the support of the advocates of revolutionary designs. Thus, the "splendid novels" —the tales of fiction and romance—the honey-flavoured vehicles for conveying the insidious poison of *infidelity,* under a palatable and enchanting form, are, in too many instances, puffed into notice by reviewers, without due regard either to candour or discretion. The classic poet [1], who has so feelingly depicted the fond attachment to native country, inherent in mankind, must have founded his opinion of human taste and sympathy on a different race of beings;—were he now on earth, alas! he would find, that the march of refinement has destroyed the virtuous chivalry—the inflexible constancy —the patriotic and kindred attachments, composing that sterling principle, to which he attached so much value; and would behold its place supplanted by the inverse rules of logic, and the opposing creeds in morals!

The accompanying object, (as the title implies,) having been expressly undertaken, for the twofold purpose of illustrating the origin and true foundation of civil government, in this Christian State, and of the causes which led to the institution of an hereditary Nobility, in connexion therewith; it has been necessary to have recourse both to sacred and profane history. Every one, the least acquainted with the Old Testament, and its historical description of the Jewish institutions, must admit, from the birth of Cain and Abel to the

[1] Ovid.

destruction of the old world by the flood, and the renewal of God's covenant with Noah and his Sons, the establishment of an *Aristocracy in the first-born*, constituting the *patriarchal feud*, consequent upon the expressed pleasure of the Creator himself, and only lost to the race of *Cain*, by an act of *murder*, and transferred to the line of *Seth* " for perpetual generations." It is, therefore, unnecessary here to refer more fully to that, which the *Bible*, the standard of every Christian's knowledge, every where furnishes, both with regard to the *theocracy* of the Jews, and their kingly, or moral form of government.

By way of contemporary illustration, of the antiquity of an institution of honour, from which all *heraldic emblems* have been derived, the history of the ancient Persian Empire, partly supported by Scripture testimony, informs us, that *Darius* was a noble *Satrap* of Persia, son of *Hystaspes*, who conspired with six other Nobles, of the same nation, to destroy *Smerdis*, who had usurped the crown of Persia, after the death of *Cambyses;* and that on the destruction of the usurper, the seven noble conspirators agreed amongst themselves, that he whose horse first neighed, should be appointed king. —This was literally fulfilled; for the horse of Darius is stated to have neighed, on passing a certain spot, before sun-rise, whereupon, the remaining six nobles descended from their horses and saluted Darius king. The classic historians of Greece and Rome, including Flavius Josephus, who especially relates his own noble descent, have thus given, under its characteristic definition, the early *precedent* of a *Nobility*, immediately connected with the rule of civil government. This paved the way for the elucidation of those objects, which in Chapters,

IV. and V. of this work, are more particularly unfolded, in the epitomised account given of the rise, progress, and decline, of the Grecian and Roman empires, selected for the sustenance of the premises.

The relative position of the English Peerage, in connexion with a constitutional monarchy, the safety of the State, and the interests of the people at large, form the basis of the subject, and its various appendages, discussed in the succeeding pages. It embraces indeed a weighty question, whether viewed in the abstract, or taken in the whole, under its multifarious bearings, connected with the fundamental interests of this Protestant kingdom; and the efforts now making, by a powerful party, to supplant the monarchy itself, by a republican institution, and, with a second, by separating the Protestant Religion from the State, introducing that of the *Papacy*, and its *absolute* dominion, in exchange for free government. The outline is presented, and the candid inquiring reader referred, wherever it appears necessary, to those standard authorities, ancient and modern, to whose research, penetration, and general learning, the author is indebted, for, whatever may appear valuable in historical narration, state policy, or legal opinion, and worthy of estimation in the conclusions he has drawn.

At no former period of our history, has the necessity for a comprehensive view of our entire social system, on a scale though limited, yet sufficiently sustained to support the object, been so emergent, as in the present age of speculation in systems of government, and general politics, termed *popular*. The entire basis of the English monarchy,—the antiquity of the connexion of Christianity, with the supreme

government or authority of the law,—the "*lex suprema juratum*," established for many centuries in these kingdoms, its corresponding recognition, and the important changes (in principle and practice) proposed to be made therein, were subjects of no ordinary moment to be considered in the discussion. Without the establishment of a sound principle of rule and action, under a governing head, or *responsible trustees*, as a foundation to build upon, no system of human policy could have been devised of a safe, permanent, or just character, adapted to sustain the political interests, and to promote the protective happiness of mankind, in a large or opulent community of free citizens: and true it is, that the general history of our favoured country, presents a narration of incidents, highly elucidatory of the progressive advances made in civilization and national improvement,—the progress of general literature—the arts and sciences, and the advantages resulting from extension of commercial intercourse with foreign nations, as we have been propelled forward on the stream of time, increasing our temporal wealth and its possessions.

The perfect establishment of a constitutional and limited monarchy, as well as the modification of our code of general legislation, are sufficiently recorded in our parliamentary proceedings, and commented upon by our most eminent law authorities, ancient and modern; but the *key-stone* of the political arch, on which the admired superstructure has been raised and upheld,—the connecting link of the entire chain, has not been sufficiently understood nor dwelt upon,—nor its value and high state importance dilucidated, with reference to the sacred contract with religion—the covenant existing between King, Government, and People, in general publica-

tions; nor duly sustained by historical *data*, and supported by the indisputable authority of eminent ancient lawyers, historians, statesmen, and men of letters. The absolute denial of this vital principle, existing in the constitution, in popular works, without such adequate counterpoise, has long been felt; and many, otherwise well-intentioned citizens of the State, including *Paley*, have erred through an absolute want of knowledge of the ancient and true foundation of those institutions, which are the most valuable of our possessions; and not sufficiently furnished in any history of England, on a small scale, however ably conducted.

The beauty, and intrinsic value of the British monarchy, with its *three estates*, result from its having been founded on the principles contained in the Oracles of Truth; and by an attentive perusal of the succeeding pages, it will be found abundantly illustrated, both from sacred and profane history, of the best kind, that no system can be truly efficacious for the temporal comfort and moral improvement of man, whether considered with reference to his individual benefit and social felicity, or his eternal happiness, which is not founded on divine justice and authority,—the sacred fountain from which all moral obligation flows, and by the pure stream of which alone can it be sustained!

The continued improvement of our social benefits,—the sustenance of Religion in its *State connexion*, as a matter of Christian duty, and of love to our fellow-countrymen, are objects which should be held paramount in importance to every selfish or ambitious consideration,—the anxious endeavour has been to sustain them with appropriate support, drawn from sources which are inaccessible to the lash of

invidious criticism, or interested detraction, however unsavoury they may prove to the sceptic and designing leveller; but which are calculated to obtain the respect and the confidence of every reflecting Christian and sound Patriot, Churchman or Dissenter, who prefers the morality which is substantial, to that which is fallacious and ephemeral,—who, disdaining the applause of the world, unjustly obtained, seeks the approbation of a sound conscience, and the favour of Him whose rewards are eternal!

To avert the horrors of revolution is the duty of every good subject, whatever religious creed he may profess. The consequences of suffering extreme opinions to progress, under the aid of *infidelity*, in a neighbouring state, have been marked in the written opinions of one man, who, more than any other in modern times, possessed, in his own person and proximate resources, the opportunity and the mental competency to form correct conclusions. Independently of the fire of a vivid imagination, and the elegancies of literary composition in the French language, the judgment of the Napoleon of 1789 and 1793, who established an *Empire* for himself upon its foundation, stands pre-eminent for its originality of thought, and power of conception. Translations from *original* letters, in his own handwriting, to his personal friend and confidant, Monsieur D'Angeais, are inserted (pp. 144 to 160). These will repay for more than *one reading*. The description given of the proceedings of the *States General*—the sections—reforming mobs and clubs of Paris, and the Convention—together with *the trial and execution of the King*—are altogether *unique;* and, in the words of his biographer, "the ideas he fixes, and the opinions he forms of them, give to

these events an air of novel interest, which makes us believe that we read of them for the first time : add to the great interest this inspires, the no less interesting circumstance of seeing *Napoleon Buonaparte*, who, at a later period, ascended the throne of *Henry the Fourth*, judge the abettors of a revolution, which was the very means of his acquiring that throne,"—(vide Note, p. 153,) and we have indeed a subject for grave reflection, adapted to progressing events.

The reader is particularly invited to an attentive perusal of the *Fifth* and *Sixth* Chapters, where he will find the early foundations and principles of those institutions, which form the entire basis of our constitutional monarchy, abundantly explained from original sources, comprehending extracts from the *coronation services* of the earliest kings of England—the Laws of Alfred—the origin and application of *feudal* rights and *Christian tenures*—the establishment of a primitive Protestant Church in Britain, by a Roman British king, anterior to the Saxon conquest, sustained by the writings of Bishop Burgess, and other standard authorities; and its subversion by Augustin (not the primitive father), the *missionary* of Pope Gregory I. in the *seventh century*,—showing *seven* distinct periods or epochs, from the time of the Apostles. Also, the full establishment of the feudal order of nobility, by William the Conqueror, and his connexion of *a state religion* therewith; the important proceedings of the ancient *baronial parliament*, in the reign of Edward the First, in opposition to the Pope, relative to the Crown of Scotland; and the subsequent resumption of the Protestant reformed religion for the State, to the establishment of the *third estate*, or House of Commons, on its liberal or independent footing, confirmed by the revolution of 1688.

In the seventh and concluding chapter, the erroneous views of Dissenters from the Church of England, on the nature and objects of Christian government, or a Church sustained by human legislation, are pointed out; and *the kingdom of Christ* vindicated [1], in the *office* of the established Protestant Church, her venerated institutions. utility, and antiquity *de jure*;—the *prerogatives* of the Crown—the *privileges* of the Peers, and the *rights* of the Commons, from their earliest foundation, are fully treated of; and the irreligious, injurious, and unprincipled character of the *opposition*, in the Commons' House, which has for a time deprived the nation of an efficient government, and the Sovereign of conservative counsellors, are shown in their objects and their consequences, with perfect independence of party considerations.

The condition of the sister kingdom, moral, political, and religious, has not been forgotten. Ireland, groaning under the oppression of a politico-spiritual despotism, from which, unaided, she is totally unable to extricate herself, is a subject of painful interest to the true Protestant heart; and whilst, as a people, we are exerting ourselves for the perfect removal of human bodily bondage, in our colonies, we should not neglect the sacred duty of mental Christian charity at home! A Christian government and people, are bound to make an effort, by the extension, not the *diminution* of Protestant instruction, for this portion of our domestic family,—to remove that bigotry and misrepresentation, which are the prolific source of civil strife; but we must remember the solemn injunction, which, commanding us to "do good to all men,"

[1] See notes, Chap. VII. and Appendix.

also requires our direct attention to " the household of faith," —there are *Protestant brethren*, for whose faith and protection, it is our duty to sacrifice our time, our purse, our person, and, if need, our blood, in imitation of our progenitors, " committing our work to God," with devotion and with confidence!

Human nature in its totality, is burdened with innumerable ills,—it is the duty of every man to lend a hand to lessen the dreadful aggregate, proportionate to his means,—" casting his bread upon the waters, that it may return after many days." Leaving the issue in the hands of a generous and discriminating Public, the Author refers for the rest, to the Table of Contents; and, winding up in the pure sentiment expressed by the great Roman statesman, bids his reader farewell!

" *Quoniam diu vixisse denegatur, aliquid faciamus quo possimus ostendere nos vixisse.*"—CICERO.

CONTENTS.

PART THE FIRST.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

INTRODUCTORY 1

CHAPTER II.

Popular Sovereignty; or, Government, and the theory of the British Constitution..... 30

CHAPTER III.

Illustration of the theory of Equality and representative Rights 49

CHAPTER IV.

The antiquity of Nobility, and relative advantages of the English Peerage, in connexion with the foundation of Civil Government and free Institutions, illustrated by Grecian History 75

PART THE SECOND.

PAGE

Further illustration of the advantages of Nobility, or the Patrician Order, in the institution of Free Governments, as demonstrated by the history of the Roman Empire: original letters of *Napoleon*, on the French Revolution, 1793 124

CHAPTER V.

The connexion of Religion with Civil Government; or, the ancient foundation of the British Constitution, in Church and State 213

CHAPTER VI.

The Christian Covenant, the basis of the settled Constitution of Great Britain, as confirmed by the Norman Conquest, under the Establishment of the Monarchy 276

CHAPTER VII.

The superiority of Christian Legislation contrasted with voluntary Religion, as a rule of Moral Government, *Errors of Paley*, &c ... 322

APPENDIX.

Translations of original Roman Catholic Edicts, Decrees, Papal Bulls, &c. affecting the interests of the Protestant Church of England—MUNICIPAL REFORM—List of Works, expository of the arbitrary Civil Policy and the Doctrines of the Church of Rome, *and Corrigenda* ..... 489 to 550

THE LORDS AND THE PEOPLE.

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER.

> " Felix, qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas,
> Atque metus omnes, et inexorabile fatum,
> Subjecit pedibus, strepitumque Acherontis avari."
>
> VIRGIL

WE have arrived at that eventful period in the historic page of Britain, when the refined sentiment, so beautifully apostrophised by the classic poet, is especially adapted to the reflection of every moral or Christian patriot. Those who have, indeed, traced *effects* to their Sublime Source, and by becoming resignation, or *rational philosophy*, deduced therefrom the comprehensive designs of Infinite Wisdom, controlling the affairs of Man, can justly be said to have cast both fear and fate beneath their feet, and may, with great propriety, be declared happy!

Whatever is calculated to promote the independence and happiness of individuals, in a state of civilized or cultivated society, is equally capable of advantageous application to the feelings, prosperity, and comfort of an entire People, if truly virtuous or Christian, in the regulation of its domestic Polity. It is only by a consistent exercise of the reasoning faculties, and

rational submission to the operation of those contingent and incidental circumstances, which Providence has wisely permitted to form the attendant lot of fallen humanity, in the character of *secondary causes;* sustained by a calm, but devoted reliance on the justice and bounty of the Supreme Being, that either Individuals or Nations, can become permanently satisfied with their lot, and fairly be said to have risen superior to the varied machinations of Evil predominating in the moral World!

Ambition and the love of change, are the leading characteristic propensities of mankind, in every state approaching to civilization; and these become enhanced, in proportion to the growing intelligence of individuals, and the increased prosperity of national undertakings—*est natura hominum novitatis avida;*—so it is equally the folly of *educated* Man, in the indulgence of imaginary notions of perfection, to hazard the shipwreck of his legitimate possessions, and barter with even his moral repose, under the irrational hope of realizing the *ultima thule* of social felicity, in a state of sublunary existence! This infatuation, prevailing with a great number of the intelligent portion of human nature, who are considered capable of exercising the faculties of *ratiocination*, with advantage to themselves and the good of their fellow-men, it ceases to be matter of astonishment, that those who are not gifted with *talent*, nor improved by the possession of the cultivated attributes of our species, or controlled by the superior influences of rational religion, should be led away by the god of *Error*, under whatever specious form, or mantle of enchantment, its pretensions are emblazoned.

When the sun of Napoleon's ambition was setting, and in the calm of his retirement on the barren rock of St. Helena, his reply to the question of his supposed belief in *fatalism*, was equally remarkable for its evidence of the superior powers

of his mind, as it is apposite to the preceding view of human nature, even in the most civilized or *puissante* society—"How few amongst the mass of mankind are influenced by *reason*,—how many are governed by prejudice! I have found it necessary, in order to attain great objects, to yield to the follies and prejudices, when I knew an appeal to the understanding would have been fruitless; and thus far have I been a fatalist. You may judge of my sincerity by my attachment to the society of the intelligent and reflecting, who alone possess the *materiel* of real power. I have weighed *cause* and *effect*, and if Cæsar or Alexander the Great were again upon earth, they would do the same; but they would learn the increased necessity for governing, by reason only, under her *sterner* policy!" If these were the sentiments of an Individual, who, more than any other man in modern times, had opportunities of becoming acquainted with the *essentials* of government, and of forming an accurate opinion of men and things in general; we may fairly be pardoned for questioning the *value* of principles, which put at issue the authority of all past judgment and all experience, on subjects of the highest moment, to the continued repose and prosperity of a great nation, for whose permanent welfare we are justified in entertaining a more than ordinary solicitude.

It has been boldly asserted, that the present age possesses the spirit of perfective excellence,—armed with the magic wand of *knowledge*, and the power of directing the rule of sovereignty, by *sound reason*, on the enlarged understanding of mankind; and consequently, that all pre-existent learning, customs, and opinions, must bow in submission and worship at its *shrine*, or pass into oblivion, before the irradiant rays of that liberal sun of Intelligence, which has burst upon us in the nineteenth century, and illumined a portion of the human inhabitants of earth with Wisdom! The design of

the accompanying historical Treatise, is to unmask the position and to illustrate without restraint, the intrinsic value of an assumption, which stands unsupported by any fundamental principle of Veracity or Excellence; but which has been promulgated, without reserve or qualification, to the Peers and People of England—intelligent and non-intelligent—reflecting and unreflecting—for their instruction in the art of civil legislation, and the mysteries of national policy! In joining issue with this "Spirit of the Age," we fearlessly assert a *Principle;* and prepare for the defence of its integrity and value, with no unbecoming feeling of arrogant presumption; but, under a sense of duty and of right, will even deign to grapple with a *phantom,* and scrupulously sift its pretensions, lest the delusive shadows it casts forth, may, in the eyes of the unreflecting, assume a substantive form, or be hailed by any portion of an intelligent people as the ascendant of a system of Truth. The moral greatness of our common country has arisen in proportion to her respect for chivalric Honour, her esteem for Virtue, and her veneration for Religion; and by the inconsiderate desertion of any one of these essential characteristics, her prosperity will inevitably become bounded, and in exchange for solid happiness, she will, like ancient Greece and Rome, leave behind only the wreck of her glory, as the reward of her apostacy, for the contemplation of future times!

Thus, the Author aims not at tendering any apology for the expression of opinions, which are the result of calm reflection, and affectionate regard for that land wherein he was born, and under whose free constitution he was nurtured, in conformity with its best principles. An Englishman's honour should be equally independent with his pride, "without fear and without reproach," in the advocacy of a question of vital moment to the interests of his compatriots. Politically, un-

connected with any party in the state, he is content to throw himself on the general good sense of Englishmen, for a correct appreciation of the *object*, rather than the exercise of a critical analysis into the literary merits of the production. The *Principles* advocated in the succeeding pages, being drawn from a higher source than human imagination; require no apologetic introduction to attract attention, disarm animosity, or pave the way to the good-will of those, whose favourable opinion is most worthy of estimation. They stand on their own merits—on the attributes of a *sacred* foundation; and need not the aid of fictitious bolstering in support of their just pretensions! Infallibility is not the lot of human nature, and has not been aspired to by any man beneath the station of the Roman Pontiff; nor, are we bound to yield our judgment heedlessly to the prevailing *cavillatio captiosa*, against the evidence of plain understanding; nor place implicit reliance on the assumed Wisdom of any Man, or set of Men, however bright their oratorical powers, or professedly liberal and disinterested their views of social policy. To many such the lines of *Terence* are more than applicable,—"*His nunc præmium est, qui recta prava faciunt.*" If such vitiated taste, want of discrimination and moral independence, prevail amongst a people, seeking at the same time the improvement of their social condition, there is little ground for wonder, that the *governing fabric* is not only constructed with materials, at once incongruous and imperfect; but that it is liable to disruption by every wind of popular ebullition or theoretical frenzy which arises!

In *the republic of letters*, despotism, liberality, and even licentiousness, claim divided empire, and each has its supporters; but, under the sovereignty of Morals, there can be but one correct rule of action; for that which appears politically right may be morally *wrong*; and in opposition

to those who would inconsiderately call upon us to remove, with precipitation, all the salutary restraints which have been deemed essential for the government of mankind and the security of society, we may, with confidence, array the sublime sentiments of *Locke*, in his preface to the "Common-place Book of the Bible." There the favourite watch-word of the French Encyclopædists—"*écrasez l'infame*,"—is fairly illustrated; yea, even that modern patriotism, which presumptuously questions the Authority that declares, "Man can receive nothing except it be given him from above," is best answered by the written opinions of one of the most liberal writers on religion and civil government, who asserts that "the great sectaries of nature, in their *four thousand years of improvements*, in opposition to precepts the most pure and perfective for mankind, gave us little besides blunders and blotted paper!"

The desire to set up systems of government, independently of the admonitory authority of religion, and the ordinances of God, is a predominating feature of the times in which we live, although it is by no means an ephemera of modern growth: yet the *salus populi* in every civilized state can only be effectually preserved, by a steady attention towards the attainment of those purposes, which should at once become the great aim of man's social existence, as they constitute the true end of his creation. All history shows, that a deviation from this line of conduct has brought with it impending misery and final ruin on the most powerful empires,—with the Jews, by their neglect of the express commands of "The King of kings," and amongst heathen nations, although possessed of learning, as in the governments of Rome and Athens, by their adoption of luxury and licentiousness, in exchange for Morality and Virtue!

The safety of the State considered, with reference to the

increase of population and its necessities, as well as the concomitant distribution of Wealth, may, in reality, require an enlarged sphere of action,—a comprehensive expansion of Ideas, in the regulation of matters of popular interest and inter-national policy; but, the principle of *Security*, alone, can never be sustained, without due attention, on the part of Government, to the certain operation of cause and effect, in the measures propounded. Thus, the *reformed* Commons of England, have entailed difficulties upon their own body, and upon the Peers of Parliament, of no ordinary moment,—they have to contend, on one hand, with the unnatural extension of principles, the result of foreign influence, of decided revolutionary tendency, and with the changes of European policy,—on the other, with the increased wants and irrational desires of a highly speculative and commercial community, which has extended its desires and its objects far beyond the boundary of prudence; whilst they have voluntarily fettered that moral independence, under which Statesmen can alone, in a free country, act with credit to themselves, the real advantage and satisfaction of their constituents, and the general weal; thereby verifying the prediction of the immortal *Burke*, in his memorable address to the electors of Bristol, in 1789. They have, in fact, become the Vassals of popular suffrage, of a power at once *tyrannous* and dangerous to the State, of which they are the chosen Conservators, and possess no longer a free discretionary will, to enable them to direct, with happy effect or becoming energy, the destinies of a great nation!

It was wisely observed by Lord Bacon, that, "to deliberate about useful things, is the safer delay," and, in contradiction to that specious philosophy, which is based on the shallow foundation of *expediency*, (a term of modern invention and convenience, in statistics,) which illustrates its objects in

theory, at once plausible and "passing beautiful," but leaves practical utility enshrouded in the imagination, it is fearlessly contended in the succeeding pages, that the *genuine powers* of government are fixed and determinate, as well as rational in their principles and their objects,—neither can they be set aside without positive violation of duty to the people at home, and breach of national faith abroad,—without injury to sound understanding; and their annihilation will bring with it inevitable punishment, in individual ruin and national dismemberment. Those who exercise the authorities of government entrusted to them, are, unquestionably, to a certain extent, responsible to the people for their correct application; and the concurrent approbation of the people themselves, is essential to their due direction; but, with reference to the duty and obligation of Christian legislators, neither the power itself, originally, nor the rights and privileges which have emanated therefrom, nor the uses and purposes for which those rights and privileges were instituted, came from Man, neither can they *justly* be annulled by Man, unless it can be satisfactorily shown, that they are perverted and rendered inapplicable to the ends for which they were ordained, by the Supreme Founder of the Universe!

An extension of the elective privileges of the people is perfectly compatible with the increased diffusion of wealth and intelligence; but it is one thing to desire an *end*, another to devise the means by which that end may be accomplished, without hazard to the national prosperity; and it must be equally evident to every reflecting mind, that *numbers alone* will not afford protection; and that unless humanity itself is *reformed*,—an extension of remedies, with an acknowledged increase of opportunities, will never produce the declared intentions of the *Reform Bill*, as far as bribery and corrupt influence are concerned; for the impressions resulting from a

due consideration of its operation hitherto, do not warrant any rational expectations of a *permanent* salutary remedy in its application. If the banners of poverty, and even *passive rebellion*, are to be unfurled against rank, life, privileges, and possessions; and bodies of men, throughout the country, are permitted, with continued impunity, to *unite* for the avowed purpose of "bearding the Executive, and compelling their representatives to pass measures which may be at variance with all sound principles of state policy; there is an end to all the moral influence, as well as the practical efficiency and design of the government itself. The interests of all parties, whig, tory, or liberal, are involved in the issue,—life and property must necessarily be preserved, public faith cemented, and public justice sustained, by the free and full exercise of the remaining powers of the Constitution, in vindication of the national honour; rather than by that spirit of truckling subserviency, which yields to the tyranny of the *one* or the *many*, as it may suit the caprice, selfishness, or malice of its votaries.

The history of past national events, is sufficiently illustrative of the dangerous pinnacle on which we rest our security as a people;—all the powers of anticipation, and even the spirit of prophecy, would be incompetent to delineate the result of conflict, or issue of trial, in that most dreadful of all struggles, *Poverty* against *Property!* What a moral reproach, then, presents itself to those unreflecting statesmen, who stimulate the threatening evil, by their impassioned appeals to the lower orders of the community,—their *erratic* attempts to secure popular applause and support, under the specious promises of improving the condition of society, and with their varied systems of regeneration, extending the liberties of their fellow-men! With such persons, there is no harmony so grateful to the ear, as the adulatory accents of a popular

assembly, however deceptive and illusory the foundation on which they are built; but the low jester thinks he has as valid a claim to this return for his *puns*, as the most profound connoisseur in politics for his senatorial wisdom; thus, their *intrinsic value* can be easily determined by the sensible mind. "I glory," said a departed Peer of England, of profound learning, "in that popularity which follows, but which is not run after, and is the result of good deeds, by noble ends acquired!"

It has been held as an axiom, that "Ignorance is the parent of Crime," and, in the absence of a general moral reformation, in men and manners, it has yet to be proved, how far the universal diffusion of *political knowledge*, will operate as a *remedy*. It may be found by fatal experience, that such a principle of education is fully capable of becoming the adept nurse of crime, and hereafter set at nought the authority of the judge and the schoolmaster, who shall attempt to oppose it. Vanity, presumption, and ambition, are the natural attendants on such a system; and the advocates for its unbridled career, should be met by a rational association of wealth and intelligence. When we reflect on the unhappy condition of the sister kingdom, this argument especially applies. There *Discordia* reigns with her ten thousand terrors, and the progress of this species of learning, has already fearfully augmented the dark catalogue of crime, with which her peasantry has become branded. Although the wretched disciples of such a school of anarchy, may ultimately prove deficient in the complication of tactics, needful for the attainment of their visionary and unconstitutional objects, and entail ruin upon themselves,—it is the bounden duty of those who wield the machinery of government to protect, in the interim, the well-disposed, by establishing and enforcing a system of legislation, which shall put an end to the lawless outrages

hourly practised against religion and the security of private life and its possessions!

The necessity for instituting and preserving a well-defined system of Christian instruction, and moral discipline, for the poorer portion of the population of the United Kingdom, must be evident to every philanthropist; and it is one of the first duties of an enlightened and liberal government, to exert its influence with the legislature, for the establishment of a national provision for this important object. The formation of many societies apparently for the *perversion*, rather than the extension of sound principles, renders such a step more imperative at this time, than at any former period. Under such a provision, the useful arts, sciences, and manufactures might be fostered, and blended with *useful* mental cultivation; and thus, in performing the work of political regeneration, *con amore*, we should perform our duty to our God and to our country! Civil liberty and its blessings may, by prudent means, be advanced towards a certain state of perfection; but, in perfect conformity with our first position, it does not follow, as many political philosophers and unreflecting economists with pertinacity assert, that, because the nature of man, in his individual capacity, is capable of improvement to an indefinite standard, the progress of society, under the various necessities of popular interests, or the expansive desires of a commercial and speculatively trading people, can be rendered *equally* tangible; or, that it can be regulated by mere *theory*, in opposition to principles which have their foundation in first causes. That sovereign rule of moral action, "the science of sciences," has nothing in common with such hypothesis; and this even Paley, with all the Christian interest he evidently felt for mankind, overlooked in his too eager desire to accommodate his theory to the feelings and growing partialities of the age in which he lived

and wrote; and the subsequent promulgation of whose opinions, in many perverted forms, has encouraged, even amongst the better-informed classes, that delusive speculation, in matters of state policy, which, sweeping every ethical principle from the mind, tends to the entire subversion of all the sound qualities of Government, Law, Custom, Authority, and Religion!

It has been elegantly observed by Sir William Temple, that "the learning of the ancients led them to a full acknowledgment of their own ignorance, — the imbecility of the human understanding,—the incapability of even comprehending things around us, as well as those above us—so much so, that the most sublime wits amongst the ancients ended in their ἀκαταλῆψία:—ours leads us to presumption and vain ostentation of the *little* we have learned, and makes us think we do or shall know, not only all natural, but even what we call *supernatural* things." Now, *revelation* alone has filled up the *chasm* which presented itself to the learning of the heathen nations of antiquity,—divest ourselves of the advantages of revelation and Christian instruction, and with all our boasted intelligence, and possession of those nobler faculties of the soul, comprehended in the understanding; and we are not one whit better informed in the nineteenth century, on subjects of human import, than were the sages of Greece or Rome, or even those of a more remote period!

The record of public events, and the progress of mental cultivation, combined with national improvement and individual prosperity, alike sufficiently illustrate, that during the greater portion of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Religion and Morals went hand in hand, in education and government; and the social energies of the people were drawn forth in a corresponding ratio. The existence of an absolute and eternal principle of retributive justice, was duly

acknowledged by all classes in the state,—Reason and Taste then associated together, with the rulers of the land, and they were the directing stars of the *literati* of that splendid *epoch*, the refulgence of whose rays shed its influence over the moral world, until the dark eclipse of the French revolution partially destroyed its lustre. As long as this spirit continued predominant, *useful knowledge* prevailed; but abstract reasonings on mere hypothesis, and unfounded theory, built on the abstruse question of "the rights of man," were discarded, as useless to social welfare and individual comfort; whilst all necessary objects were duly entertained, although not upon the mere value of their expediency—certain original and fundamental principles, adapted to the well-being of civil society, the permansion of the state, and the eternal welfare of man, were duly cherished, as the primary source of human felicity and the end of truth. This period may truly be called the golden age of England—under its auspicious light arose that galaxy of genius, that *momentum* of statesman-like power and unbending virtue, which rivalled the classic glory of ancient Rome, and at a subsequent period made the British senate, the last effectual bulwark against revolutionary despotism and the triumph of infidelity!

It can be incontestibly shown, that the spirit of the present age tends to make "the worse appear the better reason,"—there is an unbridled thirst for change,—the philosophy of the human mind is arrayed against the preconceived intentions of Infinite Wisdom, in the object and the end of man's creation. A combination of *ideas*, rather than the proper selection and arrangement of *realities*, for practical purposes of utility, absorbs the attention of the reasoning faculties, urged forward by an excessive desire to analyze all the possible advantages to which society is capable of attaining, as matter of theoretical speculation. Thus, religion and morality, the purer springs

from which the energies of a Christian people can alone take their rise, are neglected, or perverted, in favour of the natural sciences; and although their encouragement may increase the temporary comfort, it neither adds to the genuine happiness, nor the mental improvement of the people; who have formed for themselves certain circumscribed views of the machinery of government, which they imagine are realities, because they strike the senses. Under the influence of this vitiated taste, they possess an uncontrollable desire to apply *remedies*, without understanding either the nature of the disease, or the mode of their application. "This period," says an animated writer, "is one of *degeneracy*, the *senses* reign conjointly with the understanding, which is charged to prepare the popular enjoyments by its inventions, to embellish them by its sallies, and to justify them by its sophistries." Assuming, that this is a correct picture of the existent state of society, and its prospects, amongst the *mass* of our active population, although drawn by a rigid moralist, depravation of moral principle, irreligion, uncertainty, and want of confidence, are the necessary consequences of this corrupted feeling; and it presents, at once, a fair solution of the enigma of our national condition!

Amid the warfare of opinions, on the policy which directed the machinery of government, during the latter part of the last and beginning of the present century, the liberal party in this country seem to have entirely lost sight of the necessity for maintaining a fundamental rule of conduct, as the basis of all our national undertakings: and yet the history of England, and of her safer policy, sufficiently records, that whenever she put herself at the head of a *principle*, she triumphed in proportion to its maintenance: and such has invariably been the case with all other powers, ancient as well as modern. She had, politically, as good reason to dread the

splendid despotism of Napoleon, and his declared policy, of making all other states subservient to the power of "La belle France," as she had morally, to shrink with horror from an alliance with the assembly of republican tyrants, which arrogated to itself exclusive merit and superior virtue, in proportion as it prostrated religion in the dust, and dishonoured the better qualities of human nature by deeds of blood—an association from which even that ambitious man shrunk, in his early day, with undisguised horror; when, in his correspondence with D'Anjais, he expressed his feeling of detestation of their acts, in the remarkable words, "The villains! I will present them with the *model of a revolution*, which shall indeed revolutionize them all!" Still, an amicable arrangement with a man so constituted, and a people so infatuated with views of aggrandizement, as the majority of the French nation were at that period, inflated with military success, was a matter of doubtful expediency indeed; and presents a fair apology, if not a perfect justification, for the acts of those public men, who laboured to sustain the independent interests of England, by the support of legitimacy. To France, in her modern career, especially, the lines of Goldsmith are peculiarly applicable:—

> "Gay, social, land of mirth and ease,
> Pleased with thyself, whom all the world can't please."

And France, under her favourite leader, had exchanged the *social* for the *martial* spirit, and cherished that incompressible power, which could alone be met in *arms*[1], with any hope of success on the part of every European State that disdained her ascendancy and independent rule.

If war can be held justifiable under any principle whatever, it surely must be that, which calls it into action in defence of

[1] *Justum bellum quibus necessarium, et pia arma quibus nulla nisi in armis relinquitur spes.*—LIV.

religion against the inroads of infidelity, or the security of those possessions which are identified with its preservation: and, although at variance with the essential doctrines of Christianity, and repugnant to humane feeling, as war and its horrors must ever be, it has its precedent in Scripture history; and has evidently been permitted, by a wise Providence, for ends and purposes, which we are not entitled to scrutinize with unbecoming severity. And until mankind, *en masse*, is reformed, and rendered fully obedient to that feeling of brotherly love and forgiveness of injury, which the Christian dispensation enjoins, war may even still be necessary. The Redeemer himself said, "Think not that I came to bring *peace* on the earth, but a *sword*;" well knowing, that those who opposed his Gospel would render such necessary, in a defensive point of view; and it cannot be sustained, except by declamation, that it was upon the principle of aggrandizement that the late war was conducted, under the almost unanimous consent of the entire body of the English people.

It follows, that at the termination of a protracted and disastrous war, the public burthens must necessarily have increased, proportionably with the extent of measures rendered necessary by the violence of the struggle; and that years of repose and national economy became essentially requisite to recovery, from the effects of such a series of gigantic efforts as were performed by Great Britain, with little intermission from 1798 to 1815; nor, were the Peers of England, as a body, more responsible for the succeeding consequences of the war, than were her Commons, which voted the supplies, or the *national spirit* which sustained it. The evil has truly been a national one; not confined to any one part or member of the social system, but ranging uncontrolled through the entire body politic,—ambition, flushed with success—luxury, over-trading, and interested speculation, ending in ruined

hopes and individual distress,—negligence of religion in the higher, and contempt of moral obligation in the lower ranks, —these are the proximate causes of the malady: the remedy is obvious to the reflecting mind,—the unreflecting portion of the People have sought it in the *chimera* of a parliamentary, instead of a national reform! The popular mind has been poisoned and its prejudices fostered, by the active and delusive influences of an *unheavenly spirit*, unsustained by any one principle of correct action, and uncontrolled by any rule of ethics; possessing no other claim to consideration or immortality, save that which shall result from the blighted expectations of its votaries, and the increase of state difficulties, resulting from its erratic operations! The fine sentiment expressed by Cicero, should be studied with more attention by our public men generally, in matters wherein the feelings and passions of an aspiring people, rather than their reason or their true interest excite them to discontentment. "*Ratio postulat, ut ne quid insidiosè, ne quid simulatè, ne quid fallaciter fiat.*" Nevertheless, good may result from evil, if a proper advantage is taken of the crisis.

The financial condition of the nation, may fairly be compared to that of a patient, labouring under a violent fever of protracted duration, where the reaction had hardly been sufficient to restore convalescence, before a formidable disease in another form assailed the injured frame:—political agitation, of a domestic character, supervened,—the consideration and discussion of the Catholic claims, produced renewed and general excitement of the social structure; but without realizing any one of the promised advantages to Ireland, or removing that unhallowed agitation and bigotry, which are at once both her delusion and her curse, and the objects most to be dreaded. Their concession divided the connexion, and destroyed the confidence and moral efficiency of that influen-

tial and wealthy party in the state, which had proved itself, in periods of the most trying emergency, and the most onerous responsibility, to have been deeply identified, on principle, with the preservation of its ancient Constitution, and the safety of its national Church, each being involved with the Monarchy itself. Then succeeded the question of reform in the representation of the people, urged on by the speculative, admired by the inconsiderate, and adopted by the Executive, as a *panacea* for the radical cure of all existing statistical evils! During the discussion and furtherance of these questions of national moment, there has unhappily existed, both in and out of the senate, in almost every party, an entire desertion of *first principles;* and thus, under the absolute loss of virtue, in a general point of view, *effects* have been put in the place of *causes;* whilst the system of perpetual inflection pursued by the reforming cabinet, in matters of the highest import to the colonial, commercial, and trading interests of the country, at home and abroad; and the desertion *in detail* of its abler members, justly deprived it of the confidence of the intelligent and sober-minded throughout the empire. Quackery and Expediency—novelties in sound government—have literally usurped the place of Christian legislation, ability, and moral action. Party spirit, "the madness of the many for the gain of the few," has triumphed to an extent unprecedented at any former period of our political history; whilst the general operations of the Reform Bill hitherto, (as predicted by an illustrious chief and peer) have proved singularly embarrassing to the King's Councils, and produced the repeated personal fatigue, uncertainty, and distress of the royal mind! It remains then to be seen, if the regenerative powers of the shattered Constitution, will rise superior to such unskilful treatment, in the hands of more judicious and less aspiring state physicians, whose assiduous

services are imperatively required. The remedial measures must be proportionably prompt and decisive; for, without the application of an improper figure in rhetoric, the *sequel* of the political independence of the British nation, is one of Life or Death!

The depreciation of the agricultural interest, was but the natural consequence of an exchange from the high prices occasioned by the war, which was not met by an early economy on the part of the farmers and middling classes themselves; whilst rents, during the existence of unredeemed state burthens, necessarily kept up to a certain standard; and the agricultural interest stands far more indebted to the system introduced by the *political economists*, and to its own mismanagement of a humane provision of poor laws, for the gradual increase of its difficulties, and the general *demoralization* of the peasantry, than to any alleged evils occasioned by the *vituperated* Currency Bill of Sir Robert Peel.

One class of economists attributes the evil to the increase of machinery, without considering that *Capital*, the mainspring of industry, when properly applied, has been considerably augmented thereby; whilst clothing, and many other essentials for the comfort of the poor man, under a reduced scale of wages, have become more readily attainable. To this may be added, the national advantage resulting from the ability of preserving fair competition with foreign markets, which could not possibly be sustained without the aid of machinery. Hence the fallacy of such argument, where the more than gradual increase of population, and its accumulating wants, have of necessity opened new resources for their supply. An increase in the consumption of the articles of produce, resulting from increased facility of purchase, must necessarily be productive of increased revenue to the state: and there are, throughout the country, the most ample

means for removing the great moral stigma of partial want and wretchedness amongst the peasantry, provided those means are properly applied. A vast share of benefit has already resulted to the state, from the individual exertions of benevolent landowners amongst the nobility and gentry, and by associations for the employment of the peasants, to their own advantage, on small allotments of land. Amongst the former, few landlords stand more conspicuous than the Marquis of Downshire, on his estates in Berkshire, and by the general philanthropy of his conduct to his Irish tenantry.

The liberal elasticity of the English Constitution, renders it especially adapted for the genial exercise of capital. There exist no restrictions against its legitimate use, whether in the hands of individuals, public bodies, or benevolent associations. Thus, all works of public utility, would not only provide employment for that, which is most incorrectly termed *surplus population*, but interest accrue on the capital employed; whilst correct administration would produce amongst the humbler classes, that industry and emulation, which are the original sources of national prosperity, and consequent contentment. It is alike paradoxical to reason, and opposed to the dictates of humanity and justice, that in a country abounding with wealth and intelligence, and justly priding itself on the number and extent of its benevolent institutions, that any industrious man, should not be enabled to earn something more than a precarious daily subsistence, against the contingencies of family sickness, infirmity, or old age; yet the extent of the incapability is sufficiently known to those who have taken the pains of inquiring into the condition of our labouring population. And here indeed, as Sir Walter Scott emphatically observes, "Reform must begin in our own bosoms." To be effectual, it must be national; it must be

based on principle; but not the principle of *selfishness*, of which the spirit of the age, despite of all its vauntings and spectral illusions, too largely partakes! We must be prepared, whether acting the part of Christians, patriots, or philosophers, to yield a portion of the unnecessary comforts of life, so abundantly enjoyed in this free country, to the necessities of the poor man. Policy, as well as duty, demand it at our hands.

——————" Patriæque impendere vitam,
Nec sibi, sed toti genitum se credere mundo !"

When once the necessaries of life are supplied, wealth becomes purely comparative in its value, and every worthy member of society, in the sphere in which Providence has permitted him to move, is entitled to the consideration, in a statistical as well as a Christian sense, of the more fortunate of his species, with reference to worldly enjoyments. In latter years especially, the uncertain advantages resulting from commercial speculation, have engrossed the attention of monied men to the injury of agriculture, notwithstanding, that there are many millions of acres of improvable land lying waste in the United Kingdom; and that the first source of all wealth, as well as the means for the natural support of man, are centred in the earth. Neglect and destitution of the peasantry are the inevitable results; and in the additional want of adequate domestic protection, under the ill-judged system of free trade, we have enabled foreign nations to rival, and in many instances entirely neutralize our manufacturing industry. These are the all-important subjects to which the attention of a reformed House of Commons should be drawn and devoted, rather than frittering away its useful time in discussing matters of petty legislation and party feeling, ending in the vexation of individuals, without any one commensurate national benefit for its justification;

as more than one of the acts of the past session abundantly establishes, leaving out the question of their immoral tendency amongst the poorer orders.

With the view of obviating the national difficulties, as regards the unemployed portion of the population of the United Kingdom, emigration, without any adequate state provision for the *displanted*, has been proposed, and carried, to a considerable extent, into practice. Setting aside the glaring inhumanity and injustice of such a principle, as a measure of *relief*, its impolicy, as a state question, is of that magnitude which deserves the serious consideration of every peer and independent commoner of parliament, as well as country gentleman. It follows as matter of reason, that the most useful and necessary portion of the population—farmers of enterprising genius, possessing small capitals—gentlemen of little fortune—tradesmen—able mechanics, and industrious able-bodied labourers—young, active, and single men, as well as those with small families—will be the first to *emigrate;* whilst the idle and profligate, the aged and infirm—consequently the least useful part—will remain at home, and if not relieved under a poor-rate, as heretofore, must, at an increased expense, be maintained and employed in poor-houses or public asylums, under a compulsory imprisonment,—the most degrading system of provision which could possibly be conceived for a free country and an enlightened age; presenting within itself a perfect contradiction with the declared principles of men, who commenced their political career under the alleged auspices of an enlarged sphere of conception—of consideration for the wants of their fellow-men; and who obtained the suffrages of a too-readily confiding people, by their declarations of liberality and impartial justice. If benefit is to be rendered to the state on any thing like rational views of social economy, the inequalities of advantage must

be allowed, in their due order, to succeed the inequalities of exertion, made by the industrious portion of the population, and not by any system of *farm-prison*, or compulsory labour. The benefits resulting from the application of *time* and *labour*, in a free state, are the poor man's unquestionable *right*, and cannot be alienated without the grossest injustice, every way considered. The legitimate means consist in the unfettered operation of capital on industry, affording at once the stimulus and the reward for labour, on an independent footing, and enabling the consumer to purchase and to use an additional portion of the products of machinery at home, by which the manufacturer must be benefited, besides securing the comfort and loyalty of that needful portion of the people, whose interests are identified with the state, and whose preservation and improvement, must be a matter of paramount consideration with every man who has at heart the welfare of his species, and the real advantage and honour of his country. Any enactment opposed to such views of social Christian polity, is a moral disgrace to the *statute book* of the realm, and should be expunged therefrom.

The causes of the present, and rapidly increasing demoralization, amongst the peasantry of Ireland especially, lie deep,—they cannot be fairly considered as the mere consequences of legislative enactments, nor the executive acts of any particular administration; but they result from local *misgovernment*,—from the neglect of those over whom legislation, hitherto, could only exercise partial control. They rest, primarily, in the abject condition and ignorance of religious and moral obligation amongst the lower orders of the people; in their general want of useful employment; in all the evils resulting from a state of precarious subsistence, which can only be removed by a vigorous effort on the part of those, who have the means at command and their own interests at stake,

in restoring the bond of union between the employer and the employed; by connecting capital with industry, and giving the efficient poor an interest in the soil, in its improved cultivation, and thereby contribute to increase the means of their own existence; and thus present the most effectual barrier to the operations of the demagogue and the agitator; without these, or measures of a similar tendency, locally applied, the best code of laws which could be framed would, comparatively, become waste paper, and *Legislation itself a chimera*, let who will direct the functions of the executive power!

In order to give general relief of a permanent character to the peasantry of Ireland, to improve the moral condition of our own poor, as well as to lessen the weight of parochial burthens in Great Britain, it is absolutely needful to provide employment of a settled description, for the industrious Irish peasant *at home*. Should poor laws be happily extended to that country, the evils which have resulted from their *misapplication* (not their principle) in this, must sedulously be guarded against; for the aged, infirm, and inefficient from physical inability, form the only portion which can properly come within the sphere of their protection. Of all the *Evils* which could possibly befal that ill-fated portion of the British dominions, that of the extension of the *pauper barrack system*, to her unemployed population, would be most to be dreaded for its consequences; and may Heaven in mercy avert the day when a catastrophe so direful shall visit its shores! *The moral condition of the Irish peasantry can only be permanently and effectually improved on the principle of self-independence, aided by religious instruction.*

It may be taken as a principle of established truth, that the real foundations of a nation's stability and prosperity, in a moral sense, are its public *manners;* all other causes of power, durability, or declension, although they may be more appa-

rent and proximate in their operation, are but secondary to these: neither is it sufficient, that they should be merely tolerably well regulated for the all-important purposes of public peace and decorum, or private feeling and security amongst the people. There should exist in them a pervading principle of harmony, capable of influencing the strongest propensities of the national character; of suitableness to display on any great emergency the most excellent or esteemed points in its disposition; of congeniality and immediate relationship in sentiment with the most valuable of our national institutions, —or, in the words of Earl Stanhope, "there should be an identity of benevolent objects, and a community of interests pervading the social family, who should consider themselves, with the rest of mankind, as the children of one parent, who has sent them into the world for the advantage and assistance of each other." These are sentiments which redound to the honour of human nature, whilst they add to the value of the possessor,—to the respect due to that illustrious assembly of which he is a member; and cannot fail of having their just weight with the community; nor are there wanting, many splendid instances of the general liberality and benevolent disposition of the Peers of England, in promoting the prosperity and happiness of the middling, and increasing the comforts of the poorer classes in their social relations of life. The friendly paternal kindness of Lord Kenyon to his tenantry, especially the poorer portion, in Wales, and his affability as a landlord, and humanity as a magistrate, are too well known to need further comment. Neither should the indefatigable exertions of the pious Bishop of Bath and Wells, and others, for the employment of the peasantry, pass unnoticed, at a time when the people have become indoctrinated with prejudices towards the peerage itself, founded in igno-

rance of its intrinsic value, individually, and of its importance as an estate of the realm.

"There is a tide in the affairs of men," says Shakespeare, and so, indisputably, there is in the affairs of nations; and *Fortune* is not to be blamed for ill success, but the neglect of her favours—that quality which the ancients so much celebrated and admired, under the good fortune of either a prince, statesman, or general, was nothing more than his sagacity to discern, and his quickness, or *moral* courage, to improve the opportunity; and, by taking proper advantage of this tide, sail triumphantly into the harbour of glory, or the haven of prosperity. It was the promptitude with which *Napoleon* availed himself of the circumstances attendant on the French Revolution, that alone enabled him to turn to account all the incidents of that memorable epoch. "Great men," says Warburton, "are alone suited for extraordinary purposes, on extraordinary occasions, and a great crisis is the *test* of their talents." Had that bright military genius wanted either decision of character or discriminating judgment to put his purposes into execution, he never would have had the opportunity for surpassing a Hannibal, nor rivaling an Alexander in arms,—nor would the spirit of emulation and enterprise have called forth our own justly esteemed *Wellington**, or have afforded him the occasion for that display of moral deliberate courage, and patriotic virtue, which alone enabled him, with his brave soldiers, to withstand the tactics, and defeat, as it were, by plain physical strength, "the victor of an hundred battles!"

Fortune, considered as the arbitress of human affairs, was

* Misfortunes call forth the abilities of a *General*, but prosperity leaves them in obscurity!—"*Ducis ingenium res adversæ nudare solent, celare secundæ.*"—HOR.

by many of those virtuous and truly philosophic heathens, whose opinions men of taste so much admire, even at this remote period, so contemptible a *deity*, that *Homer* makes no allusion to her in all his works,—*Horace* speaks of her with detestation, and *Juvenal* with contempt,—nay, that splendid moral satirist says she has no power, but what may fully be controlled by *prudence and good conduct!* Thus Horace, "*Fortuna sævo læta negotio*,"—and Juvenal, "*Te facimus, Fortuna, deam!*"

There can be little difficulty in determining, that it is essential to the glory of the English people, at this crisis of political events, that by means of the public morals, and the manners they inculcate, an effort should be made to disabuse the minds of the less reflecting on those subjects, which involve the peace and prosperity of the entire kingdom. There is no pure morality where it is not an emanation from *religious principle*. The morality of the ancients, in theory, was beautiful; but, in reality, for permanent utility, it was purely ideal and imaginative. We must take the *initiative* for sound morality from that sublime source, which tests all springs of human knowledge, by an analysis which puts at issue the value of human philosophy and purely earthly wisdom—"By their *fruits* shall ye know them,"—said that Divine Philosopher, who pointed out, in many instances, the necessity for the observance of moral rule and discipline in human transactions, even of Him who turned out of the Temple, with *authority*, "the money-changers, and those who sold doves!" under that lofty tone which emanates from *Religion*, there should be preserved to the state an intimate and sympathetic attachment with the past incidents of our history; for this connecting link once severed, and this sympathy once destroyed, our prosperity must be bounded,—the hopes and prospects for the *future*, as regards our national independence, must lose, progressively,

the assurance we now rationally entertain, with reference to all those popular impulses which constitute the regenerative powers of the social system; and the seeds of which, under judicious culture, are capable of producing the fairest flowers and choicest fruits of *freedom*. Divest them of this fundamental virtue, and they instantly resolve themselves into a *phantasmagoria* of grotesque uncertainty,—of hope, fear, and disappointment. "Another, and another, which come like shadows, and so depart," whilst the popularity hunters, state quacks, and philosophers, of camelion perfection, perform their enchantments, and stir the cauldron of popular evil with declared *self-disinterestedness!*

It is incumbent upon all men, be they statesmen, soldiers, or citizens, when they would erect an Altar to Liberty, to cast its foundations on the rock of religious freedom, as the true basis of social rectitude,—a hint for the "Society for diffusing useful," i. e. *political* "Knowledge." *Fas est ab hoste doceri!* The *Ceratinæ Ambiguitates* of this age of intellectual attainment, will not stand the calm criticism of futurity, whatever certain busy *Doctrinaires* may inculcate. Let us carry on our work of political regeneration under the sole influence of those sound ethical principles, which, disdaining to pander to the mere caprices of that ephemeral patron, *popular favour*, invest with moral power the humblest state, and shed lustre on the highest. "Let your light so shine before men, that they seeing your *good works*, may glorify your Father who is in heaven." If the superstructure of national reform be based on principles which are opposed to religion and her attributes, to the supremacy of her rule, and built up with unsound materials; or set upon the quicksands of hypocrisy and deception, it will surely fall; and great will be the fall indeed! Neither the forms of long-established law, the preservation of national records, or monumental reminiscences,

the anniversary returns, commemorative of past deeds of glory, nor the history of former national greatness, will be sufficient to retain that genuine patriotic feeling and *puissant* spirit, which is possessed by a free and enlightened people, under the conscious mental dignity of accumulated physical strength and moral energy, produced by successive ages of honourable renown and useful learning, unless, in their habits of opinion and action, they are taught to cherish and retain an unbroken link of connexion with the chain of past events, and a becoming veneration for the source from whence they were derived. The lines of Horace * are beautifully illustrative of the correctness of these positions; and although written *two thousand years ago*, are singularly applicable to the circumstances of the times in which we live. The following poetic interpretation may not be deemed inadmissable—

VIRTUE supreme resplendent shines,
Nor at adversity repines:
——— nor with success elate:
Nor as the rabble smile or frown,
Assumes or lays aside the *Crown*,
But makes her own estate!

---

* "VIRTUS repulsæ nescia sordidæ,
Intaminatis fulget honoribus:
Nec sumit, aut ponit secures
Arbitrio popularis auræ."——HOR.

CHAPTER II.

POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY, OR GOVERNMENT, AND THE THEORY OF THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION.

"Every sovereignty is subject to a higher sovereignty."—SENECA.

THE assumption of the abstract maxim, that "all power originates with the people," has of late contributed more to unhinge the whole framework of existing society, in states and kingdoms, than any one principle which has been promulgated, either in ancient or modern times. Although the body politic, which is more expressively denominated "the people," in every state, constitutes the *physical power* by which the moral ends of all government are to be sustained in a *primâ facie* sense; yet the moral agency of man, as a being strictly accountable to a higher source for the exercise of all the duties of social life, renders it incompatible with reason, that he should possess the distinct faculty or privilege of *originating*, independently, any code or system of restriction for the control of his fellow-man, of equal pretensions with himself in a state of nature. Man, therefore, cannot *equitably* govern his fellow-man in the absence of an *authority*, which authority must be ample, free, and comprehensive, and independent of all other control, without which there would be no foundation for impartial civil justice, in punishing the bad or sustaining the good. A moment's reflection must satisfy

any man, who does not presume to dispute the existence of Omnipotence, that this necessary authority can only emanate from God himself, who formed man, not for the purposes of rebellion, but obedience! Thus the doctrine of supreme power arising *spontaneously* from the people, can only be viewed abstractedly. The early writings of Locke, who, although a great logician, was, in matters of civil government, (as his utopian scheme for *Carolina*, which proved a complete failure, abundantly establishes,) a mere theorist, at first, favoured the propagation of this hypothetical position. When Locke had, from experience, an opportunity for coming to a rational conclusion on the impracticability of establishing with any safety a system for human regulation, on this view of *popular power*, unless abstractedly considered, he was sufficiently convinced of his *error*, and that every theory for human legislation, not based on the "authority of the Holy Scriptures of Truth," was inapplicable to the purposes of social security. Then it was that he wrote that memorable preface to his "Common-place Book," in itself a splendid apology for his previous erroneous impressions, and a masterpiece of refined reasoning, wherein he asserts and defends that "inexhaustible treasure, which the divine wisdom and bounty has adapted to *all* the purposes of a holy life, directing us to a cure for every disease of the soul, considered both in a *moral* and *theological* sense;" but he had committed himself; and the attractive and evil tendency of his preconceived notions was not to be entirely obviated; he could not recall them. Paley, in his "Moral Philosophy," followed nearly in the wake of Locke, with extended sails, although in some parts of his *premises* he controverts or endeavours to overturn the original opinions or theory of the latter, presenting therein a fair illustration of the incomprehensible quality of the human mind, even on subjects where an identity of object and

purpose existed between them! So much for regulating the feelings and controling the passions of mankind, *en masse*, without the constraining power of a superior principle. "The souls of men," says the learned Doctor Parr, "with which the statesman has to deal, are *living spirits;* he who moves them inconsiderately, raises a momentum which he cannot wield; for it is no easy task to control the awakened desires, nor restrain the inflamed propensities of millions of human beings, let loose from the bonds of responsibility." Had Locke limited himself, under the influence of his latter principles, to the illustration of language and its powers, as the grand auxiliary of the human understanding, which was his *forte*, and theology his favourite theme, he would have shone pre-eminent indeed amongst the brighter literary stars of his favoured country; but his first premised views of civil rule, by the partial neglect or perversion of first causes, in favour of doctrines purely popular in their *spirit*, if not rigidly so in their *letter*, do not entitle his genius on this head to claim the palm of happiness, so emphatically described by Virgil. Paley was a liberal moralist, but by no means a deep reasoner; and as a logician, his writings cannot be fairly placed in the balance with those of his more fortunate rival. The error of Paley is decisive. His theory of the British Constitution is adapted to court the passions, rather than restrain the reason—to please the growing spirit of the times in which he lived and wrote. This is the proximate cause why his views cannot be received by rational men, who do not admit the British Constitution to be built upon *expediency*, but, in contradistinction, that it was the result of *necessity*,—to put an end to idolatry in the first place, and despotism in the second; and as a system capable of affording due protection to the governing and the governed; not being the result of accident, but having its *precedent* in that divine law which is the authority and foundation of all

government: being also duly sustained in moral reasoning by a comparison with ancient heathen systems, the defects of which are provided for, under a combination of powers, each acting as a counterpoise to the other, when duly regulated: by the monarchical power in the state being based on a sacred covenant, which holds the King as Chief Trustee, responsible to God, as well as to the State, for his actions; which covenant not only secures to the people their religious rites and solemn ceremonies inviolate, but their civil liberties, under a security of guarantee not to be obtained in any other system of purely human construction. Thus the cause of Paley's failure is manifest. Writing of him, in the spirit of Christian charity, he was a well-intentioned man, and in his endeavours to sail between the two extremes, shipwrecked his object, as did the hero of antiquity his life, in the dangerous strait of the Hellespont! This comes of human wisdom, when arrayed against the attributes of the Most High—"that great First Cause least understood." Hence, as Doctor Silver[1] has judiciously maintained, "his book on the origin of society and of the British Constitution is full of historical errors;" and, it is to be hoped, contrary to his intentions, "has proved itself highly injurious to the cause of society, to the interests of the established Protestant Church, to the British Constitution, and in some degree to Christianity itself," and which may fairly be inferred, from the abstract conclusions which many unreflecting persons have drawn from its perusal, and who have not possessed the opportunity or the inclination to read deeply, and thus, by sound analogical reasoning, test the stability of his doctrine. The same learned author, in his notes and observations on Paley's theory of the Constitution, has further remarked—"Paley talks of the *republican* part of the Constitution as living in the

[1] Late Anglo-Saxon Professor in the University of Oxford.

Commons. In modern language, a republic means a system of *equality*; but there is no such feeling ever supposed to exist in the Constitution. Popular, or *democratic*, there is, but not republican. The *milites accincti gladiis*, and those who vote for them—the possessors of real property—are, in the Commons, as much a *privileged order* as the Peers of the Upper House; they are there in consequence of their *primogeniture*. The citizens are freemen of chartered bodies holding from a King, himself reigning by acknowledged right of primogeniture; and the burgesses, for the most part, chartered from the *demesne* or private property of the Crown. There is as much rank and privilege in a purely constitutional *House of Commons*, as in that of the *Peers*; and no idea of equality in either, save only in the *vote*." As a logician, Samuel Parr was not inferior to Locke: as a scholar, and rigid moralist, he was equal to Locke or Paley; and as a profound polemical reasoner, superior to either; for his philosophy was the result of deep erudition and sober reflection, and his morality an unshackled emanation from those fundamental principles which are contained in the oracles of truth! He had indeed traced effects to their sublime source—cast fear and fate beneath his feet, and death itself, rising superior to the machinations of evil!

The views enunciated, and the opinions advocated, by those liberal writers, having been adopted and reverberated to a considerable extent, by a class of men whose station and influence in society give them the importance of a principle founded in substantial value or truth, it becomes important to inquire, to what extent such persons may be considered as possessing sound understanding, with reference to the origin and the end of civil government; or how far they acknowledge the operations of *Divine agency*, designing the usefulness, and controlling the affairs of mankind!

The exclusive right of popular sovereignty, furnished the

leading dogma of scepticism, and the favourite inexplicable theme of the sages of revolutionary France in the last century; and the light in which they entertained it, is of a character so fallacious, and so utterly incompatible with the essential principles of every religion which acknowledges the attributes and superior direction of an eternal and retributive Providence, that its presumption will be sufficiently manifest to every candid mind which will take the pains of informing itself in the history of the Jewish and contemporary nations, as illustrated by the sacred writings. Indeed it will hardly be needful to enter into a lengthened discussion on the subject! but as it involves points which are of great moment to the repose of society in general, at this remarkable *era;* and with the view of satisfying the doubts and scruples of inquiring and well-intentioned persons, in particular, when many of the *professedly religious* have imbibed the notion of its correctness, a few observations in elucidation of the weakness and purely partial character of such a *theory*—for principle it cannot justly be called—may not be deemed inadmissible at this point of our discourse.

In the first place, the great principle of power, denominated *Sovereignty*, or the independent rule of law, the *supremo jure imperare; summæ potestati præesse*, necessary for the government of mankind, is a subject of too great depth for the comprehension or regulation of ordinary capacities, or uncultivated minds; essentially, it is *pre-eminent authority*, vested either in one individual, or selected body of individuals, for the benefit of the entire community, arising out of the protective emergencies and necessities of mankind in a state of society. This forms the true foundation of all *legitimate* governments; and a calm consideration of cause and effect, as well as a perfect knowledge of the original condition of human nature, and its propensities, are absolutely requisite, before the machinery of

sovereignty or legislative rule, can be satisfactorily dilucidated. An *entire* body cannot possibly govern an *entire body*—no logical reasoning on earth could maintain the bare possibility of such an assumption of impracticable power; and, without the direct formation of a superior influence, or controlling authority, arising out of the materials to be governed, there would be no unity of purpose, of conception, or design; no medium of protection for the weak against the strong; and if even the mass could simultaneously direct the state machine on any needful emergency, which is both morally and physically impracticable, under the needful distribution of the people in every populous kingdom, anarchy and doubt, confusion and indecision, or fatal rashness of execution, ending in national evil and individual injury, would be the inevitable result, *pari passu*, with the measures taken! In the second place, there would not remain to the people themselves any security for the possession or use of that *animi firmitas*, which should ever be present in the governing power of a nation or community of men, the head of a tribe or family, to control and wield their united energies to advantage, when most needed. It was a sound maxim of Cornelius Nepos, that "under the direction of the multitude the safety of the commonwealth is endangered." This is viewing the subject in a purely *moral* sense, independently of divine influence, or the superior control of Religion. Where security of person and property is preserved by *defined* laws, which none but the represented *whole* can repeal, there the great ends of government are provided for; whether the administration of the legislative power be in the hands of the *one* or of the *many*. Where any one person, or body of men, who do not represent the whole, seize into their hands the power, in the last resort, there is no longer a government *de jure*; but what Aristotle and his followers justly call the tyrannical corruption

and abuse of one, although established, *de facto*. This distinction also necessarily excludes the right of arbitrary power, or dictation, by whatever numbers the same may be assumed; for, in strictness, there can exist no *legal right* in that which is founded in *moral wrong*, even if the mass of the people concur therein, as was strikingly illustrated under the government of the former French Revolution!

Archdeacon Paley rested his theory of the British Constitution on the foundation of its expediency alone: this view, so much the favourite one with the liberal statesmen of the day, in all their proposed reforms for abuses of government, in Church and State, is trumpeted forth without any reserve or qualification, by which even the intelligent portion of the people may form an accurate opinion of its merits. As Paley has neglected to show in what his views of the expediency consisted, and left it to be determined by others, we are at liberty to form our own *rationale* of its claims to consideration—one thing is certain, that this otherwise talented man, so highly eulogised by Coleridge, for the sublimity of his conceptions, could not possibly have studied deeply the *political* history which the Old Testament contains, or, that under his zeal for the propagation and establishment of maxims of pure Christian *philanthropy* and liberal rule, he lost sight of the unregenerate character of the materials for which he designed to legislate, as well as of the necessity for obeying strictly those principles and injunctions, decreed in the ordinances of God, with direct reference to the regulation of human transactions, even in affairs of social polity; and, whatever Coleridge or any other author may assert, with regard to Paley's divinity, the subject is of that highly important nature, it must be viewed historically, to be properly comprehended. Now it is fully evident, from his writings, that Paley was unaccountably deficient, with regard to the more ancient parts of English his-

tory, the early foundation of our civil institutions, and the causes which led to their establishment: his premises being drawn from imperfect *data*, the inferences and conclusions founded on them are necessarily erroneous and defective; and whilst he reproves others for obeying preconceived rules, customs, and prejudices, he displays the true character of human nature, both in its prejudice and its weakness, in matters of *opinion*, unsustained by the sober rules of that logic which shines in the Bible, and is the solemn evidence "of things not seen," but which are from above, and to which we are bound to pay deference, before any system of human invention, however speciously it may be set forth, or plausibly sustained, to serve the senses or please the imagination! The fine *sentiments* expressed by one of the most elegant of the French writers, if not given in his *exact words*, convey their full force and correct meaning; and are conclusive in support of this view, as having direct reference to the grandeur and decline of the Roman empire; and they are worthy of being appended to every code of civil legislation, as a *memento* of inestimable value: "*La Fortune ne domine pas le monde. Les anciens Romains en sont une preuve: ils eurent une suite continuelle de prospérité, quand ils se gouvernèrent d'après des principes fixes et rationnels; et une suite non-interrompue de revers, quand ils s'en écartèrent. Il y a des causes générales, soit morales, soit physiques, qui agissent dans chaque monarchie, l'élevent, la maintiennent, ou la précipitent* A SA DISSOLUTION!"

It follows, as a matter of plain reason, that if all power springs spontaneously from the people in any State, to that people it must with equal facility revert, and that where it originates it must also end, and become entirely subservient to every popular ebullition of the times, divested of every tangible security or stability for equal rights, or equal justice, and power of protection for the more considerate and responsible of the

citizens: neither in a moral or political sense, could such a condition of things as must result, possibly continue under a limited monarchy, or even a republic, where religion is the basis of the State: it must be injurious to every tolerated class in the community, which would become divided into contending factions, and opposing sects and parties, by whom the best interests of the state, of religion, of the people themselves, at large, would be neglected, or turned to mercenary account; until anarchy herself, with her ten thousand horrors, required the reassumption of an independent and controling power. Destroy the first great principle,—remove the base on which the pedestal of civil and religious liberty as yet securely rest,—and what assurance presents itself against our having scenes of equal depravity, of immorality, and irreligion enacted, under the spirit of uncontroled licentiousness, as those which took place in a neighbouring country of *letters*, and *refined manners*, within the period of *one* generation? It is vain and futile to preach the superior moderation, judgment, and rationality of the present, over that of the past age; public degeneracy, when once principle is broken down, proceeds with rapid step in its career of evil; and virtue, unprotected by law, has no resource but in retirement, for her persuasive voice is not heard, amid the maddened din of revolutionary innovation! Man has proved himself to be the same corruptible creature in all ages. He who knows well the human heart, and its propensities, has declared it to be "deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked." And if those guarantees for the restraining influences of religion, established by our forefathers, are undermined, *one by one*, it will become nationally corrupt, in spite of all the efforts of considerate individuals, and the exertions of literary societies.

The demoralizing effects of the former French revolution, to Europe in general, have been so feelingly pourtrayed in a

scientifically abridged History of France, by Mrs. Jamieson, the authoress of a History of Spain, compiled from the best sources; the temptation to give the following short extract, for the consideration of less matured readers, could not be avoided, as it is especially apposite to the point at issue,—the insecurity of human institutions when destitute of religion. "France, that once boasted herself the daughter of enlightened philosophy, and the nurse of *Christianity*, throwing off the restraints of her ancient government and institutions, stripped herself also of the only tie which linked the misfortunes of earth with the repose of heaven, and cheered the short span of time with the duration of immortality. France, dishonoured by the annihilation of the altar and the sabbath, and from being *Christian*, stands alone on the page of history, with having decreed the extinction of Christianity! What horrible excesses were committed by the French nation, when they made *reason* their sole guide, and *philosophy* their leading principle! 'History,' says Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 'is philosophy teaching by example.' What a lesson may be learned from the apostacy of France, the land of *Fenelon, Bossuet, Bourdaloue*, and a host of names hallowed by Christian virtues! Ages must pass away ere the demoralizing principles of the French Revolution can be totally effaced."

But to return to our own country. In the rage for reformation, *population* has been made the groundwork of improving legislation instead of principles emanating from the word of God! Discomfiture in the councils of the government, inequitable laws, public inconvenience, and national turmoil, are the inevitable results; and nothing can possibly avert the most painful consequences, short of returning trust in God, and the hope of firmness and virtue in the sovereign, by the exercise of a sound discretion in the selection of Advisers; as well as under the

election, by the people themselves, of sound and virtuous Representatives, who, whilst they may be willing to aid the progress of all salutary reforms, and matters of real grievance in the affairs of Church and State, will oppose with the promptitude and vigour of a *Chatham*, or the firmness of a *Burke*, that spirit of domination, which assumes all the characteristics of an *imperium in imperio*, and assails without reserve the constitutional ascendency which the estates of the realm, separately and conjointly, are bound to maintain. And should it still be asserted, that the people are the *primary* source of all legitimate power, it has been already sufficiently illustrated, that the maxim, in the sense interpreted, is in direct variance with the decree of God himself; for, it at once removes man from that responsibility due to authority, even that of his Maker; and leaves him to the caprices of his own free will, to all the risks attendant on repeated changes and untried schemes, and the imminent hazard of being left without the protection of government in any form.

In a limited sense, the people are fairly entitled to delegate powers, which are perfectly compatible with the interests and protection of the *entire* body politic, and this is the only truth that can be sustained historically. The consenting voice of the people, under a representative system of government, is both salutary and necessary; but the means should not be allowed to frustrate the end. Even the liberal Locke, in his dissertation on government, declares, that "Kingdoms have been as repeatedly overwhelmed by the pride, ambition, and turbulency of *private* men; by the people's desire to cast off the *lawful* authority of their rulers; as by the rulers attempting to *tyrannise* over the people." It has indeed been asserted by some rational philosophers, that the loftier faculties of the human soul cannot be expanded to advantage, without the passions are occasionally brought into action; and that they

cannot be restricted to perpetual quietude without paralyzing the powers of the mind. It is true, that in the strife of contending parties in a State, though amity may sometimes be lost, mental energy is frequently aroused; and whilst the struggle of emulation and the restlessness of ambition disturb the repose of civil society, the collision of conflicting sentiments and popular interests produces the genius which adorns it, when directed to right ends. Thus, reason, and taste, and love of glory, are the natural aim of European minds; whilst the cultivated inhabitants of eastern nations have soared to loftier heights in the ideal sphere of the imagination. The passions are the winds which propel our vessel, but our reason is the pilot that steers her. Without the winds she would be motionless, and without the discretion of the pilot she would be lost!

The right of every nation to choose its own peculiar political system, with reference to its internal affairs, no rational man would attempt to deny; but that right should be both morally and legally exercised, and not used for the purpose of perverting or destroying the objects for which the right itself was originally granted, or subverting institutions which have positively grown up and flourished under *inequality:* the thirst, therefore, for theoretical perfection, should ever give way, when opposed to positive interests. In theory, the base of the British Constitution is *liberty*, but its pinnacle *religion*, and its practice *morality;*—neither, are we rashly to court the exercise of that popular power, the *dominatio plebis*, which the immortal Burke so emphatically and aptly designated "the suspension of slavery, under the fair shadow of liberty!" *Liberè sed modestè!*

The great objects with the early founders of the Constitution were the strict preservation of religious and moral principles under the rights of primogeniture, emanating from the

head of the state, as the Laws of *Ina* sufficiently establish; and it is to the honour of the Saxon era that those laws were based on Christianity! To "return, however, to the *principles* of the Constitution, as established by our Saxon ancestors," which is the *ostensible* object demanded by many of our reformers, in express words, is nothing more nor less than to abrogate those *privileges*, which, in after times, were granted to the Commons, as representing the people at large! There never was a time shown by English history, when the Constitution became forfeited, and set up *de novo*, anterior to the *Commonwealth*, which was an *usurpation*, and not a forfeiture, and ended in its entire restoration in church and state! Therefore, essentially, the British Constitution was formed in *privilege*; from privilege proceeded *property*; and from property, *popular representation*—the latter, for the first time, in the reign of Henry the Third. This is the genuine *theory* of the British Constitution in a small compass; its *practice*, in conformity thereto, has necessarily varied in succeeding ages proportionately with national exigencies and contingencies.

The independent rights and privileges of the Commons of England, forming the *third estate of the realm*, are essential to the due security of the liberties of the people; for pure liberty consists in the power of doing that which is duly sanctioned by law—"*Libertas est potestas faciendi id quod jure licet.*" As a body, they have been subject to many vicissitudes, in the legitimate exercise of their power, before their value and influence, as a component part of the Constitution, became thoroughly known and sufficiently established. But this has rarely happened in latter ages; for men of the highest talents, honour, and independence in the state, felt justly proud of being enrolled amongst the members; and they presented, at all times, a formidable phalanx against the inroads of tyranny. The inequality of arrangement which existed in their mode of

election, whether as returned by the freeholders of counties, corporate bodies, free burgesses, or under the household suffrage, enabled them fairly to represent all popular interests, without the risk of collision of feeling, or undue preponderancy of influence in any one. And although it cannot be denied, that many serious abuses had, in the progress of time, crept into the system, which required the exercise of a hand of firm and discreet correction; yet the *principle* itself, of all others, was one best calculated to ensure the preservation of that *balance of power*, which is imperatively required in every free state for the assurance of its repose and prosperity. Thus reformation is one thing in theory, another in practice; and years must necessarily pass away, before the effects of the Reform Bill in its working can be correctly understood, or appreciated for its value by the nation at large.

In all human institutions, the good and the bad are unavoidably blended; and that extensive change which has taken place in the mode of electing the popular representatives, may possibly be productive of evils of far greater magnitude than those it was designed to remove, although probably in a varied form, whilst *corruption* may still extensively exert its influence unbridled amongst electors. Should such be the case, the *omnipotence of Parliament*, as it is figuratively termed, must again be called into operation, and act upon the *precedent*, and now fully admitted principle, of reforming even the Reform Bill itself, and of revising or remodelling such parts of the other bills emanating therefrom as shall have proved themselves *innovations*, without manifest utility, or to have been productive of inconvenience and impracticable results in their operation. It may be taken as a substantial truth, that all constitutional reforms, to be permanently efficacious, or free from evil consequences, *should be slowly progressive;* and not merely based upon expediency, but supported by necessity; for

as Edmund Burke, with sound judgment, declared, "No precipitate resolution on great changes in the fundamental principles of any free constitution can ever be deemed the pure and deliberate sense of the people!"

The records of parliament for many centuries present no parallel in support of the extensive changes which have recently taken place in the constituent principles, by which the *elected body*, forming the popular representative estate, was returned, and the ancient principle and practice of the Constitution abrogated, by the extensive disfranchisement, and consequent loss of corporate rights and borough privileges, held under the crown; and by the substitution of a leasehold constituency for counties, and a *ten-pound* household constituency for cities, towns, and districts, enfranchised as boroughs under the ostensibly declared object of rendering representation more *equal*, and the abuses of bribery and corruption less prevalent! Alas, for human judgment and speculation! this extensive innovation has hitherto been productive of very partial beneficial results, as regards popular advantage and contentment, whilst its protective powers against corrupt influence, and the exercise of party feeling in every quarter, have proved themselves fallacious indeed. Party feeling must necessarily increase with the progress of free institutions, and the increased privilege of *opinion*.

The proceedings of the last session, viewed as a *whole*, amply illustrate, that the disadvantages to popular interests, so denominated, with the sole exception of the slave-emancipation measure (which was more a question of humanity than one of popularity), have greatly preponderated; and the all-astounding anomaly of principle, which could, in one and the same session, pass an act for the ostensible purpose of depriving the pauper population of Great Britain of a *legal* provision in age or infirmity, excepting under a compulsory

system of workhouse imprisonment, presents an imperishable record of plilanthropic wisdom and Christian legislation for the contemplation of future ages! To the permanent honour of the reformed parliament of the year *one thousand eight hundred and thirty-four*, these *two* measures stand in juxtaposition on its journals, fortunately saved from the ravages of that furious and ominous conflagration which destroyed both its houses, forming a primeval event in British history! When individuals suffer injury, multitudes are wronged[1]!

When Lord Brougham held a seat in the popular assembly, and saw the prudence of lessening the influence and averting the designs of the *mouvement* or republican party in the state, he declared, by a published letter, that "disfranchisement should never be made the basis of constitutional reform." But this view he afterwards concurred in departing from, with the rest of his colleagues, to serve the popular spirit, and with the alleged view of establishing greater *uniformity* of practice, under a largely increased constituency! Thus, by grasping at that which was irrational, the proper consideration of moral causes, which, in their progressive career to maturition, risk no violent convulsions of the state, was abandoned; and in the ministerial zeal for creating a *popular representation*, neither the correcting influence of sound philosophy, nor the remote consequences, were attended to. "All men claiming a right to every thing," says Hobbes, "the result is, that all make war against all." *Jus omnium in omnia et consequenter bellum omnium in omnes!* How then is a community of property and power to be maintained, or a general community of interests rendered compatible with the varied propensities of an imperfectly restricted popular constituency? Far different must have been the views of Charles James Fox, with regard to the principle on which he intended to advocate

[1] Multis minatur qui uni facit injuriam!—BACON.

reform, to that which has been adopted, when, in the height of his opposition to the measures of William Pitt, he pronounced the British Constitution, as it then stood, to be "the happy practical equilibrium, which has all the efficiency of monarchy, with all the liberty of republicanism; moderating the despotism of the one, and the licentiousness of the other." What the nation required, and still requires, is a strictly reforming, but conscientiously conservative government, the firmness and moderation of which will sustain the true interests of all parties in the state, on purely equitable principles on one hand, and on the other, resist those inroads which passion, ambition, and degeneracy of morals, are making on our choicest institutions.

The Reform Bills have, however imperfect in principle or design, and defective in execution, become the law of the land. Their *merits* must be decided by posterity, although their evils may, in the interim, admit of partial remedy. One thing is sufficiently manifest, that the ministers who devised and carried them through parliament have already, under their operation, created so many new and conflicting interests, and indoctrinated the public mind with such a restless and arbitrary spirit of dictation, that the House of Commons has eventually become unmanageable to themselves; and all the remaining powers of the Constitution, together with the support of the Monarch, and a large portion of the people, have not been sufficient to preserve them from entire shipwreck! To avert the further ravages of the storm, may indeed be matter of doubt and difficulty; but it is the duty of every moral man, and every loyal man, whose influence is availing, to perform his part to his sovereign and his country, in proportion to the emergency which demands it.

——— "Quo non aliud velocius ullum,
Mobilitate viget, viresque acquirit eundo."

Between the opponents of all reform and the advocates of measures of decidedly revolutionary tendency, the state has become *jeopardised*, and the characteristic beauties of the Constitution treated as a dead letter: nor is there even a probability that the practice will sustain the theory of the new system. "The Constitution," said Burke, "must be viewed as a whole; for that which, taken *singly*, may appear *wrong*, when viewed with relation to other things, may be morally right, and to be patiently endured, as the only means of preventing something far more dangerous." Thus the preponderancy of the popular opinion in the House of Commons, which has lost its *purely democratic* feeling, puts to imminent hazard that harmony of co-operation which should ever subsist between it and the *second* estate, on all-important questions, especially those relating to the vital interests of the Church, as connected with the state. It is to be hoped, indeed, that the general good sense of Englishmen will rise to its proper level; will show them the necessity for preserving the independence of the Peerage inviolate; that independence is eminently needful to secure the Monarchy, on the one hand, and the rights, privileges, and liberties of the people themselves, on the other. Above all, we are called upon, by the Supreme Governor of all things to cherish and preserve our national religion—to remember, that it is upon the hallowed cause of Christian Protestantism that the hopes of the British nation rest, for Time and for Eternity!

CHAPTER III.

ILLUSTRATION OF THE THEORY OF EQUALITY AND REPRESENTATIVE RIGHTS.

"Semper officio fungitur, utilitati hominum et societati consulens."
CICERO.

ADEQUATE protection of Life and Property, blended with rational diffusion of social prosperity, being primary objects of consideration, under the institution of civil government in every free state,—in the great work of political reformation, the *remote* consequences should ever be weighed with due caution, considering, that the minds of men, which are liable to become influenced thereby, both in habit and operation, are not passive but active materials in their varied composition, as existing in society, necessarily constituted of different orders and degrees, each possessing inequality of intelligence, faculty of discrimination, and worldly possessions; and consequent inequality of judgment, interests, and opinion.

In our views of agreement, convenience, and utility, for all public purposes, connected with the promotion of the happiness and increase of the general comforts of our fellow-men in the popular state; or the removal of those abuses in established legislation, which trench on their private interests, and are productive either of real or *imaginary* wrongs,—both tending alike to the dissolution of that moral repose and general confidence which form the basis of social unity and

national security, in every well-regulated state,—we should act purely under the influence of just premises. Hence the attempt to carry objects, however popular, or however plausible in theory, *per fas et nefas*, must evidently be tinctured with the spirit of direct injustice towards one portion or other of the community, and must ultimately end in the injury of that body constituting the *entire* people. Thus, the purely rational uses and ends for which we were created, and furnished with understanding, and a presumed knowledge of the distinction between *right* and *wrong*, negative not only the propriety but the admissibility of such a course of proceeding, under every correct system of ethics! Human nature can alone be equitably or successfully governed by the control of sound maxims, and temperately adjusted to the multifarious wants and conditions of the species. In discussing the very object and process of popular or state reforms, it is imperatively necessary to pursue the object with temper and moderation; for in such matters, of all others, a trifling spark, injudiciously ignited, might produce a flame, of that dangerous extent, which neither the voice of reason nor the powers of eloquence could restrain within the bounds of social safety. Hence the utter impossibility of accommodating the various discordant views—the awakened desires of distinct masses of society,—so as to assimilate them in harmonious compact, if their separate feelings and interests are suffered to predominate on every occasion when popular grievance, party feeling, and local prejudices, or the restless spirit of political adventurers, may rouse them into action!

It is not for the petty selfish views of individuals, but rather, the enlarged and comprehensive interests of mankind, or an entire nation, with its aggregate importance in the stake, that we are bound to legislate, if we would legislate with honour, or govern with satisfactory advantage; for purification of

state abuses, and destructive schemes of innovation, to serve the mere purposes of vanity and interested ambition, are widely different things. The statesman who does not properly calculate on the conflicting influences of popular opinion, or the *momentum* of those various combinations, which have grown up under the protection of free institutions, and the opportunities of acquiring information on all subjects connected with civil polity, runs the imminent hazard of creating, in his fiery zeal, a whole series of disastrous convulsions to the state for which he proposes to legislate, and should remember the Italian proverb, "*Chi tutto abbracia nulla strigne.*" It is not his office, in the strict sense of political justice, to *create*, but rather to *improve* legislation, and that without any sudden or violent processes, preserving as much as possible of the known and tried forms, to which he may be able to return, should the designed alterations or supposed improvements fail in their safety or efficiency.

It has been asserted that *Voltaire*—one of the most dangerous of all the various classes of liberal writers—predicted, that it would not be *true philosophy*, but hypocritical sophistry, *le philosophisme*, that would entail *state* miseries on France. "*Non la philosophie, mais le philosophisme, causera de maux publiques à la France!*" As this has been so amply verified within the last fifty years, we have good reason for denouncing that tortuous sophistry which has latterly obtained in this country, and is called into requisition at the present period, against our best institutions, under the guise of every ingenious artifice, to mislead the popular mind on questions affecting its repose and the national weal. Little is it considered by the unreflecting multitude, that extensive state revolutions, which first assail the *wealthy* and the *powerful*, eventually overwhelm all property, and the securities of private life, and not unfrequently the lives of those who planned them! The

same fraternizing, equalizing, and disorganizing spirit, which *razed* France to her entire social foundation as a kingdom, and from which, after nearly half a century of miseries and bloodshed, she has barely recovered, is openly fostered and encouraged by some of our unthinking nobles, who appear neither to value nor honour their coronets, forgetting the judicious advice of the great Lord Lyttleton, who says, "In James the Second's time a revolution became *necessary*, and that *necessity* produced one, founded in moral obligation." But that necessity exists not at present, although it may be rendered inevitable, if the theories of political enthusiasts are suffered to progress, uncontroled by moral reasoning, and that grounded on the example of past events. According to the authority of *De Bourrienne*, all the political miseries which befel unhappy France, in her subsequent degradation, were attributed by Napoleon Bonaparte to Monsieur *Necker*, whose opinions afterwards prevailed amongst her peers, until at length they compromised their own independence and their country's honour. Necker he denounced, as "the moral assassin of his country's liberties." It would be well for some of our "thick and thin reformers" to ponder on his words!

Every revolution commenced under the auspices of similar principles, similar notions of equality, and of *popular rights*, must end as that of France, in 1789, ended; and that is, by surrendering the whole power of the state into the hands of a *few*, who would riot for a time on the spoils of their country, whilst the middling and poorer orders of the people, the avowed objects of consideration under the change, left without the protection of *Law*, and despoiled of their trade and securities, might console themselves with the conjoint blessings of hungry bellies and universal suffrage, or shout "liberty" to please their rulers!

It is only by assimilating civil government, in a moral point

of view, to the laws which control the slowly progressing economy of nature in her nobler works,—one reasoning principle in sound philosophy governing both,—that the nearest and safest approach can be made to perfection; for it cannot possibly be accomplished *à priori*. It was asserted by *La Harpe*, that the excessive freedom of our institutions had vitiated our taste for the polite sciences or *letters*, and morals; but, in opposition to this view, we may assert, for an historical fact, that the rational cultivation of our liberties gave us a pre-eminence in the display of mental power, the *relics* of which have principally tended to preserve us hitherto from national degeneracy, under the baneful influence of licentious publications and principles in every form. The eminence of our intellectual distinction, may be traced to the standard authorities in true logic, religion, and morals, which, during the last two centuries, have from time to time adorned the literary annals of our country, and counterpoised the evil influences of levelling infidelity, fostered amongst the less reflecting portions of the English people.

"That all men," says a learned writer, "are equal by nature, is a *fiction*, innocent enough in itself, so long as it is not made the *lever* for subverting a Constitution, that has actually grown up and flourished under inequality." And if it could possibly be maintained, that all men have equal rights *de facto*, they should, in such case, be considered as possessing full claim to that privilege *de jure*. But, the futility with which such doctrine is deeply impregnated, as opposed to every rule of established or safe polity, is easily rendered apparent to men of impartial and discreet judgment. All history goes to prove, that under every form of government which has existed, and which remains extant, that pure philosophy, as connected with the general direction of human affairs or state policy, repose from domestic strife, and security from foreign

aggression, has recognised no other right of human ascendency than that which has been acquired by long and undisputed occupancy or possession, whether it relates to property, custom, or civil privileges. It is far more rational then to maintain, that a system of well-regulated laws, adapted to the general security, by being apportioned to the relative stake or interest which various bodies, classes, and individuals have in the state, is the only system susceptible of fair or perfect equalization and security; for the *lex non scripta*, which was respected for several centuries in this country, would not be applicable to the wants nor the restless genius of modern times. Under this view, the universal rule and comprehensive reason of mankind, or the *law of equal justice*, may justly be characterised as the basis of all *privilege* and all *right*, but under no other. Thus—'*Legis virtus hæc est, imperare, vetare, permittere, et punire.*'—PAND. L. I. TOM. 3. Nicer distinctions may be imagined by men imperfectly taught, or who are admirers of the *refined* science of abstract perfection; but they can never be reduced to any rule of *settled action*, where large masses, containing all the active elements of discord, or an extensive and divided community, are to be subjected to their operation. Those distinctions, of necessity, are matters of mere theory or hypothesis: on what rational foundation do they rest?

It was some apology for the peers and people of property in France, that they were ultimately borne down by the irresistible impulse of a power which had fully determined that no effort of their's to preserve their constitution should be effectual; but no such apology can possibly be offered for the people of this country. If the representative Constitution and liberties of England—the upper senate, created by the King, and the lower senate, (as a *privilege*, which time and custom have established as a *right*,) sustained by the people

themselves, should fall a sacrifice to the pernicious doctrines of *equality*, in the popular sense, the fault will be exclusively her own. She has survived the storm; disdained to court the *growl* of *foreign* revolution, which shook Europe to its centre; and still retains the means of security, if she uses them to advantage. Those means essentially exist (although dormant) amongst the *inactive* portion of the people, which, when roused into full and co-operative action, will be sufficient to avert the moral stigma that would attach to her engendering one, without necessity, within her own bosom!

That the Divine Founder of the World has made all men equal by nature, as regards physical construction, or durability of existence, fairly proportioned to the contingencies of climate and circumstance, we readily admit; but it cannot be shown, either by sacred or profane testimony, that equal rights or equal privileges were, under any dispensation, bestowed or acknowledged in the regulations of civil government. The moral constitution of man denies his competency for the fulfilment of the complicated duties and trusts connected therewith; for although by nature he may be rendered indefinitely perfectible, through the instrumentality of mental cultivation, the natural order of human society, in the bulk, does not possess the same advantage. If the mental improvement of the individual, in a state of nature, be limited by circumstances over which he can exercise no control, how much more limited or complex in its operation must be the intellect of those great masses of human beings, called nations, with reference to the conduct of their public interests! Organic life, in its physical structure, is submitted to the laws of generation, of growth, maturity, and decay, of strength and weakness. Why then should not the *artificial life* of states and kingdoms be submitted to the same rule? In spite of the presumed perfectibility of man, or his competency for

the enjoyment of equal possessions, the number of those, who, by the very circumstances of their birth or natural condition in the world, are condemned to ignorance and obscurity,—to positive inaptitude of legislating for themselves, much less for others,—will always be large indeed. The Scripture itself declares a diversity of *Gifts* and a diversity of *Talents* to be co-existent in the human race!

The history of various times and people is sufficient to produce the strongest doubts of the progressively indefinite perfectibility of human nature, especially with reference to the existence and political improvement of nations. The Hebrews, by far the most ancient people, according to our received views of chronology, had first their religious worship, and then their tribes and orders, their kings and chief ministers. The Hindoos, whose system of government lasted upwards of four thousand years, until it was destroyed by Mahomet, preserved their *four castes* inviolate. The Chinese, who insist that they are by far the most ancient people, and who have preserved an independence of every other power—for the Tartar invasion only politically changed their dynasty—have maintained strict *inequality* in their civil institutions. The Egyptians, the Assyrians, the Medes, the Persians, and afterwards that empire which *Livy* lauds for its consistent virtue, have done the same: "*Dum nullum fastidiretur genus in quo eniteret virtus, crevit Imperium Romanum.*"

In a strictly Christian sense, all men may be *equal*, possessing the same perishing nature and responsibility to God for their actions; but as *Order* is the great design and end of the creation, and Heaven's universal law,—in human society, there must necessarily exist different ranks and subordinate conditions of men, as well as diversity of order in the heavenly bodies, and diversity of orders and species in all animated bodies. As all men are not gifted with the same intellectual

powers, physical strength, duration, or moral propensities, it follows, that different degrees of power, property, and privilege, have been invariably enjoyed, as the natural consequence of such positive inequality, by different nations, and by different individuals of the same nation, from the beginning of time; for the first man was necessarily head over his own family, from which originated the patriarchal law; and this forms the origin and foundation of power or authority, and the original source of legitimate or civil government, reposing on the broad basis of necessity, and presenting within itself a *practical theorem*, which admits of no rational contradiction. Neither can it be shown that human happiness, in the aggregate, has been disadvantageously curtailed by the existence of such disparity of rank, intellect, or power. Conflicting interests, individual danger, and national calamity, would be far more likely to arise where equality of rank and power, if such were possible to continue, were made the rule or sovereign machinery of the social system.

From all that has been already urged *pro and con*, it must appear sufficiently satisfactory to every reflecting mind, that characteristic distinctions arise eventually and *eventfully* out of human nature, in proportion to its opportunities, qualities, and exertions; and in the same ratio that they increase its honour and its usefulness, add to its worldly possessions. As the institution of civil government is admitted to be absolutely necessary for the benefit of mankind in general, none are so likely to maintain it as those who have, through the acquirement of rank or possessions, the deepest interest in its preservation. And, alas! there is that existent in human nature, even in its cultivated form, which requires the control of ascendency!

The vaunted *hypothesis*, that "the legitimate source of

all power is with the people," as toasted by some of our modern patriots, at their popular dinners, has no claim to notice, but for the purpose of exposing its fallacy and evil tendency in a moral as well as political sense. Under this view, it is dangerous to the repose of society, because no boundary can be set down for the exercise of that *right* it assumes;—neither has it the advantage of custom and prescription to define its objects, nor to regulate its proceedings. Fundamentally, it aims at the total subversion of all the better principles of religion, morality, loyalty, and contentment; and is, even in sentiment, uncalled for under a limited monarchy, with free institutions, open to all the *purely* legitimate influences of popular opinion;—and if we need a *precedent* for its evils, we have more than one recorded on the page of our own history in characters of blood!

"Nihil est ab omni
Parte beatum."

Reflecting on the beauty of this sentiment, which is stamped with the classic credit of an antiquity of two thousand years, it is lamentable to find men, otherwise possessed of learning and refined parts, bestowing their Talents and wasting their Time in discussing such points—subjects which, from their very abstruse quality, or impracticable tendency, are the least applicable to rational theory or social advantage. And if not fairly reducible to practice, what possible benefit can ever result to the mass of the people from such far-fetched and extensive declamation upon their abstract rights? Or, is the majority of any given number of those who attend popular meetings, which have been most inaptly termed "the safety-valves of the Community," capable of discrimination or prudence, to make proper use of such assumptions, even supposing their admissibility in abstract reasoning? Or, are the passions

and prejudices of any class of men to be guarded against, with reference to the abuse of power founded upon them? Does the recent spirit of the lower orders of Englishmen of the "political unions," or the "seven millions" of the Sister Isle, led on by the modern Prometheus in political *disorganization*, guarantee the fact?

Neither Talents, which are a gift of nature, nor Learning, which is an acquirement of human ingenuity, can be devoted to the true interests of our country, nor successfully applied to promote the welfare of mankind, unless they are alike guided by just principles. When applied to sinister purposes, whether under a public or private motive, they partake of the spirit of crafty design or hypocrisy, rather than of *wisdom*. So also, that genuine fortitude, or heroic moderation, which is prepared to face whole *categories* of national evil, when sustained by virtue, as was amply manifested in the immortal *Chatham*; but courage, if propelled by selfishness, and not used for the real good of the people, merits the stamp of *audacity*[1], rather than the distinction of patriotic heroism. Thus, whatever may be the *rights of man*, viewed abstractedly, yet, civilly considered, it is self-evident, that his evil propensities, which ever will have the preponderance, can only be effectually restrained for his own advantage, and the adequate security of his fellow-man, by the exercise of a power which is not subject to his capricious consent, or the domination of his passions! The disciples of the *doctrinaire* or *juste milieu* school of politics will of course continue to argue to the contrary; but this popular doctrine, their chief *idol*, proves itself

[1] "Non solum scientia quæ est remota à justitiâ, callidita potiùs quàm sapientia est appellanda: verum etiam animus paratus ad periculum, si suâ cupiditate, non utilitate communi, impellitur, audaciæ potiùs nomen habet quàm fortitudinis."

neither to be sound in moral worth, nor tenable in metaphysical reasoning.

It has been shown, then, that distinctions of rank and station must necessarily arise out of human nature, in proportion to its various gifts, conditions, or useful qualifications, in different orders of men in every country. Were it even possible to render the views of an entire nation or people accordant with one political feeling, or notion of civil policy, it is contrary to the nature of things that such a sentiment, void of miraculous power, would be permanent. The equanimity, or even tranquillity of feeling, for the aggregate proportion, at all events, must be ephemeral in its duration. Jealousy, distrust, ambition, pride, and the very love of ascendency, which is so inherent in the human character, would soon sow the seeds of domestic turmoil, raise the billows of discontent, ruffle the surface of the smooth waters, and destroy at once both the reign and the calm of *equiformity*. External aggressions, or even the bare apprehension of their approach, would rouse the dormant spirit of abstract moderation,—urge the lovers of *refined reason* and *political justice* to action; and ambition, the incompressible quality of the human mind, would claim divided empire with the equalized sovereignty of the rights of man, or speedily destroy the reign of the latter, by elevating the standard of absolutism; for when once that principle of assumed intelligent power reaches a certain altitude, it is the last of all others— as was proved by the republican tyranny of Athens and Rome—to recede from its lofty eminence!

Polybius says, that "climate forms the character, complexion, and manners of nations." Unquestionably, the influence of climate on the physical constitution of man is decided and powerful; but much less so in reference to his moral propensities, for even the relaxing influences of climate may be greatly overcome by habit, and practical abstinence from

luxurious desires. Italy is the same Italy; and Rome, "the eternal city," rests as of yore; but, alas! in the mountains or plains of modern Italy we look in vain for the manly mien, the martial form, the physical development of powers illustrative of the fine sentiment of Shakspeare, "when that this *body* did contain a *mind*;"—that being remains not! If we enter within the ruinous remnant of her ancient senatorial grandeur, in modern Rome, we may exclaim, with *Volney*, in his fine invocation to *Palmyra* in the desert, "All hail!"—But, even the genius of inspiration, which, according to Horace, loveth solitude, has departed! Do we pace the gardens or the groves, in quest of the classic muse, or call for the lofty tones of her soul-inspiring or consoling melody, she respondeth not, for her mantle of virtue has flown, and the succedent strains are the music of degeneracy! Licentious bigotry has usurped the sacred *vestibule* of her abode. The sublime and the beautiful may be entertained in the imagination,—it will be sought for in vain, in the reality! How cuttingly severe, yet how classically appropriate, is the line of *Goldsmith*, as applied to modern Italy:

"Man is the only growth that dwindles here!"

We should still acknowledge, that although Italy has degenerated nationally, through her luxurious propensities and immoralities, she has, even in modern times, produced many individual specimens of bright genius, in literature, the refined arts, sculpture, painting, and music; and were she blessed with free institutions, might recover a great portion of her lost glory.

In all countries and ages, the men who render unusual services to their fellow men, by the superiority of their attainments, of whatever kind, are sure to obtain ascendancy, power, and influence; and the venerated shade of popularity and grateful admiration, which attends them during their own

existence, will assuredly, in every civilized state, be transmitted in the hearts and records of their countrymen to posterity, in proportion to the services rendered. Even in the most savage nations, the son or descendant of the distinguished chief, or warrior, carries the votes and honours over the undistinguished of his tribe; and, in proportion as civilization advances in the stream of time, distinctions of rank, honour, and possessions, will advance with equal pace. There is existent in the human character the pride, or even vanity, of being associated with rank and distinction in private society; and much more so in communities, where the spirit of *rivalry*, or of emulation, as opposed to others, delights in assuming the attitude of greatness; and in this light it forms one of the attributes of civilization, nor can national importance be sustained without the appendage. All the various and complicated benefits of a regular system of organised government, becoming apparent, will progress with civilization; and *hereditary* succession to civil honours, offices, and immunities, ultimately gain the lead over tumultuous elections, or hasty and rash decisions amongst the people; whether the controlling power in the state be absolute or free, the constitution of divers orders, degrees, and classes, must be the inevitable result, and the sovereign power of dictation no longer remain with the aggregate multitude. So much then for the permanency of equality, the stability, the *rationale* of the views of those visionary theorists, who, in their exalted *utopia*, according to Mr. Burke's ample and sarcastic description, "are perpetually soaring beyond the sphere of our imperfect nature, to the *political empyræum*, in search of perfection, where they hope to meet with the spirits of angels, and just men made perfect!"

If we reflect on the beauties of natural philosophy, the entire surface of her dominion, animate and inanimate, pre-

sents a varied scene of the most extensive character for our contemplation, richly drawn, as it were, in waving lines. The acute angles and *parallelograms* of abstruse metaphysicians may form the basis of the science of moral philosophy, and as such are admissible, when properly used as an adjunct to the mysteries of revelation, and may be regulated by *physics*, in the hands of able disputants; but they can form no alliance with political foundations, or political reformations; the latter requiring order, simplicity, and methodical arrangement, to render them efficacious; and these views are in strict conformity with that instruction which is derived from reason and from experience.

The equiponderant power existing under the English Constitution, is at once its beauty and its strength; and this arises solely from its inequality in state distinctions, presenting what Walter Scott, both with truth and classic elegance described, "*Pondere librata suo.*" So also the enlightened *Montesquieu* declares, that "the pure spirit of democracy is lost in a state, when it passes the boundary of *rational equality*." What truly wise or pythonic politician could be found prepared to justify the levelling spirit exhibited by some arch Cynics, amongst our aristocracy of the day, whilst pandering to popular prejudices and passions—to clubs and unions, under the chimerical hope of preserving their own popularity or ascendency? Or, what can be said for the public integrity, or discreet wisdom of others, who, whilst living under the protection, and enjoying in their persons, families, and estates, all the daily advantages of adequate security, which that constitution affords, have the chilling mendacity to declare, that "the forms of our system of government have outlived the ends for which they were created, and have become a mockery of the people, for whose benefit alone they should operate." If the lamp of *shame* could be held

to their faces, would they blush not, for morals disgraced, truth defamed, and reason dishonoured? Such apostacy from good feeling, affords a splendid display of the *refined* policy of Machiavelli, or Philip d'Egalité; and we may justly exclaim with Lucretius, *O miseras hominum mentes, O pectora cæca!* —if not too offensive to their dignity! Here, indeed, we might follow the example of *Diogenes* in another form; and although such *luminaries* obtain the concurrent applause of the open-mouthed and unthinking multitude, request that the bright lamp of their *new light* might not eclipse the unassuming splendor of a mixed constitution, undazzled by the rays of power on the one hand, and unintoxicated by the narcotic influence of licentiousness on the other! Such is the rational spirit of political,—of extended representative rights and correct feeling to be fostered, for national benefit, rather than the formation of that conventional power in the state, which cannot possibly remain long co-existent with constitutional or even equitable government.

A self-created popular power, assuming an irresponsible and undefined course of action, for the alleged purpose of watching the progress of political events, which must necessarily be entirely contingent on circumstances, whilst there exists a *responsible* executive, and an *independent* legislative body in the state, one branch of which is created by the *entire* people; is the most monstrous anomaly in government, ever attempted to be justified or upheld by any man, or set of men, under Heaven, save the conventional democrats, who were the active members of the former republican clubs of Paris. Can it be possible, that the men who support such views are esteemed by any considerable portion of the really informed people of England, in the nineteenth century, as worthy to be treated with that confidential deference, that becoming and consistent respect, which should at once be the

due and the support of those who have assumed the ostensible station,—the fearful responsibility of British legislators ?

It was remarked by the historian Hume, nearly a century back, whose impartiality on this head, at all events, will not be much questioned, that there was then "lately sprung up amongst us, a set of men who endeavour to distinguish themselves, by ridiculing every thing that has hitherto appeared sacred and venerable in the eyes of mankind. Reason, society, honour, friendship, marriage, are the perpetual subjects of their insipid railleries." With how far greater justice, can the complaint be made at this period of our national progression! That was but the dawn of those dark principles, the progress of which undermined, in their insidious course, the foundation of every thing worthy of estimation in religion and ethics; whilst their influence, politically, invaded the strongest safeguards of state security; until the total loss of public virtue and private duty, let loose the baser passions, which, under the guise of revolutionary freedom, deluged Europe with human blood! With our own country, the war of principle, under a strict sense of duty, was first arrayed against the war of *infidelity;* and although subsequently protracted to a period for which humanity must shudder, and Christianity repine, Britain triumphed nationally; but the poison of the *upas tree* of Scepticism had been freely tasted by a portion of her inhabitants; and its effects were not dispelled even by the blessings of *peace*. The times have assuredly not improved in moral sentiment, although they may have progressed in speculative wisdom, and utopian notions of popular felicity, to be obtained solely through the medium of an enlarged sphere of popular representation! Vain calculations! whilst virtue is neglected in the state; for, to the topics enumerated by Hume, may be added the sacred duties of religion, by the now dominant or *mouvement* party, not considered

to be essential to good government,—the sanctioning prospects of futurity, and the truly needful obligations which bind society together. True it is, that real religion may not require the sustaining aid of human politics; but it is equally certain there will be no correct politics, unless established by religious influence or authority. It was well observed by *Saurin*, that human laws, to however perfect or high a degree of refinement they might have been carried, always showed the infirmity of those who framed them! "*Les lois humaines ne sauroient suppléer à la religion à quelque degré de perfection qu'on les ait portées; elles se ressentent toujours de l'infirmité de ceux qui les ont données.*" The baneful influence of free principles has not been merely limited in its operation to the lower orders, but it has been suffered to guide the opinion of a portion of the gentry, and from them gradually extended itself to some few members of the aristocracy, who cannot possibly have considered the consequences to themselves and the entire community. If one section of the peers of England have not approached the subject of reform, with that promptitude and nice discrimination which its importance requires; but paying a blind veneration to antiquated customs, and fostering a timid retention of admitted abuses, lest greater evils might accrue, have neglected to extend their views to the whole framework of civilized society, or the altered circumstances of the times,—on the other hand, the *minority* of that highly influential body in the state, have neglected to check, with statesman-like virtue, and firmness of purpose, the indiscriminate zeal for extensive innovations, which has in a great measure arisen from partial conceptions and unfounded conclusions. The want of candid explanation, and due consideration on the part of the upper classes themselves, who have the leisure and the means of ascertaining the real cause of state evils, has of itself materially conduced to render poli-

tical science the truly hazardous, or even dangerous speculation, it has eventually become in this kingdom. The public conduct of some few amongst the newly created peers has, indeed, been sufficient of itself to degrade, if not debase, the entire order to which they have become attached. If hereditary orders were worthy of acceptance, surely they are worthy of preservation, or there is no reason or consistency in human nature, even for the needful sustenance of family interests, and becoming reputation. *Les grands noms abaissent, au lieu d'elever ceux qui ne les savent pas soutenir!* This may be taken as a fundamental axiom: for honours and titles, however high and distinguished, if disgraced by the ignorant behaviour of their possessors, only more forcibly lessen the claim to respect and confidence,—real patriotic virtue, rather than a *Coat of Arms*, is the fairer ensign of nobility!

Having taken, as a position, that discretion is the true source of power, according to the fine view assumed by Lord Bacon, and the result of real knowledge, it becomes us calmly to inquire, in what portion of the people this very essential quality is most likely to be found. As regards the progress which may yet be made in political philosophy, in reference to the general principles of government, or the reform of established systems, and removal of abuses which have crept in, we may possibly draw a rational inference from what has occurred in the science of physics, since the period when that great genius lived and wrote; for it cannot be argued, that moral philosophy has advanced in equal ratio. Of Bacon, with truth it may be said, a man he was, *reconditæ scientiæ, et ad salutem literarum natus*. In his day the science of physics was in a much more circumscribed state than we have reason to hope *political* philosophy is at present. A long series of chimeras had, until then, amused and deluded mankind, the mist of which has gradually been dispelled, until

rationality has assumed the chair, where dogmatical ignorance had long sat in undisputed possession; but the non-intelligent and uneducated, can no more understand *political economy*, than the unlettered can comprehend the mysteries of physiology, or physics, which are deducible therefrom.

Political objects and discussions are necessarily fettered with many obstructions, from which the preceding science ever will be free,—one is far more easily reducible to practice than the other. These circumstances confirm the positive necessity for our proceeding with caution, and in conformity with the rules of deliberative inquiry, in a given ratio with the number of speculative schemes, which are perpetually engendered and brought forth; for no unbiassed man will deny, that speculation in politics has not as much taken possession of the minds of one portion of the good people of England, as well as speculation in trade or commerce, has engrossed the attention of the other. Reflective moderation will alone enable us to elucidate the objects to be attained for permanent popular advantage, and to adapt their operation to the conception of ordinary capacities: and this is the only consistent diffusion of knowledge, which is at once compatible with the true interests and liberties of the people at large, and the security of religion, combined with the assurance of good government in the State. "Such rules," said the great philosopher, "do in some sort equalize themselves to men's *wits*, and have an advantage, or pre-eminence, with the perfect and excellent motions of the Spirit!"

Whilst the balance of power can be preserved in the state, the ambition of dangerous and designing levellers may be successfully kept in check; but that once broken, the security for repose will be ephemeral indeed. The entire subversion of the liberties and constitution of Rome, was owing to the impunity with which a few leading men carried forward their

plans, after the balance of power became broken between the nobles and the commoners. The ambition and success of those innovators was but an effect and consequence of the former. When the uncorrupted part of the senate had, by the death of Cæsar, made one expiring effort to restore their former state and liberty, the success failed of their hopes, for the bulk of that assembly had so fallen below the level of virtue, both in its principles and authority, that those real patriots had no alternative but flight, or entire submission to the madness of the multitude; who, stirred up by the inflammatory harangues of designing orators, were bent upon setting up single and despotic slavery, and by the introduction of the profligate *Antony* and the worthless *Octavius*, disgraced for ever the fairer annals of a mighty empire,—infamy succeeding infamy in design and execution, until the vilest *despotism* became entailed, that Heaven in its displeasure ever suffered to be inflicted on a debased people. The circumstances which led to this entire national ruin are worthy of contemplation in our present popular proceedings,—the objects are analogous, and, if not treated with firmness and circumspection, and counterpoised by sound legislation, are capable of producing similar results.

It is incumbent on those men, who promulgate inconsiderately the sentiment that "Knowledge is power," to inform their hearers and readers of the poorer orders, or the less cultivated amongst the people, in what the actual merits of knowledge consist. Solon's maxim was, γνῶθι σεαυτὸν, "Know thyself." It certainly is not the general display of the passions and party bias at popular meetings, which manifests either the faculty of knowledge, or the ability to censure with effect the errors of government,—much less the competency to originate and execute any plans of amelioration for the general welfare. The great aim of all *public* bodies, asso-

ciated for political purposes, if they desire to sustain a legitimate or truly constitutional character, should be the *general conservation of the state*, on purely independent principles, divested of party feeling and motives of personal interest, or personal hostility; for thus only can reformation of useful institutions, and the gradual correction of abuses, be placed on a rational or permanent basis, and the consequent security of the *equitable rights of all established.* But where is this impartial or genuine patriotic spirit to be found? Alas! not amongst those who call most loudly for equality of civil interests, and a more general community of distinctions! The very tyranny of *opinion* they exercise, at once negatives the value of their patriotism, and tests the worth of their discretion. Their violence abundantly establishes the fact, that the opinions of all men, on the subject of *state reforms*, are, more or less, subject to the immediate influence of personal views and party considerations, and that those who declaim most vehemently against that influence, deserve no larger share of credit for integrity of principle, than others who candidly admit the existence of a directing stimulus, as the guide of their actions!

Under a full and candid consideration of the important and apposite reasons adduced in the preceding premises, it must appear evident, that the unlettered and non-intelligent classes can neither draw correct conclusions, nor, under any principle of common security, consistently possess a right of dictation, over the interests of the better informed of their fellow citizens, even in ordinary matters of civil policy, much less on those subjects which, from their very nature, must ever be contingent and intricate: and, although in gross numbers they may constitute the *majority*, their eagerness in every period of excitement to adopt sentiments and opinions which are entirely incompatible with all the sounder views of

legislation, and the obligations of a social state,—their ready zeal in support of inflammatory speeches,—their eager desire for the perusal and promulgation of all publications of a levelling, and even of an immoral tendency, termed "popular," are sufficiently corroborative of the justice of their exclusion from a greater share of equality than that which the constitution has provided.

The *active* section of the popular classes in this country appears totally regardless of that nicer conception of the value of representative rights, *independently administered*, which forms at once their greatest privilege and their best protection. They entertain no clear or settled notion, that free society is a state of fluctuating existence, where the compulsory obligation of consolidated law interposes itself to guard the full permansion of those rights; which, after being defined, are recognised and reduced to practice, as the only fair medium of protective assurance, against the inroads of passion, violence, and injustice, from whatever quarter they may arise!

The passion of selfishness is admitted, on all hands, to be a prevalent failing, or subordinate quality in the human character; nor do the advantages of birth, education, station, or even free intercourse with the most liberal amongst mankind, or even the injunctions of the Christian dispensation, sufficiently control the propensity; but admitting this to be a highly exceptionable failing, in our otherwise sufficiently imperfect nature, and one which is severely injurious to the general welfare of society, and free diffusion of the comforts of life, the evil is not one to be corrected by violent or summary measures; neither can that class, however valuable to the state, which, from its very situation in the scale of society, or its possessory means, is below the stage of *independence*, be considered competent to form an adequate judgment, nor

to give an intelligent, impartial, or deliberate verdict, on points which vitally affect the interests of the possessors of real property; nor over those who obtain derivative benefits, from the use of capital in the state, whether engaged in trade, professions, or commerce.

The man who derives an income of from one to five hundred pounds per annum, from any source whatever, is a far more independent agent, and his vote and opinion is infinitely more valuable, than that which emanates from the mere circumstance of his being subject to the controul of a landlord, for a rental at any given sum, especially one at a *low* standard. Property, combined with intelligence, should, therefore, always possess the *first* claim to consideration, and a full voice or due weight in the regulation and amendment of all matters connected with civil policy. Mutual security can only be established by men possessing a fair reciprocity of interests and feelings; nor, is the partial restriction, in their hands, injurious in reality to the well-being of the less wealthy or the less influential of their fellow-men, who must always command their *due share* of influence, and even of power, in the state; but, on the contrary, the general security of the commonwealth, being preserved by a balanced power of a less vacillating character, its repose must necessarily be productive of the most essential benefits, in the end, to the poorer orders of the community themselves.

When different stations and degrees of political influence are allotted to different classes in a state, where the power of rising to the highest is open to individuals of every class, a sense of honourable emulation will necessarily stimulate the man of high birth or possessions to honourable or distinguished attainments;—the hope of distinction and reward, the man of letters, the merchant, or man of business;—and the prospect of advancement, the artizan or mechanic, to

habits of useful industry. It is strictly on this principle, under a free constitution, and a limited monarchy, like that of England, that the basis of reformed or truly improved *popular representation* can be formed, to be productive of advantage to the general weal, and the fatal convulsions incidental to Montesquieu's deprecated spirit of democracy effectually controlled. On such a basis rests all that combines security with dignity and power. The salutary ascendency of free government is preserved, without any improper infringement on the *consistent rights* of the people. It presents that fair system of equality which the natural and dependent condition of man, in the great scheme of the universe, renders necessary in perpetuity for his protection and advancement; and if the *utilitas publica* is really to be entertained, is as superior to *universal suffrage*, as the clear light of day to the darkness which prevents the perception of objects beyond a limited sphere in optics, and the only one adapted for a free community of intelligent citizens. *Chaque nation doit se gouverner selon les besoins de ses affaires, et la* conservation judicieuse *du bien public; mais, la science du gouvernement, n'est qu'une science de combinaisons, d'applications, et d'exceptions, selon le temps, les* lieux, *et les circonstances. Ce qui fait qu'on n'est pas content de sa condition, c'est l'idée chimérique qu'on se forme du bonheur d'autrui!* The fine views of *Marmontel* are supportive of these sentiments, in the fullest degree. "It follows, that to establish good government, the good must be attached to the good, the evil kept with the evil, and the just and useful combined with the honest. This order or system adjusted, you see at once how the manners of the people would sustain the *laws*, and how far *opinion* would be instrumental in controling *power*, under hopes and fears, rewards and punishments, enjoyments and privations. These are the measures which the

state (*la politique*) ought to propound for the preservation of the balance of Liberty (*balance de la liberté*). Under such rules, the *world* may be governed with her counsel, by common consent."—BELISAIRE, *à l'Empereur Justinien.*

CHAPTER IV.

THE ANTIQUITY OF NOBILITY, AND RELATIVE ADVANTAGES OF THE ENGLISH PEERAGE, IN CONNEXION WITH THE FOUNDATION OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND FREE INSTITUTIONS.

"What development can the civilization of a People assume, if there be nothing to connect the present with the past,—if the depositories of human knowledge must be constantly removed,—if the finer monuments of Genius and Wisdom cannot be transmitted to posterity?"—HUMBOLDT.

"Nec vera virtus, cum semel excidit,
Curat reponi deterioribus?"—HORAT.

IT has been admitted by the most able writers of ancient and modern times, that in the institution of Civil Government there exists an unlimited power,—absolute, needful, and comprehensive. This principle of power is the *universal reason of mankind*, or, substantially, human Law, and as such seems, *à priori*, to have been deposited with the whole body politic, wherever that body rested, although in the executive part it needed an *Authority* for its foundation. Such needful authority could alone be properly supplied by a Power to which the whole human race, in its natural state and mortal condition, was both subject and responsible for its actions in every form. Hence the establishment of civil government, both in the eye and under the express decree of God, constituted a *Trust* for

certain uses and specific purposes, embracing at once the temporal advantage and eternal welfare of man, dependent upon his general conduct. This marked distinction becomes highly necessary for consideration, because, unless for the purpose of illustrating the imperfection of all human undertakings, we entirely exclude from our fundamental scheme the institution of *heathen government*, as having not only been deficient of that needful authority, but absolutely founded in direct rebellion against the Creator and Supreme Governor of the World!

It does not follow, that because the Almighty did not on every occasion, by a direct interposition, destroy those governments which were of a purely human or heathen institution, that he was either pleased or satisfied with them, and the marked denunciations of Scripture expressly negative such an assumption. The very name of *Nimrod*, in the enigmatical construction of the Hebrew language, signifies *rebellion;* and the full manifestation of God's displeasure, by the dispersion at the tower of *Babel*, which signifies *confusion*, is conclusive evidence, even where the heathen nations were concerned, against the establishment of government, or at least the executive part of it, without his authority!

"Saith *Cyrus*, king of Persia," a heathen monarch, "the Lord God of Heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth." By the delegated authority then of this heathen King was the temple of the Jews rebuilt, after its entire destruction by *Nebuchadnezzar;* and it marks the use which the Almighty made of Cyrus as an instrument of his purpose for the twofold object of manifesting his power to the heathens, and showing to the Israelites that the Temple could not be built up again without his express authority. But the perfect institution of legitimate civil government must be sought for in the covenant which God made with *Noah* in the Ark!

Upon this foundation rests the view taken by *Locke*, when in the 22d chapter of his *Common Place Book*, he arranges "Magistrates and Magistracy," as "the ordinance of God, and that by Him are they advanced to offices, and their *Titles* given them."

The authority for creating the *kingly office*, or that of supreme magistrate in the State, may be gathered from what passed between the Almighty and Samuel, who, although He first warned the people, through him as the chief judge, of the danger they would incur of becoming subservient to the purposes of pride and ambition, afterwards conceded their request, and not only appointed unto them a *King*, but the *Law* by which they were to be governed was *written* by Samuel in a *Book*. And when, as a Christian nation and people, we implore the Divine blessing on our Sovereign, in our *national anthem*, we should remember the antiquity of its precedent, and the solemn and responsible circumstances which gave rise to it: "And Samuel said to all the people, See ye him whom the LORD hath chosen, that there is none like him among all the people? And all the people shouted, and said, GOD SAVE THE KING!" "Then Samuel told the people the manner of the kingdom, and wrote it in a book, and laid it up before the LORD." See 1 Samuel, chap. x. v. 24, 25. It may possibly be objected by some, that this express institution of the Almighty for *civil purposes*, had sole reference to the Jewish dispensation and people, or the customs of one particular tribe or class of men. In answer to such objections, we may with propriety array the authority of Him, who emphatically declared, *Nemo est propheta in patriâ suâ*; but who also said to the Roman, Pilate, when on the judgment-seat, in the warning voice of admonition, "*Thou couldst have no power whatever against me, except it were given thee from above!*"

Having thus briefly illustrated the necessity for an authority

in the foundation of civil government, or the execution of the law emanating therefrom, in a Scriptural and Christian point of view, we now proceed to the discussion of those circumstances which led to its establishment as an institution of human emergency, independently of or apart from divine agency.

In the natural economy of human existence or *Life*, whether we place the power of *volition* in the head, heart, or entire nervous system, the body moves and acts by a concurrent *impulse*, or co-operation and consent of all its members, under the directing influence of the mind. This general diffusion of power, or stimulus of action, placed essentially in the *entire* body of a people, or community of human beings, is what the best legislators of all ages, in their several designs of government, have laboured to deposit in such hands only, and in such forms, as would on all occasions tend to the preservation of the whole body from the evils of tyranny or anarchy within, as well as the consequences of violence, rapine, and injustice, from without. By far the greater number, and the most eminent in every nation, have agreed that it constituted a trust of too great moment to be deposited with any one man, or single association of men of equal pretensions, independent of control; they therefore reserved to the whole body the right of maintaining an authority, but left the executive power unfettered in the hands of the *one*, the *few*, or the *many*; into which three distinct divisions or classes all purely independent bodies amongst mankind seem naturally to have separated themselves from the earliest period of time.

Passing here over the great empires of remote antiquity, of whose civil institutions, excepting those of the Jews, we have but partial and imperfect records, the system of *Solon* may be taken as an early specimen of standard perfection in

the construction of laws purely human, or based on *necessity*, as a moral foundation. In all the minor republics of Greece, Italy, and Sicily, and even the larger ones of Rome and Carthage, the people associated together in society or family compact, as soon as they arrived at a certain stage of civilization, did voluntarily divide themselves into three distinct orders or powers. The first was that of some superior genius, who had either signalized himself by his address amongst his fellow citizens, or who had obtained their gratitude and confidence, by his prowess in arms, or by the benefits rendered them in their domestic affairs,—this gave him ascendency amongst the people, and he not only became their leader in all warlike expeditions, but sat as their president in civil assemblies, and authority was given to him by, as it were, common consent, for a public benefit. This arrangement is grounded both on the law of nature and the principles of reason, as a necessary medium of mutual protection; which, in all cases of danger and difficulty, where true courage or real prudence are required, impel us to seek counsel or assistance from an individual, or select body of individuals, rather than from an uncertain multitude, whose opinions must necessarily be distracted, and whose resources could not be brought to act in unison with any hope of advantage for a common benefit.

The second division of power in the regulations of social life, has been deposited with that class of men, who, by whatever means of ascendency or acquirement, arising out of the first principle, have obtained large and dependent possessions, or have descended from ancestors of renown, whose reputation of itself had been sufficient to secure to their posterity a continued pre-eminence in the public direction or control of the affairs of their fellow men, less influential or less informed than themselves,—arising from their presumed means

of acquiring insight into the intricacies of government, under the opportunities for travelling, the advantages of education, leisure, and study, producing an enlarged sphere in the boundary of human comprehension. These having a community of interests, and being generally placed on a *par* in the scale of intelligence, and uniting in thought and opinion, felt the necessity for acting in concert for purposes of mutual protection, against internal dissensions, and foreign invasions: thus a great national council was formed spontaneously, for the conservation of the whole body; and these circumstances alone, in their regular course, without any usurpation of power, or stretch of authority, constitute the basis and early foundation of *Nobility*, or the Patrician Order, in all civilized states!

The last division of social power was that of the mass, or aggregate body of the people, whose part was necessarily of indisputable importance, and their means great, whenever they united firmly, and upon a comprehensive understanding for a common purpose, either in one general assembly, as in the infancy of a republic, or by deputation, when they became more dispersed, and their possessions increased by commerce or agriculture. Thus the basis for *three* estates was laid in all the more ancient empires and states, with the solitary exception of that of the *Hindoos*, which under the Brahminical Code had *four* built upon its foundation.

The three forms of government admitted into the schools of learning of the ancients, and adopted by different states, differed only in form, by the executive power having been deposited in the hands of *one*, or occasionally *two* heads, as with the *Spartan Suffetes*, who were invested with equal authority,—or in a *senate* composed of the noble or patrician order, and sometimes the people collective or representative; thus again forming three distinct estates, or heads of power.

Each of these three estates, or independent bodies, alternately exercised the administrative power in Greece and Rome; but the balance of power in the last resource was always, under the most renowned and liberal legislators of those ages, held to be *equally divided* amongst all three. Hence it follows, that every free state, to continue such, must preserve a balance of power within itself in the regulations of its domestic policy: so also must each separate state, to retain its own independence, labour continually to preserve the balance of power with reference to surrounding states and kingdoms; and this necessarily forms a fundamental rule of action in the policy of every wise government, which studies the general security of the people, whether the administration be in the hands of the one, the few, or the many!

As an exemplification of the important object in view, if early example be required to sustain the feebler powers of argument, Greece in her rise and glory, as well as her degeneracy, presents the fairest specimen. The renown of her *arms* and the fame of her *poets*, have alike fanned the inspirations of genius in all succeeding time. She was (wherever born) the nursing mother of *Homer*, possessing within himself, a vocabulary of language in design,—an empire of originality in thought,—of grandeur in conception,—of perfection in execution!

Οἵη περ φύλλων γενεὴ, τοίηδε καὶ ἀνδρων [1].

It may be desirable, then, in support of the preceding views, to refer specifically to the stores of antiquity for *original precedents*. If we only cursorily trace the origin of civil rule, independently of divine regulations, or the early foundation of governments, which, under the authority of the sacred writings, were out of the pale of God's *particular pro-*

[1] "*Like leaves on trees, the race of man is found.*"—POPE.

vidence, from their idolatrous constitution, the means are ample, and the moral instructive.

Civilization progressed with the Egyptians, under *Memnon*, the inventor of letters, in the age of the patriarch Jacob; they had the earliest reputation for profound wisdom, although it is more than probable, a vast proportion of their intelligence was derived from the Assyrians; and, if the destruction of the great library at Alexandria has deprived us of the early written records of the glory and peculiar policy of this ancient and extraordinary people, the researches, even of modern travellers, are sufficient of themselves to establish the correctness of that authority, which emphatically declares their learning to have "exceeded all the learning of the earth." To Humboldt, Volney, Bruce, Belzoni, Salt, and a host of names, endeared in the annals of research, are we indebted for that laborious exploration of their monumental remains, which give evidence so conclusive, as to remove the very surmise of a hypothetical figure having been used by the sacred historian, whilst at the same time they abundantly establish the fluctuating perfectibility of the human race!

To the Egyptians we stand indebted for the first conception of the useful and elegant arts; and human life, from first to last, may be truly said to produce nothing more than a series of refined imitations, whether for good or evil! *Seneca* prescribed the correct course, if we desire to render our lives truly beneficial to ourselves, or useful to others. "*Homines amplius oculis quam auribus credunt; longum iter est per præcepta, breve et efficax per exempla.*" Thus Solomon truly said, there was "nothing new under the sun!"

The Egyptians were first acquainted with agriculture and the use of the plough,—they were profound astronomers, and astute philosophers; and their funeral orations to the memories of those whose lives had been exemplary, who

were alone considered worthy of perpetuation, or of having their deeds recorded, their bodies *embalmed*, and deposited in the durable catacombs of the Pyramids, prove them (notwithstanding their idolatry,) to have been rigid moralists for many ages in their national policy. They were also a commercial nation, and it is by no means improbable they were acquainted with the use of the mariner's compass, although not in the precise forms we have it, for their computation of time, and knowledge of *Geography*, according to the researches of *Strabo*, justify the conclusion. The Phœnicians, from whose proximity to the Egyptian empire, may be said to have formed part of its first territories, even in the time of *Abraham*, had their sea ports, their fleets, and magazines of commerce; but in vain do we look for even the remains of their maritime power, such is the instability of all human objects, however magnificent in design, or apparently consolidated and perfect in execution! Where then is the theory, or what the value of the notions of those soaring philosophers, who would lead us to imagine that the human race can be reduced to a standard of progressive improvement without the hazard of declension? If *Christianity* has failed of its object, in sufficiently controlling the passions of mankind, and restraining its ambition, its perpetual tendency to act with individual and national injustice, in latter ages, what defined system will they afford to us in the exercise of their wisdom, in exchange for that which offers so many *practical* advantages? The calamities which are incidental to man and his predilections, are the same in all ages under similar circumstances,—his desires and his misfortunes increase in the same ratio with his pleasures, and leave him where they found him!—The fine sentimental reflection of the Italian moral adapts itself to the highest order as well as to the lowest ranks of human society, in every State. "*Le calamità del*

uomo crescono in ragione de suoi godimenti; e l'Imperadore che li riunisce tutti, quanto è degno di compassione!"

The nature of man is such, that he never can feel himself perfectly satisfied in this sublunary state of existence: the tyranny of the understanding warring perpetually with the imagination, all the other faculties suffer proportionably; the heart expands with hope and ambition, or it contracts and withers under disappointment. Restless and impatient of restraint, it grasps at shadows, and neglects the substance,—despair succeeds defeat and blighted expectations,—a sense of emptiness supervenes, and previously to the due performance of the earthly climax, in innumerable instances, indifference, insensibility, and even *melancholy*, assume the possession of the mind! This is the lot of one portion of mankind;—to avoid an issue so cruel in its results, another, and a large proportion, sink into the pleasures of *sense*, or they busy themselves with political speculations, adopting the misanthropic sentiment, that one portion of the species must necessarily be formed for the injury or persecution of the other; and they immediately array the angry and distrustful passions in the contest for ascendency. The conflict of *opinions* mars the progress of success for a time; but the human faculties have experienced too great a degree of development to have their cravings easily appeased, and various means are tried, many of them extravagant, and sometimes desperate; but they as frequently fail in their object: to refresh the imagination—to revive good feelings—to ascend again to the pure and healthy elevation of reason, are matters of no ordinary difficulty. The attempts, indeed, are often useless, even after the full conviction of *error*, until the excess of mischief has provided the *remedy*, as by a providential interposition, by giving a violent shock to the human race, and agitating, as it were, the depths of its nature to their foundation, excite the calm

energy and reflective spirit necessary to recommence its course, and construct anew the framework of civilization, which those who admit first causes will readily assent to.

The difficulty which exists in disproving the existence of a Supreme Being, sufficiently attests the fact to all reflecting minds, that the providence of God is *universal!* Thus, even in worldly matters, his authority is indisputable, as connected with moral rule; and we may demand with Marmontel,— "Quel homme assez audacieux peut dire avoir sondé les décrets éternels? Mais Dieu nous a donné deux guides, qui doivent être d'accord ensemble, la lumière de la foi, et celle du sentiment. Ce qu'un sentiment naturel et irrésistible nous assure, la foi ne peut le désavouer. La *révélation* n'est que le *supplément de la conscience:* c'est la même voix qui se fait entendre du haut du *Ciel,* et du fond de mon âme. Il n'est pas possible qu'elle se démente: et si d'un côté je l'entends me dire, que l'homme juste et bienfaisant est cher à la *Divinité,* de l'autre elle ne me dit pas qu'il est l'objet de ses vengeances!" What are the opinions of the disciples of the Doctrinaire school of politics, when put in comparison with sentiments like these? And yet the very fluctuating character of *popular opinion* amongst the French people, of all other nations in modern times, sufficiently demonstrates the variable disposition of human nature, in regulating questions of civil government. To imagine that our social institutions can be essentially improved by the adoption of any *model* they at present offer to us, is to betray, at best, a very superficial knowledge of the English character. In minor matters, such as their system of general public instruction, they may exceed us in its regulations; but in all classical and fundamental subjects, we are a *century* in advance of our accomplished and volatile neighbours!

The successive *retrocession* which ancient states and king-

doms have made from an elevation of the highest order in human glory, to that of barbarism and gross despotic slavery, or positive annihilation of power, leaves little to sustain the value of mere philosophy, under whatever form it may attempt the direction of human affairs; and no where can a better *moral* description be found of the mutability of earth's possessions, or the universal chain of human society, than that furnished by Pope's elegant "Essay on Man."

> "All forms that perish, other forms supply,
> (By turns we catch the vital breath, and die,)
> Like bubbles on the sea of matter borne,
> They rise, they break, and to that sea return!
> Nothing is *foreign*; parts relate to whole;
> One all extending, *all preserving soul*,
> Connects each being, greatest with the least;
> Made beast in aid of man, and man of beast;
> All serv'd, all serving: nothing stands *alone!*
> The chain holds on, and where it ends, *unknown!*"

Such, then, is the course, progressive and retrogressive, which the empire of the human mind has made amongst the inhabitants of the various states and kingdoms, ancient and modern, with whom it has risen and associated. Let them be fairly considered under their various forms and changes; and, on the other hand, reflect upon those nations that, for many hundred years, or even from the earliest periods, have made no progress whatever towards their social or moral improvement; who, from physical constitution, defective mental power, climate, and other contingent circumstances, appear unable to change their natural condition, or seem condemned to remain *stationary* in the order of creation:—view these comprehensively, with all those empires of renown, who, having once shone with volcanic splendor, present nothing for the remains but the *crater* of their dark *abyss*; and let the worldly

philosopher then calmly ask himself, what page of history sustains his assertion, of the continual or progressive improvement of mankind?

Even amongst modern nations, the faculties of whose inhabitants are the most developed, and who are presumed to possess the brighter gifts of civilization,—all the advantages of historical research, of superior geographical knowledge, and of extensive commercial intercourse, we vainly seek the possession of substantial advantages, over those of the ancients. If *refinements in luxury* are to be taken as the test of improvement, it is possible we may in many instances exceed the ancients: we may also excel them in the art of *war*, or rather in improved methods for destroying our own species with greater facility; but that speaks little for the *moral* improvement of man, as a social being; for the means are not confined to one nation or people, and there is an awful reciprocity of emulation in this anti-human feeling! As regards the useful sciences, with the exception of chemistry, and the discovery of the powers of steam, the moderns have yet a vast deal to perform to eclipse the ancients. Architecture has degenerated; and the spirit of the age is generally directed more to the supply of materials for the demands of the time present, than any becoming or generous provision for posterity.

It is possible, that the natural sciences have progressed in modern times, or rather, that they have changed their *character*; but they only render us in some measure better acquainted with the theory or phenomena of nature, and such progress merely consists in resolving some few of these sciences into others: the same may be urged with regard to the progress of the human imagination, and of all the other sciences, to which it is the fostering parent! When we reflect upon the degree of perfection to which the *plastic arts* attained, under the training of some ancient nations, we have

grounds for despairing of our ever being enabled to come up to them. Of the design and powers of their *music*, we are miserably ignorant: it appears to have been the early sublime language of the earth, for the most ostensible purposes; and its principles and effects well understood, by whole tribes, or communities of men. The metrical composition and musical design of the Psalms of David, in Hebrew, surpass in grandeur of conception, and lofty power of execution, all the music which ever was composed. The same may be advanced with respect to *language*; and the most powerful of all language, that of *poetry*, the first-born of music, which has assumed new, but not superior forms.

Reflecting seriously on these things, we may form a better *rationale*, with regard to the truth or intrinsic value of those histories of mankind, which, under specious colouring, represent it as continuously moving onward towards perfection,—that the *march of intellect*, in its ambiguous course or uncertain route, is never actually arrested in its progress,—that the *retrogression*, which is occasionally apparent, is only a progressive movement in disguise,—and, that taking into the account the whole family of mankind, or the individual characteristics of Man, and tracing his steps, vacillating or not, through all the succeeding periods of time, we acquire full knowledge of his powers and attainments! "Nature," said Bacon, "is an intricate labyrinth, and if you move hastily therein, you will be sure to lose your way." Assuredly the views of such philosophical reasoners, present a very fine or captivating idea under the principle of unity, or uniformity; but where is the continued unity of principle, or the uniformity of practice, afforded by any one nation, or people, on the face of the earth, save that of the Hindoos, who were eventually destroyed? The Chinese may be an existing exception, but we are excluded from knowing them.

In our historical view of the genuine character of man, we must make reference to first causes; but we are not in this essential science better instructed than were the Greeks, or Romans, even in their earliest times,—hence the difficulty of our being enabled, on the most rational foundation, to come to satisfactory conclusions, or to produce beneficial practical results, in our various schemes of social policy. The human race must be analysed in its *totality*, to be thoroughly understood and regulated with any prospect of success. It is this which alone can supply us with a complete knowledge of the character of Man,—of the immensity of his wants and desires —of the number and quality of his passions and prejudices, with their variation in each successive age, or their aspect in different times and countries. Thus may we may imitate the honourable conduct of ancient Nations and People, and partake of the glory and renown attached to their virtuous deeds. In undertaking a task of such moment, we must not commence at the top of the *pyramid*, but at its base, without which we never can obtain the elements of its proportion, nor the materials requisite for completing its superstructure. *Ce n'est pas un songe de prétendre mener les hommes par l'amour-propre et l'intérêt. Rappelons-nous comment s'étoit formé, dans la* république naissante, *ce sénat où tant de vertu, où tant d'héroisme éclatoit. C'est qu'il n'y avoit dans Rome rien au-dessus d'une si grande âme; c'est que l'estime publique étoit attachée aux* mœurs honnêtes,—*la vénération aux* mœurs vertueuses, *la gloire aux* mœurs héroïques. *Tels ont été dans tous les temps les grands ressorts du cœur humain!*

If we desire to know the human race generally, it is necessary to make ourselves acquainted with its particular examples and exceptions; that is, the various classes which compose it; and, to know them properly, it is requisite to examine each in what is peculiar to itself: this can alone be determined by

strict scrutiny into its language, history, customs, and predilections.

Notwithstanding the exertions of modern travellers, and men of refined genius, we are not yet in possession of those faithful portraitures of existing states and kingdoms, with reference to their present civilization, minutiæ of their features and localities, or the varied contingencies on which these are dependent, and which are absolutely necessary to enable us to form a correct judgment on the progress of society. Were we, as a people, possessed of this treasure, we should have ample truths for contemplation, and materials sufficient to convince the most querulous, that each nation, or community of men, presented a perfectly distinct view of human nature. Thus the real benefits, supposed to be possessed in common by all mankind, would be reduced to a limited number, and the discrepancy, both in quantity and character, would be far more striking than the resemblance. The Great Parent of all, has provided for the *natural* necessities of Man, in each place,—not his *artificial* means of existence!

Thus, in concluding with these discursive observations, although it is possible they may have been extended somewhat further than may, at first view, appear necessary to the taste of ordinary readers, they, nevertheless, present to the Christian patriot and the philanthropist a wide field for contemplation and inquiry. Reflecting on the vast desires, the soaring pretensions, the richer and apparently unlimited faculties of man, as a social and cultivated being, and contrasting them with the contracted boundaries of his natural state, and the miseries attendant upon it,—we find the theologian ranking him in the order of creation as a fallen creature of the first rank,—*a dethroned king*;—the pseudo philosopher, a *denaturalized animal*; or rather one punished for his own folly, in voluntarily quitting his proper station, and surrendering his

independence;—the Cosmolite considering him nothing more than a workman, or *machine*, who is dismissed from all claims on *futurity*, after having performed a few evolutions at the gigantic wheel of human *perfectibility*;—but the Christian, (armed with a higher authority,) views him with compassionate regard, as an immortal and highly responsible being, who commences his education in *time*, and is charged to perfect the first part, before *eternity*,—who has the light of *truth* provided to direct his reason, and *Faith* as his *polar star*; and who, advancing with steady step and slow progression, presses forward on his earthly journey, with certainty of arriving at its destination; because it has been decreed in the Councils of The Most High, that he shall live for ever! Thus armed, the just man is firm in his purpose, whilst performing those duties his probationary state requires for the temporal benefit of his fellow men: he looks upon the world merely as the grand theatre of his earthly mission,—the fiery zeal, or mistaken counsels, of his fellow-citizens are unable to divert him from his purpose—his mind soars above tyranny, to *immortality*, where he designs rendering up the "*five*, or the *ten* talents," deposited in his hands!

> "Justum et tenacem propositi virum,
> Non civium ardor prava jubentium,
> Non vultus instantis tyranni
> Mente qualit solidâ."—HORAT.

After the death of Pharaoh, by the Greeks called *Amenophis*, Sesostris, by the improvement of the Egyptian laws, and his general wisdom, as that of one directing head or leader, rendered that people the most powerful nation upon earth; for the various inhabitants of the continent of Europe and its islands were then wild and uncivilized. Refinement descended from the Egyptians to the Greeks; and Cecrops landing with an Egyptian colony at *Athens*, may be said to have been its

founder, for he introduced civilization, order, and harmony amongst the original inhabitants of the villages, and thus Athens eventually became the first seat of regular European government upon record. The Grecian history may be divided into four periods or *epochs*,—the first extending *one thousand years*, from the building of *Sicyon*, to the memorable siege of *Troy*, which lasted *ten years*: the second, from the demolition of Troy to the reign of *Darius*, who rebuilt the Temple at Jerusalem, on finding the decree of *Cyrus* for that purpose, written on a roll, amongst the archives, and who inflicted the penalty of *death* on any one who should interrupt its progress (when the Grecian and Persian history intermingle), containing *six hundred years*: the third, from the beginning of the reign of *Darius* to the death of *Alexander the Great*, comprehending the most important part of Grecian history: and the fourth beginning with the death of Alexander, and continuing, through the gradual declension of the Grecian power, till totally reduced by the Roman arms. *Sicyon* formed the most ancient state of Greece, and according to their early historians, its first king was appointed before the death of *Noah*. Then followed successively *Argos*, whose king, *Inachus*, was contemporary with Abraham, after Nimrod 297 years. Then Athens; Sparta, or Lacedemon, Corinth, Thebes, founded by Cadmus; Macedon, Thrace, and Epirus. The Greeks also had *four* distinct languages,—the Attic (from the Egyptian), the Ionic, Doric, and Æolic. After the confusion of tongues, in the reign of *Nimrod*, the Attic became the most polished and elegant of the four;—Thucidydes, Isocrates, Zenophon, Plato, Aristophanes, and Demosthenes wrote in it.

If we desire to trace the slowly improving career of human government in European states, on the basis laid down, the able authority of the Grecian historians furnishes us at once with the narration and the model of their institutions. Various

indeed were the conflicting circumstances of the infant State of Athens, until the period of her third king, when we find *Amphictyon*, a man described as having been endowed with extraordinary genius and strength of mind. He it was, living 1496 years before the Christian era, who united in one common system of politics all the States of Greece, by engaging twelve of their chief cities to join together for mutual benefit and protection, each of which sent their two deputies annually to the senate of the renowned *Thermopylæ*, who there debated the interests of the commonwealth, with the King as their president, and by him named the Amphictyonic Council. By means of this *select* representative body were the interests and independence of the infant States of Greece preserved at home, and her power maintained abroad, against the united strength and repeated attacks of the Persian empire. Do we further trace the progress of this very renowned people, in their career of increased prosperity at home and authority abroad, to the time of *Theseus*, we find him giving superior power and civilization to *Athens*, by the institution of new religious rites and ceremonies, which, although superstitious in their principle, had the effect of improving the public manners and morals! If we wish to learn how Theseus finally improved the condition of the Athenian people and their laws, —he is engaged in inviting strangers of learning and influence to settle at Athens under legislative protection,—and finally in dividing the whole population into three distinct classes or orders of men—the Nobles, the Merchants, and the Agriculturists. The two latter, from the state encouragement given to arts and agriculture, soon became opulent and powerful, and, as similar interests have progressed in the history of Britain, consequently possessed great influence in the state!

Thus the ancient Athenians, who, from the reputation pro-

verbially given them by their own historians, independently of their love of glory, were admirers of *Liberty* and self-interest, and possessing moral as well as physical courage and commercial enterprise, present an early, but very fair prototype of the old English character; and they flourished proportionately as they steered clear of popular excesses, and preserved the balance of power in the direction of their social institutions. But, let the calm and reflecting English reader mark the *sequel;* and under the guide of those feelings which are based on genuine patriotism, contemplate gravely the picture of the Athenian people, when losing sight of even the lesser ties of moral duty and social rectitude, they burst asunder those links by which the better interests of mankind can alone be preserved; and let him apply the scene and the circumstances to his own times, if he is desirous that the whole frame-work of civilised society, as established in his native land, should not be entirely dilacerated, to serve the purposes of the designing agitator and the levelling demagogue, or to crown the hopes of the infidel!

Under the system laid down by Theseus, the Greeks continued the improvement of their social condition, with varied success, to the time of Codrus, the seventeenth and last king of Athens, who was slain in the war against the *Heraclidæ*, 1070 years before the Christian era, when the Athenians, abandoning themselves to perfect idolatry, laxity of principle, and republican rule, proclaimed that *Jupiter Ammon*, the *deity* of the Egyptian mythology, should be their only king; whilst about this period the Jews, the chosen people, to free themselves from the partial and unjust government of the sons of *Samuel*, and to enable them to compete with their enemies, petitioned for a supreme head, or civil form of government under a *King*, which forms the basis or first precedent for the establishment of monarchical rule under the ecclesiastical law,

and the decree of God! It is from this institution that the model of government established by the Anglo-Saxon kings of Britain, and continued to the present age, in the coronation service, trusts, and duties, imposed on our kings, was taken.

With regard to the social progress of the Athenians after the death of Codrus, we find them existing for three centuries under the despotism of perpetual *Archons*, or chief magistrates, when one of that order, *Draco*, gave them laws written in characters of blood! Until the time of *Solon*, these iniquitous laws remained in force, when he revised and remodelled them, and re-established the supreme court of justice, or the AREOPAGITÆ, founded originally by Cecrops; and whilst the Athenians retained any semblance of virtue, they upheld and venerated it, and even the Romans referred to its authority, and submitted to its decision in matters of doubt and intricacy; but by the laws of Solon none were admitted to preside therein who had not passed the office of archon. Even the witty Aristophanes, in the full exercise of his unbridled licentiousness, had not the temerity to assail this venerable court of civil judicature, which upheld the Greeks from positive loss of public morals to the time of *Pericles*, when the members refusing the admission of the latter amongst their body, he resolved to court popular favour, by lessening its authority, as well as that of the *nobility*. Thus Pericles artfully paved the way for his own despotic ascendency, turning his bright abilities to the disadvantage of the real liberties of the people in every form. Under his influence, Cimon and Thucydides, two of the ablest of their leaders, were banished; and the Athenians, always jealous of their freedom, suffered him to remain for fifteen years the despotic sovereign, or only minister of a jealous republic! From that time the morals of the people became corrupt, and the Areopagites were no longer conspicuous for their virtue or refined justice. It is true, the

ambition of Pericles raised the glory of the Athenians in *arms;* but the Peloponnesian war, which lasted twenty-seven years, was concluded by the destruction of their empire, and the demolition of the walls of Athens. Thus the Greeks had substantial reasons for execrating the memory of a man, who, in spite of their victories and indulgences under his command, had, by his bad example, successfully corrupted their morals, who made licentiousness respected by them, and the indulgence of every species of immorality the best qualification for civil or military honours! The satirical censure of Demetrius, who, when their leaders talked of *reformation* in Athens, told them to *begin at home;* and Mr. Burke's finely drawn picture of their gross degeneracy and its consequences, are alike lessons of inestimable value.

"The whole history of this celebrated republic," says Mr. Burke, "is but one tissue of rashness, ingratitude, injustice, violence, and *tyranny,* and indeed of every species of wickedness that can well be imagined. This was a city of *wise men,* in which a Minister could not *exercise his functions;* a warlike people, amongst whom a General did not dare either to *gain* or *lose* a battle; a learned nation, in which a philosopher could not venture on a free inquiry. This was the city which banished Themistocles, starved Aristides, exiled Miltiades, drove out Anaxagoras, and *poisoned Socrates!*—This was the city of *freemen,* which changed the forms of its government with the moon;—eternal conspiracies, daily revolutions,—nothing fixed or established! A *republic,* as an ancient philosopher shrewdly observed, 'is no one species of government, but a *magazine* of every species.' Here you find every sort of it, and that in the worst possible form. As there is a perpetual change, one *rising* and the other *falling,* you have before you all the violence and wicked policy by which the beginning power must always acquire its strength; and

all the weakness and wantonness by which falling states are brought to complete destruction!" Such then was *Liberty*, or her sovereign rule, in the fairest city of Greece, the seat of polished learning and the refined arts,—a fair criterion of the worthlessness of mere *knowledge*, however bright or splendid, when unsustained by *principle!* The philosophy of the Greeks had its origin in ignorance, and terminated in astonishment. Admiration has indeed occupied a portion of the interval since their downfal; but, as with the Greeks, the first philosophy was necessarily the offspring of superstition, so the last will be the matured child of reflecting adoration, for it will be controled by the superior light of *Christianity*,—thus presenting, under the influence of pure religion, a perfect contrast to the vacillating and levelling policy of the Athenians!

With regard to the laws of the Spartans, giving an equal division of *property*, they were those only of a roving, semi-barbarous state, framed by *Lycurgus* for a nation of soldiers. Under them, the sciences were banished, and these people were consequently held in little esteem by their more civilized neighbours of the Grecian States. Founded in gross superstition, and under the presumed inspiration of the *Delphian Oracle*, the laws of Sparta were a tissue of inconsistency,—on the one hand denouncing luxury, dissipation, and drunkenness,—and on the other, encouraging by their public spectacles immorality and licentiousness! The Spartans, after a career of about eight centuries, left little to record beyond that of their military renown; and as the once powerful empire of the Egyptians, ruined by a succession of weak monarchs, became a prey to the growing power of the Persians under Cambyses, until at length it fell prostrate at the feet of the Macedonian conqueror,—so also, the independent state of Sparta, with the rest of the states of Greece, became

tributary to the rising power of the Roman arms—presenting a sad testimonial of the vanity of human glory!

Thus it has been fairly shown, by a short sketch of the history of some of the most powerful and intelligent nations and states of antiquity, that whenever the balance of power was broken down in any one of them—whether their system were monarchical or republican—by the weakness, negligence, or ambition of the hands that held it, or by the people themselves, suffering the preponderance to diverge to either scale, the power never long remained in equal division between the remaining two; and such must inevitably be the case with all empires or systems of government, of which that of Rome, in more recent time, which rose upon the ruins of Greece, notwithstanding the anxiety and labours of her statesmen to avert the catastrophe, furnishes a powerful and conclusive example. This also gives the best definition of that which is denominated *tyranny*, or more properly the establishment of an unequal power in balance, by the most eminent Greek authors who have ever written on the subject; and which is not considered by them the mere seizing of the unlimited or uncontrolled power into the hands of a single person, as many most erroneously suppose; but the destruction of the balance, by whatever hand or party effected, and leaving the *momentum* wholly in one scale.

The undue usurpation of power, in any free State, or the establishment of despotism in opposition to the pre-existing privileges or customs of a people, are by no means limited to any one party, or member of a party. Two or three instances, drawn from ancient and modern history, are sufficiently corroborative of this view.

According to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, the Romans having sent to Athens and other Grecian cities for copies of the best codes of law, elected *ten* of their ablest and most re-

putedly liberal legislators, to put them into a form of adaptation for their own republic, and passed a law for the suspension of the consular power or office, during the exercise of the functions of the *Decemviri*, leaving the executive in the hands of those newly chosen state authorities. These very men, selected for the avowed purpose of digesting a body of laws for the protection and improvement of a free State or People, immediately usurped the entire government amongst themselves, established arbitrary power, and having appointed their spies and guards, affected kingly state, destroyed the nobility, and oppressed the people in various forms; and one of them having grossly insulted a Roman lady of courageous virtue,—a repetition of the same circumstance which only sixty years previously had occasioned the downfal of the *regal* power, also in this instance caused the expulsion of this decemviri of tyrants. So much for placing unrestrained power in the hands of professed liberals!

> "La liberté convive aimable
> Met les deux *coudes* sur la *table*."—VOLTAIRE.

The *Ephori* of Sparta were at first only individuals appointed by the king to judge in civil matters, whilst he, with his generals and the most aspiring of the people, were engaged in foreign wars; but these men, selected for the performance of a trust, or the mere fulfilment of a judicial duty, frequently usurped the royal authority, and proved themselves as great despots in every respect as many who obtained the name of *tyrants* in those cynical ages.

We have the unexceptionable authority of Thucydides, showing that after the fatal expedition to Sicily, the Athenians chose a senate of *four hundred*, who were also empowered to exercise the executive functions according to the established laws; but these men (all of an *equality*), becoming a body of arbitrary despots, were designated in the language of that

day an *oligarchy*, or tyranny of the select few, under which hateful designation they were, for their nefarious proceedings, violently deposed by the people. Xenophon, in his Book *De rebus Græcorum*, states, that when Athens was first conquered by Lysander, he appointed thirty persons to the government of the city, who immediately assumed the grossest tyranny; and conceiving that their power of domination was not sufficiently extensive, admitted *three thousand* into a share of the administration, who, when thus augmented, became an association of the greatest despots upon record, murdering, without just provocation, great numbers of the best men in the State. And in his *Memorabilia*, lib. iii. the same author further states, that this number "amounted to nearly a *third* of the whole city, which contained about ten thousand houses, and forming a majority of the people effective, or who were capable of taking any active part in popular affairs!" This sufficiently demonstrates that numbers *alone* present no security for the exercise of liberty, and that the greater the equality of rulers, so constituted, the greater are their facilities for trampling on the privileges of their fellow citizens.

Polybius relates, that in the second Punic war, the balance of power in Carthage became augmented in favour of the people, and to such a pitch, that contemporary authors considered their government to have been a perfect *dominatio plebis*, or popular tyranny, which this people at all times appeared prone to degenerate into; and at length occasioned the ruin of their independence. Their jealousies, their restlessness,—the frequent murder of their best Generals and leading men, as related by Diodorus, may also be adduced as another striking instance, if one were wanting, that *despotism* is never confined to an individual, nor to any specific number of individuals, in any state. From the last author, we gather one further striking example, and one so perfectly ana-

logous to that which occurred in the former French revolution, that they may with propriety be placed in juxta-position on the page of political history, although the latter event took place after a lapse of more than 2400 years; and it also, as an authentic fact of history, affords a memorial for the reflection of our own Legislators in modern times. Thus (in lib. 15.) it is related that "the *orators*," which, in modern phraseology, we would call *popular representatives*, "in the senate, stirred up the people of Argos against the *Nobles*, of whom *sixteen hundred* were murdered at one time;—and, lastly, these very orators themselves fell a sacrifice to the popular fury, because they withdrew their impeachment;"—or, in modern language, public declamation and political agitation, having raised a factious spirit they were totally unable to suppress! The circumstances attendant on the French revolution of 1789, are sufficiently known to most readers, and do not require enlarged description;—most of the leading *originators* of that memorable *crusade* for the professed object of extending the liberties of "*La belle France*," and curbing the pride, or controlling the independent rule and naval glory of "*La vieille Angleterre*" perished on that scaffold they had erected for others, or suffered ignominous deaths; and ultimately paved the way for a perfect military despotism;—for the entire control of *one* master mind,—a *genius* which ruled the French nation with a rod of *iron*, although he sprung not from her proper bosom! Like the Athenians of old, France, always jealous of her liberties, allowed herself to be led tamely captive in the glittering chains of glory! nevertheless, no man, in ancient or modern times, better understood the fickle and ambitious vain-glorious character of this chivalrous people,—he moulded them imperceptibly to his purpose, and gave them the quality of *consistency:* in his hands the French eagles soared above the sphere of even Roman renown,

and eclipsed the fame of the greatest of her captains: he made good use of the splendid satires of M. de Voltaire against his countrymen, and resolved to constitute himself their *General;* and France, "the country of talent, combined with folly,—of industry, marred by idleness,—of philosophy, impeded by fanaticism,—of gaiety, blended with pedantry,—of good laws and deep transgressions,—of good taste, inconsistency, and even *impertinence,*" shone out under his *leadership* with that singleness of purpose, and unanimity of sentiment, which all her popular powers, diversified or combined, were never able to command for her!

Historiæ decus est, et quasi anima, ut cum eventis causæ copulentur!—BACON *de Augment. Scien.*

Without the least hypothetical reasoning, we may fairly draw a few practical inferences, from the preceding examples in ancient and modern popular governments. In the first place, that a mixed form of government, partaking of the forms received into the schools of learning, is by no means an Institution of purely Gothic invention, as asserted by many of our pseudo-politicians, but has its foundation based in natural and reasonable causes, sustained by the opinions of the most eminent logicians and rational philosophers; and that it was adopted in most of the ancient States of renown or civilization, discretionally, whether it appeared under the figure of a *monarchy,* an *aristocracy,* or a *republic*: as those of Athens and Rome, without enumerating the several minor commonwealths of Gaul or Germany, established after the introduction of regular government into the States of Greece, and described by *Cæsar* or *Tacitus.*

If we take the experience of the best Grecian historians as a standard, Polybius asserts, that the best government upon earth is that which consists of *three independent forms,*—"*regno, optimatum, et populi imperio*"—which may, in strict

propriety, be translated or compared to our own, as consisting of *King, Lords,* and *Commons!* Such was the constitution of Sparta, as formed by Lycurgus, who, observing the evils and imperfections to which every one of these three forms, separately, were subject, perfected his scheme out of them *all,* reges, sehiores, and populus;—and the substantial authority quoted further informs us, that the Romans fell upon this system by *chance,* but the Spartans by *design!* Such at Carthage constituted the *summa respublica,* or the supreme rule of power in the last resort; for they had their kings, whom they designated *Suffetes,* and a senate composed of the nobles, or chief magistrates; and the commons also had a representative share in the government, but not in the character of a dominatio plebis, or *universal suffrage.*

In the next place, it must appear self-evident, that those political enthusiasts of the age, who talk largely of upholding the balance of liberty in Europe, and justly crying down the injustice done to unhappy Poland, by the despotic policy of Russia, and the impolicy on the part of Great Britain, in suffering her growing ambition to usurp the independence or government of Turkey,—the necessity for establishing free Institutions in Spain, Portugal, and Germany, act with flagrant inconsistency and specious deception, with regard to their home patriotism, when they catch at every opportunity, in principle and practice, to destroy that balance in the constitution of their own country, which is the greatest stake in her political, as well as moral existence and dependence!

If England is ever called upon again to aid by her counsel and example, or her energies in arms, the preservation or extension of rational liberty, which rests, *primarily,* in the retention of a well defined balance of power, in and between other States and Kingdoms; she will present but a sorry specimen of political wisdom, or even common integrity, by commencing with the destruction of that essential principle,

under her own domestic policy, for the maintenance of her most valuable institutions! The oratorical displays which have recently been put forth by some of our *reforming champions* of dubious fortune, and still more dubious principles, afford a perfect *burlesque* upon the art and science of legislation. The mirror which flatters not, may well disclaim such an association! The cause of truth needs not such assistance; and those who follow steadily in her train, may proudly say with VIRGIL,—

> " Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis,
> Tempus eget!"

Lastly, the error of those politicians is decisive, who give it out as an incontrovertible rule, that power is always most safely deposited for the public welfare in the hands of the *many*, rather than with those of the *few*. The law of Nature, and the argument of common sense, are equally opposed to such a fallacy,—public benefits can alone be secured by laws which are not liable to be violated by every popular impression of the day, or party ebullition of feeling amongst individuals.—" *Communis utilitatis derelictio contra naturam est*," says Cicero; and another renowned authority, in his Institutes, has illustrated the evils of a relaxed state, or military policy, even in peaceful times.

" *Hinc tot ubique ab hostibus illatæ clades, dum longa pax militem incuriosius legit; dum possessoribus indicti tyrones per gratiam aut dissimulationem probantur!*"—VEGET. L. I. ch. 7.

Enough has been shown, that neither nature consulted nor reason applied, to attain correct ends, support the extreme liberal position. The logical reason adduced in favour of extensive popular power, is founded on no rational basis, nor does it enable us, even inferentially, to come to any other than a hypothetical conclusion, with regard to the *possible* advantages which may result from its application in a state like

that of Britain, where freedom of opinion is so apt to run riot, and form alliance with licentiousness;—and it may be fully sustained, under the arguments which have already been adduced, that in order to preserve the balance properly, under a mixed form of government in all free states, the limits of power to be deposited with or between each party, should be nicely determined and sufficiently elucidated to the people at large, by those who pretend to initiate them in the mysteries of *knowledge*,—that they may be enabled to form not only a proper estimate, or correct notion, with regard to the relative interests, or share which they may be fairly entitled to possess, or the control which each party may consistently exercise on the other, but with direct reference to the good of the entire body politic. It is the want of proper attention to this most substantial principle, which has produced all those struggles for ascendency, liberty, equality of power, or the exclusiveness of kingly prerogative, arising from the encroachments of the few upon the rights of the many, and of the many upon the privileges of the few, which have distracted the councils and tormented the minds of mankind, from the time that civil government first became an essential institution for human society; and the result has invariably been, in every State, the establishment of despotism, with one party or the other, as a necessary sequence of human vanity, prejudice, and ambition, arising out of the want of such perfect definition and understanding. Well, indeed, might Juvenal inveigh against the follies of nations in his day, in the fine vein of satirical censure, quoted in the preface to this work; the acute justice and reasoning powers of which, are fully applicable to all classes of mankind, and to every age and form of government which has existed, not excepting that of our own excellent constitution, under the ardent fever she has been struggling with for many months past; and from which she

has barely yet approached the stage of convalescence! It behoves us, then, to treat the case scientifically,—to moderate the inconsiderate violence of popular reaction, if we indeed desire to ensure a perfect restoration of first principles.

It is only the politically insane portion of the British people, that can possibly be brought to consider "history an old almanac," or custom and example in affairs of government obsolete matters, and unworthy of attention. With the novelty-hunters, or notoriety-mongers, such views indeed are cherished; and, being so fostered, they speak little either for their practical wisdom or theoretical honesty, in matters of social policy. Common sense, as well as experience and accurate knowledge of the human character, sufficiently illustrate, that whichever of the three divisions of power enters upon the struggle for ascendency, unless due precaution and independent control are exercised by the other two, upon every new question or propounded measure, that party most interested in the progress, will assuredly decide in its own favour; and this purely under the influence of that self-esteeming quality existent in the species. Thus the partizans of each and every particular body in the State, will talk largely upon inherent or *original rights*,—they will engender and propagate animosities,—create, foster, and promote prejudices; and reserving to themselves the spirit, or the right, of dictation, will magnify the value or importance of comparatively trifling privileges, in order to answer the purposes of their own plans of *expediency*, or aggrandisement, whenever the opportunity presents itself;—they will make ample demands, and limited concessions, generally becoming considerable gainers under their agitation, until the equilibrium is destroyed, when despotism must inevitably succeed; and it can be of little moment to the people at large, from which of the three original powers this supervenes,—for tyranny, in any

form, varies little in its essential characteristics, or its practical results, whether it be monarchical, oligarchal, or republican.

It behoves the sober-minded and reflecting people of England at large, to ponder these things seriously,—the practical manifestation of their consequences is daily,—nay, even hourly, passing before their eyes, in contemporary states. Let not the severe *exposé* of Voltaire ever become applicable to the *English character*, as it has, within half a century after his predictory sarcasms, been verified with his own countrymen in atrocious sacrifices of human blood,—although France imagined she wisely fostered her *schoolmaster* and his *system*, before the birth of the nineteenth century!

"*Les guerres civiles de France ont été plus longues, plus cruelles, plus fécondes en crimes, que celles d'Angleterre; mais, de tous ces guerres civiles, aucune n'a eu* une liberté sage *(ou rationnelle) pour son objet!*"—M. de VOLTAIRE.

It does not appear that the Hall of the *Academy of Sciences*, or of any other of the schools of learning in *Paris*, (political or instructive,) is decorated by a tablet for the purpose of recording the *moral* opinions of this versatile genius, in letters of *gold*, although his other writings are so generally admired, —for, the *spirit* of the *Doctrinaire* has assumed to itself superior intellect to that claimed by the astute *metaphysician*, whose philosophy of the laws of *matter* has been found inapplicable for the regulation of the intractable materials of Time and Sense! *Mais le sentiment de Monsieur de Voltaire est un tableau tiré de la main du mattre;* and here it stands for contemplation!

The pretension to the right of exercising a declarative opinion or judgment upon any given question, however novel in expediency, or precariously unsafe in design, its object falls but little short of the exercise of the *entire power* of declaring

that to be *law*, which may admit of being freely contested in a hundred ways, where the right of deliberately canvassing the *merits* or intrinsic value of the proposed undertaking is preserved. To urge, imperatively, the passing of any measure which has for its ostensible object the advancement of *one* party or power alone in the State, when no law is in progress of adoption for the general good, as a counterpoise, is to claim the full exercise of a voice, and the practice of a principle, at once positive, dictatorial, and tyrannical; and where exists the difference in the character of increase, either in the declared opinion or exerted authority, excepting in the mode by which it is attained?

The assertion that the great increase and changes which have taken place in the quality and diffusion of *property*, and the various alienations that have been consequent thereupon, have created new interests and sources of power, and that fresh dependencies have resulted therefrom, is a most dangerous doctrine to be either promulgated or fostered in any free state. It follows, that if such a position were once held tenable, as a rule of conduct in affairs of government, without limitations, that the changes of system must progress proportionably with the changes in the distribution of property; or, at least, with the powers held to be dependent upon them. Additions to the various powers unquestionably have taken place, each being dependent on the other in the increase, acquirement, and preservation of property;—and if increased dominion is to result from the increase of *possessions*, it should follow in the same order and ratio through each division; for changes in property, through the entire body of a people or nation, especially constituted like that of Great Britain, where the interests of the aristocracy and democracy are so much associated, or blended with each other, make but slow progress, with reference to their *distinct* independ-

ence, whatever the economists may urge to the contrary;—and, in every free state, its due share of influence and power, will invariably attend property, in the ordinary progression of events, without the necessity for rash speculative changes.

To determine, that whatever is commenced by any body or party of power in the State, should be pursued to the *end*, or followed up without due regard to the various contingencies which may arise;—to resolve on coming to final conclusions, or to endeavour to establish fixed principles, before it is possible to be in possession of the value of the *premises* urged for acceptance, is not only to establish despotism by anticipation, but even that *infallibility* in design and execution, which it is not, and never can be, the attendant lot of human nature, even in ordinary matters, to be enabled to command or effect with any degree of certainty;—yet, preposterous as it does appear to the reflecting mind, such has been the course generally adopted by far the greater number of our popular assemblies throughout the Empire, through sheer ignorance of the correct limits of privilege and power, on the part of those who have attended, and those who have presided therein;—they have, in fact, adopted the inverse rule, with reference to the sound maxim,—"*Commune quod est, ne tuum solum dicas!*" But, it never was intended, nor can it ever be wisely permitted, that any property, privilege, or power, in which the *entire* State possesses a *public right*, should be monopolised by any individual, or association of individuals, to the prejudice of the remainder, let them assume whatever characteristic designation they please, under the three heads already laid down;—nor, has it yet been pretended, that a *fourth estate* exists, save in the creative brain of some few utopian philosophers and state conjurors!

Important and varied indeed may be the changes effected in free government, and yet the *form* continue, provided the

balancing influence is retained; but large intervals of time must elapse, and many struggles intervene, and virtuous patriotism, and moral energy be exerted, between every innovation to mould and render them of a piece with the original superstructure. Such a state of perfective combination, and conclusion of political arrangement, as may be imperatively required for the welfare of the people of England, can never be attained *à priori*, even with the assistance of the wisest men, or under the protective aid of property: time alone can demonstrate, satisfactorily, the practical advantages. It was thus that Solon modelled the laws of the Athenian Commonwealth; but, it is greatly to be feared, there are very few *Solons* engaged in the work of political reformation, for our own devoted country, in the nineteenth century of the Christian era, and the twelfth of her parliamentary Constitution!

It is presumed, that it has been sufficiently sustained, there has existed in all states a natural balance of power, and the mode in which it has been divided by those who may be said to have rendered themselves free, from time to time: sometimes by the people themselves, as with the Romans; and sometimes by the Legislators, in those institutions they deemed necessary for public utility, and individual security, as in the various states of Greece and Sicily. And here we may, with some advantage to our own country, enlarge on a consideration of the general means which have occasionally been adopted, for the specific purpose of destroying that needful equipoise in legislation, by every one of the three parties concerned, whenever the opportunity presented itself to their views, or circumstances favoured the operation of a self-interested course of proceeding; for it may taken, by reasonable analogy, as an established rule, that despotic or absolute power, in any one State or Kingdom, is of the same character in all ages, with universal monarchy in several

states adjoining to each other: yet, so unreasonable are the desires of mankind in general, considered with reference to their persons or possessions, that they will, in every condition of society, if possible, grasp at *all*, and cannot form any scheme of excellence or perfect happiness, with desires more rational.

"In all nations," says *Juvenal*, "which lie from *Cadiz* even to the *Ganges*, few have had the clouds of prejudice sufficiently removed from their eyes, to enable them to discern those things which were for their good or injury!" Thus, ever since men became associated together under the form of government, as the examples of the most powerful and intelligent Empires and States verify, the hopes and labours, the fears and anxieties, for the attainment of *universal monarchy*, in one form or other, have been bandied amongst them, from the reign of *Ninus*, the son of *Belus*, who founded the Assyrian empire, to that of the far-famed Citizen-King, and *juste milieu* monarch of the all liberal France:—neither can it be denied, that *Republics* have indulged as freely in their varied notions of despotism, as *Monarchies*,—of which those of the Athenians, Spartans, and Thebans, who each aimed at the entire sovereignty of the states of Greece,—as well as the larger ones of Rome and Carthage, who attempted the universal monarchy of the world, may be taken as splendid examples!

It has also been sufficiently proved, that the desire for *absolute power*, has been fostered by the several parties in each and every state, from the beginning of the ancient republics, down to the establishment of the larger monarchies of Spain, Italy, Germany, France, and Russia, where *individuals* have generally had the largest share of influence, and the greatest measure of success, although the efforts of the few and the many have been sufficiently frequent and powerful, both in

design and organization,—yet, seldom possessing uniformity of purpose or action, they could never, for any time, maintain the contest with advantage, nor preserve the ascendency when they obtained it, but were as perpetually deceived by the popularity and designing ambition of some daring adventurer, who turned their credulity, or their vanity, and love of conquest, to his own selfish account; and this at once shows the facility by which *absolutism* became established, and which would have had insurmountable obstacles to contend against, had the people preserved amongst themselves a fair balance of power.

The extraordinary public events of the last fifty years, and the multiplied changes which have taken place in the governments of various European states, and are still progressing; to which may be added the great South American revolution, ending in the declared *independence* of the Spanish colonies, and the universal desire of setting up fresh systems,—amply demonstrate to the reflecting statesman and rational philosopher, that it must inevitably prove a most fatal step against true liberty, whenever the Commons of England shall so far forget their duty to themselves and their country, living under the twofold blessing of a mixed constitution and a limited monarchy, as to carry their objects, of whatever kind, to that point, which must necessarily destroy the equiponderant power of the three estates. Neither absurdity nor insanity can appeal to *reason*; but it must be evident to every man of plain sense, that a perpetual system or course of *inflection* in state policy, must ultimately destroy the very best constitution that the skill of man could devise,—perpetual reform, therefore, is the *herald* of perpetual destruction,—in fine, an absurdity,—*Credent quia absurdum!*

The usurpations of an oligarchy may prove temporarily injurious to freedom; but they can at all times be far more

easily controlled by the united influence of the crown and the people, than a rash democracy, let loose from the bounds of restraint; which universal history shows, is never so easily subjected to the control or moderation of the other powers, separate or united. Thus, *par excellence*, the British Constitution stands unrivalled in the chart of political institutions!

As a specimen, or conclusive evidence, of the value of extreme popular government, without the correcting counterpoise of hereditary *nobility*, or the authority of a *king*, we are exultingly referred to America,—but America is yet in the full *infancy* of her *republic*; and with the assistance of a powerful authority, we will sufficiently elucidate elsewhere, the portentous evils which await her progress, and which, in their moral results, must inevitably sap the foundations of her prosperity, and produce accruing degeneracy to her entire population, from the voluntary system of religion she has espoused in her state *impolicy!* If universal suffrage be the test by which the issue is to be determined,—then, the recent proceedings in her popular elections, are sufficient to prove, that under their domination America is fast approaching to the most decided and fatal *despotism*,—the despotism of unbridled licentiousness, setting law and justice at sheer defiance; and trampling on the equal rights of citizenship in the display of perfect wantonness, and destruction of property!

We Englishmen, the natural friends of *Liberty*, may even look on her spoilt child, with a feeling of sympathetic tenderness, and inconsiderately admire the present results of republican freedom in a new state, under the most favourable circumstances, and with laws borrowed from her natural parent, of the old English monarchy, without being subjected to any charge of impure prejudice; but reflecting comparison, on the moral advantages of each state, will bring us back to

a preference for our own tried form of monarchical government, and all the social enjoyments, which shelter under the downy plumage of her widely extending wings,—notwithstanding the natural interest we should ever justly feel, for those who are of the same blood, speak the same language, and whose enterprising spirit, as a people, renders them worthy of being remembered on all occasions, as having once constituted the members of our own family.

If we desire a parallel to the present condition and probable prospects of Northern America, let us take that of the infant state of Athens, with her *twelve* dependencies. The first president of the United States of America, legislating for a more populous or extensively distributed community, may, with perfect propriety, be compared to *Theseus*, who first brought the Athenians, living in dispersed and scattered villages, into cities, and established the popular or *Representative State* in Athens, assigning to himself the guardianship of the laws, and the chief command in war. Thus, *Washington* combined in his own person the two most noble and essential attributes of human nature, civilly considered—the able general, uncompromising in arms; and the disinterested patriot, labouring in peace for the welfare of his fellow-citizens, abstracted from every feeling of selfish ambition or personal aggrandizement, giving them good advice, and laws adapted to their early state of independence. In the infancy of her political career, this excellent man was perfectly aware, that America needed not the stately emblems of *monarchy*, to direct her social energies with advantage, nor to improve the *morale* of her rising institutions; but, conscious of the advantages of constitutional rule, and impressed with the necessity of establishing, in her earliest day, a balance of power in her system of government, lent the aid of his powerful and virtuous mind in framing for her a constitution, which has its

prototype in the limited monarchy of England; and, preserving as much as possible of the forms, for the usages of a people, placed by circumstances on a footing of *equality*,—America at once possessed, with a president, the advantages of kingly direction, combined with the *economy* absolutely needed for the attainment of her first objects. But England, in no one period of her history, from the invasion of the Romans, was ever placed in similar circumstances to those in which Washington found the American people. Governed or guided by those circumstances, he assisted the formation of their republic; and it will be well for them, for many ages to come, if, taking advantage of the example of his Roman virtue, and profiting by his counsel, they labour to sustain their independence, in the retention of sound principles. Let the infant republic of America, resting on religion as her sheet-anchor, take her monitory lesson from that of Athens!

> "Fuit quondam Græcia!
> Fuerunt in Græciâ Athenæ,
> ——— nunc neque Athenæ,
> ——— neque in ipsâ Græciâ Græcia est!
> Sic transit gloria mundi!"

Notwithstanding the manifold advantages possessed by the Athenians, under the wisdom and moderation of the government established by Theseus—the encouragement given to commercial enterprise and agricultural pursuits—the facility by which foreigners acquired the privileges of *citizenship*—and the protection afforded to all classes in the State, in the due preservation of the rights of property—the very liberty enjoyed, by this people, soon made them insensible to its blessings; so speedily does prosperity, in every condition, when left to its unmolested career, render the human heart corrupt, and blind the eyes of its possessors. Thus, in spite of their

general intelligence, and advancement in the knowledge of the useful sciences, their most rational Legislator and patriotic General, after a very short time, was compelled to abandon the Athenian people to themselves, from the unstable and intractable violence of their republican temper; so that between its domination, and the natural consequences of revolting superstition, resulting from their dark system of *mythology*, their prosperity rose and fell, under various tyrannical forms, through many ages, until the final dismemberment or dissolution of their independence by the Romans.

The very extensive geographical condition of America presents to view numerous obstacles against the *perpetuity* of free government, unless she shall become divided, like the states of ancient Greece, into several independent possessions, when the struggle for ascendency, sooner or later, will be sure to arise in one or more of them; and, in the event of an extensive or long-protracted war, America is as likely, through the direct agency of natural as well as moral causes, to merge at once into absolute monarchy, or all the attributes of despotic rule, if victorious under some successful leader, as she is to retain her federal constitution in a state of undisturbed peace! The very advantages she at present possesses, with regard to her means of rapid internal communication, by steam and rail-roads, may prove so many facilities in the hands of active enemies and aspiring partizans, for the overthrow of her independence.

The institution of government framed by Theseus for the Athenians was that of a mixed monarchy, or equi-monarchical and democratic, rather than a decidedly *popular state*; and yet America has her president, exercising all the functions of the kingly office, which constitutes the chief guarantee for her security. When Solon assumed the direction of the affairs of state in Athens, he found the people divided into

two most violent and contending factions—the *rich* and the *poor*—the nobles and plebeians, and anarchy existing under it in the worst possible form. He very prudently refused the tender made him of the monarchy, and preferred, like Washington, casting the model of their civil institutions in another form, wherein he especially provided for preserving the balance of power, by the appointment of a senate of *four hundred* substantial men, of known repute for public integrity, not elected by universal suffrage; but each of the *four* tribes or classes, into which he judiciously divided the people, having the privilege of choosing *one hundred* representatives for their general as well as relative interests; and such assembly formed the great National Council; but all the chief officers in the magistracy were appointed independently of popular control, and with due regard to their *property* or *estates*, reserving only to the people the right of *appeal* to the senate, and even its supreme power in the decision of certain processes was specified.

Thus, having produced by his wisdom and energy a rational reform in every department of the state, and completing the most salutary regulations in civil policy, Solon bound the leading men amongst the people to observe them, by a solemn oath, for the space of *one hundred years*, that due experience might be obtained of their practical utility; and to further manifest his own impartiality in the strongest possible manner, he voluntarily resigned the office of their *Legislator*, when he might have remained their *absolute King*,—presenting, by that act, one of the finest specimens of self-denial upon record in the pages of ancient history, but certainly imitated in the character and conduct of the first President of the United States! But, alas! the labours and patriotism of the wisest of her law-givers were soon forgotten by the factious people of Athens, and they speedily laid themselves open to the ambi-

tion of Pisistratus, which Solon evidently foresaw in their disposition, and preferred retiring to a foreign court, that he might better contemplate in quietude the emptiness of human glory. Distressed by the folly and apostacy of his fellow-countrymen, after ten years absence in Egypt and at the court of the rich monarch of Lydia,—improved alike in his knowledge of the human character, and the essentials of government, from his residence amongst that people who possessed the archives of remote antiquity, Solon returned home; but finding his best laws and regulations treated as a *dead letter* by his capricious fellow-citizens, despite of the fine example he had set them; and sickened at the spectacle of their social dissensions, and contests for ascendency, in the midst of increased and increasing prosperity, he could not remain their calm spectator, and preferred ending his days under the protective securities offered by a *king*,—yielding to Philocyprus the honour of depositing his mortal remains in the kindlier bosom of a remote land, and of founding, according to Plutarch, a city to his memory!

Cicero, who was a personal witness of the benign influence produced by the laws of Solon, has recorded his opinion of their framer in terms of the highest admiration,—of veneration for the wisdom of a man, who, in spite of the corruptions of his age, and the difficulties of the undertaking, had the mind to devise and the virtue to complete their execution,—presenting, even in their impaired form, *four centuries* after his decease, traits of inestimable value; and, let both the calm English and American reader remember, that those very laws for the free and independent state of Athens were based on the *inequality* of representative rights.

We have the authority of Herodotus, that even Pisistratus, called the tyrant of Athens, governed the Athenians under the laws of Solon, and, that without which he never could have

reigned in that city and preserved internal peace for so long a period; and it was only in proportion as the several powers united, were controlled, or directed by the chief magistrate or *archon*, that the Athenian republic assumed the attitude of independence at home, or the means of successfully maintaining foreign contests for its preservation, through the philosophic policy of those laws. Under it arose Miltiades, the first great captain of Athens, and the Greeks progressed, despite of their perpetual internal dissensions—their continual jealousy of the nobles, beginning with gross and impolitic ingratitude in the treatment of Miltiades, notwithstanding his marked success against the Persians in the ever memorable battle of *Marathon*, and suffering him to die in prison of his wounds,—their banishment of their next great general, Aristides, by *ostracism*, until they saw impending ruin on their heads, when they repented, and recalled him,—their base ingratitude to Themistocles, after the splendid victory of *Salamis*,—their conduct to Pericles and Alcibiades, two of their best commanders, which secured the triumph of Lysander, who razed their fairest city to its foundation, and changed its laws!—All of which bounded their prosperity.

And yet none of these disastrous results afforded a lesson of permanent practical wisdom to the free Athenians. Besotted in their republican despotism, and sunk below the level of rational and reflecting beings, their final *murder* of Phocion, who regained their independence after the conquest of Lysander, to the final subjugation of their power by Alexander, justifies to the fullest extent Mr. Burke's severe but true picture of their immorality: it is the choice sketch of a masterhand. Within the space of little more than a century, these various incidents, in succession, abundantly establish the folly and contingent ruin of *extreme popular opinion* in affairs of civil government: and hence arose the keen satire of one of

their best philosophers, that "the Athenians knew good manners, but left the Lacedemonians to practise them!"

It should nevertheless be stated, in justice to this aspiring portion of the Grecian people, before their positive degeneracy, that they never assumed to themselves the quality of *infallibility* in matters of legislation. Their jealousy and ambition were their greatest stumbling-blocks. Neither did they, as it is too much the case with the self-conceited and self-opiniated orators of our own popular assemblies in modern times, labour to confirm by obstinacy that which was commenced in speculative folly, without manifest utility. The demagogue agitation fostered in unhappy Ireland presents no fair parallel to the general policy of the Athenians. Dissimulation, and dismemberment of social interests, for the sake of promoting the rank objects of individual ambition or priestly influence, formed no part of their nursing system of legislation. The Athenians frequently showed that they did not think that it compromised their dignity to repent of preceding political rashness; nor to correct the evils of previous licentiousness, although repentance at length came too late for them to profit by its admonitory voice. And, such invariably will be the result in all states, to the end of time, which labour to preserve the abstract science of perfection—that aim at uniting the extreme ends of perfective excellence with the extremes of liberality in government! Let America profit by the example of the Athenian commonwealth; let her establish her system on a sound moral foundation—secure the prominent and permanent advantages of religious instruction; let her labour to preserve the balance of power under her kingly President, by keeping in check that *dominatio plebis*, or tyranny of popular suffrage, which assails the vitals of her independence;—and she will do far more for the *permanency* of her free institutions, and the good of her citizens, than can ever possibly result

from the most extended commerce, or all the benefits of her steam and rail-road intercourse—auxiliaries to her prosperity under a well-poised institution of power, but so many ready engines for the propagation of evil and dismemberment, proportionately with mal-administration, in the regulation of her domestic policy.

"Human nature," says Thucydides, "is proverbially the same under the same circumstances every where." This able author informs us, that in the popular commotions of Greece, the middle-men, or those who took no part with one side or the other, were injured and destroyed by both parties, either from envy of their situation, or because they did not voluntarily share in the troubles and fermenting changes of the times. "All kinds of immoralities and licentiousness prevailed under them; and simplicity, or honesty of character, of which generosity very much partakes, was laughed entirely out of countenance by those who called themselves improvers of liberal rule." "Some states, that were the last to be agitated with this seditious feeling, took great pains and credit to themselves for going beyond any thing they had ever heard of, that they might only share the praise of ingenuity, from having invented something new in policy, or the praise of having outdone their opponents in some species of unworthy cunning, and of having found out new means of inflicting punishment on their adversaries;—proceeding to detestable and cruel necessities, they committed the most horrible excesses to effect them, and inflicted punishments, not such as equality of *men's rights* and public utility seemed to require, but much more violent ones, and appointing them at pleasure on any occasion; and, either condemning persons by unjust and forced sentences, or, by dint of violence, seizing the supreme power, they prepared to gratify their foulest ambition." It would seem, from this, that the reign of the

guillotine, and the terrors of the Cap of Liberty, ensanguined as it was in France, in 1789, *Le vrai bonnet rouge*, had their early precedent in Grecian freedom! Let those who aim at levelling distinctions of rank and title in the English state, ask themselves what securities they can command against similar results?

It has been already observed, that the Americans stand indebted for the model of their popular constitution to that of *England*; but the means for preserving the balance of power, have not been placed on an equal footing. The constitution of England has its early model in that of *Solon*, upon which it has improved, by the connection of kingly power, under a *Christian covenant*,—by which the supreme head in the state is held amenable for the due performance of a *trust*;—so also, under this point of view, it is fully obvious, that the constitutional prerogatives of the crown, with reference to the right of selecting the responsible ministers of office, and that of giving to the people at large the privilege of freely electing their own representatives, in cases of national emergency, rank high amongst the choicest of their rights.

We have a practical illustration of the advantages of our own system, furnished by that very competent authority, *Diodorus*, who says, that "*Antipater*, one of Alexander's captains, found it necessary to *abrogate* the popular authority in Athens, and to restore the power of *suffrages* and magistracy, to those only who were worth *two thousand drachmas*, by which means the republic came again to be *justly* administered by the laws of Solon." This sufficiently proves, that Diodorus considered an extreme popular government, with its ready appliances to all the purposes of discord, and the *equable* laws of Solon, two very different things;—and, as a further proof of the great disadvantages which their partiality of unlimited suffrage had engendered amongst the

Athenians and Spartans, Polybius expressly relates, that from the time when Greece was made a conquest by Alexander's captains, to that of the Romans, Athens did not produce *one Man* either skilled in Counsel or in Arms:—it was a dark spot—a blank on the page of their political history; and, excepting the Achaian League, under Aratus and Philopœmen, and the fruitless efforts of Agis and Cleomines, to restore the independence of Sparta, groaning under the turbulence of the popular passions, and the despotic authority of the *Ephori*, Greece presented nothing for contemplation, but a sad spectacle of human degeneracy, of ambition and folly, of vanity, cruelty, and depravity, until she finally fell prostrate at the feet of the Roman eagles! With wise men at her command,—the experience of ages of renown before her,—and prosperity, apparently within her grasp, she as frequently let slip the golden opportunity for preserving her supremacy; conceited and self-sufficient,—proud, arrogant, and fickle,—she was, in the midst of all her learning, perfectly unacquainted with herself.—" ΧΙΛΙΑΙ ΠΟΤΕ ΔΥΑΙ ΕΙΣΙ ΠΑΡΑ ΑΛΕΙΣΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΧΕΙΛΕΑ," and so Greece in her downfall verified her own proverb! The two words of Virgil, emphatically inscribed to Troy,—" *Fuit Ilium*," comprise her history!

CHAPTER IV.

PART THE SECOND.

FURTHER ILLUSTRATION OF THE ADVANTAGES OF NOBILITY, OR THE PATRICIAN ORDER, IN THE INSTITUTION OF FREE GOVERNMENTS, AS DEMONSTRATED BY THE HISTORY OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

HAVING elucidated, in the form of an *epitome*, the rise of the Grecian independence, and the various contests and dissensions between the Nobles and the People, in the famed republic of Athens, and the consequences which occasionally and eventually resulted therefrom to that people,—the ostensible object in view, will be further strengthened by a brief reference to those particular events, which arose in the career of that illustrious empire; which, eclipsing the greatest glory of Greece, not only aspired to, but obtained, by the prowess of her *arms*, the wisdom of her domestic policy, and the devoted courage of her people, the sovereignty of the then known world. And this subject will ever afford a magnificent memorial of the utter imperfection of all human institutions, and the uncertain tenure of all earthly possessions, however great and powerful, whilst history retains a page, or morality a lesson of *state policy*, on the surface, of the terrestrious globe.

Rome, the great and powerful, the *arbitress* of the earth,—in the days of her moral courage and virtuous deportment,

comprised within herself advantages obtained by no one heathen nation or people, from the establishment of the Assyrian empire, to the final dissolution of the Grecian independence, under her authority. She possessed, as the seat of her power, the important twofold benefits, of a prolific soil and temperate clime:—placed between the *torrid* and *frigid* zones, in her geographical position, and with lively capacity to comprehend, and ability to use to advantage the impulses resulting from example,—she had before her eyes all that remained of the preceding history of the rise and fall of *empire*,—with children reared in her own bosom, whose genius, learning, and research, presented to her aspiring view, at one glance, whatever was worthy of acceptance or rejection, in the economy of human nature, for the social rule of mankind. The Assyrian, the Median, the Egyptian, the Persian, the Grecian, and, finally, as foretold by the Prophet, (*Deuteronomy*, chap. xxviii.) the *Jewish* empires, had successively risen, flourished, and passed away; and the wreck of their glory, and the record of their prowess, glided calmly into her lap, in the mournful progression of events, and under the calm direction of the finger of Time!

> ——" Mortalia facta peribunt:
> Nedum sermonum stat honos et gratia vivax;
> Multa renascentur quæ jam cecidêre, cadentque
> Quæ nunc sunt in honore vocabula, si volet usus,
> Quem penes arbitrium est, et jus et norma loquendi!"

The *Horatian* view, so beautifully depicted, must not only have been founded on an accurate and rational knowledge of human nature, but incited by a feeling of painful reflection, on what the poet foresaw must be the inevitable doom of even Roman grandeur—*All human works must perish!* Too proud in her own learning, and too strong in her prowess to submit to the direction or superior independence of any one

power on the surface of the earth, Rome, nevertheless, presented more than once, in her state policy, the full desire and the wisdom of taking advantage of whatever was valuable or worthy of adoption for her laws, from the whole. Her sons possessed both the physical constitution and the martial fire, necessary for the perfection and retention of conquest,—the conception and the execution of great enterprises;—and, the soldiers of her armies, under the *inequality* of their military organization, disdained not the honourable occupation of citizenship, nor the pursuits of agriculture and general civilization, when they laid down their arms. But alas! Rome, replete with worldly glory, and the possession of all those concurrent means necessary for the use and retention of power, fell short, very short, of the essential principle, which is alone capable of controlling the destinies and wielding the energies of mankind, to purposes of comfort or real advantage. Her government, however splendid in design, and powerful in execution, was primarily founded in *Paganism*;—veiled in dark superstition, and based on the relics of that system, she vainly sought to improve by the rigid exercise of morality and virtue, that which, for ages, had been denounced by the decree of God;—neither did she profit by the scene nor the admonitory circumstances of her having been the last appointed instrument in the hands of the Most High, for perfecting his work of punishment, on his own disobedient people! Her eagles surrounded the holy city, whose temple had once contained *the ark of the covenant*,—her chosen generals found within those venerable walls that ominous Scripture, which so plainly foretold the awful doom, the end of *Jerusalem*, in the day when the measure of her unbelief should be filled to the *brim*, in sorrow and affliction;—they trod the sacred ground whereon the *Saviour* of the *world* expired; and beheld the spot, where, with glory, he

ascended before their astonished guards from the *Tomb!* They conquered, and returned triumphant, enriched with the *spoil*; but, vain-glorious with success, let slip from within their grasp the finest opportunity ever presented to any people in the history of the universe, for founding, with their full strength, a government in moral rule, accordant with the direction of the Supreme Governor of all things! Thus the Roman people and government afford, at one view, the best *moral* lesson extant, of the inefficiency and presumption of all worldly undertakings, however supported by learning, moulded by experience, or consolidated by success!

True it is, that about the third century of the Christian era *Constantinus* made a memorable attempt to perpetuate the establishment of civil government, and, in conformity with Christian obligations, to destroy the very dregs of idolatry; but, as Christ himself said, "*hereafter the prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in me*,"—so *Roma nova*, admired in all succeeding time for the beauty of its situation, as it well displayed the judgment of the founder, by its selection for the capital of the Christian world, became the prey of the *Infidel*, through the indulgence of a false security. Human society can alone be preserved by the agency of human means, which the Almighty has furnished in every age for the protection of his people, having given them reason to apply those means properly. The removal of the valorous Roman legions from the different garrisons which flanked *Constantinopolis* rendered the people unwarlike, and ultimately paved the way for the inundation of the barbarian conquerors. Men who know no rule of moral or religious obligation, in every age and under every circumstance, can alone be successfully opposed by the strong arm of *power*. It was thus that the Almighty justified the wars of the Jews for the preservation of their *religion*, against their pagan enemies. The transfer of the Roman soldiers

from the lower empire left her without the means of adequate protection; for after the fulfilment of the *Messiah*'s advent, and the descent of the *Holy Spirit*, supernatural agency was not reasonably to be looked for, nor has it ever taken place. Had the successors of Constantinus preserved a well-regulated military connexion with their Western Empire, on the side of which they then had no formidable enemies to fear, the jealousies which arose between the two divisions might have been avoided, and, not improbably, the sad fate of their Eastern Empire averted.

The fall of Constantinopolis was one amongst the proximate causes which led to the rapid and final dissolution of Roman power. It was here that one of the grandest displays of the moral courage of her people, despite of the limited means and disadvantages under which they laboured, took place. The memorials of that memorable siege having been preserved by the Mussulmans themselves, as tokens of their success against the first Christian city, amongst which stands most conspicuously the great mound of *Maltepé*, where Mahomet the Second displayed the standard of the false prophet.

When we contemplate the vast extent and power of the Roman empire, which had this city, fortified alike by nature and by art, for its latter capital, and its advancement in all the arts and sciences needful both for its improvement and preservation, we cannot but feel astonishment that it should have fallen so early a conquest to the obscure and barbarous tribes which only a short time previously had issued from the mountains of Asia, and were distinguished for nothing but their ignorance, cruelty, and gross fanaticism. The cause must be principally attributed to the weakness of the rulers, who had neglected the necessary means of early provision for the defence; or ascribed to their having miscalculated the strength of the enemy,—to their separation from a great many of their nobles

and most enterprising men. But, when it is further considered that the Turks invested the city with an army of 200,000 men on all sides, and that the number of the garrison did not exceed 8,000, to guard its vast extent,—weakened by that superstition which still unhappily prevailed in the first ages amongst the Greek Christians, and depressed by the series of disasters which had befallen them, until at length they shut themselves up in this their *last refuge*,—our admiration of the heroic devotion with which *one man* inspired and urged them to the defence, gives an earnest, that with comparatively trifling aid they would have proved victorious over the Infidels.

It is somewhat remarkable, that in the history of the lower Roman empire, the name of Constantine was borne by *fourteen* emperors, and that they were all marked by imbecility of character, excepting the *first* and the *last*—he who founded the empire, and he in whom it terminated. The details of this termination, and of the character and conduct of Constantinus Paleologus, are worthy of the best ages of Greece and Rome. Seeking death in the midst of his enemies, and the enemies of his God, under a feeling of Christian devotion he displayed the calm confidence of patriotism, with the genius of the soldier and the duty of the king! The breaches which remain in the wall for a great extent, and which the Turks have never since repaired, near the entrance of the gate *Top Kapousi*, are incontestible proofs of the bravery of the defenders—of the utter inutility of any further efforts to arrest the ruthless invaders. The dead body of Constantine was found in one of these, where he had placed himself as a last but hopeless barrier; and a magnificent tree, of the *Pistachia Terebinthina* species, in the words of Clarke, grows out of and marks the "sacred spot where the last of the *Paleologi* fell!"

It is equally probable that the Christians, relying on the sacred justice of their cause, neglected the early physical

means of rendering themselves a match for their barbarian assailants, and that it was not until the inevitable consequences of destruction presented themselves to view, they prepared to perish in defence of their religion and their altars. On the other hand, the Turks, infatuated and excited by that blind confidence or apathy which *fatalism*, and the presumed favour of their prophet imparted, and that feeling, roused into ferocity by their previous success, and the resistance offered, together with the certainty of gaining immense booty, gave them considerably the advantage over the Christian, Greek, and Roman followers of their valiant leader. How far different the result, when the first Constantine, with comparatively a handful of the soldiers of old Rome, routed 100,000 Goths! "*In hoc signo vinces*,"—the motto for his standard, or *labarum*,—yet he neglected not the means for attaining the object! And yet, lamentable as was the scene and were the circumstances attendant on the capture of this devoted city of the first Christian government, they produced the spread of the *gospel dispensation*. For the clergy and learned men seeking refuge in western Europe, they brought with them its imperishable truths and richest treasures.

Proceeding with our historical notice:—As ancient Greece was divided into several states, so was Italy into separate dependencies or republics. And as the kings of Greece were occasionally deposed by the people, on the ground of their arbitrary proceedings, and through jealousies of their success in arms, without the immediate loss of public independence, it is somewhat remarkable that the several petty states of Italy merged into the dominion of the Roman emperors; still, the differences in the constitution of the Grecian monarchies and the Italian republics were not by any means essential. Thus, the accounts furnished by Homer prove, that many of the Grecian princes who went to the siege of Troy were on

a footing in rank with the kings of Sparta, the suffetes of Carthage, the archons of Athens, and the consuls of Rome; and that their separate state and distinction were duly acknowledged by each republic and by the whole of their armies. It is equally manifest that a mixed and limited power existed, as the most ancient and approved principle, with both these intelligent and enterprising people, in their state government; and, notwithstanding that several changes occurred, the material forms were preserved by the Romans, from the time of the foundation of the monarchy by Romulus to that of Julius Cæsar. During the whole of this time the commons were gradually growing into prosperity and power, gaining upon the patrician order in the government, until at length they entirely destroyed the equilibrium between the relative parties in the state, under which the grandeur of Rome had arisen, and opened the way for the unrestricted and licentious conduct and evil practices of popular declaimers—of reckless political mercenaries and enthusiasts, who as speedily destroyed the wisest republic, and enslaved the noblest people, allowing (*cæteris paribus*) for human frailty, that ever signalised itself upon the stage of political renown, in the history of the world!

Marmontel has elegantly and forcibly defined the sound principles under which mankind may be properly understood and successfully governed, in all times and under all circumstances, in his fine dissertation on the policy of the Romans, who, during many ages, made them the rule of their conduct. But his allusion to the objects neglected by Constantine is perhaps the most forcible in its style, as depicting in glowing colours the effects on the general *morale* of the people, and the beneficial consequences which their revival would produce in reference to the Justinian age of corruption and degeneracy:—"*La liberté, les biens des peuples, seront protégés*

par les lois. *Dès lors, l'empire se relève, ses membres épars se réunissent,—le plan de Constantin, élevé sur le sable, acquiert des fondemens solides,—et du sein de la félicité publique,—je vois renaître le courage, l'émulation, la force, l'esprit patriotique, et avec lui cet* ascendant *que Rome avoit sur l'univers.*"

The comparison between the rise and progress of the Roman empire, and her succeeding glory under free institutions and well-regulated laws, is truly appropriate to that of Britain, which has eclipsed all the splendour of antiquity, including the brightest periods of her illustrious predecessor; and little could Virgil have calculated on such a result, when he indited the historical sentiment, "*Britannos toto divisos orbe penitus.*" Yet such are the mutations of human greatness! Rome became the imperial mistress of the *uncivilized* world; but the pre-eminence of Britain has shone resplendent amongst modern nations, far advanced in literature, in the arts, in sciences, and in arms! And how has she obtained this ascendency—sustained a successful competition—a fair rivalry with Learning and Genius? Was it under the dominion or the supreme direction of the rule of *equality*, in her measures of state policy? Or rather, does not Britain owe the elevation of her moral greatness amongst the nations of the earth, first, to her having, in her Saxon age, embraced *Christianity* as her early foundation;—secondly, to her having given her *Church* the lead, or pre-eminent authority, in matters of *State*, by which she secured to herself a succession of Christian rulers, in the persons of her kings, and treasured up the *archives* of religious and general learning, in her earlier ages;—thirdly, to her restoration of the *patriarchal feud*, by which she established an independent and responsible hereditary nobility;—fourthly, to her having based her *Laws* on Scripture authority, on the original precedents decreed by God in the Bible—the "*suprema lex scripta*,"—for the universal rule of mankind;—

fifthly, and lastly, to her having founded her free constitution of *King, Lords,* and *Commons,* on the combination of all these fundamental principles, under which all classes in the state have had fair incitements to emulation, under the bright shield of a pure and humanizing religion, protected by law? Is Britain, in the nineteenth century of her career of general improvement, prepared to bow down her head in apostacy, and sacrifice all these blessings at the dark shrine of political atheism? Impossible! The modest Mantuan Bard, on whose tomb is inscribed his last expiring sentiment—

> " Mantua me genuit; Calabri rapuere; tenet nunc
> Parthenope: cecini pascua, rura, duces!"—

would have honoured the genius of Britain in his finest strain, would have remembered the respect paid to valour and learning by his own countrymen; and hailed even the dawn of her glory with admiration, however painfully he must have lamented the degeneracy that was destined to lower the honour of his native land, and lessen her importance in the scale of European nations!

The fatal consequences of a deviation from sound principles are so fully marked in the decline of the Roman empire, that an apology can hardly be required for the introduction of a few of the leading circumstances of its history, showing the means under which it fell from its lofty eminence, in sovereign rule.

Whilst Rome was governed by kings, the monarchy continued *elective.* Romulus, when he founded the city, by the universal consent of the people, and by the *augury,* (which the Romans, under their superstition, believed to be divine agency,) was declared *king.* His first step was that of dividing the whole body of the people into *two* classes, Thus, having the precedent in the more ancient monarchy of Greece,

he instituted the patrician order, or *nobles*, and the plebeian, or *commons*. The first may fairly be compared in rank and general character to that of the ancient English barons of the period of the conquest, and the latter decidedly to what our commons then constituted, for they were *tenants* or dependents on their patrons, and protectors of the patrician order, who were responsible for their appearance, when required, and defended them in civil suits, which is fully shown in the chapter on the foundation of the British monarchy, from its early foundation. They also supplied their baronial leaders with money, and their services in the feudal wars, in return for their protection; and this system of *patronage* was of still far more ancient origin, and long practised by the Greeks, who derived their early system from the Egyptians, as the Egyptians had derived their's from the Assyrians and Persians. Thus, even with heathen nations, there existed the first precedent for the patrician order, from the most remote period of history, as the concomitant attendant on civilization.

Out of the patrician order, so instituted, it was that Romulus, at the commencement of the Roman empire, chose *one hundred* for a senate or supreme council, to assist him by their superior judgment and advice in the administration of the affairs of state. A good beginning generally gives the earnest of a propitious end; and Romulus began with dignity that system which rapidly and yet steadily developed its superiority in the march of Roman civilization at home, and the progress of her arms abroad. *Moribus antiquis stat Roma!* Whilst Rome paid due respect to this invaluable maxim, she flourished alike in honour and security; when she lost sight of it, her prosperity became bounded abroad, and within her bosom she became the prey of intestine calamity, the sport of faction, and the victim of hope and disappointment, until all her finer energies becoming enervated, and her nobler powers para-

lysed, the ignorant *Goth* and savage *Hun* speedily destroyed that refinement which ages of mental toil—of bravery and tried consistency—of patriotic devotion and virtue—had alone been sufficient to accomplish !

The first national Roman council, like the early senate of Britain, was originally composed exclusively of nobles, and formed of themselves a standing parliament or state assembly, vacancies being filled up therein from time to time from men of the same order. The general body of the people—(*populus communis*)—were convened on those occasions only which, under the institution of Romulus, fell properly under their cognizance. These were, definitely, the appointment of civil magistrates, voting in the construction of new laws, and to advise with the nobles when entering upon war ; but the first two of these popular privileges required the deliberative confirmation of the *senate*, over which the king presided on grave occasions, and the last was expressly subject to confirmation under the king's exclusive prerogative. This then constituted the utmost extent of power possessed by the popular interest, or even pretended to, in the time of Romulus —the entire arrangement being very analogous with that of the English monarchy for several centuries subsequently to the conquest by William of Normandy.

At the end of an interregnum of a year from the death of Romulus, the Roman senate, under exercise of its own authority, without seeking the consent of the commons, elected a successor and a *stranger* to the kingly office, solely on account of his fame and virtue. This precedent was followed in the two succeeding reigns. It is true that the people fully approved the choice ; and history, ancient or modern, does not record a parallel to the splendid rule of Numa Pompilius, the second king of the Romans. His reign presented one continued series of virtuous *conservatism*, applying the energies

of a highly-gifted and philosophic mind, in subduing the violent passions of the people, by inculcating in their minds the needful duties of religion and morality—by the suppression of idolatry, and division of the citizens into different orders or classes. Thus, during forty-five years of uninterrupted peace and growing prosperity, the arts and sciences progressed, the laws were respected, and the temple of *Janus* remained closed. The Augustan age of Rome, with all the advantages arising from time and experience, cannot fairly be put in competition with that of Numa Pompilius, in which were laid the foundations of her rising lustre on the broad basis of *inequality* in all her social regulations, and the moral benefits of which conveyed an impulse of the most decided character for upwards of one hundred and fifty years after her patriot king had finished his earthly course.

During a period of two hundred and forty-four years, Rome was advantageously governed by kings, until the violent conduct and oppression of the last of the seven monarchs became so atrocious, that it occasioned the destruction of the monarchy, and the establishment of a democratical form of government. But the conduct of Tarquinius Priscus, the fifth king of Rome, was diametrically the reverse to that of the last; and if the dignity of the senate had been duly sustained, as established by him, on the part of the people, in the subsequent reign of Tarquin the Proud, he never would have been permitted to trample on their privileges. Tarquinius Priscus reigned with moderation and popularity, yet the whole tenor of his rule was decidedly conservative. He increased the number of the senate, by electing one hundred representatives from the popular class, and these he distinguished by the appellation of *Patres minorum gentium*, a designation in itself sufficiently expressive of their rank and station; while those of the patrician order were entitled *Patres majorum gentium*;

and thus again a balance of power was created. The glory of the Roman arms, which had been sustained with so much dignity by the former kings of Rome, received under this judicious arrangement a fresh impetus. The victories over the united forces of the Latins and Sabines, and the entire conquest of the twelve nations of *Etruria*, were the result.

It was the abuse and not the use of the monarchical power that caused the injury to liberty in the reign of the second Tarquin. He commenced that reign by an act of unnatural infamy, and terminated it in just dishonour; and had he alone been the sufferer, the catastrophe would have been a moral blessing. Neither was it a necessary consequence of his tyranny, that the Roman people, in the height of their indignation, changed their form of government. Had they acted with due reflection, they would not so soon have forgotten the benefits derived through the wisdom of his illustrious predecessors, and the veneration shown to their memory by the retention or restoration of their institutions, would only have had the certain effect of rendering him, if possible, more detested whilst yet he lived, and more infamous in the eyes of posterity. The Romans, by this inconsiderate act, were compelled to commence *de novo;* and they laid the foundation for a whole series of national evils, the several categories of which followed in rapid succession, and nothing but the enterprise and cool martial ardour of the people, aided by a few virtuous leaders, could possibly have preserved their independence of foreign authority.

The commencement of the Roman consulate was, like that of the republican rule of Athens, the signal for the reign of jealousy and suspicion. With their liberty, unrestricted by a supreme directing head, the people at once acquired the full spirit of faction; and the very first of their consuls, who had exerted himself with the greatest energy in the assertion of

their freedom, was banished, merely because he bore the name or was of that family one or two individuals of whom had become obnoxious by their bad conduct; and such was their weakness, and their newly-engendered views of liberality and citizenship, that another was compelled to pull down or dismantle his house solely because it soared somewhat above that of his fellow-citizens in its elevation!

A government deposited in the hands of any *two* of its aspiring members for the short space of a year, who were expected to perform some extraordinary act worthy of their consulate, must necessarily give rise to ambitious men, daring exploits, great jealousies, and desperate seditions. This was precisely the result with the Roman consulship. "What is it to me," said Napoleon Bonaparte to M. D'Angeais, when aspiring to wield the *destinies* of the French nation, "whether the portraits of an Alexander, a Sylla, a Cæsar, a Charles the Twelfth, or a Cromwell, be *imaginary*, or that the painter may have flattered them? Whatever these *giants* of the human species may have been, I wish to be as mighty as history *paints them*; and if it were possible would give myself their gigantic appearance, and even endeavour to surpass it." And, when cautioned by his friend against the romantic danger of his ambition, added further, "You do not feel the glow of heroism and noble ambition. The man actuated by these two great exciting passions does not consider whether those who preceded him in the same career expired on a bed of down or by the dagger of an assassin. In the supposed destinies of those heroes, who no longer exist, and in the existence he anticipates for himself, he only sees and reckons on the *glorious* moments. The dangers to which those great men exposed themselves, or were exposed, do not even enter his imagination. Such at least would I be, if *fortune*, forgetting who I am, would assist me to become what I desire."

How amply did Napoleon verify these sentiments, in his consulship of France! His ambition was the very auxiliary good fortune he wanted to possess. But for that he would have lived and died an obscure individual, and this was precisely the case with the early consuls of Rome. Yet their efforts for the attainment of glory and ascendency often failed of success; and although the Romans might once have boasted, that the greater majority of individuals in their armies could have filled with honour and ability the responsible offices of consul and chief magistrate, there exist in their own historical annals, many periods marked by the most adverse circumstances; and the national character itself degraded by the oppression and wanton conduct of their leading generals.

After a most precarious political existence of about one hundred and twenty years, under the consulate, during which time she passed through a series of perpetual warfare with the neighbouring states, and the general injustice and barbarities of which, on the authority of one of her own historians, she blushed to own in the day of her dignity, and summit of her glory, Rome was near falling a prey to the barbarian power of the *Gauls*, and, but for the timely succour of *one man*, who had been banished, under her impure passion for selfishness and equality, her very name and existence bid fair to be expunged from the page of history;—that individual was *Camillus*, and, as a last resource, the Romans were compelled to appoint him *Dictator*. The city had already been reduced to ruins, and the temples and chief buildings pillaged and destroyed; but under his genius victory resulted, the enemy were expelled, and Rome rose again from her ashes with increased splendor. Had not Camillus forgotten and forgiven the dark ingratitude of his fellow-citizens, what was their alternative between utter extinction or slavery? They had destroyed the noble, or patrician order, in the state, and were destitute

of even one directing hand,—bereft of power and organization, and the victorious enemy in possession of the *remains* of that city, which had risen by the labour of kings, the wisdom of senators, and the exertions of industrious citizens, under the inequality of state distinctions! Their popular, or purely democratic power, proved itself their greatest evil; and had not Camillus shown himself as virtuous as he was brave—as firmly moderate as he was rational, in what position would the proud and independent minded Romans have found themselves under his compulsory dictatorship? The office of Dictator, as the very name itself implies, was the most absolutely despotic that can possibly be conceived—*Quoniam dictis ejus parebat populus*,—named solely by the consul *vivâ voce!* He could proclaim law, and war, levy forces at pleasure, conduct them against an enemy, and disband them! He punished at his will, and, until later times, there was no appeal against his decision; in fact, he was the *supreme master* of the republic, and exercised an authority never pretended to by the most absolute king!

History abundantly testifies, that when supreme political power is lodged in the hands of an aspiring and factious citizen, it is generally productive of the most lamentable consequences. This was actually verified in the Roman republic in the worst possible form; the most horrible results, in many instances, supervened the appointment or office of the *dictatorship*. The most marked and oppressive cruelty and unnatural tyranny, succeeded obedience to law and general subordination amongst the people; and to those causes alone the unparalleled effusion of human blood, under a *Sylla* and a *Marius*, may be fairly traced.

Had the Romans, after the expulsion of the tyrannical Tarquin, been satisfied with a judicious and salutary reform of their monarchical system, they might have saved them-

selves ages of inquietude, anxiety, perpetual doubt, and civil contention;—as it was, they went from one extreme to the other; and this has generally been the result with every people, who have suffered themselves to be led away by the excitement of the moment, whenever they set upon obtaining redress for matters of state grievance, whether well grounded or not; rarely indeed has it occurred that the middle course has been adopted, unless under the influence of some one directing hand, who has had the prudence and the firmness to undertake the task. And yet, the Roman people had before them two bright examples, in the persons of their *second* and *fifth* king: nor, can it be denied, that their own factious proceedings and grossly irrational conduct, after the death of the latter, in the unbecoming and impolitic election of Servius Tullius, a man of mean birth, an alien, and a slave, to the highest dignity in the state, in opposition to the nobles, was the occasion of the selection of the imperious Tarquin, in the succeeding reign.

The revolting and unnatural scenes that were enacted by this family, were but a just judgment and retributive punishment on the people of Rome, for their want of moral propriety, their desertion of virtue, in the choice they had forced upon the more considerate of their fellow-citizens; and the entire state must have been sunk deep in the mire of degradation, that could have calmly witnessed the iniquity which passed before their eyes, at the conclusion of this reign. That which is founded on immorality of principle, cannot reasonably be expected to end in any other form than disgrace or ruin; and the Romans suffered the ignominy to fall upon their heads, of having the dead body of the king of their free choice driven over by the chariot wheels of an impious daughter, in exultation of her father's murder!

There are few nations but what have some dark spots in

their history, and the more renowned, the more conspicuously do they display themselves to the disadvantage of the people, who have furnished the materials for commentary. It is our duty to profit by the gloomy examples which, from time to time, have obtruded themselves into the arena of political events. One decidedly false step in national policy, may require *ages* of toil, of perseverance, of sound judgment, to remove the evil consequences engendered. This was especially manifested with the Romans; they commenced their reform with speculating on the adoption of new theories and untried systems; and Rome no longer "stood upon the foundation of her ancient morals,"—she exchanged the substantial forms, or safeguards of liberty, for their shadow, the political *euphanasia* of her own imagination, and produced, as its sequence, the necessity for the greatest struggles for the preservation of her independence.

It has been generously, yet justly recorded, that "the *first* Romans conquered their enemies by valour, temperance, and fortitude;" their moderation also, and their justice, were well known amongst their neighbours; and not only private possessions, but even mighty kingdoms were left in their power, to be distributed amongst a family, or to be insured in the hands of a rightful successor. Under their consular government, they became self-interested and rapacious, artfully supporting the weaker party in every quarrel, that the more powerful might be gradually reduced, and the more easily fall under their dominion;—under their dictatorship they were cruel and despotic; and under their emperors proud, mercenary, and ambitious. Still, many bright traits of the original genius of the people occasionally illumined the otherwise dark surface created by ambitious leaders.

A very fair comparison may be made between the proceedings which took place in the destruction of the Roman mo-

narchy, consequent on the deposition of the impious Tarquin, and those which paved the way to the dissolution of the French monarchy in 1789; save, that the Roman people, in the early age of their heathen virtue, displayed that reason, moderation, and sense of human justice, which puts to everlasting blush and shame, the refinement and morality of the nineteenth century of the Christian era! The Romans were not only justified, but justifiable in the expulsion of the monarch, who had infringed so grossly on their liberties; had violated the sacred obligations of human nature, and the duties of citizenship. But, what was the punishment decreed to that individual, whose *life* might justly have been deemed forfeited to the state, with hardly the *privilege* of appeal for a second hearing? Mark it, ye liberal reformers, who attempt to justify, or even vainly *palliate*, on public grounds, the conduct of those who were the first actors in that black tragedy, which has eclipsed the honour of human nature in the fourth grand scene, or *epocha*, of its earthly performance. The gates of Rome were closed against Tarquin! He was proscribed with the just indignation of horror, but not destroyed in cool blood! The Romans did not degrade their legal records with the ceremony of a *mock trial*, that they might in their own eyes appear justifiable in the performance of a legal murder! "*Spem Catalinæ mollibus sententiis aluerunt, conjurationemque nascentem non credendo corroboraverunt.*"

The moderation of the unfortunate French monarch, and the imbecility of his Peers, paved the way for those direful calamities, which a stern deportment and a judicious management would, in all probability, have averted. The king was unsuited to the times in which he lived, and ill adapted to regulate the intractable genius of the nation it was his unhappy lot to preside over; for govern it he did not. There was nothing cruel nor vicious in his entire nature; still

less was he opposed to a rational reform, as his condescending inclination to make large concessions, sufficiently verifies: surrounded by imbecile, or designing ministers, and opposed by a factious population, he spoke with mildness and good-nature to those who were plotting his ruin,—to men "who deserved to have run the gauntlet!" At once generous and unsuspecting, he became the fair mark for the dark objects of the *Mountain* party, and the victim of his own credulity!

We will take the opinions of that Man, in proof of the correctness of these views, whose rise upon the *consequences* that ensued, test the soundness of his judgment and the accuracy of his conclusions. The Napoleon of 1789, and the Napoleon of 1815, or even of 1819, when he indited the memorable *manuscript of St. Helena*, was perfectly well acquainted with the genuine qualities of the French people, "*social, literary*, and *political*,"—two or three specimens shall suffice—they are especially appropriate to the subject.

Napoleon Buonaparte to M. D'Angeais, dated "De Guise, 3d September, 1789."

TRANSLATION.

"Eighteen months have elapsed, Monsieur, since your departure, and yet this is the first despatch you will have received from me: I call it a *despatch*, for that term suits me better than the word *letter*. This delay is not owing to negligence; I wished to write *facts*, not *words*. I have advanced one step; I am *lieutenant;* is not that something. Well, it had but little effect upon me. To tell you the truth, the more decorated my uniform becomes, the higher my wishes aspire. I can neither comprehend nor fathom myself, such an *abyss* do I appear. From a lieutenancy to the

object of my secret ambition, the distance is, in comparison, as the glimmering of a taper to the glare of the solar ray!

"The lowly plant aiming to reach the height of the cedar, would give you a faint idea of my future expectations, and of my secret thoughts. Have I any foundation for my hopes? *Yes*, I answer; though, if the whole universe were asked the question it would reply, *No*. Which of the two will be right? Time must unravel; and that time, my friend, no longer exists in *imagination!* Already do I see the career; nothing is wanting but an opportunity, years, and the right balancing of myself, to enter on the race-course. The first will speedily spring up for me; years I am acquiring; and the other I will take upon myself to obtain.

"What wonderful events have transpired since your departure! Men and affairs, master and servant, subject and prince, are no longer in the same place. What, you will ask, is the king doing? Alas! he is acting the part of a good man, and of an excellent father of a family! *he speaks with mildness and good-nature to men who deserve to run the gauntlet.* I would have made any sacrifice to have been his *Minister* only for a *month.* I am only one-and-twenty, my friend, but I would have handled the reformers *(les innovateurs)* rather roughly. The prince, no doubt, would have been afflicted at my severity, for his fault is, that he is too indulgent; but his family, his faithful servants, every honest man in France, would have thanked me in their hearts. The very *dregs* of the people, whom I would have opposed, would now be under an obligation to me, for, in the manner they are proceeding, it may cost them the last drop of their blood; and yet, to stop the first inroads of an inundation, which will perhaps *overwhelm the whole of Europe*, the plan to be pursued was but trifling. I would have commissioned *six regiments* of cavalry, or more, if necessary, to bring before me the haughty innovators, and thus would I have addressed them: 'Gentlemen, if it be within your jurisdiction to *remonstrate (faire des remontrances)* with your sovereign, surely it was not becoming your duty, and I will even add your *dignity*, to imitate those ballad singers, placing yourselves, as it were, at

the corner of every street, to carol forth *couplets*, with which the king alone ought to have been acquainted [1]. You have not only committed an error, but even a *crime!* Be that as it may, the king, my master, as *just* as he is *indulgent*, will take your *reasonable* complaints into consideration, and forgive you, on condition that you no longer secretly tamper with the people. If you counteract this order, you may expect to be sent to Toulon or Marseilles, to ply the oar as galley-slaves.' A threat by the bye, which I would quickly and strenuously have put into execution, if the delinquents had swerved in the least from their duty.

" This remonstrance, given in *private*, which I would have backed by that which causes every undertaking to succeed, an imposing force, ready for action, would, without fail, have repressed the indiscreet, or rather *self-interested*, zeal of these remonstrance-makers: the consequences would have been, that the people would not have even thought of their complaints. But this is, my dear friend, only the first spark of a conflagration, which has kindled, and is daily increasing. A conflagration smouldering in the embers, from which I may hope to realize part of my expectations. Alas! why is the king so virtuous, so humane, and so mild? Why does he always show himself the tender father, whilst his *ungrateful* and *rebellious* children are constantly plotting his ruin? Why does he not take up the lash of *Louis the Fourteenth?* Why did he not rush into the Tennis-Court at the head of his guards, and drive out his new intrusive guests? An act of determined boldness like this, supported by strenuous prepara-

[1] The Napoleon of 1789, the subsequent *idol* of the French nation, and who, despite of all his failings and ambition, was passionately attached to *La Belle France*, sufficiently showed that he possessed the *materiel* for governing; and that, in 1813, he entertained the same opinions, when he said to the legislative body, " these affairs ought always to be treated as family matters." His sentiments respecting the *impolicy* of assembling the *States-General*, are worthy of perpetuation,—not merely on account of the refined strength of style in which they are conveyed, but for the correct views, and sound logical reasoning under which he made his deductions.

tions, and a few *executions*, if requisite, would have stopped the evil at its very source;—but the virtuous Louis the Sixteenth, wishes to be a father, rather than a king; and yet, at the critical moment he ought to show that he is a *king*, if he wishes to remain a *father!*"

SECOND LETTER.

Addressed as the former.

" *5th September*, 1789.

" He who first advised the king to assemble the States-General, would well deserve the name and merit the fate of *Prometheus!* The latter encroached on celestial power, by animating a *mortal*,—the former gave a stab to *royalty*, by animating the *monster*, whose offspring were to devour him! All the elements of the *revolution* it is said, were then in existence, and the convocation of the States-General was indispensable. The former assertion is *true*,—the latter utterly *false*. The events, it is true existed; but the *regal authority*, strenuously displayed in every sense of the word,—the effervescence restrained in its very beginning, would have prevented them from bursting forth, and for the time have destroyed the greatest part. A wise reform afterwards,—a better system of finance,—fair sacrifices made on the part of privileged classes, who should be compelled to make them,—the interests of all orders nicely *balanced*,—these different subjects discussed in a select council, or committee, *(assemblée d'élite)* and rapidly put into execution, would have calmed the minds of the timid, insensibly restored order, disconcerted all the hopes of the ambitious, and afforded time to strengthen the weak sides of the *monarchy*, or reconstruct it on a foundation more appropriate to the manners and the necessities of the people.

" To bring about all this, I have no hesitation in saying, that *violent* measures must have been used; there must have been some

victims,—some exemplary punishments;—perhaps, even one might have passed for a month or two as a harsh, inhuman, and unfeeling ruler: what is all that compared with the yawning abyss which has just opened under the *throne* and the *nation*? The good effects brought about by the reform, the restoration of internal peace, the fair popularity aimed at by the sovereign, would assuredly *(assurément)* have caused all the past to be forgotten. So true it is, that a king (even unjustly) who would choose it, might *murder* half his subjects, and yet make himself idolized by the other; the only difficulty is to know how to go about it. This assertion, Dangeais, may appear bold to you; but weigh it in the balance of reflection, and you will be convinced there never was a more fundamental truism; besides, we are so constructed it cannot well be otherwise; it is human nature! A happy people, who see their riches and their happiness daily increase, are incapable of condemning the *means* employed for both, by the supposed author of their prosperity. They are in possession of them, enjoy them, and they require nothing more. This is a true picture of man and society, of every climate and of every age.

"What I predicted respecting the States-General, was realised much sooner even than I imagined. That impolitic measure of convoking a large assembly of men in times of public effervescence, puts every ill passion on the alert. One, who never thought of taking a part in the legislation of the state, makes use of a thousand stratagems to get his name enrolled amongst the actors of the *political drama* about to be represented. Another, who, through despair, was preparing the deadly poison to put an end to his own existence, his infamy, and his *debts*, lays it aside, realises a little money, and then comes to the capital, determined to take advantage of the first critical event, *(le moment périlleux,)* that can extricate him from embarrassment.

"This first assembly was, however, composed of men of the highest merit, *(le plus grand mérite,)* and whose political education was by no means ignoble; these enlightened subjects *(sujets illuminés)* will most probably be the ruin of France, and undermine the

throne. This assertion may at first sight appear hazardous; and yet, in my opinion, time will discover that it is well founded. *This self-constituted assembly will not be the first to erect scaffolds, nor to insult the sovereign power; but it will pave the way for those atrocities;* — those luminous discourses *(conversations lumineuses)* on *political problems*, the solution of which ought to be confined to a few, will stir up thousands of *factious demagogues of every species*. From these will spring other assemblies, whose talents and principles will be in *inverse ratio* with the principles and talents of their predecessors, and into which ambitious delegates will insinuate themselves, ready to *stab, weaken, or pervert their colleagues*. The lower class will then assume the principles of their assumed superiors, and every thing will be destroyed! This self-constituted assembly, I repeat, will not indeed demolish *(abattre)* the edifice of the monarchy, but will first point the way to its destruction!"

These equally remarkable and interesting conclusions were formed from daily *personal* observation on passing events,— *la suite des choses qui ont passé tous les jours devant ses yeux.*— A more admirable definition of the results, which actually took place, cannot well be conceived,—they speak for themselves.

THIRD LETTER.

Addressed as the former.

" 8th *September*, 1789.

" I resume my pen, Dangeais, and cannot help expressing my regret at your not being on the spot. Each day would produce some new event for your consideration. That country which you have left, and the countrymen you have abandoned, are no longer morally in existence: there are absolutely new laws, new people, new manners. Armies have sprung up from the earth as if by enchantment. What a rich *mine* this France will present for the skilful

man, who will know how to investigate it, after thousands of investigators, *(des examinateurs,)* both good and bad, will have perished, by discovering to him the different *veins!* You would smile, my friend, at the fanaticism of the present French population;—a man, who has not even bread to eat, spends his time in assisting at the fine speeches of a political forum. A *word* has been thrown in among the people, of which they do not even comprehend the meaning. It has, however, been picked up by them, in order to hang up at the first lamp-post, *(à la lanterne)* or cut into pieces any person they may suppose to be hostile to their measures:—this is the word, *aristocrat;* a term implying sentence of immediate *death*, which is put into immediate execution, without inquiring if the unfortunate accused is deserving of it or not! The counsellor of state, Foulon, and Berthier, the inspector of Paris, were assassinated the 22d of last July, in virtue of this term, to which you may give the epithet of *incivic*, or *diabolic*, just as you think proper.

" This *reforming mob* does not confine itself, however, to such *trifling* exploits as these. The romance of the dungeons of the Bastile was no sooner related to them, than they marched in a body to this state prison. The governor, M. Delaunay, who should either have opened the gates to them peaceably, or fired upon them at once, has been beheaded by the citizen Denot, *cook* of his department! Flesselles, the sheriff, ended his days by *command of Le Sieur Moraire*, a silversmith of Charleville! In short, my friend, I could send you about thirty little dramatic pieces, all in *this style*, represented in a truely patriotic manner, in every lane and alley of the metropolis, which are imitated in every other province. *Mais la grande tragédie approche!*

" This statement, although lightly drawn, of the situation in which the French nation is placed, will, no doubt, create sorrow in you, who are the heir of an extremely rich uncle; nothing can be more natural. He who loves to live peaceably, whom fortune loads with her best gifts, will never look with a placid countenance on *political convulsions*. If every one of those who now take share in the revolution, had, like you, Dangeais, acquired a rich inherit-

ance, depend upon it that the revolution would never have taken place, that the monarch would be revered, and his subjects happy and quiet.

" Many reasons have been assigned for revolutions in a State; but, in my opinion, the principal and primary cause is the physical or moral perplexity of one class in particular, or of several combined. Wherever a revolution breaks out, it is certain that there exists somewhere a factious or suffering people; for, an individual who grieves not, who is not ambitious,—(for ambition is grievous) —who sees his affairs and his family prosper,—if in his reason— is a decided enemy to all revolutions, and wisely so; but that is no reason why every one else should be of his opinion, or that I should.

" You have already seen that I pitied the monarch, and did full justice to his virtues; you have heard me wish that he possessed energy, firmness, and even insensibility,—a quality he certainly needs at present, in order to repress the unwarrantable audacity of some of his subjects. Well, if I thus expressed myself, feeling for his interest and his safety, it was that I identified myself to his title, to the *authority* which he ought necessarily to possess in all its fulness, and which he allows himself to be deprived of through his good nature. In short, *I placed myself on his throne*, and with regret saw that he acted not in the manner in which I would have acted in a similar situation;—his blindness has been a warning to me. But, laying aside this sentiment, I see with inexpressible pleasure, on other grounds, both the too great indulgence of the monarch, and the too insolent audacity of the subject. This is my lesson. Such is likewise the opinion I have of the labours of those directors convoked by the king,—still the same want of energy, productive of the most outrageous violence (*impétuosité furieuse*) on the part of the people. And yet I should despond if all these atrocities did not exist; for it only leads to an *explosion* that seems most likely to raise me from the *imperceptible eminence* on which I at present grovel,—an explosion that will bring me into notoriety, and afford me the means of realizing those expectations I have cherished from my earliest infancy.

"However dark the political clouds may appear, as they are settling over the horizon of the French nation, you will scarcely credit when informed, my friend, that it is the foreboding of some dreadful storm! Yes, Dangeais, the vessel of the state is threatened with hurricanes (*ouragans*) and multiplied destruction. I do not think it in the power of mortals to stem the raging winds that roar around it;—the Divinity alone can safely guide it into harbour[1]!

"This forced penetration (*pénétration par force*) into the convulsions our country must necessarily undergo, makes me six feet higher than I was. I fancy to myself that fortune wishes to realize the truth of the note placed by my name in the list of candidates in the Military College. Yes, I aspire at an eminence, and circumstances will favour me; we can no longer doubt it. You will then, Dangeais, recollect the conversations of our youth—my first desires—my expectations—and the sentiments I confide to you in this despatch. You will say to yourself, '*he cherished every future hope by present anticipation, and my friend was not indulging in idle fancies.*' May my first sheets be a convincing proof to you that I am approaching the goal[2]!" . . . .

[1] "La Divinité seule peut le conduire au havre assuré."—NAPOLEON.

[2] "How much more strongly would the details conveyed in this voluminous epistle of Buonaparte have interested me, had not the impetuous writer intermingled them with his *gloomy* reflections! However curious I might be to know how far he might entangle himself in the *maze* of ambition,—his projects, his principles,—the wishes he expressed to see the misfortunes of his country multiplied in aid of them,—all these things, I say, inspired me with a certain involuntary aversion for him, which certainly would have induced me to break off every connexion had I not, on reflection, considered the improbability of his *means* ever becoming proportionate to his *desires*. This conviction alone prevented me from implying, in my answer, a formal disapprobation both of his principles, and the wishes he manifested. His description of subsequent scenes of horror were *unique*, and his feelings for the destruction of *royalty* may be well contrasted with his ambition."—*Note by M. D'Angeais.*

N.B.—*The fourth letter relates to the King's execution.*—Author.

SECOND SERIES.

From NAPOLEON BUONAPARTE, General of Artillery, to M. D'ANGEAIS.

"Toulon, 17 December, 1793.

"This is, I think, Monsieur, an attestation of some *rank*—some superiority and hopes of preferment—so much received *on account* from fortune, for the delightful promises with which she has ever buoyed me up.

"Well, Dangeais, now say, '*Buonaparte, you do not reflect; your brain is certainly cracked; your means will never be proportioned to your ends.*" What a pitiful case is your's, my friend, to be acquainted with a madman,—who is rather an original one, by the bye. You must at least confess, that this proportion of means is not badly *sketched out;* yes, sketched out; that is the very word. And yet, if this were the completion of my destiny, I would place myself on the first *mortar-piece* pointed at the enemy! Are not, moreover, *my* means (*mes prétensions*) allowable, since now-a-days *the meanest individual sets himself up for a legislator and governor?* Ah! my friend, what an *abyss* does our *revolution* present! How many heedless and headstrong victims will fall into it! How many have already fallen! The crisis is indeed terrible! Thanks to Heaven, I have the hope of being *preserved;* but, in speaking to you of this abyss, I am silent about those *persons* and *events* that are daily rendering it deeper. These details are due to *you*. Mark well

[1] "If the police had not deprived me of my papers, the public would here find the *second* letter (or despatch) that Napoleon wrote to me, in which it would be seen how unwelcome to him were the observations I made on the apparent absurdity of his ambitious *projects*. There would also follow the *three* despatches he afterwards addressed to me, and in which he gave me *his own* remarkable account of the principal events that happened consecutively in France, from the beginning of 1790 to the 26th July 1793, the day when *Petion*, the mayor of Paris, gave a grand dinner to the *Marseillois*. The next despatch would be a continuation, and nothing would be found wanting. It is true, the events he describes are to be found in numerous books, and known almost to every one; but the *original* manner in which he relates them belongs to him

where I left off in my last *despatch*. Do not, however, expect a *regular series of facts*. I will give you a sketch of the principal subjects of this vast and gloomy picture, not so much to lay them in judgment before you, as to convince you of my own character, and impress *you* with the idea that my aim is not too lofty, when I think myself worthy of aspiring at every thing.

"If perchance the happiness of your country should be your favourite illusion,—if you are not fully persuaded, that in a revolution the good are daily exposed to *fall by the dagger of the ambitious*—quit for ever the perusal of these despatches. In them you will find no *common narration*; the subject is new, terrible, and such as is seldom to be met with in the *annals of civilized nations!* If, however, you continue to peruse them, be not astonished if *I mark with an indelible seal certain persons and actions*. In deeds so unnatural, so outrageous, it will be utterly out of my power to use a natural and placid style. My language will necessarily deserve a part of the reproaches belonging to the *actions* it will describe. Forewarned, therefore, be not entirely surprised at my extravagance.

"From Besançon, I arrived again at Paris, on the 10th of September, 1792. This was a new-modelled city—a nursery for mean shufflers, seekers after preferment, cut-throats, and weak, paltry citizens, driven headlong from crime to crime, and who, after having proceeded so far, find it difficult to retreat. Such a gang (*bande*) collected in this *gulf of perdition* (*golfe d'infamie*) was perfectly conformable to my aim. On the *twenty-second* of the

alone. The ideas he fixes, and the opinions he forms of them, give them an air of novel interest, which makes us believe that we read them for the first time. Add to the great interest this inspires, the no less interesting circumstance of seeing *Napoleon Buonaparte*, who at a later period ascended the throne of *Henry the Fourth*, judge the abettors of a revolution which was the very cause of his acquiring that throne. Thus I say, if the historical importance of these *stolen* and lost papers is deeply felt, *Fouché* ought to feel the weight of it, and a still greater *national resentment*, for the betrayal of his patron and best friend. The subsequent facts I have preserved for history."—*Note by M. D'Angeais.*

same month *royalty* was abolished, and the *republic* ordained! It was then, Dangeais, that I exulted with expectation, and not without a motive: brutes alone have no foresight!

"In the month of December I was still at Paris to solicit promotion. During all the time not given up to my solicitations, I was employed in sifting into men and motives, nor could I occupy myself more profitably. I frequented assiduously the sittings of the *Convention*. There I learned that the *philosopher* and the *observer* are one and the same person; and that at times each may acquire more knowledge in fathoming a *volcano*, than in investigating a bed of plants. Half a century devoted to hard study, and all the books that have ever been printed, could not have instilled the *hundredth part* of those valuable notions which I acquired in the dark bosom (*le sein noir*) of this representative *chaos!* All the elements of *moral evil* were, I believe, there in fermentation. If fear still kept within it a *few* honest individuals (*une poignée de gens honnêtes*)—a circumstance probable enough—I am certain *they* must have rested upon *thorns*.

"The *ninth* of December the pleader Target informed me that the virtuous Louis the Sixteenth (*Louis* xvj.) would be brought to the bar of the Convention on the *eleventh*. At this information, one half of my frame sprang with hope, and the other half shuddered with horror! *Frenchmen!* from Pharamond until this day what have we witnessed? Nothing, in comparison to the great events reserved by fortune for this period.

"A just and benevolent king, who has nothing to reproach himself with but his *unbounded clemency*, brought on a sudden before his subjects, who have *constituted themselves his judges*, to be hereafter his *executioners!*—such a man, I say, compelled to lay aside his name, his title, and his rank, is one of those terrible spectacles that rend the heart of the good man and faithful subject; that are awful and painful to the philosopher; that are rapturous and sublime to the ambitious! How blunted soever may be the feelings of a man, he would, if it were possible, purchase, even at the price of his blood, the *right* of assisting at such a meeting.

"I arrived at the Convention,—I seated myself,—the monarch

enters. Oh, Nature! who ordered thee to imprint on the foreheads of legitimate sovereigns so much grandeur and dignity! why am I not gifted with the same majestic appearance? How well would it suit my projects! But, no: indiscreetly liberal to this thy favoured class, thou art a rigid step-mother to others! Such were the jealous reflections that assailed me, Dangeais,—I must confess it,—at the sight of the king of France before this imperious assembly,—reflections, which, on an attentive consideration, were succeeded by milder sentiments. Nature, said I, is in the right in having distinguished these privileged classes. Who will captivate by favour and benevolence, if it be not the man who governs his equals? This title alone, whether acquired justly or not, is sufficient to conciliate the inclination (*concilier la volonté*[1]) to the *protection of supernatural and divine beings.*

"My looks were again turned towards the accused monarch. The serenity of his soul could be traced on his calm and dignified countenance. His *innocence* was amply manifest in his least motions, and the bench of criminals (*le banc des criminels*), on which he had been placed by *crime* and *ambition*, appeared to me a splendid throne of glory and majesty (*un trône magnifique d'honneur et de majesté*). Excuse me, my friend, if, to display these noble scenes to you, I make use of an heroic style; but you well know, that every thing that strikes my mind assumes the height of the *cedar*. My thoughts are lofty, therefore my expressions are so; and that which would be ridiculous in another, in me is only the perfect effect of nature.

"The king spoke (*le roi parla*). He was at once *concise* and *sublime;* it is not, therefore, necessary for me to repeat his words. I expected at one time that his *self-appointed* judges (*constitués à soi-mêmes*) would fall down at his feet; but, alas! I was deceived: they possessed both the audacity and the sullen energy of *wickedness*. Silent, they looked upon the king, and shuddered not. Neither the rank of the accused, his innocence—which no *one* present doubted—the serenity of his countenance, nor the

[1] Faculté de l'âme!—AUTHOR.

august appearance (*contour*) of his whole person, had any effects on the *iron* hearts (*cœurs de fer*) of these men, determined to brave both *celestial* anger and human revenge! Such fixed audacity (*hardiesse determiné*) on their part raised them, in one sense, in my estimation; at least, said I, they *act their part* admirably, and their criminal insensibility is some recommendation; for, if *virtue* has its heroes, so has *guilt*.

"Shall I, Dangeais, entrust you with a secret? Well, then, these guilty wretches made so deep an impression on me, that, (being in the secret) had it depended on my myself to have been any thing but a mere witness of the *mock* solemn condemnation they were about to pronounce, or one of those who condemned him, I should not have hesitated in my choice. As a subject of the prince, I would have taken my place amongst his judges; but there my ambition, expansive as it is, would have known where to stop. I would have spoken boldly in favour of the monarch, and probably have saved him. If I am mistaken, be it so; it is an idea that has often possessed me. Learn, Dangeais, how I would have steered my course in this impetuous ocean. I would, in the first place, have secured a method for escaping; for he is only half a hero who falls a *victim* to his *laurels;* and my end would have been defeated. This important precaution first taken, and my plan ready, I would have rushed forward into the perjured assembly, not to *refute* the accusation brought against the king of France, —whose death was already *secretly planned,* and who (base meanness!) was led forth for form's sake,—but to cut short all deceitful decorum (*formalité décevante*), and proclaim aloud the secret intentions of the guilty directors. Thus would I have addressed them:—

"'REPRESENTATIVES! what has the king of France to do *here?* Why act a prelude to his death, by judiciary forms? Why impose on yourselves the unpleasant task of supporting the reproach, the majesty of his looks,—the serenity of his countenance,—the sublime self-consciousness of his innocence? Why torment yourselves to *invent* charges against him? Why require him to justify himself, when the *irrevocable* decree of his condemnation is written on your

hearts? What! you, who have trampled under foot all law and decorum,—you, who have broken through every tie, and destroyed every privilege, do you now lower your tone, in order to feign, to ape justice! Gentlemen, you are out in your parts. On the footing you are now, your sovereign can no longer *exist;* you well know it yourselves, but dare not proclaim it, as if fearful of withstanding the indignation of other nations. In the name of your formidable renown, be not *stultified*—be for once great and sincere in this *illustrious murder!* Let one of you, like a sublime *regicide*, thus address Louis the Sixteenth:—"Successor of *Henry the Fourth*, henceforth France will no longer obey *one King alone*. We impose the task on *seven hundred Sovereigns;* consequently *you* can no longer live; prepare for death!" '

"Do you not think, my friend, that such a speech would have changed the order of things? Would the assembly have listened to it with indifference? Would it not, in short, have roused the energy of those, who in the Convention were secretly inclined towards the fallen prince? I am convinced, that the numerous sensations necessarily produced would have brought on a better state of things. As to myself, wisely making my escape after the meeting, I would have taken my refuge with the French princes, and trusted to their *honour* for my safety and advancement. But my situation condemned me to the pain of remaining a mute spectator.

"These were, my friend, the *aërial* castles my active imagination formed in the midst of this popular vortex—this crater of the baser passions! The ill-starred monarch is at last directed to provide himself with a *counsel*, and the guards (*automates*) reconduct him to the Temple. Next day I was informed that the pleader *Target* had refused his assistance to his sovereign. This was, in the fullest force of the term, *blotting out his own name from the annals of immortality*. But this coward of prudence replied to this, '*By risking my own life I should not save his.*' In that respect he possibly was right, and were I in his place I should perhaps have acted in the same manner; for to tell you the truth, I love my own life; it is a natural failing. Well, *Malesherbes*, *Tronchet*, and *Desèze*,

devoted subjects, whom I could not imitate, but whom I would place on my right hand, if I were a king, reserved to themselves this honour, and united to defend the grandson of Saint Louis. Should they *survive* this courageous act, I will never pass by them without a respectful bow."

ADDENDA, dated 20th February.

"Having gone to Versailles, on some *private* business, I did not return to Paris before the 16th of January. I lost, consequently, three or four scenes of this dark, ambitious tragedy; but I was present, on the 18th, at the Convention. Ah! Dangeais, in spite of all that may have been advanced by *the furies of the revolution*, a king is not a mere man. His head falls, it is true, like that of a *peasant;* but he who commits the murder inwardly shudders at the deed; and if inferior motives, which direct him, did not benumb his senses, he would not dare to utter the fatal condemnation.

"I eagerly contemplated the determined wretches who were about to pronounce sentence on their virtuous sovereign. I watched every motion of their countenance. I probed into their very hearts. The magnitude and importance of the crime alone supported them. The name and rank of their victim secretly alarmed them, and had they hesitated, the prince would have been saved. Unfortunately, they had said to each other, '*If this head do not fall to-day, ours must soon hereafter fall under the axe of the executioner.*' It was this thought, more than anything else, that influenced the votes. What pen would be sufficiently skilful to depict the situation of the assembly? Pensive, mute, hardly daring to breathe, their eyes were fixed alternately on the *accused*, the judge, and the counsel. Unparalleled circumstance! This dreary pause terminates. D'Orleans exclaims, '*I vote for death!*'.... Electricity itself could not have produced a more instantaneous effect. Directors and judges rose dismayed, and the court re-echoed with a murmur of *horror*. One man alone, immoveable as a rock, remained seated. I was that man! The reason I gave myself for this insensibility was found, first, in my innocence of participation in the guilt,—

Catholic martyr. The revolution of 1830 sinks into insignificant importance in the comparison, as it was only an *effect* or consequence of the former. Mr. Burke's eloquent eulogium on the virtues of Maria Antoinette, and his lamentation for the departure of *chivalry*, and Napoleon's homage to the *virtuous* deportment of Louis the Sixteenth, are keen satires upon the justice and honour of human nature in popular proceedings; they afford a moral lesson, which kings and statesmen may study with real advantage.

The notice of these important topics will hardly be deemed a digression by the intelligent reader, who will at once see, that Napoleon took the model of the institutions he designed for the French people from those of Rome; and notwithstanding that he exhibited many blemishes of character in his career (and all great conquerors have had their blemishes), the French nation is indebted to his genius and firmness for the restoration of its chivalric character—its emancipation from that vortex of revolutionary degradation, and desertion of religious and moral obligation, which desolated its hearths, desecrated its altars, and depopulated its soil! Under his rule the arts and sciences revived, and the man of letters or of genius, from whatever clime, found in him a patron and a friend;—his reception of, and the honours he conferred on, our own countryman, Sir Humphry Davy, in the height of our national animosity, evidence this fact. How marked the contrast, then, between his government (however despotic), and that of *republicanism*, which peremptorily sent, in derision of science and learning, the unfortunate *Lavoisier* to the scaffold! From the mire of revolutionary degradation we come at length to a system of some form, possessing the classic title of *Consular Government*.

This government was to consist of a *conservative senate*—a legislative body of three hundred members—and a tribunal

of one hundred members. The consular government was accepted on the 7th of February, 1800, and this may be called the *fourth* constitution with which the French nation had been honoured with in a very short time. Buonaparte was named *First Consul,* and shortly afterwards his celebrated code of laws, entitled the *Code Napoleon,* was promulgated. Under this popular legislative protection, the Concordat stood at once most conspicuous, allowing full protection to the French clergy of all classes for the exercise of their religious duties; social security was revived; and the churches were once more opened for public devotion. These were certainly redeeming points in the career of ambition; and the Christian patriot may view in him a second Cyrus rebuilding the Temple, as an instrument of Almighty Power!

There is something melancholy appaling to the reflecting mind when taking a retrospective view of those revolting and gloomy scenes which were enacted during the *nine years* that France proscribed the *Christian Religion* from her bosom. What a nation of *freemen,* reduced below the level of Mahomeddan morality!—a nation, which, making Liberty its idol, was without religious temples, into which the devout of any class might enter to worship the Author of their being, apart from the maddened din of profligate, political, murderous *atheism!* "During this period of moral abstraction and dreary solitude," says an elegant writer, "children grew into manhood, 'without God and without hope in the world.' The long apprenticeship which the young people of the revolution had served at the altar of *Reason* rendered their modes of thinking so completely new, that on the restoration of religious worship they stood *aloof* from the aged few, emerged as it were from the tomb, who assembled with the court to celebrate, in the cathedral of *Notre Dame,* the ratification for the treaty of peace, in 1802." This, in a great measure, jus-

tified Napoleon's remarkable address to the Catholic clergy of the department of the Rhine, on his assuming the imperial purple,—that "he had done more, by his solitary example, to restore Christianity to the French people, than they seemed inclined to effect by their labours;" and, warning them against interference in *politics*, to the neglect of their sacred duties, concluded with the extraordinary words,—"I established the *Concordat* for general protection and security of conscience. Had I not done so, my duty would have impelled me to become a *Protestant*, and *twenty millions* of people would have followed my example!" The succeeding circumstances attending the *imperial regime* in France are so generally known, that a further notice of them here might be deemed superfluous.

We now return to the Roman people, for the purpose of briefly noticing the proceedings under their varied forms of popular government, until they ended in the despotism of a single individual, which, without the smallest perversion of facts, can fully and fairly be traced to the equally impolitic and unjust conduct that was repeatedly manifested towards the noble, or patrician order, ending ultimately in the entire subversion of the liberties of Rome.

It has been shown, that the election of Tarquinius Priscus, the fifth king, was partly popular, and that, according to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Populi impetratâ venia*,—this was a very rational step in the march of freedom, by whatever means effected; and the king manifested a proper sense of the confidence reposed in him, by causing one hundred representatives to be elected out of the commons. Had the people, at his death, remained satisfied with the *precedent* he had given them, and exercised their privilege conjointly with the nobles, in a consistent and becoming manner, the election of Servius Tullius, which led to the separation of the interest and support

of the former, would never have taken place. But the popular classes having discovered their strength, soon applied it to the most rash and improvident purposes. Servius, in his weakness gratified their vanity, by giving freedom to servants, and enabling them to possess equal privileges with the rest of the citizens, and in return he was by them declared and confirmed no longer Protector but King! This profligacy brought with it a corresponding laxity of public morals, and the nobles having estranged themselves from all active participation in the affairs of state, the balance of power was entirely set aside.

Thus, within the space of a few years, it will be seen, that the democratic party in the city proceeded so far, as to wrest even the power of electing a king entirely out of the hands of the nobles. This was so great and irrational a stretch of ascendency, and occasioned such a struggle and convulsion between the two parties, that the state barely sustained itself under the loss of its early constitution. Under the conflict of opinions that supervened, civil dissensions of the most inveterate description arose, and these were speedily succeeded by the despotic rule of a single person, as the latter was by the entire subversion of the regal power, and a settlement upon an entirely new foundation.

At the institution of the consular government the balance of power was again re-established on a new basis, between the nobles and the commons. Under this arrangement the two first consuls were nominated by the nobles, and confirmed by the commons; and a law was passed that no one should bear any office of magistracy in Rome, *injussu populi*, or without the concurrence of the commons. Yet this arrangement (however popular) did not long satisfy the people, who, urged on by some artful and ambitious citizens, became clamorous for the establishment of a new order of magistracy, under the plausible pretext of watching over the *popular*

rights, and attending purely to the interests of the democratic party.

It may well be imagined, that in such turbulent times, many of the poorer order of citizens were considerably in *debt*, either to the richer sort amongst their own body, or to the higher order of the Senators and Nobles; and this was precisely the case in Rome, in the early part of her consulate. The laws for the first *four centuries* had expressly provided, that after a set time of payment, the debtor, on failure of performance, had no alternative but that of becoming the *slave* of the creditor[1]. This provision was wisely made by Romulus, for the purpose of preventing profligacy, and enforcing just principles in dealing. But the lower orders of the people, taking advantage of the opportunity, which the confusion of these times presented, joined with the unprincipled and seditious faction of individuals, who had resolved to emancipate themselves from their obligations, and they quitted the city in a state of rebellion against the constituted authorities. How well does this early fact of history accord with Napoleon's marked description to M. D'Angeais, of the unprincipled proceedings and designs of those persons who promoted the subversion of the laws, and the downfal of regal authority in France!

The Roman senate, weakened in its power and influence, and destitute of the direction of a master mind, which would at once have seen the advantage resulting to the state, by its entire separation from so refractory an association, yielded to its domination, which demanded as the condition of its returning allegiance, the acquittal of all the members from the payment of their debts; and moreover, that certain magistrates should be annually chosen to defend them from prosecutions. These being instituted, were called the *Tribunes of the people*,

[1] Regulat. ab urbe conditâ.

their persons were declared sacred, and their acts inviolable; and the people bound themselves by an oath never to abrogate the office! By these very Tribunes, in process of time, were the people grossly deceived and artfully managed, as might reasonably have been expected under their constitution, to serve the purposes and forward the designs of ambitious men, in the perpetration of such exorbitances, as could not possibly end in any event short of the entire dissolution of the government.

These popular tribunes, within a year or two after their institution, fomented the most painful dissensions between the nobles and the commons, on the account of Coriolanus, whom the latter had impeached, and the consequences of whose impeachment, but for the forbearance of Coriolanus, was nearly proving fatal to the Roman independence; and it required all the influence and persuasion of the family of the latter, to prevent his entering the city, at the heed of a powerful army of the *Volsci*. Although thus forewarned, from this time the tribunes commenced the system of accusing whatever nobles they thought fit, several of whom, under this arbitrary form of proceeding, were banished or put to death, on the most frivolous pretexts during several succeeding ages.

About this period, the Romans were much engaged in wars with the neighbouring states; still, upon the least interval of peace, the contentions between the nobles and commons revived, and one of the most frequent and exciting subjects of their dissensions was the conquered lands, which the latter demanded should be divided amongst the people. This was very properly opposed by the senate and the nobles, on public grounds, who insisted on their retention for the benefit of the state; for several of the wisest amongst this body, with just reason, apprehended the unconstitutional increase of the democratic power. With this evidence of inflexibility, in

trampling on rights which no independent body could with the least share of self-propriety relinquish, the senate put itself into an attitude demanded by the crisis, and corresponding with its own dignity; and knowing what an undue accession of influence would accrue to the popular party, used every means to prevent it. Amongst the opposing party of the nobles, the *Appian family* was the most conspicuous, when one of them having delivered a luminous speech on the national impolicy of suffering a division of these lands, he was impeached on the part of the people of *high treason*, and a day formally appointed for his trial! but, disdaining to make a useless defence, or suffer the ignominy of a triumphant execution on the part of popular fury, preferred the Roman alternative of destroying himself! But this rash act was followed with fatal results to the independence of the nobles, and the best interests of the state. The commons, forgetting that public property could never be fairly considered amenable to individual rights, grew more resolute for the attainment of their object, and ultimately the conquered lands were distributed amongst them.

When unreasonable demands are once conceded to a factious people, the concession invariably opens the door to further clamour, and demands still more unreasonable. This point was no sooner gained, than fresh agitation and new dissensions arose: the republican party insisted on the passing of a law of *equality*, under which all the rights and privileges of citizenship should be placed on the same *level;* and that the power of every *tribunal magistrate* should be increased within his own jurisdiction, as much as that of the consuls! Preposterous as were these demands, they were not only carried, but measures of a far more levelling description succeeded. The intelligent and impartial historian informs us, that the tribunes obtained the power of having their number

doubled from five to ten, and that their insolence and domination increased with their number; and the seditious movements amongst the people augmented with corresponding malignity.

In the early part of the fourth century from the foundation of the Roman government, the tribunes had obtained so great an ascendancy in the name of the commons, as to accuse and confine the consuls themselves at pleasure, although the latter represented the kingly power. The senate observing how far, under this despotic system, it was compelled on almost all occasions to yield to the popular tribunes, upon deliberate consultation, and to preserve the state from the horrors of civil wars deemed it the most prudent course to submit to the demands, *pro tempore*, and to have recourse to an expedient, for the purpose of getting rid of a system so truly obnoxious to all the wiser ends of civil government. A decree was thereupon passed by the nobles, for sending ambassadors to Athens, and the other Grecian governments, established in that part of Italy called *Græcia Major*, with authority to make collections of the best known laws, in order that, with their auxiliary assistance, conjoined with some of their own forms, they might rid themselves and the state of the popular tyranny.

Out of the different codes of law procured by these commissioners, a new and complete system of legislation was framed, and promulgated as *the laws of the twelve tables*. In order that these laws should be properly digested and carried into effect, *ten* individuals of reputed judgment and discretion were selected, with the approbation of the commons, and the administration of all public affairs submitted to their control: the use they made of this power, in trampling on the liberties of their fellow-men, has been already shown in the

preceding chapter; and which never could have taken place if the people had properly sustained the independence and authority of the nobles. This most important revolution, effected without bloodshed, is a striking evidence of what may be performed in any state, where the people are sufficiently discreet to suffer those, who have great interests at stake, to exercise a deliberate judgment in the management of national affairs. But this extraordinary and necessary change in the Roman government, was entirely brought about, and enforced as it were, by the repeated, impolitic, and unjust encroachments of the popular party; and the contingent fate of Rome might have been placed on entirely another basis, if the folly and vicious propensities of those principally interested, had not prevented it. The *decemviri*, availing themselves of the jealousy of the commons towards the nobles, seized the opportunity of supplanting, as soon as practicable, the controlling influence of both!

In the distracted councils of a state, verging towards its dissolution, these unhappy feelings generally predominate: little regard is paid to the correcting rule of just principles, even amongst those who are colleagues in authority; and the canker-worm of jealousy insinuates itself amongst all classes, even those who are associated in wielding the affairs of government,—the destinies of empire! This impure principle, or passion of the human character, requires, in all states, the correcting influence both of a religious and temporal authority; without which no people, however powerful or intelligent, can assure to themselves the permanent retention of their liberties. The force of this argument has been strikingly illustrated in two lines by *Lucan*, an authority which may be appealed to with advantage; for his tragical end, under the tyrannical *Nero*, exemplified the independence of his spirit,

and his knowledge of Roman history and of morals is fully displayed in his poems [1].

> " Nulla fides regni sociis, omnisque potestas
> Impatiens consortis erat."—LUCAN.

L'homme n'est jamais moins misérable, que quand il paroît depourvu de tout. Thus, in the course of a very few years after the promulgation of the laws of the twelve tables in Rome, the commons, representing the entire people, made another daring inroad upon the power and privileges of the nobles; demanding that the consulship, which had previously been limited to members of the patrician order, as the office of highest trust and dignity, should be open in common to all Romans, of whatever rank or station! This astounding proposition, couched in a peremptory form, was successfully opposed by the nobles and chief orators at first; but, by dint of uncontrollable perseverance on the popular side, was at length carried; and from that moment the real liberties of Rome received the seal of their final doom. The successive events which took place, in the interesting and ever instructive history of the Roman people and government, were nothing more than the *alternations* of tyranny, uncertainty, and licentiousness; until they established the imperial *regime*, the first title

[1] Of all the compositions of *Lucan*, none but his *Pharsalia* remains. This poem contains an account of the civil wars of *Pompey* and *Cæsar*, but is unfinished. This aspiring poet first incurred the displeasure of Nero by entering the lists against his imperial master. Lucan selected *Orpheus* for his subject, and Nero the tragical story of *Niobe!* He obtained the prize of merit, and Nero, jealous of his rising poetic reputation, resolved to be revenged. Being accused of entering into a conspiracy with *Piso;* and the alleged plot having been discovered, he had only to choose the manner of his *death*. He requested that his veins might be opened in a warm bath; and, as he expired, he pronounced, with great energy, the words which in his Pharsalia, lib. iii. v. 639—642., he had put into the mouth of a *soldier*, who died in the same manner as himself.—Vide *Quintil.* 10.—*Suet.*—Tacit. Ann. 15.—Martial 7. Ep. 20, &c

to which, under the comprehensive distinction of *Imperator*, was given by the Roman *soldiers*, to one of their successful leaders, as the splendid victories of Napoleon, and the attachment of the French army to their chief, in derision of the *red cap of liberty*, and despite of all the craft of republican philosophy, and the all-enticing charms of equality, seated him on his throne of pre-eminent despotism,—a throne which France, smiling in her prowess, deemed cheaply purchased by wading through fields of blood and death! And yet, this but further elucidates the necessity for a fixed system of government,—the retention of a balance of power, of which Napoleon saw the full emergency, under his own *example*, and profiting thereby, re-established the French peerage, which gave strength to his government; and under which, the best interests of France can alone be properly sustained. In proportion as she curtails the privileges of her *peers*, so will she curtail the true liberties of her people; and, rendering them *dependent*, ensure the domination of the kingly power. "*La clémence des princes, dit M. Rochefoucault, n'est souvent qu'une manœuvre politique, pour gagner l'affection du peuple*" One would imagine, that this author was intimately acquainted with the *juste millieu* system of manœuvring—the choice policy of the French court in 1834!

The historical *data* adduced on behalf of the government of ancient Rome, in this dissertation, is principally obtained from the writings of the elaborate and diligent historian, Dionysius, of Halicarnassus, who left his own country, that he might study in the "*eternal city*," all the Greek and Latin authors, whose compositions treated of its history. Esteemed by all the learned of the age in which he lived, "*Palmam qui meruit ferat*," might, with full propriety and justice, have been placed upon his monument, as a modest record of the fine termination of his mortal course, and the consummation of

his literary career. To the other qualifications of the elegant historian and critical observer, this ancient author has added the choice merit of stern *veracity*, and the equally valuable characteristics of an orator and shrewd politician; giving honour to that Augustan age, which preceded the earthly advent of the Messiah!

It might possibly open a wide field for controversial discussion, if we were to attempt to illustrate or determine at what precise period the balance of power was most equally sustained, between the *lords* and the *commons* in ancient Rome; for this would, in great measure, be dependent on the different feelings of various politicians, and the details of a variety of writers, both in ancient and modern times. We are informed by Polybius, in his *Fragment*, lib. vi. that at the period of the Second Punic War, the Carthaginian people, proverbial for their insincerity *(Punica fides)*, were declining in political influence, in consequence of the balance of power preponderating on the side of the people, whereas the Romans, on the contrary, were in the zenith of their vigour, by the power being entirely deposited with the *senate*. The writings of Dionysius, which are extant, do not reach this period by about two hundred and forty years; but it has been remarked, by all the best authors, including *Plutarch*, that in all the political dissensions and popular tumults of Rome, from the period of the destruction of the monarchy, and although the populace used most violent language and contumacious behaviour, no *blood was ever shed* in any of the quarrels between the nobles and the commons, until the time of the *Gracchi*.

It was long held, in anticipation, a most disgraceful act for a Roman to spill the blood of another, on account of any political difference between them (without trial) in a purely popular tumult; and certainly this principle of virtue contributed, abstractedly, to the preservation of a balance of authority,

for many ages after it had inclined to the side of the people. One great cause of this preservation, was the strict moral as well as military discipline, observed in the Roman armies, composed of the flower of the people, naturally warlike, and headed by commanders whose genius and enterprise tended to that end. No statesman, or general, was better acquainted with the true character of the Roman people, under their declining policy, than *Scipio Africanus* the younger, nor with the defects of their popular system; and he, in vain, exerted his patriotic zeal and splendid abilities, in endeavours and persuasions to moderate their unreasonable proceedings. Although Rome stood solely indebted to his judgment, bravery, and self-denial, for her preservation from the conquest of *Annibal*, (the Napoleon of Carthage,) and with whom the Napoleon of France proudly identified himself, in his memorable address to his soldiers, on the invasion of the Peninsula, " this war of Carthage must henceforward be decided on the plains of Spain,"—Scipio was doomed to experience the deep ingratitude of his countrymen, when he opposed, with sincerity, their presumption and their folly; and, when he fairly sought the honours of the consulship for two meritorious friends, had the mortification of seeing his application treated with contempt, and those honours, under the clamours of the multitude, bestowed on a person, neither recommended by character, ability, nor merit! He entertained, on deliberate reflection, well-grounded apprehensions of the consequences of the continual encroachments made by the commons on the station and privileges of the nobles; and, as a man of commanding talents and shrewd penetration, with an independent spirit, had every means of making himself acquainted with the popular excesses and corruptions of his own age; and which, as a statesman and an orator, he declared had entered into the constitution of his country; and they enabled

him to foresee the ruin of her independence, which he resolved not to witness; nor even to allow his remains to be entombed within her walls! The triumphant conqueror of Annibal has perpetuated his credit as a politician, as he ably sustained his pretensions as a patriot and a general. When Scipio asked Annibal what rank he would have claimed had he conquered him, the Carthaginian general, (who had been ranked with Alexander the Great, and Pyrrhus, king of Epirus) exclaimed, "*If I had conquered you, Scipio, I would call myself greater than the conqueror of Darius, and the ally of the Tarentines.*"—Yet this was the man whom Rome, under the fever of her favoured democracy, drove from her bosom!

History, indeed, has sufficiently shown, that the qualifications of the soldier and the statesman have often centered in the same individual,—the great danger to be apprehended, is the impure ambition resulting from success, and the power produced by victory:—to both of these the Roman general was a stranger,—the first was not the primary object of his heart, and the jealous *civilians* of Rome, who would have been slaves, or dependents, but for his valour, deprived him, with great impolicy, of the latter. The death of Annibal, in the same year with that of Scipio, may be said to have averted the fate of the Roman empire, and was the occasion of great rejoicings in Rome; he had always been her declared enemy, and his first and last ambition — the entire destruction of her power. "*Solvamus diuturnâ curâ populum Romanum, quando mortem senis expectare longum censet,*" were his expiring words! Juvenal, in speaking of him, says, that "the single ring which caused his death, made sufficient atonement to the Romans, for the many thousand rings that had been sent to *Carthage* from the battle of *Cannæ*." The fate of empire may be regarded as a matter of common occurrence in the history of the world; but the causes which lead to its

dissolution, in all civilized states, are many and complicate, although many general circumstances, tending to that end, may be deduced by the philosopher and the calm observer; for, the politician is more frequently the man of prejudice, and the less competent judge. That all forms of government instituted by men, like that of their authors, have their periods of prosperity, duration, and decay, *limited* by contingent circumstances, as well as the existence of individuals, is a truism, that no rational being will deny,—"all forms that perish, other forms supply;" but, there are few amongst the mass of mankind, who devote their attention properly to, or examine calmly the real cause of those diseases, which, being imperceptibly bred in every state, hasten its end. These remarks are more especially applicable to our own country, as a warning against the growing evils of popular tyranny. We have conquered, and should endeavour, in peace, to preserve the fruits of our victory. The evils attendant on the destruction of the power of the patrician order in Rome, are sufficiently manifest;—whilst Annibal, mourning over the ruins of Carthage, and Napoleon on the barren rock of St. Helena, the *imperial exile* of the nineteenth century, contemplating in gloomy melancholy his fallen glory, and lamenting the lost destinies of his beloved France, under his own dynasty, are fine lessons for the reflection of all great conquerors!

The words of Polybius, as an historian and commentator, living in the time of Scipio Africanus, are very apposite to the decadency of Rome; and expressed in terms nearly similar with those of the talented Montesquieu, who probably had them in his mind's eye, when he pronounced his prophetic observations on the fall of the British constitution. The former, with direct reference to the state of affairs with the Roman senate and people, thus expresses himself:—"That these abuses and corruptions, which will eventually destroy the

government, have been sown with the very seeds of it, and both grown up together; and that, as rust corrodes and eats away *iron*, and worms devour *wood*, and both may be considered species of plagues, or cancers, born and bred along with the substances they destroy; so, with every form and scheme of government that the wisdom of man can invent, some vice or corruption will creep in with its very *institution*, and growing up with, will at last destroy it[1]." This acute author also predicted the particular fate of the Roman government, namely, that its *ruin* would be occasioned by the popular tumults, which would introduce a perfect *dominatio plebis*, (or popular tyranny,) and terminate in the arbitrary government of a single tyrant!

It is sufficiently evident, that the Romans, in the midst of all their information, mistook the true course of nature, and the proper ends of civil government, in direct variance with their system of military jurisprudence; and, that whilst their ablest men were perpetually obtaining triumphs, and making conquests abroad, they were indefatigably engaged at home in subverting the benefits. In the inconsiderate arrangement of their popular policy, they thought only of the *evils* that were to be avoided; but made no adequate provision for securing the *good* required by the State, under its growing prosperity. The notions they acquired of Grecian independence, tended to their disadvantage rather than their benefit. Impressed with the infatuated opinion that the bare possession of *public virtue*, with the imaginary train of her brilliant rewards, was the *gem of solid power*, and the directing medium of *perfect happiness*, they entirely neglected the study of first causes, or their application to the affairs of mankind; and applied all their energies to the regulation of effects; believing, that their favourite goddess, with her "*thousand* charms, would

[1] Polyb. Frag. lib. v. and vi.

always ensure to them *ten thousand* advantages." "Alas!" says a truly sensible American writer[1], on the infatuation of *democracy* in his own country, "such illusions are as thin as the gloss on other bubbles; politicians have vainly supposed that man is really what he should be,—that his reason will do all it can, and his passions and his prejudices no more than they ought. Whereas his reason is a mere looker on,—it is *moderation* when it should be *zeal*,—is frequently corrupted to vindicate, where it should condemn,—and is a *coward* or a *trimmer*, and will take hush-money. Popular reason does not always know how to act right, nor does it always act right when it does know. The agents that move politics are the popular passions; and those are ever, from the very nature of things, under the command of the common disturbers of society. Few can reason;—all can feel;—whilst the popular passions are sure to govern, and the *reason* of the society is sure to be awed into *silence*, or to be disregarded,—if it is heard, what hope is there, that *our constitution* will not be as headlong, as rapid, and as fatal, as that of all governments, by mere popular impulse, have ever been? The turnpike road of history is white with their tomb-stones!"

About the middle of the fourth century from the building of Rome, it was declared lawful for the nobles and plebeians to intermarry; which custom, in many ill-regulated states, has contributed greatly to the ruin of the former, and the elevation of the latter to power. About this period, the highest employments in the state were, successively, under laws forcibly enacted by the commons, made free to the people, even that of the consulship; then the office of censor, that of the questors, or commissioners of the public treasury; the office of prætor, or chief justice; the priesthood, and even that of *dictator!* The senate, after a lengthened opposition,

[1] Fisher Ames.

yielded to all these encroachments on the original constitution, for the sake of preserving social harmony, and to satisfy the perpetual urging and clamorous demands of the commons, who were, principally, not composed of the affluent and intelligent classes amongst the people, and felt no personal interest in the preservation of a balance of power; but, on the contrary, saw the prospect of individual advantage and ascendency, in proportion as they destroyed it. In all these proceedings they were urged on by their advocates, the popular tribunes. A law was also passed, shortly afterwards, that the *plebiscita*, or vote of the commons, should be of universal obligation; and, in process of time, the original constituted method of framing the laws was entirely inverted; and instead of the *senate* confirming the *plebiscita*, or vote of the people, the latter eventually, at pleasure, confirmed or disannulled the *senatusconsulta*, or decision of the senate; and these proceedings, according to Dionysius, must inevitably have produced a furious *civil war*, and the entire ruin of the state, had not the Romans been engaged in perpetual foreign contests, which kept their attention engaged, and alone induced the nobles to sink what, in their chivalrous spirit, they considered minor differences.

The custom of admitting to the senate the sons of freedmen, or such who had once been slaves, was introduced by *Appius Claudius*, who obtained his power by force and oppression. Under this arrangement, as may well be imagined, and other proceedings equally levelling, that illustrious council degenerated into a most corrupt and factious body;—an association of *levellers*, divided amongst themselves, and whose very authority became ultimately despised amongst the people of Rome, and the laughing-stock of the neighbouring powers, who, profiting by their perpetual dissensions, sought every opportunity of harassing the Roman independence.

The century and a half following, to the termination of the Third Punic War, by the memorable destruction of Carthage, was, nevertheless, a most interesting period in the Roman history: the intervals between each succeeding war were of so short duration, that the people and their tribunes had but little spare time for engaging in domestic feuds; but whenever the opportunity presented itself, the dissensions and contests for power were renewed, and it is recorded that *Terentius Leo*, one of the tribunes, prostituted all the privileges of a Roman citizen, through sheer malice and inveterate resentment towards the nobles, who opposed his proceedings. Under the same spirit were the illustrious Africanus Scipio and his brother, after all the eminent services they performed for the state, *impeached* on some frivolous pretexts, by a debased and ungrateful commons; and even at this period, *omnia venalia Romæ*, subsequently applied to the imperial mistress of the world, would have been a just reproach for her popular inconsistencies!

The wars of the Romans with Pyrrhus and the Tarentines, displayed their character in a very different point of view; if they previously had fought for freedom and independence, they now drew the sword of ambition, and displayed all the desire for conquest, the aspirations of glory; and here we behold them conquered in the field, and yet refusing to grant that honourable peace, for which even their conqueror himself had sued; and this spirit has not unfrequently been manifested by modern nations, to the fullest extent, without regard to the sound principles of justice, or the claims of humanity! The advantages gained by the Romans in their battles with Pyrrhus, the king of Epirus, increased their ardour for martial pursuits,—to be warriors was now their grand aim; and in losing or gaining a victory, they were enabled to take advantage of the manœuvres, observe the discipline, and im-

prove on the order and encampments of those renowned soldiers, whose coadjutors and ancestors had been the companions of Alexander the Great, in his conquest of Asia. The whole of Italy became subject to Rome at the conclusion of the *Tarentine war*, and that period of time has been designated by the most intelligent of the Roman writers, the second age, or *adolescence* of the Roman empire.

The warlike genius of the people, their acquirement of foreign territory, and dominion of the seas, in their wars with Carthage; and the constant employment which these undertakings produced, preserved them, as it has been already observed, from positive domestic collision, till the age of the Gracchi,—"*Omnibus hostes reddite nos populis, civile avertite bellum,*" appears to have been their leading principle; and it upheld the honour and dignity of the Roman commonwealth under every disaster, foreign or domestic, until this family, emerging as it were from *Pandora's box*, and entering upon the social scene, in a period of profound peace, let loose their infernal arts for the disturbance of its repose. The time arrived when those desperate innovators, Tiberius and Caius Gracchus, resolved to put into practice all the unconstitutional encroachments which had been progressing *seriatim*; and which, under the eye of an ambitious mother, they fostered and promoted by their eloquence,—their seditious and pretended attachment to popular interests; through whose means the Agrarian law was revived, and the riches of *Attalus* divided. But the triumph of Tiberius Gracchus, the principal mover in these proceedings, was but of temporary duration, for he was stabbed to the heart by *P. Nascia*, in the midst of his associates, whilst proceeding to his re-election as a tribune; and the Roman name in him became stained with the first popular assassination! Caius, pursuing the same tract, sustained, within a few years afterwards, a similar fate; having first

fled for protection to the temple of Diana, at Ephesus, were, according to *Plutarch*, and other authors[1], he would have committed suicide, but for his friends' care; and being subsequently suspected of having stained his hands in the blood of Scipio Africanus the younger, who was found murdered in his bed, he was destroyed by order of the consul *Opimini*, (A. C. 121.) and his body, in degradation of his principles and his actions, thrown into the *Tiber!*

At the instigation of the elder Gracchus, the tribunes, under their legislative authority, had declared that the conquered lands were not disposable by the nobles, but by the commons only. The younger brother pursued the same design; and procured the passing of a law, that all Italians should vote in elections in common with Roman citizens; nor did they rest here, for they suggested, as *state reformers*, such alterations in the proceedings and authority even of *judicature*, that although they both lost their lives in these pursuits, yet they laid the basis for all the nefarious measures which were afterwards adopted by Marius, Sylla, Pompey, and Cæsar, to the utter destruction of the Roman freedom and greatness.

In the time of Marius, *Saturnius*, a tribune, procured a law that the senate should be bound by an *oath* to agree to whatever measures the people would enact; and Marius used every means in his power, when filling the tribunal office, for depressing the nobles, and especially curtailing their power in the exercise of judicature, which was their most ancient and inherent right; and Sylla, under similar measures, became a perfect despot in Rome. In opposition to Marius, his early patron, whom he succeeded in the consulship, one of his first acts was to add *three hundred* additional members to the

[1] Plut. in Vitâ.—Cic. in Cat. 1.—Lucan 6, v. 796.—Flor. 2. c. 17.—Lib. 3 chap. 14, et cætera.

senate, from the inferior orders amongst the people, which, introducing the utmost discord and disorder into the entire body, left it entirely subservient to his caprice, its authority becoming ineffectual; when, throwing off the mask at once, he abolished the office of tribune, the ladder on which he ascended to power. No one the least acquainted with Roman history, can be ignorant of the atrocities of Marius and Sylla, in their jealousy and rivalry of each other. In acts of wholesale murder, and of diabolical wickedness, they stand pre-eminent, — each out-heroding Herod in deeds of blood and infamy; and their undisputed career has placed a blackened page of an indelible character in the leaf of every book which records their prowess, exciting only astonishment that a people so renowned as the Romans, could have bent their necks in apparent abject submission to men, whose actions were worthy only of the most savage age and society! The cause must be obvious to every rational observer of human nature.

Under Julius Cæsar and Pompey, the rage for civil war was carried to unprecedented excess; it was not undertaken merely to avenge a private injury, but became a contest for the entire *sovereignty*,—the Roman people had now been taught to spill each others' blood, without reluctance and without remorse. Although each of these aspiring despots wore the mask of pretended sincerity, and professed himself the friend and supporter of the republic, nothing short of the entire destruction of freedom was the object; to attain which they divided the people into two parties, or furious contending factions. What Julius began his adopted son perfected: the fine ancient spirit of Roman independence was totally extinguished at the battle of *Actium;* and the remnant of her virtue torn and scattered in the dust! After this fatal day,

Rome settled down in sullen melancholy, or listless apathy; and her people seemed totally unable to govern themselves, without the assistance of one controlling head, or chief, who, under the title of *Imperator*, reigned with as much sovereignty as another *Tarquin*; and yet, reflecting on the long train of political miseries, that had for several ages preyed upon her vitals, and at length rendered even her reputation odious, Rome needed such a change: in the midst of all her intelligence she fell short of the requisites for ensuring even ordinary happiness,—her prosperity and her evanescent glory, were but the ebullitions of one general mind, panting for unbridled freedom, and drunk with victorious success; but totally unable to govern herself, under their intoxicating influence; and as she had destroyed or neutralized the independence of her patrician order,—lost the flower of her nobility, under her maddened career of popular sovereignty, she had no alternative, no resource, but submission to that stern necessity she had imposed upon herself.

Plutarch, the bold assertor of the natural right of mankind, *liberty*, decidedly asserts, that both Pompey and Cæsar, in their union for depressing the nobility, through their credit with the populace, had in aim the entire subversion of the government, and that it produced the civil war, which led to that end, and established the despotism of the latter. The reputation of this author is sufficient to stamp his opinions with all that force and credit the important subject calls for. The historian of Chæronea, in his lives of the great men of those ages, delineates their different characters with consummate skill and impartiality. In his own person he had enjoyed the confidence of the emperor Trajan, the consulship of Rome, and the governorship of Illyricum, as the reward of his merit; and he may be considered a competent judge and

rational critic, with references to the vices he denounces, and the consequences which individual ambition and venality brought upon the Roman people.

The deductions which have been drawn on the subject of popular encroachments in Rome, from time to time, until absolute power was established, will enable the reader to determine how considerably the balance of power had preponderated, with little intermission, on the side of the people; and the improper use they almost invariably made of it. Long previously to the battle of Actium, the entire foundation was removed; and it had become a moral impossibility for the *republic* to sustain itself under any additional shock. Every form of a government, even that of the *triumvirs*, had departed, and nothing remained but a perfect *popular domination:* it is interestingly instructive to mark their proceedings in this extremity, when left entirely to their own resources.

It may be taken as a fundamental truth, that every people in the history of the world, giving way to the caprices of popular suffrage, have shown themselves far more adroit in *pulling down and setting up systems of government*, than in preserving those that were fixed; displaying, on most occasions, the reverse of Mr. Burke's essential state qualities,—"the disposition to *preserve*, and the ability to *improve*,"—and, that they have been equally bent on seizing more than their own, as they have proved themselves profligate in disposing of their acquisition to the *worst bidder*, or frequently sacrificing it without the smallest equivalent. If men would but consider, that the boundary of rational freedom can alone be marked by the supreme government of *defined law*, prescribing the just limits of power, which each party is fairly entitled to possess, they would successfully avoid those evils that popular excesses never fail to engender. The Romans, under their corrupt notion of divine or supernatural things, were prone to the

service of a plurality of deities,—the *idols* of their imagination, or the illusions of a creative fancy; and although they multiplied their gods *ad infinitum*, yet their earthly devotion was seldom paid to more than one idol of their popular creation at a time, whose cumbrous car they dragged along with less murmuring, and more judgment, than when they held the reins entirely in their own hands, and heedlessly drove the aerial chariot of liberty, over every rugged road and dangerous precipice!

The several provinces of the Roman empire, after the accession of Pompey to power, were governed by the great men of the time; those upon the frontiers with powerful armies, either stationed for conquest or defence. Each of these armies, or divisions of the military power, had been engaged in some successful foreign enterprise; and their commanders, upon the occasion of any design of personal ambition or revenge, were sure of meeting with partisans, and a divided power at home. In this extremity of the state, they artfully turned the distracted condition of affairs to account, closing in with the people, as the *stronger party*, in political influence and authority, but the least likely to defeat their objects, from the entire want of concert and unanimity that existed in all its proceedings. Unfortunately for Rome, two men of the most aspiring ambition she ever produced, lived in the same age, having an identity of object in view, but not a fair community of interest existing between them for its attainment. The *conjuncture* was most suitable for their designs, but the most dangerous to the safety and independence of the commonwealth, for the development of such a contest, as they had determined to set up. Thus, the conjunction of two such stars of genius and power, as *Pompey* and *Cæsar*, proved as fatal to the independence of the people, as their most inveterate opposition, from the very first, could possibly have done. Their whole scheme was nothing else than a memo-

rable crusade against the few remaining liberties of the Romans.

The people, and their coadjutors, the tribunes, having now triumphantly subdued all other competitors for power, commenced the last performance of a *successful populace*, that of choosing for themselves a *Master:* this finale, or last grand act of the popular drama, the nobles foresaw, as well as its ulterior consequences to the entire state, and they unsuccessfully opposed it. The first step on the part of the people, was to make Pompey their *admiral in chief*, giving him full power over all the Mediterranean seas and their appendages; soon afterwards he was created captain-general of all the Roman forces by sea and land, and governor of Asia. On the other side Pompey restored the tribunitial office, which his predecessor, Sylla, had abrogated. In his consulship he also obtained an *ipse post facto* law, for the alleged purpose of examining into the conduct of public men, for the twenty preceding years, but solely with the view of gaining popularity and power with the people. There are many other examples recorded of his measures for enlarging and preserving his ascendency; but they lost their effect from want of timely opportunity for their introduction. The success of Cæsar, with his legions in Gaul and Germany, proved a most powerful check on the policy of Pompey, and the interest of the senate and people became divided between them; for the latter was eminently successful in the art of ingratiating himself with the popular party, and in this respect speedily outstripped his rival.

Cæsar in his own Commentaries states, that the senate, having passed some severe decrees against his proceedings, and also against the *tribunes*, who had warmly espoused his interest, the latter left the city and joined his party, taking with them the affections and interests of the mass of the

people. This is further corroborated by the account he furnishes of the inhabitants in most of the leading towns, mutinying against their commanders, who supported the existing government, and delivering both into his power. This was the use he made of his pretended predilection for the popular cause, and the pretext for commencing a *civil war*,—namely, the restoration of the tribunitial authority, and the emancipation of the people from the alleged oppression of the nobles. All ambitious despots have followed the same course; seldom able to compete with men of their own grade or capacity, they assailed the *multitude*, as the most vulnerable body, and the most likely to become their grand auxiliary in storming the citadel of freedom! It was not the undistinguished numbers of the people of England, asking without concert, who arrested the despotic career of *King John*, at *Runnymede*, but the united *barons*, who in a voice of thunder proclaimed, —*Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari!* Had the nobles of Rome been suffered to adopt a similar course, Cæsar would never have had the opportunity for trampling on her essential liberties: nor for the use of his exulting exclamation,—*Veni—vidi—vici*, after his unjust triumph over Pharnaces!

It must, nevertheless, in fairness be admitted, that Cæsar made a far more honourable use of his power, than many conquerors of even less renown, and inferior pretensions. The Roman dictator, in the quietude of peace, improved the study of *literature*, and zealously promoted the progress of the refined arts, especially within the capital; at the same time, that he used every means to enhance and consolidate the resources of the state, in a form corresponding with its dignity; whilst he had, by the success of his arms, raised the Roman name to the highest point of military glory;—yet, in the death of Cæsar, the Roman character was both stained with black atrocious assassination, and republican ingratitude; and

the conqueror, who could perform an act of the most single-minded greatness and noble generosity, at the battle of *Pharsalia*, partly fell by the dagger of an individual he had most imprudently taken into the bosom of his confidence! What else could reasonably have been expected at the hands of a *parricide?* One might be tempted to imagine, that even the Roman senate had itself conspired to raise Cæsar to the highest pinnacle of eminence, in order to render him the object of popular or party jealousy; and that in voting him a *crown of laurel*, it was determined to render his murder the more illustrious! His appeal,—"*Et tu quoque, Brute,*"—was little calculated to make an impression, (to use the remarkable words of Napoleon, in reference to the *formal murder* of Louis the Sixteenth,) "on the iron hearts of men determined to brave both celestial anger and human revenge." Cæsar, with all his learning and opportunities, displayed a very inadequate knowledge of human nature. He assisted in forming the monster that was to destroy him—popular and single-handed despotism, could not possibly remain co-existent in the same state.

It is fully evident that the senate, or at least its primitive portion, the nobles under Pompey, and the commons under Cæsar, had come to a final decision of the long contests that existed between them for ascendency. Pompey, to save himself, had joined the interest of the former; but a calm retrospective view of all the circumstances which preceded the dreadful civil war, does not warrant our coming to the conclusion, that the ambition of individuals alone created it: the remote cause may be found in the concatenation of all those circumstances which have been detailed in their progress, from the first destruction of the monarchy, and the consequent loss of the balance of power in the governing machine. True it is, that civil dissensions never fail of introducing the

ambition of designing men, nor of inspiriting them in their work of demolition, where aggrandisement is to be purchased without risk of personal loss,—thus they become the *leading instruments* for the decision of state quarrels; and, at length, feel themselves entitled to seize the *prize of power*, as the reward of their presumption and prowess. Whilst the balance of power is equally sustained, the ambition of individuals will ever find its level, whether it be put forth by popular orators, designing innovators, or successful commanders, in every civilized community; and produce no well-grounded apprehension of their ability to enslave their country; but, that fundamental principle of social harmony once broken through, the divided parties are compelled to unite, each under its own head, under whose management, or fortunate success, one side is at first victorious, and at length *both* become enslaved. Under the ominous indications which commanded its solemn attention, the Roman senate felt that it became a solemn duty to exert the means committed to the executive department, in providing for the general security,—those means were not adequate to the emergency, and Cæsar's success left no alternative but submission. The circumstances that supervened on the death of Cæsar, put it beyond dispute, that the entire subversion of the Roman liberty and constitution was entirely attributable to those impolitic measures, which had completely removed the balance between the nobles and the commons; and, that the ambition of individuals was but the natural consequence. The independent members of the senate, it is true, made one grand and expiring effort to restore the former state and liberties of their country; but those virtuous Romans were borne down under the clamour, or rather *madness*, of an excited populace, who preferred that the profligate *Antony*, and the puerile *Octavius*, should wield the destinies of a mighty empire, and entail despotism, the most vile that can

possibly be imagined. The "raging of the sea and the madness of the people," have been aptly compared in holy writ; and, in the proceedings which were adopted by the popular party in Rome, at this juncture, the force of the comparison was abundantly illustrated. The reply of Brutus to Cicero, who offered to intercede with Octavius for his pardon, so expressive of *contempt*, would have done honour to the head and heart of the former, had he not treacherously embued his hands in Cæsar's blood!

Thus terminated all the show and parade which, during successive changes, had been frequently made for the assertion of liberty in Rome, leaving not even the shadow for contemplation. Here was the grand depository of all the grave contentions and arduous struggles for power, that for ages had disturbed the repose of the *Commonwealth*, and dissevered the interests of the Nobles and the People, sunk into the bosom of a Nero, a Caligula, a Tiberius, and a Domitian! These circumstances, and the rational conclusions which may be founded upon them, will ever present a lesson of the highest import to all states, when placed by the force of events in similar circumstances; and both are singularly applicable to the popular proceedings of modern times, when we see on the part of the people of most civilized states, the inclination to pull down inconsiderately, and to set up hastily, new systems of government.

From the love of glory, and the thirst for freedom, the Romans descended to apathy and selfishness, and their soldiers were ready to yield their allegiance to that man who would purchase it at the greatest price. Not only the highest offices of state, but even the *imperial purple* itself, became the object of mercenary consideration. *Omnia venalia Romæ!* In this state of things, little security or happiness could be looked forward to, even in the imperial palace. The reigns of the

successors of Augustus present a varied scene of conflicting uncertainty, and unprofitable variety. One proved himself the most profligate amongst mankind—driven headlong to *eternity* by his own criminal proceedings, his vices, and unbounded dissipation. His successor, a prince clement, just, and deservedly popular, fell in the midst of his guards by the dagger of some worthless assassin! Few amongst the number of the Roman emperors escaped a similar fate. If one, lulled for a time under a false security, inconsiderately trusted himself to the popular generosity, at length to pay with his life the forfeit of his credulity, another, with no better advantage, consulted his security in the numerous chambers of his palace, perpetually changing his *dormitory* in secret, and at length falling a victim to the contents of the poisoned bowl! Thus, after the descendants of the ancient Romans had been alternately governed by a succession of princes of weak and varied character, the empire was at last divided by Constantine (an Englishman born, and son of the Roman governor of that name,) into two divisions, about the year 328 of the Christian era. The fate of the lower empire has already been noticed: the upper, or western portion, was surrendered into the hands of the *papal power*, including the whole of Italy, by Charlemagne, about the year A.D. 800. The political events of Rome, under the *absolute sovereignty* of the Popes, afford few incidents possessed of interest of sufficient importance to aid the elucidation of our grand object,—the means under which *free* or constitutional government, adapted for the general benefit and satisfaction of mankind, may be established and destroyed.

Having concluded our historical observations on the principal events that paved the way to the final dissolution of the independence of Rome, and the destruction of her imperial sway over the nations of Europe, it remains to be considered,

how far the examples adduced, and the deductions which have been made therefrom, are applicable to the progress of events in our own times, or to be placed in juxta-position with the general principles of modern state policy, more especially in European kingdoms. Serious reflection upon the state of public opinion and affairs, in our own hitherto favoured country, at this juncture; and the all-important objects in which we have been recently interested as a people, and are still anxiously pursuing, with reference to an extensive reformation, (or rather *remodelling* of our *entire* system of church and civil government,) for the avowed purpose of meeting the *spirit of the age*, and the altered condition of our general population and national resources, have been the inducement to this undertaking; and it is presumed that no one fact or circumstance under the influence of political bias, has been overstrained to favour the argument, or to sustain the ostensibly declared object. The entire series of events referred to, and the subjects chosen for consideration, are matters of no ordinary importance in the historical career of a once mighty empire, to whose people and institutions the great and the learned of all subsequent times and countries have looked back with mingled feelings of contemplative reverence and unaffected regret; and although, occasionally, under the deliberative exercise of free opinion, an unusual view may have been taken of the remote or proximate causes that led to those aggravated public calamities which have formed at once the exciting and interesting theme for discussion, or the conduct of noted individuals placed on a footing, which, from the very nature of the subject, and the conclusions it justly leads to, cannot possibly in every instance be congenial with popular taste or notions. The great aim has been, the candid elucidation of events—their application to the established rules and principles of sound, virtuous, and truly liberal govern-

ment in all times, as contradistinguished from the rule of single-handed despotism, or the irregular control of popular tyranny—the consequences resulting from mistaken views of *freedom*—the practical advantages resulting from their due consideration—and, above all, the preservation of the language of *consistency* and *truth*, in the narration and application of the various topics introduced. On this foundation alone can the propelling means of human misfortune and even of misery, in the affairs of civil government, be rationally determined, and their baneful effects avoided: nor is it by any means necessary that men should be rendered either sages or philosophers to attain the grand desideratum on which true happiness hinges in the ordinary regulations of social life, provided their desires and their actions are kept within the boundary of sound reason, the ample circumference of *just principles*, as one of the most distinguished Roman poets, influenced by similar reasons and sentiments, has himself so forcibly expressed in the following elegant satire:

> "Quisnam igitur liber? Sapiens, qui sibi imperiosus;
> Quem neque pauperies, neque mors, neque vincula terrent;
> Responsare cupidinibus, contemnere honores
> Fortis, et in seipso totus teres atque rotundus!"

From the previous familiar dissertation on the dissensions and contests between the two leading bodies of the nobles and commons in ancient Rome, arise many valuable reflections for our sober consideration. It is sufficiently obvious that the *destinies* of the British empire must henceforth be wielded by its *intellect*, rather than swayed by excited popular prejudice, which has ever proved itself a most unsteady hand in holding the balance of *power*, and the least capable of retaining its possession. To steer clear of impending national destruction —to avoid the overwhelming swell of hasty and turbulent

revolution—to outstrip "*the tenth wave of human misery*,"—the all-ponderous and heavily-laden vessel of the State must not be left to the guidance of desperate pilots, nor manned by a disunited crew, prepared to denounce all authority and command, and by seizing on the rudder, plunge her headlong into the whirlpool of dissolution!

Thus when the equipoise of power is duly established in any state, nothing is more impolitic for the general security, nor more unwise towards the governing principle itself, than to give way to the first demands of *irrational* popular encroachments, which are generally submitted to under the vain hope of appeasing vexatious clamour, or, for the purpose of promoting ambitious objects, are bartered and sold by the designing, like other matters of ordinary traffic. The breaking in, without consideration, on a fixed constitution to remove a present evil, or to supply an existing exigency, is like the remedy of an *empiric*, who suspends momentary pain and bodily suffering, but creates the certain means of sudden and terrible returns. "When a child," says an old noble author, "grows easy and contented by being humoured, and when a lover becomes satisfied with small compliances without further pursuit, then expect to find *popular assemblies* content to rest with small concessions." Could we indeed produce a solitary example from the entire page of history, relating to the political affairs of nations, of any one popular assembly or association of men, sitting down in quietude, after the commencement of a contest for power—any one instance of a purely popular society that ever understood, defined, or declared what extent or share of ascendency was its just right, then might statesmen entertain some rational hope that the complicated question of the abstract rights of men were a matter of easy adjustment, by debates, by reasonings, and by conferences. But, since all that ever existed, and that remains, is diametrically the reverse, there

is no other course to be pursued in a settled state, but a steady, constant, and inflexible resolution, in those to whom the remainder of the balance is entrusted, never to yield so far to popular clamour—to make such a breach in the constitution, as will admit a thousand abuses and arbitrary encroachments, far more destructive than any *evils* they may be assumed to supplant.

It may also be determined, without great difficulty, by the intelligent portion of the legislative body of the people of England, what are the proper boundaries of popular encroachment on the Constitution, as established by the recent reform, or change in the system of electing representatives to the Commons House of Parliament: by observing which, with due perseverance, those, who properly sustain the balance in the State, may effectually control the contending parties, and by the timely application of appropriate *remedies*, prevent the fatal consequences, which otherwise must inevitably ensue. Without any disrespect to popular assemblies in general, it is evident, that no one passion, folly, or unworthy ambition, to which man in his individual capacity is subject, can be *excluded* from a body of people, collective or represented, composed of men in possession of all their natural infirmities. And indeed, such assemblies, it has been abundantly manifested, are too frequently susceptible of all the evil impressions which the very worst disposed amongst themselves are capable of designing; for, independently that they are generally composed of men of restless spirit, or disappointed expectations in worldly pursuits, they have the ill-fortune to be led by some fair-mouthed orator, or *gobe-mouches*, who passes undeservedly for a great genius; or they become the tools of what are termed *leading men*, or the heads of parties, whose schemes are seldom productive of any real advantage to the community at large. Hence, we frequently find in whole bodies of men the same

thirst of ambition,—the same spirit of cruelty and revenge, of pride and malice,—the same blindness, obstinacy, and unsteadiness of purpose,—the same ungovernable anger,—and the same injustice, sophistry, and fraud, that ever existed in the breast of an individual; any or all of which invariably lead to despotism, the *summa imperii*, or deposit of unlimited power in the hands of the *one*, the *few*, or the *many*,—the evil most sedulously to be guarded against in all free states.

These concluding remarks have direct reference to the present posture of affairs in this kingdom; to the recent popular proceedings consequent upon the change of administration, and the return to power of a decidedly conservative party, evidently determined to do its utmost to uphold the institutions of the country in a style corresponding with their pristine dignity. The spirit of faction which has been so extensively engendered by the destructive aspirants for ascendency, has amply developed both its *pretensions* and its *objects;* the former resting its claim for advancement on the avowed sacrifice of every principle by which the common interests of society can be bound together; the latter, fundamentally aiming at the entire subversion of the English Constitution, under the plausible pretext of *reforming it*, or removing abuses,—the dissolution of a state religion and the downfall of the monarchy! In all these attempts, hopes, and expectations, we read the levelling spirit of former ages, and behold the nefarious projects of former times and people adapted to the circumstances of the present, and which have been pourtrayed in the preceding chapters, and stand as *beacons* for our guidance. All the schemes and expedients which have been resorted to at various times for the destruction of power in England, in the different periods of her history, had their *precursors* in ancient Greece and Rome.

True it is, that we may not be enabled to prolong the dura-

bility of a state, beyond the decree of God, or the pleasure of an overruling *permissive Providence*; but, under Divine regulations, although we may be unable to avert the general course of nature, any more than to enlarge the span of human existence, we may tenderly nurse and judiciously manage even a weakly constitution, and preserve a *strong one*. We may guard against violence and accidents from without, as well as from *excesses* within; we may remove excrescences, and "specks and films," from that, which Bacon aptly denominated "*the eye of England*," in allusion to her *Church*, "without employing such a sorry oculist as would destroy that eye entirely;" and, by rational means, render the State long-lived, though not immortal! Some of the most able physiologists have maintained, that if it were practicable to keep the several functions and fluids of the human body in an *exact balance*, each with its opposite, the duration of human existence might be indefinitely protracted. If this be true, the duration of a political body can be determined by analogical reasoning, in proportion with the preservation of this principle.

The dissolution of the independence of every free state, however great and powerful, like those of Greece and Rome, may justly be apprehended, when the great body of the people are supinely negligent with regard to the proceedings of busy individuals in politics, prepared to usurp authority; or else giving in, with all their might, to those very practices which ensure destruction. When we see whole bodies of men combining to destroy the State, by the very same means which have destroyed many powerful states before, prepared at once to break down all the salutary barriers of a mixed constitution, the strength of which is its inequality; when we find opposing parties, who can agree in nothing else, yet firmly uniting for this one ostensible purpose, even with the risk of bringing dire ruin on their country, we are justified in enter-

taining well-grounded apprehension as to the results. In this respect, even the heathen author *Lucretius*, who denied the immortality of the soul, has outstripped the rationality of many *enlightened* modern state reformers, in the respect he paid to the control of *Fortune*, or the *wisdom* he ascribes to her, in directing the social affairs of mankind.

> " Quod procul a nobis flectat Fortuna gubernans :
> Et ratio potius, quam res persuadeat ipsa."

Some few of our modern statesmen have, indeed, attempted to treat with ridicule and derision those fears which the sober-minded and reflecting entertain of our popular proceedings, as conducted by a *section* of the British people,—asserting, that the genius, intelligence, and spirit of England will never admit an *arbitrary*, although it will ultimately have a *perfectly free*, or, in other words, a *republican* form of government! Alas! such men, with all their assumed knowledge, reason upon short-sighted views, and possess only a moderate share of thought. To calculate upon the stationary, or even improving genius of any nation or people, in all ages, betrays a total want of knowledge both of men and things in general;—to attempt to establish such as a standing argument, is a perfect fallacy, since there is hardly a spot of the European continent remaining, where the inhabitants have not frequently changed their temper, genius, and customs, as well as their forms of government, the absolute monarchies of the Popedom and Russia partially excepted;—neither, is there any reason why the political genius of a nation should be more stationary in the question of government, than in its morals, learning, and religion, its disposition and conversation, or its diet, habits, and complexion; all of which notoriously vary in every age, and every one of which, indepen-

dently of external examples and influences, must be productive of corresponding effects upon the notions which men entertain of the science of government.

Since the Norman conquest, the balance of power has often varied in England, and more than once been entirely overturned: the part which the commons possessed in it—that most disputed point in its original progress and extent—was, by their own confessions, but a very inconsiderable share indeed: generally speaking, they have been progressively gaining ever since, although with frequent interruptions, and slow advancement. The abolition of *villainage*, together with the custom introduced, or permitted, of the nobles selling their lands, in the reign of *Henry the Seventh*, produced the first great addition to the previously circumscribed power of the commons: but a far greater increase took place in the reign of his successor, by the dissolution of the *abbeys* and monastic establishments, and sale of their lands; for this entirely turned the clerical order out of the *scale*, who had so long filled it, and placed the commons entirely in their stead; who, in a very few years, became possessed of a vast quantity of those and other lands, by grant or purchase.

About the middle of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, according to that acute observer Lord Bacon, the power between the nobles and the commons was in more equal balance than it ever was before, or probably has been ever since. Shortly after, arose that noted faction in England, which, under the quaint denomination of *Puritan*, grew extremely popular, by moulding up a new scheme of religion with *republican principles* in government; and, gaining upon the *prerogatives of the crown*, as well as the privileges of the nobles, under various forms, for the space of about *sixty years*, did, at length, entirely overthrow the established constitution, and, following

the usual course of all such revolutions, introduced a perfect despotism, first of the people, and then of a single person, craftily styled *The Protector!*

After a furious civil war, the murder of a Protestant king, —the shedding of much blood,—and the ruin of thousands of families, the ancient government was again restored; but the progress of public affairs, for almost thirty years, under the reign of two weak princes, was marked by few incidents of national advantage, when, at length, the last introducing another religious contention into the State, for the purpose of re-establishing the Roman Catholic form of worship, the revolution, and placing William Prince of Orange on the throne, were the consequences. And here it is worthy of remark, that the people of England, *en masse*, contributed to preserve the balance, which was nearly lost; but what would have been the result had William wanted either virtue or ability for the *crisis*, or had he been surrounded by a factious and arrogant nobility? The British nation stands indebted for her free Protestant Constitution of 1688, far more to the firmness and moderation of her *peers*, than to the energy of her *commons*, however laudably displayed. It was the promptitude with which some of those illustrious men, whose names add lustre to the fairest page of English history, first met the tyrannical views of *James Stuart*, that compelled him to abdicate the throne, preserving by that act, the balance of power, until a successor was appointed, to which *all parties* in the State, as it were, by a providential union assented!

It appears to be the ordinary talent of human nature to run from one extreme to the other; so we, Englishmen, in the course of a very few years, made extraordinary leaps from the heights of the kingly prerogative, to the depths of popular ascendency, and to the very last degree that the Constitution could sustain; and the interposition was almost miraculous

which saved this country from perpetual despotism or a whole series of inveterate revolutions. Since the accession of William the Third, the balance of power in the State has been preserved with general uniformity, because the prerogatives of the crown, the privileges of the lords, and the rights of the commons, were rendered more definite, and the people rationally entertained all the advantages they had derived, and duly cherished the repose and prosperity which resulted.

"In a state of nature," said the refined *Montesquieu*, "there are no rights: they are the fruits of *social laws*;—before the existence of these laws, man is in a state of constant warfare, and the right of the strongest is the law. The liberty of the press has been said to be the truest safeguard of constitutional liberty. It is the *Constitution* which guarantees *liberty*,—it is for the representatives appointed by the people, to *maintain the government*; a few pamphleteers could never be its chief guardians. As England has been repeatedly quoted, I stop a moment with her. The English Constitution is a sublime phænomenon in its results. It is the strongest government in the world; and yet it is a composition which chance only seems to have put together, for the mind of man never could have conceived it. The Parliament exercises an overruling authority, before which every one must be silent, and every thing gives way. This power is justly exercised by the *majority*: it is this majority which gives the *law*—it seizes upon all places, and engrosses all power."

"What strength is greater than that which holds all—which desires to retain all, which escapes from *all responsibility*; because it is always this majority which makes the law, the accusation, and the sentence, and which finally executes it? It is necessary to give to the people a kind of compensation against such an energy of authority—against a government so vigorously effective, which, if not pressed upon by some countervail-

ing force, would doubtless end by destroying itself. I admit that the general morality of those who compose this power, and who are worthy to command such a nation, is a perfect model for state integrity,—and what has a government so powerful to fear from this boasted liberty of the press? Pamphlets are neutralized—responsibility itself escapes from their vain declamations; they have no power whatever against the united strength of the government,—they serve to amuse the public, and this is all!" These are the views which the French President of the Council entertained of the balance of power in England, in 1814;—it remains for her United Parliament of 1835 to preserve that balance, in the regulation of those *reforms* which are proposed in the constitution of Church and State. The good sense of the people of England at large appears once more to have been aroused to a performance of the duty they owe to themselves and to the State, on all occasions of national emergency, by having, in support of the legitimate prerogative of the crown, returned to the commons' house of Parliament, a *majority* of independent and well-educated gentlemen, disposed to preserve rather than destroy the powerful superstructure, so forcibly described by Montesquieu; but as the movement party seem still resolved on going desperate lengths to carry their objects *à la plénitude de la liberté*, without corresponding checks, it would even be desirable, if the collective body of the commons, *elect*, would form a *pandect* of its own *privileges*, founded on the entire system of representation, as at present established, to prevent any further inroad on the Constitution, until the presumed advantages of the reform shall be fairly put to the test: this might be rendered as solemn and as effective as Magna Charta, or the Bill of Rights, and thus put an end to the dominance of *unionism*.

A fair and rational opposition constitutes the grand palladium of the liberties of Britain in her Parliament; but it

ceases to be either a benefit or a virtue, the moment it assumes the spirit of *faction*, and, by fictitious majorities, aims at the subversion of established order. When the section of a party, dictated by a dominant spirit from without, arrogates to itself the right of fixing one foot of the compass, wherever it thinks fit, and proposes carrying the other to an extent which describes no circumference whatever, as the boundary of its desires, we may well imagine ourselves, as a people, to be placed in that desperate position which the author of *Oceana*, with all the aid of his expansive imagination, never contemplated! It will hardly be pretended, by the most captious reformer, that there exists at present any well-founded apprehension of unjust encroachment either on the part of the crown or the peers; the danger, then, exists on the side of the popular party, the least competent to decide on the *limits* it would prescribe for itself, in the adjustment.

A more striking instance of the necessity for establishing a balance of power in a mixed state, cannot well be adduced than that exhibited by Cromwell, who had notoriously essayed, by levelling all *state distinctions*. Thus, before he had fully performed the *second act* of his drama of despotism, under the guise of the most artful hypocrisy, he found it expedient to summon a parliament, and to create an entirely new house of *lords*, selected even from contemptible materials, to act as a *counterpoise* to his own previously created *commons*. And yet, considering the utter worthlessness of the clay of which those automatical vessels consisted, it is somewhat astonishing, that no popular orator, or lover of freedom of that day, presumed to interfere with the profound *autocracy* of the potter, or to ask him,—What hast thou, mighty Christian lawgiver, presumed to form, for the embellishment of thy kingdom of republican equality? But the sequel of a popular usurpation had arrived, and paved the way for the

exhibition of that single despot, who, in the words of Napoleon, "had all the ambition to be a king, without the virtue to uphold the office!"

It has been said, that "in the multitude of counsel there is wisdom;" but this position does not always hold good in logical reasoning, for many mistaken conclusions and unfavourable results have arisen in great assemblies, both ancient and modern. It follows, from what has been urged, that all public bodies, or associations of men, are liable to all the infirmities and vices of individuals, although a greater check may exist, proportionately with the intelligence and known integrity of the members associated. When there are exceptions, it must be of assemblies of men, who, sinking all the lesser notions of selfish and party-feeling, act upon principles of general concert for the public good, and for purely public ends,—entering upon debate under the influence of a spirit divested of personal considerations, and free from the example or control of factious and inflammatory leaders,—such, whose members, instead of canvassing to procure majorities for their private opinions only, are prepared to comply with the general sober results arising from fair discussion, although they may be contrary to their own preconceived sentiments. Whenever the members composing the representative assembly of a free people, act upon these and similar views, they may be considered more or less exempt from the several selfish imperfections to which individuals are subject.

The grand source of most of the mistakes and erroneous decisions, in matters debated by popular assemblies, arises from the impure influence of private persons, of some notoriety or property, upon great numbers, styled, in common phraseology, *leading men* and *heads of parties:* if these are not influenced by motives of real public utility, the consequences are obvious. Whenever we find a string of words

put together, sustained and carried by a fictitious debate, which passes for the *vote* or resolution of the assembly, and which we cannot possibly reconcile to prudence or public advantage, we are justified in concluding, that such a vote is, primarily, the conception of a single brain, promoted by an obsequious party, and confirmed under the usual sinister methods, by a *purely artificial majority*. It is not possible to conceive how some of the measures of the late Parliament could have passed the House of Commons under any other circumstances.

Let us, for the sake of argument, imagine a body of five or six hundred intelligent men, balanced in point of common sense and public honour, intermixed and associated together, in the manner becoming the *independent commons of England*; and let us suppose sections of them propounding, debating, resolving, and voting, according to the mere notions of their own circumscribed views, popular feelings, and partial understanding; it must be evident, that an abundance of ill-digested and abortive schemes, many foolish and pernicious measures, as well as many ridiculous overtures between parties, would arise, and create, like other bubbles, a temporary ebullition on the surface; but that under the natural swell of sound deliberative judgment, exercised by the entire body, they must soon sink into oblivion, if that body performs its duty; for, it must be urged, in behalf of human nature, in its cultivated capacity, that common sense and plain reason, when men are disentangled from prejudice and acquired opinions, will ever exercise some general influence upon their minds, independently of the pride of being supposed to act in conformity with sound integrity, and escaping responsibility, under the general decision; whereas, the species of vicious interests and objects, are ever infinitely diversified in a mixed assembly, where the clamour and presumption of in-

dividuals generally finds its level, or is only productive of momentary inconvenience; and where they never could command a *majority*, if inattention or other improper means did not enter, and pervert the will or the better judgment of the body collective.

It is a task of some difficulty to determine how parties are formed in the popular assembly of a free state, like that of Britain, and it is also one of varying uncertainty; for party-feeling is engendered by many spontaneous and unlooked for circumstances. It is a species of political gambling, always attended with difficulty to those who engage in it,—*Periculosæ plenum opus aleæ!* If one of the contending parties succeeds in raising a clamour from without, although the question may be *worthless* in its merits, a point is gained by the discomfiture of the presiding administration, who may be opposed to it. Whether those who arrive at the station of eminent leaders, are generally indebted to any inherent merits of their own, to the possession of extraordinary talents and sound patriotism, or to the *tact* they display in getting up an *opposition*, may be a point of much dispute. Where the object sought for is mainly to be attained by party spirit or influence, the means designed to attain the end, are canvassed and applied according to circumstances: thus, they are frequently such as cannot be justified, even on the broad principle of common integrity; and this is the dark part of the science of *statistics*, not generally known to, nor considered, by the public at large. Hence the desire to court popular favour, and to obtain the means of exercising undue influence, which the people are ever too ready to grant to designing men, in the hands of whom they generally become the ready agents, the voluntary engines for creating a *momentum*, which is ultimately turned against themselves; nor is it an easy task to convince them of the delusion practised, under their misled

feelings or angry passions,—thus, when a *leader* is once fixed, there will never fail to be followers, *(imitatores servum pecus,)* although he may be the worst amongst the entire flock. The calm punishment of experience may indeed at length convince them of their folly, and its consequent evils, but experience comes too late to be available against the mischief completed, and they are left without remedy; for the few independent stragglers that remain are borne down with the torrent!

Again, there is one question which, with relation to the influence of parties in a state, is of all others decidedly injurious, and that is, the practice of voting in support of all measures which may happen to be propounded by an eminent leader, without due discussion and deliberation on their *merits*. Is it sufficient, that because we entertain a general confidence in the policy or judgment of an individual, or even agree in his views of particular matters, having the good of the people as their chief end, we should be entirely guided and governed by them in all the means they may involve? Is it enough to vote from mere influence of party-feeling or confidence in a leader, without examination? Are these proper methods to make up what is termed the united wisdom of the nation? Such are utterly unworthy of independent representatives; far below the dignity both of human nature and human reason, to be engaged in any party, however plausible or powerful, upon such servile conditions.

This influence of one upon many, seems to be as great amongst a people fully *represented*, as it was of old in the body of the commons *collective;* and the consequences it has produced upon the legislature, at different periods, in our constitutional history, have been sufficiently marked in their importance. Hence the imminent risk of unnatural *innovation*, and the necessity for the continual strenuous exertions of the independent body in the state, as a counterpoise to the ab-

stract notions of individuals, prepared to disturb the constitution at their pleasure, by the advancement of private schemes. It is earnestly to be hoped, that the newly-elected members of the House of Commons, as a body, will ponder seriously the critical position of the nation at large; and, waiving all personal and party considerations, support those measures only, which have direct reference to the real security of the state. With the Romans there long existed a fundamental law of emergency, which law was attributed by them to their chief deity, and it not only authorized, but justified, all measures, under which the security of the commonwealth might be preserved.—"*Jupiter ipse sancivit ut omnia quæ reipublicæ salutaria essent,—justa et legitima haberentur.*"—Cic. Plin. 2. The independent commons of England are imperatively called upon to exercise the *spirit* of that law, at this conjuncture, as a matter of urgent state duty, in their responsible characters of British legislators, and with the highest sentiment of Roman virtue, without contemplating on popular resistance, as the result of their decisions,—the bare possibility of fatal effects from the approaching "*Ides of March,*" or the improbable necessity of "sailing through seas of blood," for the purpose of sustaining with becoming honour the great destinies of their country!

The condition of the sister kingdom is a subject of paramount importance, for the consideration of all those who have at heart the welfare of their country, and the good of their fellow-men. The heart recoils from the narration of those deeds, which daily transpire in defiance of law, religion, and authority, in the bosom of that unhappy land, which, blest with so many natural advantages, suffers herself to be humbled to the lowest depths of human degradation,—at once the sport of faction, the nursing mother of bigotry, and the willing slave of an iron-handed despotism, that exults in pro-

portion as she writhes under the agonies of intestine popular commotion,—dragging, like the wretched devotees of another *Juggernaut*, the ponderous car of her great *political idol*, and prostrating herself, with her crippled frame and mutilated limbs, before it; not in the agony of despair, but under the madness of *fanaticism*, which has fastened itself on the vitals of her population! Can any portion of ancient English pride remain, and permit the continuance of this *moral stigma* on the nation's honour,—or, rather, is it not the duty of her Parliament, by one united effort, for one mighty purpose, to arrest the monster in its career of levelling depravity,—to show that it reverences its country in its laws, and reveres the King for the sake of both? That such a lamentable state of private feeling and morbid condition of public morals, exists in Ireland, the records of the recent popular election bear witness; and they alike require the combined possession and prompt exercise of that heroic moderation, which, in periods of national danger or excitement, is the greatest attribute of statesmen,—even the control of that master-spirit which a Chatham could pourtray in the ennobling declaration, "I know no party but that of my country,"—by the early application of efficient measures for ensuring the duration of her proud monument of civil power, which still exists the terror of its enemies, and the admiration of surrounding nations.

It will be well, if our representatives, taught by the experience of past events, and looking back upon the storms which have been raised, as well as considering those they have escaped, will reflect, that the late Parliament, with the government at its head, after having been the authors of a new and most extraordinary popular measure in the constitutional history of England, were unable to sustain either the executive or legislative functions of the state machine, under its operation; and that the confidence of the reflecting and

intelligent portion of the numbers they represented, should, step by step, have been withdrawn from them, after they had been so openly caressed by the people, barely escaping *contempt* in the declension of their power. If they would know the secret of this extraordinary result, as the wind up of the reign of popularity enjoyed for a season by their predecessors, they must impute it to their unparliamentary desertion of the first great principles of government,—to the unconstitutional abuse of setting up individuals as popular leaders, and creating, by their means, a *dominatio plebis*, unknown to the constitution and the law of the land. It was not the freedom of debate, however irregular, within the House of Commons, but the encouragement given to persons, disowned by God and distrusted by Man, for the promulgation of their opinions, which destroyed the Whig ministry. In this conjuncture, the mass of the people of England opened their eyes, and the result has shown, that they will not endure to be governed by rules opposed to the dictates of sound reason and sober sense, although their own representatives may acquiesce therein!

The change of domestic policy, which has marked the present from the past and preceding reigns, has yet to be put to the test for its consistency, and the permanent advantages which the state may derive from its application. The aversion of the people at large, for the latter proceedings of the late administration, and its obsequious House of *Delegates*, as well as the intestine distractions in the cabinet, that led to the dissolution of both, are *contingencies* which may be improved upon, and applied to good purposes, in the hands of an intelligent ministry, and a deliberative House of Commons; far more advantageous for settling the balance of power once more upon an equality, than appears at first view, under the operation of recent measures. Under the unprecedented changes which have taken place, England has

nothing to fear from her peers of Parliament.—their common interest, if inclination and duty, binding them to the state, did not influence their conduct and guide their actions, is alone sufficient to induce them to make more than one struggle for preserving the essentials of her constitutional ascendency; nor, can this feeling possibly be entirely laid aside by her representative commons, who possess an integral share of responsibility. The remaining security rests upon the love and sense of gratitude which the people bear towards their present kind-hearted *Sovereign*, grounded upon full conviction and experience of his merit, as well as ready concessions to all their reasonable desires. Human passions are transitory, in proportion to their violence, and time alone can reveal the ultimate consequences they may produce; but, to whatever point of attainment the general wisdom of the nation may have arrived, whenever it comes to pass, that the popular assembly, free from tumultuous influences, or not, and already possessed of more than an equal balance of power, shall continue to act under the impulse of an opinion, which *(per fas et nefas)* declares its insufficiency,—by unfairly cramping the hand which holds that balance, and, by contentions and dissensions with the peers, should still labour for more; there exists nothing, in the ordinary constitution, or the progress of human events, which can possibly prevent the production of similar effects and consequences to the British empire, from those which marked the ruin of the liberties of Greece, and the destruction of the independence of Rome. Let England stand upon her ancient morals!

CHAPTER V.

THE CONNEXION OF RELIGION WITH CIVIL GOVERNMENT; OR, THE ANCIENT FOUNDATION OF THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, IN CHURCH AND STATE.

"Thus saith the LORD GOD, Behold I will lift up mine hand to the *Gentiles*, and set up my *standard* to the people: and they shall bring thy sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders.

"And *kings* shall be thy nursing fathers, and their *queens* thy nursing mothers: they shall bow down to thee, with their face towards the earth."

Isaiah xlix. 22, 23.

THE rise, prosperity, and renown—the succeeding intelligence—the naval and military glory, and the enterprise of Britain, in her past and present position amongst the nations of the earth, may solely be traced from, and attributed to, the invaluable construction, and the dignified character of her religious and civil institutions. The outline of such a system had indeed struck the admiring imagination of one or more of the sages of antiquity; but was considered by them far too perfect to be capable of attainment, or practical application to the purposes of human government.

Without Religion, as a foundation, and that religion based on the hope of rational immortality, a nation may not inaptly be compared to a heavily laden vessel, cast on a sea of

many currents, exposed to conflicting elements and storms, to rocks and shoals, and quicksands, without a rudder or a compass; and the consequent imminent peril of destruction. Man, in his vain presumption, has indeed attempted the direction of her precarious course, on the ocean of events, by the aid of his unassisted judgment; but the utter ruin of his ambition, and the shipwreck of his hopes, have been the general result; for, however repugnant to his pride, the imperfectibility of the human character has been the theme, and the standing truth of all ages, from the first fallen man in Paradise, to the very generation now rising into maturity.

Although states and empires have risen, flourished, and passed away, in succession, and ages still roll onward with the possession and loss of mental power, man must necessarily remain imperfect, until he shall, under the beneficent dispensation of Eternal Providence, attain that station, where he will be placed in seposition from the concomitant cares and necessities of his worldly existence, and the great end of his creation become perfected!

In the general pursuit of a steadily consistent principle, England, from the humble condition described by the Roman poet, a mere insignificant state, or "sequestered spot in the Western Ocean," has attained that station of proud preeminence and independent rule, which has never been realized nor maintained, on a similar footing, by any other power in the history of the world! Shall she, by encouraging any fatal delusion, be the leading instrument of effecting her own premature downfall? Shall she, by the changes of her domestic polity, part with that pure and humanizing religion, in which is placed the greatest consolation and the best of hopes, and, under a momentary infatuation, embrace the *shadow*, the semblance of *liberty*, in exchange for independent rule, rational security, and social order? It can hardly be imagined,

that any thing short of a general national insanity could tend to so direful a catastrophe in human events!

It is no longer a matter of difficulty to illustrate, that the primary and ostensible causes, which led the prosperous advancement of Great Britain at home, and the proud attitude she had long since attained amongst the other states of the European world, in the progress of her political career, arose solely from her having embraced, cherished, and maintained, during successive ages, a fundamental principle, as the guide of her actions,—that principle was nothing less than *Christianity*; and, in proportion to the respect nationally paid to the superior power and moral influences of Christian rule, in her system of government, England has experienced, alternately, her periods of splendour, of happiness, and misfortune!

We have assumed, then, as a position, that Great Britain started with a substantial principle, the improvement upon which, in succeeding ages, essentially contributed to the moral greatness of her people. To the more than partial neglect, or perversion of that principle, amounting, in some instances, to its entire desertion, during the latter period of her progress, may reasonably be attributed the political turmoil—the jealousies of party—and the ambition of sectarian interests,—the anxiety for political changes—the hostility towards her venerable establishment in Church and State,—and, above all, her loss of confidence in the estimation of foreign powers; to say nothing of her domestic or local distresses, which, under a more religiously prudent conduct, amongst her general population, might have been avoided; for, "God is great, who renders the retribution of anarchy and despair to an unrighteous and factious people!"

Our ancient forefathers have left incontestible proofs of their having laid their foundation for the security of *civil liberty*, or which Edmund Burke elegantly termed, "the char-

tered rights of men," and which, in every civilized community, are deemed sacred possessions, on the broad basis of religious security; and, that they were duly sustained by Divine Authority, and human experience of its importance, in their most solemn state proceedings. They did not entangle themselves with metaphysical disquisitions on popular rights, abstractedly considered; but committed the interests of the *entire* commonwealth, in the general and equal construction of their *laws*, leaving the full and perfect *recognition of those rights*, secured under the religion they identified with the state, —binding the Chief Magistrate to their protection and due observance, as the supreme head of the law. It remains to be seen, if the present generation of Englishmen, enlightened with knowledge, as it assumes to be, will continue to profit by the example of those eminent men, who did not merely consult their own temporary advantage, but laboured assiduously, like true patriots, for the benefit of posterity, in the means they adopted for the preservation of their country's happiness, her religious prosperity, and her moral independence!

The origin and true nature of our religious and political institutions, as a Christian people, should ever form a subject of the highest interest for the study and reflection of every sober minded Englishman; but, at no former period of the history of this country, was there so many striking inducements to reflection, as at the present national epoch. From the uniform and strong attachment that, during many ages, has been shown to those institutions, by men of the highest genius and acquired learning, including enlightened foreigners and statesmen, highly distinguished in letters, it follows, that something of inestimable value must, of necessity, have been interwoven with their construction, which the united wisdom of succeeding generations, under the aid of investigation into the lore of antiquity, comparison, and

lengthened experience, has moulded into practical adaptation to the real wants and interests of an aspiring and intelligent people,—has obtained from them a proper reverence for that social compact,

> "——— by blood of martyrdom
> Cemented; by hands of wisdom reared!"

As it has been abundantly shown, that the perfection of all human institutions and speculations have ever been comparative and fleeting, so it is equally manifest, that the original form of government, instituted for the British empire, has had, unavoidably, its changes, fluctuations, and vicissitudes; but the grand principle of religious pre-eminence, on which the integrity and security of the nation has been fundamentally based and bound together, for a period exceeding a thousand years, has never been entirely broken; not even during the short interregnum, or usurpation, of the *Commonwealth*, which was founded in *fanaticism*, and ended in the perfect restoration of the liberal Christian dispensation. This principle, of so much importance to be perfectly understood and stedfastly maintained, had its earliest foundation in the *consecration* of the kings of England; which, by the perfect establishment of an *original compact* of a twofold and *sacred character*, formed a contract between *God*, the *King*, and the *People*; and it is from this source alone, and the early point of time, after the introduction of Christianity into Britain, and its adoption by its kings, that all our privileges, liberties, and national securities, have had ther rise, *ab origine*.

It is of the highest importance, in sustenance of our object, to be enabled to show, that the native inhabitants of the British islands virtually became *Christians* under the teaching of the *Apostles*, long before the invasion of the Saxons, who

previously were, professedly and confessedly, *Pagans* and *Idolaters;* this took place in the early part of the *first* century after Christ, and laid the first foundation for the solemn compact, which some of the earliest kings of Britain, under the *Roman rule*, virtually recognised by their open profession and protection of "the faith once delivered to the saints," and the foundation of Christian churches, under the first bishops. It is essential also to be enabled to record the fact, that the first privilege of *country* and *tribe* was given in the first century of the Christian era, by a Roman British king, together with *civil* and *ecclesiastical rights* to those who embraced the *Christian Faith!* This also laid the foundation for the "privileged orders," or the *three estates* of the realm; the Anglo-Saxon kings having, after their conversion, adopted the same system. It is of equal moment to note this privilege, as will be sufficiently shown hereafter, for the constitution of England rests upon it. It is rather unfortunate for Dr. Arnold, the popular writer on Church Reform, and *Caput* of the Protestant Grammar School at Rugby, that he should have fixed the period of the establishment of Christianity in this country at the latter part of the *sixth* century [1],—so also Mr. Le Bas [2], in his Life of Wickliff:—both these authors attributing the foundation of Christianity, under the Anglo-Saxon Church, to Augustin, the missionary of Pope Gregory the First. Without desiring to be invidious, it is essential for Protestant authors and divines, in this age of inquiry and research, to furnish every possible fact, connected with the *ear-*

[1] Arnold's Christian Duty.

[2] Le Bas's Life of Wickliff.—Compare Jewel's Defence of "the Apology of the Church of England," and Cave's *Historia Literaria, Augustinus*, vol. iv. p. 549. "Government of the Ancient Church," p. 253—255. Also the writings of Bishop Stillingfleet, Usher, Davis, &c.

liest introduction of *primitive Christianity* into Britain, and the causes which led to its injury, and the subsequent ascendency of the papal authority in the *seventh* century.

Now it is a recorded fact in the history of the primitive church in Britain, that she rejected both the authority and discipline of Augustin the monk; and it was not until her bishops and disciples were reduced by *force of arms*, at Bangor, in Wales, and elsewhere, that the authority or practice of Augustin, *six centuries* after the first introduction of Christianity into Britain, and adoption by its princes, under the Roman and Saxon rule, was at all established. One or two well-authenticated facts of history are worth a hundred illusory statements; especially when it is a matter of the highest moment to the interests of the Church of England herself, that the truth should be elicited and recorded.

We are, in this age, especially indebted to the venerable Doctor Burgess, for his valuable investigations into the origin and state of the primitive Episcopal Church of Britain. These show seven distinct periods, or *epochs*, anterior to the arrival of Augustin; namely, as follows:—its first establishment by the apostles, and apostolic men, in the first century;—its religion and worship openly professed and protected by *Lucius*, a British prince, and son of the Roman general of that name, in the second;—in the third and fourth centuries, that it was involved in the Dioclesian persecution, St. Alban and other martyrs falling therein; and, besides other councils held in the latter century, that of *Arles*, attended by the bishops[1] Eborius of York, Restitutus of London, and Adelfius of Caerleon, who subscribed to the canons; in the fifth century, the memorable council held for the suppression of *Pelagianism*, with Germanus, Lupus, and Severus, from France, &c.; in the

[1] Contemporaries of Constantius Chlorus, the Roman governor. Eborius and Restitutus, both *Romans*,—Adelfius of *Caerleon*.

sixth century, the solemn synod of *Llanddewi Brefi*, under the Archbishop and Metropolitan of the Britons, Saint David, for the same purpose as the last; and, in the seventh century, the *rejection* of the doctrine and authority of Augustin, by the succeeding bishops.

By way of contemporary illustration, we find that Christianity was introduced into France in the early part of the *second century*, that *Clovis*, A.D. 481, subjugated those provinces which were still in the hands of the Romans; and that having defeated Syagrius, the Roman general, and marrying *Clotilda*, a Christian princess, he was, under his vow to her God, that he would embrace the Christian religion, provided victory was decided in his favour, baptized by the Archbishop of *Rheims*, before the whole court, "many of the nobles following the pious example, and, in a short time afterwards, the greater part of the French nation became Christians, and he gave the name of France, or, *The* Land of *Freemen*, to his newly acquired dominions."—See Jamieson's France, 1834;—a most valuable little work.

We find, in reference to our own records, that *Ethelbert*, the Saxon king of Kent, openly professed Christianity, and founded Christian churches, and that he married *Bertha*, the daughter of Clovis of France, and that the church of Saint Martin, in Canterbury, which had been a Roman temple, was dedicated to its worship;—that the kingdoms of *Wessex*, *Sussex*, *Cornwall*, and *Northumberland*, of the *Heptarchy*, were under its influence; and the whole of Scotland, which at that time included Ireland, under the name of *Iona*, or, as Bede calls it, *Hii;* and Lindisfarn, under Aidan, Finan, and Colman, their first successive bishops, who were entirely independent. The British Bishops received their consecration from the Archbishop of Rheims, who was of the Greek Church. From Jamieson's History of France, we learn further, that the

Romans, under Cæsar, had conquered Gaul about forty-eight years, A.C. and that they retained possession of it about 400 years. They left Britain gradually, about the middle of the fifth century; previously to which, as is recorded in the *British Triads*, a very ancient work, that "Lleirweg, in Latin called *Lucius*, also called *Lleuwer the Great*, gave the full privilege of the country and tribe, with *civil* and *ecclesiastical rights*, to those who professed the faith in Christ."

From the old Saxon Chronicle, quoted by Bishop Davies, we learn, that "perpetual warre and striffe ensued between y^e^ Saxons and y^e^ *Brytaines*, on account of y^e^ latter beinge *Chrystaines*."

Again, *Tertullian*, who lived at the latter end of the *second century*, writes as follows:—"In what other than Christ, have the nations at large believed? The Parthians, the Medes, the various races of *Gætulia*, the many boundaries of the Moors, all the extremities of Spain, and the divers people of Gaul, and those parts of Britain which are accessible to the Romans, have been subdued by Christ."—Tertul. contra Jud. ch. 7.

Origen, about the same period, demands:—"When did the land of Britain, before the coming of Christ, consent to the religion of one God?" Other authorities, equally conclusive, cited by Dr. Burgess, show that we are indebted to St. Paul and his followers, for the first establishment of the Christian faith in Britain, and that, according to Clemens, he had advanced to the "utmost bounds of the west."

With reference to *Ethelbert*, the Anglo-Saxon king, and the mission of Augustin, Bede writes thus, as translated from the original Latin:—"The tidings of the Christian religion were brought to him, long before that Augustin arrived in the Isle of Thanet—his wife, *Bertha*, of the royal family of France, being a Christian; he having also accepted her at

the hands of her parents, upon condition that she should preserve her faith and religion inviolate, together with *Luidhard*, a bishop, whom they had bestowed upon her as a helper in her faith."—Bæde, lib. i. chap. 25.

Having thus entered into a short detail of the first circumstances which attended the introduction of Christianity into Britain, it will not be matter of difficulty to illustrate, that many or most of the Saxon kings of the Heptarchy became Christians; for the Christian faith was preserved by the succeeding kings to *Egbert*, who united the kingdoms, (A.D. 800,) and from *Egbert* to the time of *Alfred*, whose Christianity, in the ninth century, has been sufficiently established, —nor can the solemn consecration service, performed for King *Ethelred* the Second, and his Queen, (A.D. 978,) have been without its *precedents*, for we find by the Chronicle, that the laws of *Ina* (A.D. 710 and 712,) had fully enforced the Christian rites of *baptism* and *marriage*, thereby establishing the Christian covenant.—The oath of Ina. " I promise to my *Christian* people," is conclusive on this point; for all others were considered out of the compact. It may, by some readers, be deemed irrelevant to enter into these particulars; but they are of the highest moment, especially, as they have reference to periods when the Roman Catholic Church possessed its ascendency and state connexion, which connexion, it has been shown, did not take place till after the reign of *Ethelbert*, that is, in the *seventh century*—neither does that circumstance deduct from the original value of the ceremony itself, nor lessen its apostolic and Christian beauties, which are drawn from the finest portions of the Old and New Testament; exhibiting in the prayers the sublimest truths of the Gospel, in purity of language and classic style, unequalled by any similar composition!

The following is the form of *oath*, as extracted from the

MS. Cotton, Claud. A. iij.—" HÆC TRIA POPULO CHRISTIANO, *et mihi subdito,* in Christi promitto nomine.—*In primis* ut Ecclesia Dei, et omnis populus Christianus, *veram pacem nostro arbitrio in omni tempore servet.—Aliud, ut rapacitates et omnes iniquitates omnibus gradibus interdicam.—Tertium, ut in omnibus judiciis, æquitatem et misericordiam præcipiam, ut mihi et vobis indulgeat suam misericordiam clemens et misericors Deus qui vivit.*"

The words commencing, " In the name of Christ, I promise three things to the *Christian people,* my subjects," &c. are too definite to be mistaken, and show a perfect adherence to the oath of Ina, before cited. In the prayer, after the delivery of the *sword,—Deus providentia tua propitiare* Christianissimo regi nostro—" our most Christian king,"—*virtute gladii spiritualis*—" by the power of his *spiritual* sword." And again, on the delivery of the sceptre in the charge, *Accipe sceptrum, &c,—et sanctam Ecclesiam populumque videlicet Christianum tibi a Deo commissum regia virtute ab improbis defendas,*—" and the holy Church and *Christian people,* committed by the Lord to thee,—mayest thou with royal zeal defend them from the wicked."

The coronation service of William the Conqueror, was in nearly the same form as that performed for Ethelred, and a reference to which will satisfy any inquiring mind, that the solemn truths of religion and law, as founded in the Old and New Testaments, even at this early period, were deemed essential to be interwoven in the government, emanating from the king as its supreme head. It is a remarkable fact, that this most impressive ceremony should have lost nothing by the Conquest; but that, on the contrary, it became strengthened. William's title rested solely on the *right of conquest;* for the laws of the Anglo-Saxons, collected by Alfred, had expressly forbidden the transmission of the crown to an *illegi-*

timate; and they were strictly observed by Edward the Confessor, who died A.D. 1066. Robert Duke of Normandy tenderly loved his natural son William, and knowing the difficulties he would have to contend against with his nobles, relative to his succession, he appointed two Christian princes as his guardians—Henry the First of France, and *Alain* Duke of Brittany; and having induced his nobles to take the oath of allegiance to his son, as their future duke, he set out, at an advanced age, accompanied by a numerous retinue, to visit the holy sepulchre at Jerusalem, from whence he never returned. William, on his father's death, had to contend with many of his factious nobles, who disputed his succession; and Henry, forgetting his obligations to Robert, attempted to seize the dukedom of Normandy; but struck with remorse of conscience at the injustice of such an act, towards the son of his generous protector, and seeing his standards of the lion and the cross at the memorable battle of Val-de-Dunes, surrounded by many of his father's people, he joined his forces, and the factious nobles were completely routed. William still finding he had to contend with the prejudices of many of his nobles, consulted the duke of Brittany, who advised his acceptance of the invitation to England, the people of which had become disgusted with the tyranny of the Danish princes and their successors. He accordingly embarked with *Roger de Grai* (his paternal kinsman), a large army, and many Norman chiefs: and the success of his enterprise is sufficiently recorded in our own history. This forms a remarkable epoch, for the feudal system then had its full general establishment in England. The charters of William the Conqueror still extant, show that he respected many of the civil rights of Englishmen, refusing *fealty* to Rome; and the manuscript in the Bodleian library has the Anglo-Saxon coronation oath contained in it. It commences with the *Ordo Coronationis*

pro Ethelredi ij. Regis:—"*Incipit consecratio: Regem de conventu fidelium servorum* duo episcopi *per manus producant ad ecclesiam et chorus decantet hanc, Firmetur,*" *&c.*

The service follows precisely in the same form as that observed in *Ethelredi ij.* substituting the word *Britannia,* in one instance, and omitting the words "*Anglorum et Saxonum regnum,*" where they occur, by the king's command.

The following is a translation of the charge given by the bishops, on the investiture of the sword of temporal power:—"Receive this sword, presented to thee as king, and appointed, in right of our spiritual benediction, to the defence of the holy church; presented to thee by the hands of the bishops, although unworthy, yet nevertheless consecrated, as acting instead of, and by the authority of, the holy Apostles; and remember"—

Thus it is shown, that the Norman kings of Britain, by their oaths, bound themselves in succession to the protection of the ancient interests of the Church, as connected with the State, from William the Conqueror, which formed their only *legal* title, there having been no other authority than the recognition of the three estates—the Church taking the lead at the ceremony of the consecration.

In the Bodleian library may also be seen a perfect copy of the *Ordo Coronationis Edvardi ij. Regis.* The importance of the service is here more strongly illustrated, and the prayers are especially impressive. Nearly the entire form was preserved at the coronation of George the Third.

It has been objected by some, that these solemn ceremonies and forms had their rise in monkish superstition, and a desire to fetter the consciences and liberties of mankind, to serve the ambition or selfish purposes of priestcraft:—it is but too true, that the ambitious character of many of the popes, and their despotic tyranny, which tended even to the fettering of

the consciences of *kings*, as well as to the abject subjection of their people in the middle ages, have given reasonable grounds for this prejudice, considered *primâ facie*; but, in no one part of this most ancient and solemn service, which we have selected for our particular discussion, and showing the importance of a state religion, with the king as its chief trustee, is the charge of either ambition or selfishness applicable. From the earliest period, it breathes throughout the spirit of *protective* Christian charity, divested of every thing which can with propriety, in such a religious ceremony, be deemed superstitious; nor, can any liberal Christian, whatever creed he may profess, offer any reasonable objection to the solemn duties it inculcates, nor the mode by which those sacred truths it contains, are to be preserved.

It has been already shown, that the Church of Rome possessed no power, nor even influence, in this kingdom, till after the arrival of the missionary of Gregory, in the early part of the seventh century, at the court of Ethelbert, the Anglo-Saxon king of Kent. The writings of the venerable author, Bede, although his bias was favourable to that church, may be taken as consistent with fact. This author states, that "the very valiant king of the Anglo-Saxons, Ethelfredi, collected a large army at Chester, and gave the perfidious nations a signal defeat." By "the perfidious nations," it is meant to designate those ancient Britons and converted Saxons, who had retired with their bishops and priests, after their refusal to obey the mandate of Augustin, and who, it would seem, after the death of Ethelbert, had prevailed on his son and successor to take up arms against them. It is further admitted by Bede, that "twelve hundred" labouring men, "all living by the labour of their hands—fifty only escaping—were slain," although they did not *bear arms*, but came to see the fight, and to pray for the success of the British arms;

" upon which Ethelfredi, as they came to pray to God against him, and the success of *his arms*, fell upon them first, and slew them, upon which the others fled."

It would appear from Le Bas' account, in his Life of Wickliff, that Ethelbert was a very tolerant prince, and to this may be attributed the success of Augustin, who did not fail, after his settlement at Canterbury, to promise temporal power and advantages to all those who would aid the objects of his mission; and his arrival in Britain with forty monks is fully detailed by this author. " Ethelbert was apprised of the arrival in his dominions of certain strangers, habited in a foreign garb, *and practising several unusual and mysterious ceremonies*;—their object, as they stated, to be admitted to the presence of the king, in order that they might communicate to him and his people tidings of measureless importance to their everlasting welfare. They were received by the king in the Isle of Thanet, surrounded by his nobles, in the open air. They approached in solemn procession, bearing a silver *crucifix*, and the figure of the Saviour painted upon a banner, and chaunting the solemn Litany of their church. They then stated to him the objects of their mission; and having received from him a prudent, but suitable reply, were permitted to fix their residence at Canterbury."

Bede corroborates this statement, and says, " When they drew nigh to the city of Canterbury, they sung, with due modulation, a litany, beseeching God, to take away his wrath from the city," &c. It does not, however, appear, that Ethelbert or his court espoused their form of religion, or " unusual and mysterious ceremonies," any further; nor does it seem, by the subsequent proceedings of Augustin and his followers, that they obeyed the precepts of that holy religion, which breathes charity, and peace, and brotherly love.

By the permission of Ethelbert, a conference was held with

the bishops or learned doctors of the nearest British province, "who, when a lengthened disputation had taken place, refused to consent to the prayers, exhortations, and reprimands of Augustin and his companions; but preferred their own traditions, to all the Church's, which agree together in Christ throughout the world."—BEDE. A second *synod* was afterwards held, "when came *seven* bishops of the Britons, and other of their most learned men, for the greater part, many from the very famous monastery, which is called in the Anglo-Saxon tongue *Bancor-nabury* (Bangor), over which *Dinoot* the abbot presided."

When they came, Augustin sat still in his chair, and they, seeing this, were angry thereat; and observing his pride, took pains to contradict him [1] in all that he said; and, after a long discussion, in which Augustin demanded their submission to the doctrines of "the universal or holy Roman Church," they answered, notwithstanding that he threatened them, "they would do none of these things; neither would they have him for archbishop."—BEDE.

These extracts are introduced for the purpose of showing that, for six centuries, primitive Christianity, more or less, existed in this country, and in the substantive form of a *Church*, with "bishops and learned men," (according to that venerable authority, Bede,) who did not acknowledge the papal supremacy. And it should be borne in mind, that Ireland retained its own primitive church and bishops, until it was conquered by Henry the Second, at the latter part of the twelfth century.

It is a circumstance worthy of serious attention, that the ancient and purely apostolic ceremony of the coronation ser-

[1] Acting under the advice of an aged anchorite, or holy man, whom they had consulted. *Vide* "*Protestant Journal.*"

vice was never altered to favour the peculiar forms or rule of the Roman Catholic church, by the introduction of masses, litanies, &c.; and had that of Ethelred (A.D. 978.) been framed by a synod of Protestant bishops of the period of the Reformation, it could not be less exceptionable on this head.

According to Doctor Silver, the former learned Anglo-Saxon professor at the University of Oxford, the Laws of Edward the Confessor were only a collection from the various codes of the first Christian kings of the Saxon Heptarchy, including all those of Ethelbert, Ina, Offa, and Alfred. They were, therefore, on that account, the more valuable, because they were the laws of the whole nation. Now it has been fully shown, that Ethelbert, before the arrival of the embassy from Pope Gregory the First, had his established Christian court and bishop at Canterbury; and on the authority of Bede, the Saxon Chronicle, and other ancient writers, "bishops, doctors, and learned men," settled in this kingdom, who had, with their predecessors, for six centuries,—under the Roman rule, the Dioclesian persecution, the prejudices and paganism of the Saxons, and against the *Pelagian heresy*, (which denied the doctrine of original sin, on the authority of Pelagius,)—sustained the vital truths of Christianity. Add to this, that Bertha, the wife of Ethelbert, was a Christian princess of the royal family of France, and that, according to two ancient writers [1], Gregory was the last spiritual bishop and first Pope, his authority could not have pre-existed in this kingdom; and we have just reasons for concluding, that the Christian covenant was fully admitted and recognised by the earliest Saxon kings.

The first residence of the mission of Gregory was of a *permissive* character, and it is sufficiently clear, that Ethel-

[1] Riveti Critici Sacri.—Genev. 1626. Abp. Parker's Ecclesiastica.

bert, with the view of eliciting full information into the truths of Christianity, and deciding on the superiority of the doctrines of the contending parties, sanctioned the synods and discussions that took place with Augustin[1]; nor, was any attempt made to force the primitive bishops into acquiescence during his life. It is true, that his son, to acquire *temporal power*, and to subdue the independent Britons, joined his interests with those of Augustin; but the laws were not changed. There is an end then of the charge or assertion, that these solemn ceremonies and their objects had their rise in monkish superstition or intolerance. The Constitution of England is founded on the ancient principle of the patriarchal law, with reference to the authority *vested* in the king, by the three estates, at his coronation. The prayer on the enthronement of George the Fourth, was founded on that used in the consecration of Ethelred, as may be seen by comparison; and as it has been affirmed, by an able authority, before quoted, "this ceremony must be regarded as the origin and source of those *powers* which are attributed to the Constitution, and as the *key-stone* of the political arch, which all the parties sharing in it then contract to form."

Thus, sufficient has been adduced in proof, that the ascendency obtained by the church of Rome—(even aided by the temporal power of the Popes, which during a long period held nearly all the princes of Christendom in a state of vassalage,)—has not in any way lessened the purity, nor severed the links of this original compact, which the kings of England, from the earliest ages of her history, have held with their people. The coronation service of Edward the Second confirms the preceding forms, with the addition, that "the Gos-

[1] Not St. Austin, who lived in the second century of the Christian era.—AUTHOR.

pel being properly read, the king shall approach the altar, and through the hands of the metropolitan, or bishop, shall make an offering of bread and wine, in imitation of Melchizedec." And in the *Ordo Coronationis*, expressly, "*et de legibus et consuetudinibus regni confirmandis ac firmiter statuendis*;" the oath being still more conclusive.—See Coronation Service, Geo. III.

Any doubts which may have arisen in consequence of the changes from the Roman Catholic forms of religion, introduced into the court of Edward the Sixth, and previously by Henry the Eighth, for the state generally, became dissipated; for it was decided, that the original principle of the covenant remained *unbroken*; and the Reformation created no change therein, but rendered it, if possible, still more permanent and binding on the succeeding Protestant monarchs of these realms.

In the coronation service of Edward the Sixth the *recognition* is added, which proves that the Protestant counsellors of the prince had duly weighed this vital question; and it was on this ground, and this alone, that Henry the Eighth was enabled legally and constitutionally (whatever may be advanced to the contrary) to restore the primitive state religion. No act of parliament, unsupported by this authority, could have effected it, without destroying the original consecration principle of the Constitution, and introducing an entirely new form into the system of government.

The Laws of Alfred began with the *Ten Commandments*, adopting many of the Levitical Laws. "These are the laws which God gave to *Moyses;* but the only begotten Son of God, our Saviour Jesus, when he came into the world, taught openly, that he descended not that he should break the Law, but that with all mildness and goodness he should fulfil it. Then, after his sufferings, before that his Apostles were sent

forth over the earth to teach, and whilst they were yet assembled together, they sent letters." "But when, at the propagation of the Gospel, many nations added their faith to it, many conventions of bishops and other wise men were held, who, for a *money fine*, were willing to commute a first offence; but they refused to grant this remission to a *Traitor* and deserter of his Lord, because such a man they did not think an object of *mercy;* and also, because God has willed, that those who despise him should be unworthy of all pity; and also, because Christ himself did not entirely pardon those who traitorously occasioned his *death*." "He who, when alone, or by his servants, or by hirelings, acts treasonably against the Life and safety of the King, let him forfeit his Life and all his Property: and in like way, We ordain, through all ranks, *Cearle*, or *Earle*, ignoble or noble, those who are guilty of treason towards the life of their Lord, let him forfeit his Life and all his Property." Hence the crime of *Læze Majesty* is fully exemplified. These laws were written with the king's own hand, who bore the *two sceptres*, emblematical of spiritual and temporal power, and displayed on the *gem* worn by him on state occasions, which is preserved in the Ashmolean Museum. The same form is repeated in Canute's Laws, and those of Henry I. and Henry III.; and traced by Dr. Silver to the earliest periods of the Saxon Heptarchy.

It will be advisable to return to the civil proceedings of the Romans in Britain before they relinquished its conquest, as illustrative of their example on the succeeding progress of the Anglo-Saxons, with reference to their laws and religious institutions—the Saxons having ultimately become converts to Christianity, as established in these Islands.

The feudal system was unknown to the Romans, or not exercised by them before Christianity, in their foreign conquests; which deficiency always left them exposed to casual-

ties, whenever they could not retain by force of *arms* what they had previously won. There was nothing in the shape of a fixed and determinate custom to bind the vassal to his lord, nor to preserve subordination, or the right of *succession*. The Roman leaders, aware of this difficulty, could only obviate it by dividing the land annually amongst the soldiers of their legions; but this left them open to the constant jealousy and resentment of the native chiefs and inhabitants of their conquered possessions; and, by degrees, as their own people became dispersed or distributively settled, lessened the ties of fidelity to the parent state, whilst it left the society itself insecure, and without the moral advantages of a regular governing power. By degrees the chiefs themselves became independent of the mother country, and were constrained to rely on their own resources. This was especially manifested towards the decline of the Roman empire, and after the invasion of Gaul by Pharamond.

It has already been stated, in the preceding part of this chapter, that Christianity was openly espoused, and legally protected, by a Roman general and British king, in the early part of the second century after Christ. This also gives the first record of the establishment of a *Feud*, by grant of privilege to all those who chose to attach themselves to the person and service of the *Prince*, by becoming *Christians*. Under the Roman rule in Britain, Lucius, by right of conquest, had become territorial lord of the soil, and reigned as a *King* in Surrey, Sussex, and Kent, the boundaries of which extended to the river Humber in the north, and to Cornwall in the west. Lucius, as well as the majority of the Roman generals and their attendants, could not have been entirely ignorant of the ineffectual efforts made by Tiberius, in the preceding century, to stop the march of Christianity; nor of the writ-

ings of their own countrymen on the subject of the Redeemer's mission,—of the official report of Publius Lentulus to the Emperor and Senate, minutely describing his very person, his qualities, and his powers, before his crucifixion;—nor with the legal circumstances attending his death, under the rule of an enlightened nation, abounding with men of letters; at least, by aid of history, and traditionary reputation, within one century, we may fairly infer, that they were possessed of collateral information supportive of the facts narrated by the Apostles. Neither could they have been ignorant of the arraignment of St. Paul, nor of the fame of his writings. Surprise then ceases, when we find that almost the first public act of Lucius, as an Anglo-Roman governor, reigning almost independently as a king, was that of giving the full privileges of citizenship, "with ecclesiastical rights," (lands, &c.), and civil *tenures*, to those who embraced Christianity. It may therefore be reasonably inferred, that he possessed not only the inclination, but the ample means, of performing this act, in which he must have been duly supported by those around him. It was by these means, more than by force of arms, that the succeeding Roman governors retained possession of the lands in Britain, as *territorial lords*, until the time of Constantius Chlorus, who held his seat of government at York, from the middle to the latter part of the fourth century.

According to the authority of that learned writer, L'Abbé Velly, in his work, "*L'histoire de France depuis l'établissement de la Monarchie, jusqu' au régne de Louis xij*," we find, that "Honorius reigned in the west, and Theodosius the younger in the east of Gaul, when the Franks crossed the Rhine under Pharamond, and pillaged the city of Treves. It was about the year A.D. 420, when, being lifted up on a *shield*, he was shown to the whole army, and acknowledged the nation's

chief; and this was all the inauguration of our ancient kings." But it has been already shown, that the Gauls had embraced Christianity in the second century, contemporary with the reign of Lucius in Britain; and that Clovis, A.D. 481, in order to attach his new subjects to his person and government, married Clotilda, a Christian princess, and niece to Gondebaud king of Burgundy. The Romans, who had only become Christians partially, had reconquered Gaul after the death of Pharamond. "At the time of the reconquest by Clovis, he was only nineteen years old. Having granted many privileges to the bishops, and favoured those who professed the Christian faith, he himself at length publicly embraced it." This event happened immediately after the defeat of the Allemani, at Tolbiac, near Cologne, A.D. 496. Thus, the *feudal system* took its rise in France and Normandy under similar circumstances of emergency, and nearly coeval with those which existed in Britain, on the part of the various chiefs who claimed to rule by the right of conquest alone; and the abortive attempts made by Pharamond, and his successor Childeric, fully illustrate its advantages, and the powerful aid it afforded in the establishment of Christianity over Idolatry, in the first ages of the Church. About this period, it is also recorded by ancient historians of unimpeachable learning and integrity, there were holden many councils and conventions of learned men, attended by *bishops*, and others professing the Christian faith in primitive purity, under its Gospel dispensation;—all these circumstances fully and sufficiently establishing the antiquity of the Christian Church in England, and its state connection, even before the arrival of the Saxons.

The institution of the Christian marriage, baptism, and the rights of *primogeniture*, form another remarkable feature connected with the introduction of Christianity into Britain. Our

Saviour himself fully restored the primeval marriage[1], and partly the Jewish institutions, and therefore Christ's kingdom is of *this world*, in the outward form. He restored the primeval marriage, although not strictly upon its original principle, and well knowing that the Jews would not obey the change, he made it *general* for mankind, agreeably with the express declaration of the prophet Isaiah. Baptism he established by *positive command*, to perfect the objects of his death and resurrection, that the *Covenant* may be fully restored, and man born again spiritually, and thus recover what he had lost by the fall—the security of that covenant having been sealed by his blood! The descent of the Holy Spirit crowned the great work of redemption, and fully confirmed the faith of the Apostles. This following the injunction, to "*teach all nations*," so shortly after it had been given—coupled with the affectionate promise, "and lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world,"—sufficiently implied the re-establishment of a temporal, as well as spiritual jurisdiction, over the minds and actions of men; for in his memorable Sermon on the Mount, Jesus explicitly declared, he "came not to *destroy*, but to fulfil. Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the *Law* till all be fulfilled."

The ancient fathers of the Church were fully impressed with the importance of these opinions; and it became a paramount duty with them, acting under the conviction that they had the express authority of God himself, in his revealed word, in their intercourse with mankind, to connect civil legislation with religious discipline, or, rather, to found civil legislation on the *Divine Law*. By this means the spread of the Pelagian heresy, which must necessarily have subverted

[1] See marriage at Cana, in Galilee, New Testament.

every principle of Christianity, became arrested in its progress. No other means, connected with human agency, could by possibility have presented such a check: and hence may be seen the fatal error of Paley, who, diverging from his *Bible*, sought vainly in the system of human or moral philosophy for the essence of that lesson of authority which is there presented to our view. The doctrine of the *Atonement* is the key-stone of the Old and New Testament dispensations. It formed the subject of all the solemn sacrifices and ceremonies under the Levitical Law, as *typical* of the advent of the Messiah, his incarnation, sufferings, death, and resurrection! How classically appropriate, how beautifully illustrative, are the lines of an ancient Christian poet[1], and how justly severe the castigation they convey to those who assume the powers of human wisdom or philosophy as competent and perfect,—who marshal them in array against the decreed judgment of Omnipotence!

> "Quippe minor natura aciem si intendere tentet
> Acriùs, ac penetrare Dei secreta supremi;
> Quis dubitet victo fragilem lassescere visu,
> Vimque fatigatæ mentis sub pectore parvo
> Turbari, invalidisque hebetem succumbere curis?
> Sed facilis fidei via!"

Thus translated—

> "Should man, inferior in his nature, strive
> Into the secrets of his GOD to dive,
> O, who can doubt his finite sight must fail,
> And all his mental pow'rs confounded quail,
> Or sink beneath the vain attempt! 'Tis *faith* alone
> Can speed her way to *mysteries unknown!*"

The advent of the Redeemer was marked by a period of universal peace. "In the reign of Augustus, when all the

[1] Prudentius, a Latin poet who flourished A.D. 392.

world was at peace, was born in Bethlehem of Judea the Prince of Peace. At his birth came the *Magi* (wise men from the East), directed by the star, which arose and shone over the place of his nativity, amongst the shepherds, and those who kept the cattle-herd. These prostrated themselves, whilst the Magi presented their *ingots of gold*, in token of submission, and joy was heard in heaven."—"During thirty-three years of his earthly mission, in sorrowings and watchings, in fastings and temptations," says Tertullian, "he was never known to laugh, but often to sigh and weep." Publius Lentulus—that "in person he was fair to behold—in compassion exceeding all men; but in reproving he was terrible;" and that performing miracles, he had many disciples, "who believed him to be the Son of God, though the Jews called him a deceiver," &c. Again, Flavius Josephus, the Jewish historian and general, who cannot well be suspected of partiality in his historical remark, "a man there was, if a *man* he might be called," &c.; and who so fully, in his description of the siege and destruction of Jerusalem, by Titus and the Roman arms, (as foretold in Deuteronomy, and by Christ himself in his agony in the garden,) illustrated the fulfilment of the prophecy.

When it is considered that the Jews lost not only their city and temple, but their correct computation of *time* (according to the calculations of some eminent modern astronomers), we have no just grounds for undervaluing the judgment of those who in the early ages of Christianity restored the patriarchal feud. Tiberius persecuted the Christians, and used every exertion to prevent the propagation of the Gospel Faith, through fear of its entirely supplanting the arbitrary rule exercised by the Roman emperors; but had they united Christianity with the state, under their then existing power and knowledge of letters, as was subsequently done by the enter-

prising Constantine, it is by no means unreasonable to conclude, that Rome would much longer have preserved the friendship and retained the empire of the civilized world, any more than it would be reasonable to deny that Britain rose in the scale of nations by her acceptance and support of a state religion, and that religion based on the sacred foundation of the Word of God.

Almost the first persons converted to Christianity were the Roman British inhabitants, who had passed to Scotland and Ireland; and subsequently the Anglo-Saxon kings and their officers: nor is this by any means extraordinary, when we find King Agrippa, on the judgment-seat, admitting to Paul that he had "almost persuaded him to be a Christian." Through the imitation of the ancient Welch custom, which recognised the parental power, as vested in the head of the family, the Anglo-Saxon kings at once removed that system of insecurity by *allodial tenure*, which had previously constituted the only division of the land. The Laws of *Howel Dha* evidently display a patriarchal origin, and they descended from the *Aborigines* and *Cymri*, the earliest inhabitants of these islands, mentioned in history.

By a comparison of the Hebrew and Celtic languages, of which the ancient Welch is the only remaining one, the affinity is sufficiently striking. The Druidical superstition of human sacrifice, was only a gross perversion of the sacrifice of the real Atonement. They lost the privilege of primogeniture by the introduction of the law of *gavelkind*, a system continued in some parts of Kent to latter ages, by which the lands became divisible in equal proportions to all the sons of a family, producing perpetual discord, jealousy, and family dissensions; but, notwithstanding, the druidical system of government was essentially *patriarchal*.

The Saxons, like the Spartans, were merely a roving Gothic

military nation, but without any regular system of laws; and on their invasion of Britain they found institutions, which, although *abstract*, were nevertheless rational in their form, and philosophically perfect for the time. Thus, they interwove some of the Welch family customs respecting *gavelkind* into their system, before their perfect conversion. The earliest idea of *representation* in these realms was derived from the Welch laws; but as they only possessed *one legislative council*, there was nothing defined to preserve the balance of power in the state, nor to prevent domestic discords, which rendered the ancient inhabitants of Britain and their possessions an easy conquest both to the Romans and Saxons. It was to the remains of the military intelligence and enterprise of the Roman leaders, through their intermarriages, combined with the classic learning and assiduity of many of the early propounders of Christianity, that the Anglo-Saxons were indebted for their laws, comprehending the parental, the priestly, and magisterial offices, as an institution originally founded by Jehovah himself, for the due protection of truth, the exercise of civil rights, and the performance of social duties.

Agreeably to the patriarchal law, Christianity became united to the state, and connected with sovereign power. The Welch historians firmly attribute the conversion of the ancient inhabitants of the Principality to *Caradog*[1], the first British general, who was taken captive to Rome (A.D. 51.), and whose father,

[1] By the Romans called *Caractacus*—the British general who opposed them on their first invasion, and who, having been defeated and taken prisoner, was carried in triumph to Rome, but afterwards released by order of the emperor, on account of his great personal skill and bravery, and on condition of his father remaining as a *hostage*, that he should not bear arms for seven years against the Roman power.—*Ancient Welch History*. This is also corroborated by the Roman historians, who relate the triumphant procession into Rome, and the presentation of Caractacus to the emperor, who treated him with great kindness.

as his hostage, became fellow prisoner with St. Paul; in support of which, the authorities already cited, show, that there was a famous monastery, or religious establishment at Bangor, in the time of Ethelbert, with bishops, and other learned men there stationed, who had their predecessors. By their aid the Saxon kings unquestionably framed their first regular laws; the principle contained in them is too pure, scriptural, and original, to have been derived from any other source. It combines the protection of the patriarchal covenant with the simplicity and security of the Gospel dispensation. By its power WODEN and THOR, the Saxon idols, were destroyed, and the name of Christ established in the state; and this, as fully became the occasion, and the importance of the subject, by the public and solemn act of the king, sitting in deliberative judgment, with his WITENAGEMOTT, or parliament, composed of the immediate persons of his family, the elders, chiefs, and learned men,—by this proceeding Christianity was established in public estimation, for it was consolidated by authority, and the king at once became its "nursing father!"

The law of *Ina*, (passed A.D. 712,) after corroborating the laws of his predecessors, and confirming the institution of *Christian marriage*, also enacted, that any man neglecting to bring his child to be *baptised*, should "forfeit all his land," and other civil privileges;—it then proceeded to detail the rights of *feudal tenures*, and the guardianship of single women, agreeably to the Saxon custom. Thus, those first disciples and followers of the Apostles, who came to Britain, literally fulfilled the last command of their beloved Lord and Master, "Go and teach all nations;" for they came to the *nation*, and having, as soon as possible, obtained the conversion and authority of the *prince*, or chief magistrate, they bound him also to the due protection of Christianity, in the

exercise of its worship; and, under Scripture authority, in opposition to the gross idolatry that had preceded it, "took possession of the high places, and destroyed the altars."

Venantius Fortunatus, a Roman, as his name at once implies, and Bishop of Poictiers, expressly says, that "Paul passed over the ocean, even to the British land;"—and the *British Triads* further relate, that "Bryan the Blessed[1], the son of *Llyr Lediath*, first brought the faith of Christ to the Cambrians from *Rome*, where he had been seven years detained as hostage for his son Caradog; and that he was released, by order of the emperor, the same year with St. Paul." —See also *Leges Walliæ*. Considering that St. Paul was the appointed apostle of the *Gentiles*, and that he himself expressly states, 2 Cor. xi. 23., that he "was three times shipwrecked," that he "was in perils of waters;" and that he declares to Timothy, "I have finished my course,"—there is little room for doubting his having personally visited these islands[2]. He proved himself an uncompromising Roman; and his views were especially indicated in the opinions afterwards entertained by his own countrymen, the Roman leaders in Britain, and their successors, the Saxon princes.

[1] Consecrated, or *behallowed*, as a Bishop.—*Author.*

[2] Bishop Burgess, in his Tracts on the Antiquity of the British Churches, relates, "that the general diffusion of the Gospel was in the latter part of the reign of *Tiberius*; the introduction of it into this country, was in the interim of the events mentioned by *Gildas* (the ancient historian). This interim is limited, on the one hand, by the event which is last mentioned by him—videlicet, the defeat of *Boadicea*, the British Queen, at St. Pancras. A.D. 61, and, on the other, by the events not far distant, such as the defeat of Caractacus (Caradog,) A.D. 51. This interval comprehends not more than ten years. The commencement of the interval is *twelve years*, after the end of Tiberius's reign. The interim includes the time of St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome, A.D. 57-58, and the release of Caractacus's family, as well as St. Paul, 58. This corroborates the Welch history."—*Note by the late editor of the Protestant Journal.*

The earliest ministers of the Christian religion, on the introduction of their faith, and for the purpose of sustaining them in their functions, were freely admitted to a share in the *land*. Here again was fulfilled the prophecy of the Redeemer to his apostles, that they "should receive houses and lands, together with persecutions on his account;" and, had he disapproved of it, he would have forbidden it, for he foresaw it; and here he again restored what the priesthood had in the beginning. In proportion as men became converted, they intermingled in their scheme of government the practice and maxims of the Sacred Writings, under the belief that they had a divine authority for them, as circumstances rendered necessary. It must be borne in mind also, that the people were found in a state of entire destitution of all regular law, in consequence of the desertion of a system intended by God to have been *universal* for mankind.

It must be admitted, that the necessity for the re-establishment of an authority of a superior description for controlling the minds and actions of men became apparent; and it is equally clear, that the people, or rather the heathen tribes of men, which then composed the nation, were of themselves totally incompetent to the framing of laws, without a *model*; which should at once be applicable to the twofold purposes of their protection and general improvement. Thus land was allotted to those who were appointed to, or set apart for spiritual duties and instruction; and afterwards learned men, monks and others, received grants, on account of their studies in law, the sciences, and polite education, as collaterally connected with the advancement of religion in the state.

At this period of our history, few, if any, of the military chieftains applied themselves to the study of *letters*; and it became positively necessary for those who attended to the

priestly office, also to give their wisdom and attention to framing laws, or forming and remodelling, from their acquired knowledge of previous institutions, such parts of the scheme of government, for the social system, as the wants and prejudices of the people required: without this advantage, instead of progressive improvement, which the history of the *Heptarchy* presents, in spite of foreign invasions, and intestine commotions, the inhabitants must have reverted to the original state of ignorance and idolatry, or become the *tributaries* of some ruthless foreign adventurer.

It is no less singular than true, that many learned men, who have not considered the subject scripturally, have been at a loss to account for the rise and general adoption of the feudal system in Britain. It was one of those political measures, nearly coeval with the dawn of Christianity, by which the people of these isles were more effectually severed from their previous idolatrous habits, than any other that could have been devised for the times; and it proves itself sufficiently important, when properly understood; and that it could not possibly have been devised by men who were rashly speculative, or ignorant of the general principles under which society, in a state of nature, is regulated; but that they were far advanced in civilization, considering the many difficulties they had to contend against. The feudal system, therefore, first arose from the conviction which the military chieftain entertained of his own unprotected state, without it. By its application subordination was introduced, and the life-interest of the possessor, of the king himself, as lord of the soil, enhanced; yet, the legitimate title was wanting to render it perfect, and, without the aid of *religion*, it never could have become a valid security. The enactment which rendered the feud *hereditary*, was immediately derived from the Christian rite of *baptism*; which, re-establishing the law of *primoge-*

niture, and the law of *wardship*, which the Lord Chancellor now holds, and Christian marriage, united with the *oath of fealty and homage*, afterwards added, rendered the tenure perfect.

According to Lord Coke, the oath of fealty and homage [1] is coeval with the earliest ages of the Heptarchy; besides having been taken at the coronation of the kings, it was repeated in the baronial court, by all the barons, or freeholders, who were either elder sons, or those who represented the eldest male branches. When the land became *subinfeuded*, or held under a freeholder, he who held it made reservation that he would be faithful in all things that did not interfere with his religion, or his loyalty to his sovereign,—"*salvâ fide Deo et terræ principi.*" Every landholder was pledged in an oath similar in effect to that taken to the king's,—"*tactis sacrosancti Christi evangeliis,*" and he was obliged to come into open court and make the declaration before the *pares curiæ*. These and similar usages were superseded by the act for commutation of tenures, passed in the reign of Charles the Second; but there is an express reservation made of all the rights and privileges of the *crown*, as showing the ancient custom, and all the obligations are still implied in the consecration service, although they are far more vaguely expressed in the present oath of allegiance, than that anciently used.

The same feudal oaths are also found in the laws of *Edmund*, quoted by Brompton; and, in the time of Alfred, entailed estates existed, which could not be alienated; but their perpetuity was confirmed by his will. The laws of Edward the Confessor, so called, are Anglo-Saxon; so also are those of Henry the First; they were a compilation of subsequent

[1] "Omnis homo debet domino suo fidem de vitâ et membris et terreno honore et observatione consilii sui per honestum et utile."—*Lord Coke's quotation from the Red Book.*

laws, embodying those of *Alfred*, as those of the latter were a collection up to the period of his reign. In his preface to them Alfred says,—"Those that I met with, either in the days of *Ina* my relation, or of *Offa*, king of Mercia, or of *Ethelbert*, who first of the Anglo-Saxon race received *baptism*, —those that seemed to me most right I gathered those here together, and the others I set aside. I then, Alfred, king of the West-Saxons, showed these to all my *senators*, and they gave their consent to their being held."—MSS. Bodleian.

The change produced by the conversion of the Anglo-Saxon Princes to Christianity, is fully marked in the civil code of Ina (A.D. 712), and shows the Saxon feud as existing in the head of the family, and the eldest male born; for it is a gross error to suppose that the feudal system was first introduced by the Normans, although their baronial nobles perfected it.—"I Ina, by the Grace of God, King of the West Saxons, with the advice of *Cenrad* my father, and *Hedda et Erkenward*, my bishops; and of all mine aldermen, and of my eldest born *(eldistan witan)* or *senatores natu majores*, and a great assemblage of the servants of *God*, now consulting concerning the establishment of our kingdom, and the health of our souls, that right marriages and holy king's laws may be established."

The ceremony of the *wapenstake*, or weapon-touch, was strictly a feudal performanee, where the Thanes and barons of the court baron assembled, and formed the *feudal militia*; also those belonging to the manor, the county courts, and the hundred, who succeeded to their landed estates by right of primogeniture. In the Saxon laws, as well as the *Chronicle*, are many passages which show, that all the parts of the Saxon feudal system were complete. When alluding to *Harold* the Dane, who was chosen king at Oxford (anno 1035,) by the Witena Gemot, the terms used are, "they

chose him to hold all their lands of him;" but "all the Eldistan Witan in the kingdom of the West Saxons, opposed the election." In 918, the Eldistan Witan are again mentioned, and they are there called *Nobiliores* from the privilege of birth. In 924, *Edward* was chosen by the King of Scotland, and the seniores, men of the north, to be their "father and lord," which are strictly feudal terms.

The laws of succession, as those of the kingdom of *Wessex*, always gave to the eldest son the chief fee. Land bought or acquired could be disposed of by will or gift; but *bocland*, which came through family inheritance, could not in any way be alienated; nor could a female inherit as long as a male heir remained. The bulk of these regulations, with the additional guardianship of single women [1] and widows, were in full force in the reign of Henry the First, who expressly decreed, that the barons should observe the same towards the sons, and daughters, and wives, of their dependants. Of this system the provision for the poor always formed a part, as may be seen by reference to that most ancient and valuable work, the "*Mirror of Justices*;" and, indeed, poor laws appear to have been one of the earliest emanations of Christian government.

The land was held in a chain of subordination subject to a supreme head in the state [2]; and the religious faith formed an express part of the acknowledgment, by which the tenure was held; and that the Christian marriage and baptism,—the Christian oath and the right of primogeniture, were imperative conditions, and joined with the civil suit and military service,—that the *eldest sons* were the holders of the *real* pro-

[1] Under the Saxon laws, every single woman had her *Mundibora*, or guardian.—*Silver*.

[2] "Terra totius Regni ad Regem pertinet: Rex namque dominus est totius Regni, alii autem omnes domini inter se pares sunt."—*Leges Walliæ*.

perty, and with them, in the several courts of the Thane, baron, or hundred, and of the *county*, the judicial and military powers were principally vested. It was to the Saxons, and not to the Normans, that *chivalry* became indebted for the magnificent ceremonies attendant on the *knighthood* of the eldest male born—a custom still observed, in form and festivity, in most of the ancient noble British families, on the attainment of *majority* by the eldest son.

These relics of the civil policy of our Saxon ancestors, abundantly illustrate the interest they felt for the perfect establishment of religion in the state,—they are conclusive against those modern sophists, who endeavour to persuade the *unlettered*, that the first principles of the British constitution have been departed from, under the ascendency which religion has obtained in our system of government; whilst they show that at no one period of English history, were the protective interests of a state religion, so well considered, and so forcibly provided for, as under the entire principle and operation of Saxon law. It would require more space than could conveniently be allotted in this work, the design of which is to present the leading facts attendant on the progressive development of our constitutional system, to insert the various minor regulations contained in these laws, all bearing to one great point, extracts from which are given for the satisfaction of the intelligent reader: and, as they are preserved, they form invaluable records against the promulgated opinions of men, who barter reason and honour, duty and public principle, to purposes of ambition, or temporary advantage,—who even pervert talents, education, and the advantages of birth and station; and are prepared to sacrifice both *religion* and *truth*, at the shrines of falsehood, inconsistency, and error!

RELIGION, from the earliest foundation of civil government

in these realms, was made the basis of the state. As with the Jewish king, whose power emanated from the joint consent of Jehovah and the Jewish people, so the Christian king sprang from that authority, under the New Testament dispensation, which decreed a Christian government upon earth, universal for mankind. The words "all nations," contain no figurative meaning or *enigma*—they convey a positive and express command; and the Christian Lawgiver pledged the perpetuity of his presence, as the head of that government over his Church upon earth, "even unto the end of the world!" Thus the first British king, under his baptism and consecration, in a limited sense became the representative of the original and greater authority, so far as he was able, in maintaining and upholding all his rights and divine laws. In a civil point of view, he became at once the parent, the priest, and the magistrate, uniting the triple powers, precisely on the patriarchal principle.

The law restoring the rights of primogeniture, had in express design the perpetuation of the Christian covenant. These rights, vested in the king, were transmitted in a smaller degree to the people at large, who held similar rights under him,—first the lords spiritual, then the lords temporal, and lastly the commons, who ultimately became an independent estate of parliament, but all subject to the crown, and to revert by *forfeiture*, as in the case of *treason*, &c. The foundation of the law is explicitly defined in the *Premium of the Mirror of Justices*. "In understanding the origin of the usages of England, established by law, I found in short the necessity of which I was reminded, and in which my companions will assist me, of studying in the *Old* and *New Testament*, and in the *Canon*,—there we found it written, that *law* is nothing else but rules given by our holy predecessors in the holy Scriptures, to save our souls from perpetual damnation."

Then follows the enumeration of the several books of the Old and New Testament, from which the law was compiled.

"And, in order that all our usages should be accordant with the Scriptures, and in language that might be more intelligible to the common people, and for the shaming of false judges, I compiled this treatise; and I call it the '*Mirror of Justices*,' because I have found all the virtues and substance of it described and used in holy customs, according to the rules aforementioned, ever since the age of *Arthur*."

This extraordinary book, which is partly of the age of *Alfred*, removes all doubt of the antiquity of a state religion; and of its having formed the primary object in the institution of the government, as the civil jurisdiction was secondary thereto.

The *Premium* further adds,—"The first part treated of is the sin against holy peace, the several *titles*, and the origin of holy laws." Then follow the contracts, which were alone legal and valid with the king's "*Christian subjects*."

The Mirror fully elucidates all the striking advantages of the Christian faith, producing real liberty and philosophical rule in conformity with the principles of religion and sound morality,—a system which the Romans had in vain sought the establishment of, during ages of toil and application, in which both genius and learning exhausted their finer powers, or sunk in despair without the attainment of the object. In this ancient law book is explained the laws relating to feofs, or slaves,—such as became free in various ways under Christianity, some by *baptism*, as was the case with Infidels, taken prisoners by the Christians in battle.

In the commencement of the *second volume* of his *Records*, Prynne further defines the prerogative of the king, and that the protection of *theology* and Christian faith, as the first human duty, constituted its essence.

"First, his sovereign powers are, to command by their laws, and enjoin all ecclesiastical and other persons whatsoever, within their dominions, to serve, worship, profess, fear, love, and obey the only true God; to believe and embrace the holy Scriptures, and articles of faith revealed in them. Secondly, to prohibit, suppress, and extirpate, to their power, all *atheism*, blasphemy, heresy, idolatry, paganism, irreligion, false worships, religious errors, superstitions, sects, schisms, profanations,—crimes tending to God's dishonour, the prejudice and scandal of true religion, the endangering of their subjects' souls, or disturbance of the churches, as well as the kingdom's peace, by laws, edicts, and suitable punishments inflicted on all who are guilty."

These extracts are sufficient to show the early provision made by our kings, for the maintenance of religion in the state; and that the establishment of a *feud*, in connection therewith, when the diffusion of learning was not sufficiently general, to point out the importance of Christian obligations, was the only safe practical course left open to them:—thus, the feudal system, viewed in a scriptural sense, and divested of human abuses, which ever will be attached to human institutions, originated in a pure conception and chaste idea of the controlling influence of divine power. Our feudal system and its *remains*, in our civil institutions, whatever partial authors state, or however designing adventurers distort facts, may therefore be traced to the inconvenience of original national customs,—to the irregular state of warfare, which was unavoidable thereupon, and to the immediate agency of those sacred and even *political* principles, which God himself has ordained in the Scriptures, moulded into practical application, under a defined form. It was not the result of mere superstition, as hath been asserted, much less of ignorance, except ignorance of the refined theory of abstract rights,—nor was it tyrannous,

either in principle or practice, for the interests of all parties, from the prince to the peasant, were protected by its operation, under the Saxon laws. From this system first emerged the spiritual and temporal barons,—the ancient English *nobles;* the commoners, or the eldest born inheritors of *real estate,* as recognised by the constitutional law of England, also had its origin therein; and, lastly, the citizens and free burgesses. The spiritual barons in the ancient summons to Parliament were styled "*Ratione Specialis Dignitatis et tenuræ,*" in distinction from the *Abbots,* simply designated "*Ratione tenuræ.*"

This system at once demonstrates the importance of the solemn consecration of the kings of England, evidently designed by men who saw the necessity for establishing a perfectly defined principle, in the social machinery, as far as human ability was capable of rendering it secure, or applicable to the purposes of Christian government. It is only by entering into the spirit of this service, that the *mixta persona* of the kingly office can be properly understood, and its uses made manifest. Here at once is shown the *dominium rectum* and the *dominium utile,* creating it, under the investiture in the act of consecration, performed in the presence, and under the sanction of the *three estates;* and according to the judgment of the most eminent ancient lawyers, essentially necessary to the perfection of the civil contract. By this act, in the presence of the several estates, and the acknowledgment by them of "an *antecedent authority,*" says Lord Coke, "does the king alone become the *caput et finis et principium,* of the social system."

It has already been observed, that this system was not introduced by the Normans, although they enlarged upon it, adding other forms, called the *burthens of tenures,* &c. which, in process of years, introduced abuses, and rendered the

practice unpopular. The changes which time has produced in the practice, have not destroyed the principle, which still remains vested in the crown.

The peers of England, from the earliest ages of her political history, have always formed the highest judicial assembly in the realm, and the last resort in all cases of appeal; the decision, or vote of the *majority*, being *final*. As a body, they are especially responsible under the constitution, for the due preservation and advancement of the state religion, which, at once constitutes the foundation of the government itself, the security of the *monarchy*, and the authority for framing and executing the *law*. If the original principles of the constitution are to be taken as the basis of *reform*,—then let those who embark as leaders therein, make themselves thoroughly acquainted with those principles; and they will neither neglect their duty to God, nor sacrifice to bare purposes of temporary expediency, the best securities of the state, —nor hazard the permanent injury of its individual members, in their interests—their lives—their happiness, and their possessions!

The order contained in the celebrated Roman law of the twelve tables, and addressed to the senatorial, or patrician body in the state, is worthy the attention of British statesmen, at all times!

The king's Thanes, and the Thanes, having their *sac* and *soke*, were the lords of manors, and the freeholders or barons, holding their court barons under the Normans, were again eldest sons, and styled, as in the Saxon laws and Chronicles, *senatores majores natu*, the same as Eldestan Witan. In the Witanagemot, or national council, the lords of manors formed a special court, with the king as their head, and precisely in the form in which the Saxon *Llaford*, the Norman baron presided. The parish and the manor generally were co-extensive,

and the lords and freeholders gave the *waste* on which the church was built, to which they often added *glebe*, under the express authority of the king (the supreme head), as the endowment of the *advowson*, formed a separate part of the *dominium rectum*. Thus, under the Conquest, in every manor, the triple power united, and they ran through all the 1600 manors, and through all the courts of the kingdom united. Originally, according to Glanville, all those holding the *regalities*, or all lords of manors, came to parliament; but on the further division of the land, and as it became of more value, only the holders of the largest manors were summoned. This is fully corroborated in Rymer. The House of *Lords* has always constituted a body of *representatives* equally with that of the commons. The peers are trustees, in their legislative character, of the highest national interests, standing independently between the crown and the people. They are summoned *hereditarily* by the king "to represent and guard the royalties and hereditary privileges granted out by the crown to the numerous lords of manors, whose power exists virtually in the kingdom, although it is no longer exercised in parliament; to whom, in legal strictness, all the lands of the commons are granted, and through whom the allegiance to the sovereign was meant to be conveyed, and in whom the *dominium rectum* is still vested.

The members of the House of Lords are still, by descent, the chiefs of that estate of the realm, which from the earliest periods of the government, held the regalities of the crown; and it at once shows their antiquity, and the grounds of their authority for forming the supreme court of justice; they always presided individually in their own courts, and collectively formed the high court of judicature for the kingdom at large. The records of Parliament for 1200 years present no instance of the commons having, at any time, sat as a court

of judicature, excepting under the usurpation of Cromwell, who turned his back upon all law, and despised every precedent that did not suit his own purpose. If ever the commons should arrogate to itself the right of sitting as a *court of judicature*, the act would simultaneously destroy both the balance of power and the constitution, and by that single act establish the most decided despotism.

"So long," says Silver, "as the people of this nation shall have dignity and virtue to consider the preservation of the principles upon which the religion, the laws, and the customs of their country have been founded, of more importance than mere money matters; so long will the House of Peers be considered as important in rank, as it is in age. The commons, as an estate of the realm, are as old as the lords spiritual and temporal; but the House of Commons, as an estate of *Parliament*, is of much later date. The rise and progress of the commons demonstrate some important truths, not very favourable to the popular theories of the day. From a convention entered into between Stephen and Henry, subsequently king, it appears, that many of the cities, and all the *royal burghs*, were *in the king's demesne*, and consequently tenants at will. Their power in those ages did not embrace political rights, which were vested almost *exclusively* in the holders of real property, or spiritual corporations. Originally every lord of a manor held of the king, and came as a peer to Parliament; when circumstances rendered the meeting of an increasing body inconvenient, the more powerful only were summoned by the crown to represent *hereditarily* the rights of the remainder of that estate of the realm, in whom the *regalities* have remained vested, and to whom the *dominium rectum* of the commoners' lands still belong."

These, then, form the entire grounds from which the three estates of privileged orders derive their origin and their rights,

as vested in the crown, from the time of the Anglo-Saxon kings,—the necessity for their being perfectly understood by all those who are engaged in the onerous task of introducing new principles, falsely denominated *reforms*, into our social compact, is at once apparent to all who are not blinded through prejudice or ignorance. Many well intentioned persons err through an imperfect knowledge of the ancient laws and valuable designs of our forefathers, who paid due attention to first causes; but, it is incumbent on men who set up to be legislators, to acquire something more than a superficial insight into those matters which involve the interests of a whole people,—to avoid influences which are fostered by "the whisper of a faction," whose aim is *power*, rather than state security! Although some modern *Solons* have pronounced "history to be an old almanac and custom obsolete," the security of their own lives and possessions rests on the foundation of our old established customs. Law, religion, and practice, have fully recognised the investiture of civil rights and property in the person of the king, for the public benefit; and fully and sufficiently confirmed the contract, under the solemn ceremony of his consecration, not as a mere *fiction*, but a lasting covenant of that twofold nature, the validity of which, and its utility, amidst civil contention, was so fully proved by the retention of the balance of power, and simultaneous union of all parties, at the ever memorable Revolution of 1688!

In treating further upon this subject, Silver thus expresses himself:—"The rights vested in the crown are marked out, in a great measure, by the *titles* which the earliest law writers give to the king. He is not in *law* a part of either the estate of the Realm, or of Parliament, but is recognised as an antecedent pre-existent authority. He has a *prerogative*, or a pre-supposed power. This state maxim may be traced in the

patriarchal institutions of the *Cymri;* as the father of the nation, all their land was held of him. In the Saxon writings, he is called *Christis Gespelia,* or Messenger of Christ; in the Latin, the *Vicarius Christi;* in the law, the *Caput et Principium* of the different estates; and his public and private rights and property are mixed together and almost inseparable, and held exactly as the rights of any other freeholder; liable like them to forfeiture on misconduct, but as secure and immoveable where the duty is done."

"It is one of the chief causes of the strength and beauty of the constitution, that all the land is derived from him, as it originally was from one head of a family; and hence the public and private rights are so blended, that they can scarcely be separated; and this constitutes their security. For, whether the source of authority is supposed to be in the head of a family, or the chief of a conquering tribe, in either case, a superior and antecedent power is admitted, and the people claim no higher right than the recognition and adoption of it. In the ages of papal superstition an error prevailed, that the powers conveyed at the consecration gave such a right, as exempted the crown, and those holding power, from *responsibility.* But, in the *Bible,* the right established by *God,* is always made responsible: rights and duties are ordained as *correlative,* and the one springs and ceases with the other. Where the party is no longer responsible to God, who ceases to act, (as was the case in the beginning,) immediately in the affairs of man, the party of course becomes responsible to those who assert they hold authority from God; but the right of the office may be *inalienable* and *indefeasible,* although the person of the officer is responsible."

The beautiful idea that, in the British constitution, *the king never dies,* and which forms its leading principle, is here fully exemplified. It was this standing covenant that alone

justified William Prince of Orange (*ex necessitate rei,*) in the preliminary arrangement and final execution of all those ostensible public acts, which the British nation, by its Parliament of three estates, required at his hands, for the preservation of the state itself, in connexion with its constitutional monarchy. The principle is perfectly accordant with the spirit of the ancient Roman law, already quoted, and which justified all measures based on the preservation of the commonwealth. Now, the security of the state could not possibly have been assured nor maintained, without the perfect establishment of a well understood and sufficiently defined principle of permanent power, resting in the hands of the one, the few, and the many; and, therefore, it was on this footing alone, that the English constitution, with its limited form of monarchy, and Protestant succession to the throne, became finally settled by *Act of Parliament*[1], arising from the necessities of the people, and the *emergency* that called it into operation.

If an ancient precedent is required in sustenance of this Christian principle, then we proudly return to our Saxon ancestors. By the aid of Christian moderation, and not by force of arms, were the kingdoms of the *heptarchy* originally divided, and the laws preserved. The tenacity of all the

[1] "The paramount authority, or rather, the *salutary omnipotence* of the English constitution, never had a more glorious display, than on the accession of the illustrious house of Brunswick to the throne of Great Britain—a period pregnant with all the elements of a *civil war*—when the whole nation was divided into two opposite parties, whose animosity was raised to such a pitch, as to convert them into *factions*,—when an ancient *dynasty*, still existing, was to be finally proscribed in favour of a new one,—in short, when the *natural heir* to the late queen, by the right of his birth, supported by a strong party at home, and likely to be so by some foreign powers, was to be *excluded by the legal heir, supported only by an Act of Parliament*, all these symptoms of danger vanished—George was proclaimed *king;* and immediately all parties, rallying themselves around *the constitutional settlement of the crown*, concurred in acknowledging the *lawfulness* of his Majesty's claim to it."—BERTRAND DE MOLEVILLE.

Anglo-Saxon princes, in this respect, is worthy of notice. Thus we find *Ina* (A.D. 712) collecting and confirming the laws of his predecessors. *Offa* (A.D. 785) those of Ina; and, lastly, *Alfred* (A.D. 908) those of the whole heptarchy; and it is evident, from Alfred's elegant translation of the Latin works of *Bœthius*, into the Saxon tongue, that he not only possessed the inclination, but in a high degree the ability for conducting government on purely Christian principles. The Saxon Chronicle expressly states, that Offa was "consecrated king according to the ancient and established custom;" nor is it improbable that Alfred took the impression of the twofold nature of the kingly office from the practice of his predecessors; and that his emblems of official dignity resulted therefrom, as well as his titles. The laws of Edward the Confessor, as already stated, were a compilation of the entire laws of the Heptarchy, consequent upon the union of the whole, the constitutional principle still remaining unbroken and undiminished, in the hands of the supreme head, or chief magistrate in the state: and based on the *indefeasibility* of the Christian covenant. Hence Edward not only retained all the forms and customs which had been transmitted to him, but he consolidated them; and his retention of the titles "Christus Gespelia, et vicarius Christi," at once shows that he was impressed with the duty of perpetuating, as far as was in his power, the conjoint uses of the kingly office, the ascendency and authority of the Christian Church and government; and the due submission of the people to those patriarchal customs which the Divine Head of that Church had declared to be *immutable*, "until all things were fulfilled." If superstition be charged against these early Christian kings, it was the superstition of duty, of obedience, and submission, to the authority of *Him*, who decreed the preservation of the moral law!

The Apostles were explicitly commanded to commence their

ministry at Jerusalem,—"beginning at Jerusalem and Judea;" and until the great work is perfected, and the Jews themselves converted, the final forms which the Jewish Church, as the supreme head, will receive, can only be conjectural[1]. It should be remembered, that the descent of the Holy Spirit took place on the occasion of the great feast of *Pentecost*, showing at once the pleasure of the Almighty in the restoration of primeval customs. There, not only the people of Judea were assembled, but devout men from every state and kingdom upon earth: these could not make offerings on account of landed possessions in Judea, but of the countries they represented. Thus, the "first fruits" of the Christians were offered in token of submission to the temporal rule of Christ upon earth, as the Supreme Head, and under whose Gospel dispensation they were thenceforward to hold their lands, subject to the same principles as those which had guided the Jewish tenures, and the usages of their civil institutions.

As a specimen of the early effects of Christian rule in Britain, the decree of the memorable council of *Calcuith*, held A.D. 787, in the kingdom of Mercia, stands pre-eminent.—"OFFA, king of the East-Angles," &c. "That, in the *ordaining* of our kings, no one at any time permit the opinions of wicked persons to prevail, but, that our kings shall be *lawfully* chosen

[1] "On all occasions, when the final victory of the Church is anticipated in prophecy, the Church of *Jerusalem* is pointed out as the head of it; and that head is invariably and most clearly described as a *kingdom*,—as invested with *supreme power*,—as holding the *sceptre on earth*, and the authority of a *lawgiver*, —a power she never lost until the *Shiloh* came. This power she will, on her perfect conversion, regain. It is also clear, that other Churches will be like her. In the allegorical descriptions of prophecy, they are figured under the types of virgins; the Church of Jerusalem is the *bride*,—the bride is the *Church and State* of the Holy Land; and other Christian kingdoms are expressed as standing in the same typical relation to her, with respect to religion, as the virgin to the bride."—*Silver's Commenturies.*

by the priests and the chiefs of all Christian people, and not by any of those born in adultery," &c. "For, according to the canons, such cannot be appointed unto the *priesthood*, so neither can one not born in lawful wedlock become the *anointed of the Lord*, the king of the whole realm, and the *Heir of the Country*, according to the holy prophet,—'*Know ye that the* LORD OF LORDS *is in the kingdom of men, and his is the kingdom. He giveth it to whomsoever he will.*' WE therefore exhort all men generally, that with one voice and heart and hand they entreat the Lord, that He who appoints the king to his kingdom will give him also the right rule of his holy discipline to govern his people. Honour therefore is to be given to them by all, the Apostle commanding to '*Honour the King*,' therefore let the lawful inheritance be denied to illegal offspring." These laws, with the solitary exception of the consecration of William of Normandy, continued in full force to the time of Edward the First, A.D. 1308, who retained the title "*Vicarius Christi.*"

The coronation service of Edward the Second shows that the Christian principle, after the religious ceremonial of the Jews, became strengthened by the additional solemnity of the offering of *bread* and *wine*, in imitation of Melchizedec.

Thus has it been fairly shown, that the ordinances of God, antiquity, and long established custom, give their fullest support to a Church and State connection; it follows, that the *necessity* (and not the *expediency*) for their separation should be established on a conviction founded in moral truth, before the desertion of such a system can be fairly argued, much less justified. Now, the necessity for their union and preservation has been abundantly maintained by the Word of God, by immemorial custom, founded on the wants of man, and by moral reasoning. It remains for man, in the exercise of his

finite judgment, and by the actual circumstances of his present condition, to establish the superior claims of expediency over that necessity.

One of the most determined infidel writers of the present age, when arraigned before a Christian jury of his country for blasphemy, freely admitted, "that the rules laid down in the Gospels of Christ formed an unexceptionable basis for a code of *civil legislation*, if men would act up to them." The infamy of his writings is of itself a sufficient reason for omitting his name; but the fact stands recorded in the annals of British Christian justice.

In a professedly Christian community it will surely not be denied, that "every good and every perfect gift is of God," even of that Supreme Being, "by whom kings reign, and princes execute judgment." This admitted, whence is the origin of government? or, rather, to whom should a Christian people attribute the foundation and advantages of those laws and regulations, which are alike calculated to preserve their temporal and promote their eternal happiness? Can it be sustained by fair argument, that the moral conduct of mankind can be rendered more perfectly available for the extension or permanency of civil rights, by the irregular exercise of principles which are not based on the authority of the Sacred Writings, but which absolutely negative the interposition of eternal Providence in directing the counsels and controlling the affairs of his creatures? With the materialist, or modern philosopher, such a doctrine may be assumed; but, with the true patriot and rational Christian (Churchman or Dissenter) it is absolutely inadmissible, when even pagan Rome, in the exercise of her sober discretion and moral virtue recognised the authority of Jupiter in the direction of her state policy; and thus for many ages avoided the disastrous fate which befel

the degenerate Athenian race of *men*, who chose a republic and a government independent of divine agency, and which sank in infamy and ruin!

The history of the world fully demonstrates, that it would be utterly impossible for a large body or community of men to act together continuously, in harmonious compact, without establishing something in the shape of a covenant or contract, in the nature of an *oath*—at least in absence of the dread of a superior power. Neither can the natural ties between religion and human government be established on a firm basis without such oath, as the only means of cementing their union. It becomes also a matter of paramount consideration, that a perfect agreement should be made as to what will constitute a *legal oath*, in the strict sense of the word—acceptable to God and secure to man. This then is a point of the first necessity, considering that the civil power is a Divine Ordinance in all Christian states, and that any instrument would necessarily be considered useless that did not answer its end. Since all things made by Christ were also formed for the *glory of Christ*; and, "all things having been put under his feet," it follows, that the kingdom of Christ, *i. e.* the Gospel Dispensation, and the kingdom of idolatry and unbelief, which literally is the kingdom of this world (*unregenerate*) cannot properly be co-existent in one body, even in the outward form.

This spiritual kingdom existing in the world is called *the Kingdom of the Son*, because Christ, as the Mediator, received it from the Father, to order the government and administration of it, to the end of time. He is the Head Supreme and Saviour of his Church; he confers both grace and glory after his own good pleasure. "I appoint unto you a *kingdom*[1], as my

[1] The Redeemer could not in these words have meant the spiritual kingdom, independently of temporal power.

Father hath appointed unto me;" and the Apostle—"Know ye not, that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God;" therefore, is the temporal kingdom, of necessity, founded upon and subject to the spiritual, because a man cannot possibly be at one and the same time a citizen of *two cities* or states which observe contrary laws and distinct institutions; nor be at once obedient to two masters.

We are called upon in the nineteenth century to show how far we have improved in the principles of Christian duty (which involve morality), with the advantageous experience of ages, and the pious example of eminent Christian men, before our eyes. Alas! for human frailty, the comparison by no means redounds to our honour. On referring to the Anglo-Saxon laws of Britain, and to the ancient records of this Isle, we find, in the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries, fine examples of strictly Christian virtue: princes and rulers, fundamentally impressed with the solemn truths of *Revelation*, revising, remodelling, embodying, and confirming the work of their progenitors of the very first centuries of the Christian era, with a solemn gravity that no synod of divines could exceed in the present age, or republic of letters. This proves, that Christianity is the same in its *essence* in all ages. Accordingly, we find that Alfred, adopting both the Patriarchal and Christian obligations, embodied the *Ten Commandments* as the foundation of his laws. He concluded, and justly concluded, that Moses, when asserting "In the beginning God made the heaven and the earth," and the Apostle, when affirming that "all things were made by Christ which are in heaven and in earth, *visible* and *invisible*," had both exactly the same obligatory meaning, judging both from the *letter* and the *spirit* of those laws.

In his covenant with the Jews, Jehovah swore by himself. This forms the original precedent of a *sacred oath;* and it has

very properly been referred to the authority of the *second* commandment, to define the precise nature of this solemn obligation, and to justify its use: which, by expressly forbidding the worship of idolatrous images, and giving obedience to any but the only true God, also prohibits the power of *punishment* to any but the Holy One, which is fully implied by a *Christian oath*; for "what agreement hath the temple of God with idols?"—and again, "thou shalt not make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land, when they go after their gods, and do sacrifice unto them;"—"what communion hath light with darkness, or what concord hath Christ with Belial?"—and again, "*when the land shall be given unto your power, ye shall destroy their altars.*"

The very nature of this spiritual obligation points out its grave solemnity and importance. Purely moral obligation sinks in the scale of comparison into utter insignificance; therefore the Anglo-Saxon kings, in the exercise of a sound discretionary judgment, having "committed their work to God," selected the second commandment as the *basis of national law*. Let the works of Bracton, Fleta, and Bretton, or Reeves, be carefully consulted by every man who wishes to be somewhat more than superficially informed on the original construction of English law, connected with the Supreme Head in the State. As a *legal fiction*, the correctness of the principle here illustrated has been admitted to be essential to all good government and social security, by Locke, Rousseau, De Lolme, Bertrand de Moleville, and other eminent writers on civil legislation; but sufficient has been adduced in proof, that it is *coeval* with the introduction of Christianity into this country. The authority and sanction, therefore, for this form of oath no one will have the temerity to deny who believes in the Scriptures of *Truth*; and whilst the *Decalogue* stands unrepealed, and Christianity is not rejected, but retained as the

fundamental basis of our social system, it does not merely constitute a legal fiction, according to the doctrine of Paley, but it positively involves a holy and irrevocable compact, as long as religion and government remain united. By virtue of this oath, and the covenant it secured, has Gospel Christianity been established in this kingdom. It overthrew both Roman and Saxon idolatry, and converted their temples into the temples of the living God, and secured the first civil and ecclesiastical rights to its inhabitants. Thus, we find the church of St. Martin, in Canterbury, which had been a Roman temple, consecrated to the service of the Christian faith, and used by Ethelbert and his consort as such, under the charge of a primitive bishop.

The original term, on the accession of the Saxon kings, was *Feng to Rice*, or "took to the kingdom;" but when Christianity progressed, it set aside this presumptuous or fictitious hereditary right, founded on conquest only; and hence Offa, A.D. 785, deeply impressed with the solemn importance and obligations of the divine law, at an equally solemn assemblage of the bishops and servants of God—the "*senatores natu majores*," the elders and chiefs of the people—caused his eldest son, Egfurth, to be *behallowed* (which is the Saxon term used for the consecration of a *bishop*) as king of Mercia.—Consecration with oil is one of the most ancient and solemn ceremonies of the Jewish people, and existed in the time of Jacob[1]. "Then Samuel took a vial of oil, and poured it upon his head, and kissed him, and said, Is it not because the Lord hath ordained thee to be captain over his inheritance?" This expressly denotes the setting apart a person for a conjoint holy and temporal office. The solemnity of the Saxon prayers, the hymn invoking the gifts and graces of the Holy

[1] Gen xxviii. 18. Exodus xxix. 1, 2. 1 Samuel x. 1.

Spirit of God, and the solemn charge, imply a sacred authority, as well as the faith of the assenting parties. The Saxon form was expressly as follows:—"Stand and hold fast from henceforward the place of royal dignity, whereof thou art the lawful and undoubted heir, by succession from thy forefathers, being now delivered unto thee, by the authority of Almighty God, by the hands of us and all the bishops and servants of God." From hence may be deduced the implied authority to *teach all nations*, conveyed in this most impressive ceremony, on the part of men holding a divine commission; and it has been strictly preserved and strengthened to this period, as may be seen by reference to the coronation services for George III., George IV., and his present Majesty.

As it is of importance to deduce that the first impulses of our national prosperity commenced with a full acknowledgment of the moral power and genial influences of the Christian religion, emanating from the head of the State; so it is essential to be enabled to establish, without fear of contradiction, that the same became the mainspring of an independent rule of government, progressively adding to the national wealth and general happiness of the people, in due proportion to its observance. The original principle of government established by the Anglo-Saxon kings and people, it has been proved, lost nothing by the Norman conquest; for William balanced his right by that conquest, under God's permission, against his *illegitimacy*, and, as a baptized Christian, becoming a consecrated king, and confirming the previous coronation laws, consolidated them, and thus rendered it imperative on his *successors* to continue their preservation. His resistance to the temporal authority of Pope Gregory the Seventh, and his reply to that potentate, that he "held the tenure of his crown by God's favour," and his peremptory refusal to perform *fealty* for it to the haughty monarch, are conclusive evidence that

he did not intend his own individual case should operate as a *precedent* to alter either the letter of the law, or the spirit of the holy coronation service. The addition of the words "*Confirmetur*" and of "*Britannia*" to that service, are sufficiently in point on this question.

It is perfectly true, that the government of the Conqueror was of a more absolute character than even that of his predecessors, because *representation*, which was only at first an emanation from the feudal system, so fully adopted by him, had not come into practice, but was the result of state necessities, engrafted on the original principle of the Constitution in after times. Here then is fully exposed the popular error of "returning to the original principles of the Constitution," so loudly trumpeted forth by many flaming modern patriots, who do little more by such spoutings than display their own utter ignorance of the ancient institutions of their native land, thereby showing themselves to be presumptuous croakers indeed, far exceeding those of the *Æsopian fable*, who, it is presumed, were without the advantages of history for the correction of their judgment and the improvement of their understandings!

The *original* principle of the English Constitution involved the adequate protection of ecclesiastical and civil rights in the person of the *King*; and this principle lost nothing of its power or of its legality by the change of forms introduced into the practice of religious worship at the Reformation.—The Protestant bishops, under the retention of their authority and privileges, as spiritual barons, were required, as part of their office, to impose the same solemn obligations on the sovereign, and on behalf of "the Christian people," as had been the custom with the earliest bishops, and their successors of the purely Roman Catholic faith. This, therefore, it must be fully manifest, is the most anciently acknowledged privilege

of the English Constitution. The bishops, as the spiritual barons, can alone, by their aid and authority, render the oath of the sovereign legally valid, or the covenant sacred, as must appear when the *foundation* of that oath is considered and understood. Neither can the *investiture of civil rights in the king*, conveyed for the protective security of the people themselves, become permanent, or safely repose on any other footing. The sanctity of the Christian oath is paramount to every other consideration, in a trust of such great importance, primarily considered; and in a secondary point of view, as forming the precedent and basis of security in all judicial proceedings, and matters of evidence, affecting the life or property of individuals, it is of equal moment, that the king, and the judges who represent the king, should act under its influence on all occasions.

It is submitted, that the importance to the people themselves, even in a civil point of view, of the spiritual barons retaining their full privileges, has been fully elucidated; but it may not be amiss here, as this forms one of the topics of dispute in the present day, to give the recorded opinion of a British king[1], delivered in full Parliament, when applied to for the purpose of dispensing with the temporal assistance of the bishops:—"I have no earthly power to take away that authority in Parliament, which they have so anciently and fully enjoyed, under so many, my ancestors, even before the Conquest, and ever since; that I feel I am bound to maintain it, as one of the fundamental institutions of this Christian kingdom."

It is on this foundation that the privileged orders rest their security; and, as the late learned Anglo-Saxon Professor in the University of Oxford has so aptly observed, "Although

[1] Charles the First to the Parliament.—Vide Parl. Hist.

the offices are liable to forfeiture by neglect, the Constitution provides the means of reviving them. There is the despotism of the one, and the despotism of the many; and although apparently opposite and different, yet they move in the same circle, generating each other. To these the *privileged orders* present an immovable barrier; and, if they are not removed, they will always perform their duty, in rescuing the people from the danger that will surround them, should they ever act upon the maxim, that all power springs from themselves."

It follows, that a correct, if not a comprehensive, knowledge of the true principles of our constitutional form of government, on which all our rational hopes of peace and prosperity are built, not only with reference to our domestic repose, but our international policy, is at all times valuable, but especially so at this crisis of public events. This knowledge is of the really useful kind, and eminently necessary for the preservation of the State. It is of all others most calculated to save it from the consequences which rash measures of change, or violent innovation, rather than of *reforms*, consistent with its security, would lead to. Napoleon is no more; and every day's experience in the progress of public events, tends to remove the prejudices against his memory; when, to use his own words in his captivity, "the fever of prejudice should give way to the impartial pen of history, and do him justice." At least we may fairly attribute to him the faculty of keen discernment, who, "although he could profit of treasons, yet despised traitors." "How depraved," said he to M. D'Anjeais, "must be the moral principle of every government that seeks its first support in the speculative follies or vices of the people!" Napoleon, no mean judge of men and things,—the same who denounced *Necker* as "the first moral assassin of his country's liberty, and the sole cause of all the misery, irreligion, and

bloodshed of the former French revolution[1]." These are the recorded opinions of one whose latter policy we justly opposed, because it tended to the destruction of our independence as a nation; but they convey the sentiments of him who once spoke the fate of kings, and decided the lot of empire, and whose ambition was his greatest weakness.

Every well informed Christian knows, that the promises made by the Almighty to Noah formed the first basis of *legitimate* government, as well as the institutions of justice which were founded upon those promises. In this order of public justice, as hath been so truly remarked by an able commentator, "it is not the injury which is done to man, as in the case of *murder*, but the *sin* against *God*, which is considered and punished with *death*, as an injury done to God himself. It is the sin, and not the crime; for the death was commanded on account of the destruction of a creature made in the image of God, and the consequent injury to the Creator by the loss of one so nearly allied to him." Now, in such case, the punishment of death could not possibly be regular by a purely human tribunal, which could not legally exercise the judgment of life and death, without an authority; and by way of illustrating the injustice of human laws, in this particular instance of murder, a *money fine* was afterwards substituted in heathen countries, in direct opposition to the Word of God; for "none can redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him," Psalm xlix. 7. "Vengeance is mine, saith the Lord, I will repay." Vengeance, therefore, the most inevitable and bitter, would necessarily await those who knowingly usurped the prerogative of the Most High in this respect, even of Him to whom "*all power is given in heaven and in earth*," Matt.

[1] Vide De Bourrienne.

xxviii. 18. Therefore, no man can make satisfaction for another, in respect of an injury done to a third person, unless by the express permission of the person to whom the injury is done. The power of the life and final pardon is with God alone, even in the case of murder; the authority, therefore, for the human punishment, can only be legally obtained from God, especially in all Christian states. This security is absolutely necessary for the prevention of barbarous punishments, which are entirely incompatible with Christianity—the example, and not the extent of punishment itself, or suffering, being required to sustain the ends of Divine Justice. The first inroad on the civil rights of mankind was made by idolatrous and barbarous kings, in the desertion of this principle; and it led to the establishment of a most unprincipled and unjust distinction, by which the strong had ever the advantage over the weak, until the Christian dispensation restored the patriarchal law, and invested the power of punishment, by the establishment of Christian justice, upon the original foundation—in the person of the chief magistrate.

It is only needful to turn to the pages of the Holy Scriptures for evidence of the fact, that from the creation of the world, or, what is more strictly definite, *the beginning of time*, the parental and priestly powers were blended with those of the civil magistrate, although they were exercised by different persons. Thus, all who held the power of judgment in cases of life and death were required, by express command, to acknowledge the doctrine of the *Atonement*, under the Levitical Law, by keeping the solemn feast of the Passover; and under the Christian Covenant, receiving the holy *Communion*—the latter, by the direct authority of that humane Lawgiver, who thus remodelled and re-established the institutions of his native land. "This do ye in remembrance of me,"—a service

required to be strictly observed by all our Christian judges, and without which their judgment of life and death would not be legally valid.

When the Redeemer had perfected all the objects of his earthly mission, and in the *fulness of time* it became needful that the new Covenant should be sealed with his blood, he gave, on the cross, the fullest evidence of his divine authority, in the pardon of the dying thief—"to-day shalt thou be with me in paradise;"—and at the *instant* he expired, or, as it is more emphatically expressed, "gave up the ghost," the Jewish covenant finally ceased, the veil of the temple, in token thereof, being *rent in twain;* and even the authority for their original computation of time appeared to cease, by the darkness which overspread the earth from the sixth to the ninth hour; and their *legal* judgment of life and death closed with their independence as a people.

It is then fairly illustrated, that the British Constitution, in its original form, is based on the Christian Covenant. In the consecration of the kings of England, the Communion Service forms an indispensable part of the ceremony, and previously to the recent most unprecedented State changes, every public officer was expected to observe it; but at the coronation service, all the estates being present, they do virtually join in and sanction the act of the sovereign, whose first duty it is to make this confession; nor does the investiture of civil rights take place, until the king has most solemnly sworn to maintain the Christian form of government inviolate.

The investiture binds the king to the perpetuation of his covenant with the Church, which he is bound to protect, as well as to observe the trusts under the lay investiture for the tenure of *lands*, and preservation of the rights of freehold property. From the investiture, the term "*vested rights*"

derived its origin; and they are thus transmitted from the supreme head to all bodies corporate and bodies politic in the State. Every part of this imposing service has an express meaning connected with its insignia, regalia, symbols, and legal forms, establishing the connexion of the Christian faith, which alone gives the legal power. Blackstone, in his Commentaries, sufficiently defines the relative situation of the three great estates of the realm, as being present in the person of the King,—the Lords Spiritual, the Lords Temporal,—and the Commons, in latter ages representing the entire body of the people, under the *Writ of Summons*. The records of Parliament for twelve hundred years fully establish that the Constitution has arisen from this admission of privileged orders, and, that it is not the entire or undivided mass of the people which recognised these rights.

These views of religion, connected with civil government, are unexceptionable with all those who have at heart the real welfare of the State, and the general good of mankind; for true Christianity has nothing of tyranny in its composition, and wherever it has been fully established, Liberty has succeeded the reign of Despotism. In the words of an elegant author, "they are founded on the mutual engagement, contracted in the sight of God, by the king, the priesthood, and the people, together with the powers given and received by all the assenting parties: exhibiting in reality an instance of a religious and political compact, which modern writers have thought necessary to constitute a legal and perfect government. In this contract *Religion* points out both the rights and duties of the several contracting parties, and fills up a vast and dangerous chasm in *politics*, which all the intelligence of those who have founded rising kingdoms has never yet supplied without it." These are sentiments which redound to the honour of Christianity, and they show the value of sound philosophic reasoning, aided

by pious feeling and historical research, when compared with that crabbed and intractable sophistry, which aims at the perversion of all reason and all truth, even the blinding of our understanding, in matters of plain sense, to favour the speculative follies of the day. "*Ciencia es locura si buen senso nola cura,*" says the Spanish moralist!

CHAPTER VI.

THE CHRISTIAN COVENANT, THE BASIS OF THE SETTLED CONSTITUTION OF GREAT BRITAIN, AS CONFIRMED BY THE NORMAN CONQUEST, UNDER THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE MONARCHY.

" It is the ornament, and as if the soul of history, that the relation of events is illustrated by an exposition of the causes which produced them."—BACON.

THE various authors and ancient *data*, which have already been cited, sufficiently establish, that the government of England from the earliest period of its political history, has been a Christian monarchy; but that does not convey by implication, much less in words, the impression of an *absolute sovereignty*, existing by pure prescription in the crown, although it partakes of the *prescriptive forms* and prerogatives [1], necessary for the exercise of kingly rule, because, even under

[1] In the exercise of constitutional law, the king is absolute, because he is the trustee of that law, and has to fulfil its executive duties and powers. *Junius*, the liberal writer, says,—" In the execution of those prerogatives which the *law has given him*, the *king* is irresistible and absolute, *according to the forms of the constitution.*"—So again Lord Coke, " The highest prerogative of the crown is the right *vested in the chief magistrate*, for the choice of his responsible ministers."—See also Blackstone on the prerogatives of the crown.

the Norman feudal system, there existed a right of representation in the *Barons*, as there had previously done with the Saxons, in the *senatores natu majores*, or the eldest born inheritors of real estate; and the ancient consecration service fully bound the king to the maintenance of the privileged classes in the state, as it does at present; and gave them the needful security for their religion, laws, and independence: still, as the constitution had not yet fully expanded itself, and as the great body of the people were poor and uncultivated, some of the sovereigns of those times exercised an assumption of authority, which, in succeeding ages, became progressively more and more limited; yet, at the very height of the feudal system, they were amenable to the privileged orders, whenever those bodies thought fit to act in defence of the liberties of the people, and to perform their duty to the state independently; neither could the king legally perform any *public act*, without previous deliberation in council with his barons, whose voices, in majority, were needful for its confirmation, as was exemplified by the solemn proceedings of the baronial parliament, held at Lincoln, A.D. 1301, on the occasion of Edward the First claiming the crown of Scotland.

That ancient law authority, Fortesque, also fully settled this question, by telling the young prince, who had in design the assumption of an absolute or arbitrary rule, that "by the law and the *constitution of England*, such an act would place the tenure of his crown in jeopardy,"—this soon brought the youthful sovereign to his senses, and gave a splendid specimen of the value, as well as the early importance of the privileged orders, at a period when the commons had attained to no authority in the state, and were not even acknowledged as an *estate of parliament!* Having commenced with the period of the Conqueror, it is not a matter of difficulty to

show, that the monarchy of England became established by right of conquest, and the consequent usages of baronial law; and that the whole of our representative system emerged therefrom, all corporate rights and franchises proceeding from the first charter granted by William of Normandy to the citizens of London, and that they centered in the *crown*, i. e. the monarchy by prescriptive usage, to the time of King John; and from his act emanated the consolidated representative monarchy we at present possess, William the Third having restored all the ancient charters and borough privileges. The existence of the constitution is dependent, with its three estates, on this principle of monarchy, which Sir Dudley Digges, in the House of Commons, two centuries back, declared "had, by its antiquity, *de jure*, and by the exercise of *kingly prerogative* and authority, commensurate with antiquity, ever been sustained *de facto*." It is also on this principle, that the peers of parliament have, in latter times, stedfastly defended the kingly prerogative, and supported its free exercise, as that of the combined powers of the constitution, vested in the crown. The majority of the lords, by such proceeding, have shown a correct sense of honour, station, and duty—under their oaths, they stand *pledged* to defend the integrity of that monarchy, which is the result of a Christian compact, inseparable from the stability of the throne itself, as it is needful for the preservation of their own hereditary estate, and the just rights and liberties of all classes of the English people, conceded to them by *Magna Carta!*

More than forty years ago, were these views manfully sustained by Edmund Burke, the "ancient Whig," and, in the denouncing words of the French Convention, "the *Orestes* of the British Parliament," in his opposition to Charles James Fox and Mr. now Lord Grey, in his place in

the House of Commons, and in his writings; and the history of the constitution proves, that the old conservative Whig party in this country, as long as it stood upon *pure principle*, strenuously supported the constitutional prerogatives of the crown, so fully shown in the last public acts of a worthy departed peer[1], on the reform question.

The term *monarchy* is expressive, without enigmatical construction of a government by certain powers, defined or not, according to the practice and customs of different states and kingdoms. The constitutional character of the British monarchy is dependent on its long prescriptive usages; but there are derivative benefits therein, which could not possibly exist without them.

From the feudal system arose franchises, privileges, and emoluments, of a permanent and settled character, and amongst them long established customs of a local and personal nature to the possessors; such as fines of alienation, heriots upon death, and quit-rents. These are only *legally* redeemable by purchase or composition, and enfranchisement upon pecuniary or other adequate consideration. It has been admitted, that all *vested interests*, by the common law of England, by ancient usage and immemorial custom, are acknowledged objects of protection; and, as such, under that law, emanating from the king, in the investiture, as the head of the state, and his coronation oath cannot be abrogated or annulled, without breach of national covenant, to meet any other principle.

Representation, therefore, is of feudal origin, and the source of all corporate rights and borough franchises, from William the Conqueror downwards, who, by his first charter to the citizens and merchants of London, acknowledged and guar-

[1] The late Earl of Carnarvon.

anteed these rights, always centered in the crown, which is substantiated by *Magna Carta.*

" *Omnes autem istas consuetudines et libertates,* quas Rex concessit, *regno tenendas quantum ad se pertinet, erga suos; omnes de regno, tam clerici, quam laici, observabunt, quantum ad se pertinet, erga suos*[1]."

This is the language of the *seventy-second* article of *Magna Carta;* but the *fourteenth* is, if possible, still more conclusive on the question of representative rights. It is the relative and combined powers constituting the English monarchy, united with the rights and liberties of the *distinct estates* of the people, which are to be considered. Upon this basis rests Montesquieu's view of the intrinsic value and moral efficiency of our monarchical form of government,—views, which all the eminent legal authorities of this country have sustained, in their speeches and their works, including the names of Lyttleton, Coke, Bacon, Somers, Clarendon, Dunning[2], Hardwicke, Mansfield, Erskine, and *Eldon;* whose judgment, founded on personal observation, deep reading, and unwearied research, as well as long and intimate acquaintance with the principles and practice of the constitutional law of England, at various important periods of her history, cannot be impeached.

We can hardly avoid being admirers of ancient institutions, when we have evidence of their stability, wisdom, and value, in the recorded page of history. To remove, *step by step,* the solid benefits of a well-tried system, is just as irrational as to root up a goodly tree, because there happens to be a canker in some few of the branches; neither are we rashly to destroy, but to replace. Thus, the established opinions of illustrious crown lawyers and statesmen, delivered in full Parliament, at

[1] Duchy of Lancaster copy, reciting, &c.

[2] Lord Ashburton.

different periods, and on most important occasions, admitted and received by them, are good and sufficient authority for our purpose; as they are illustrative of the original structure, and fair composition of the English monarchy and its appendages,—far superior to the views of modern theorists, whose chief aim is that of attracting notoriety, *(ad captandum vulgus)* by the promulgation of opinions, which are unsustained by either the authority of law, custom, or learning.

By right of Conquest, William the Norman introduced, in lieu of the Saxon, the feudal baronial law, as it existed in Normandy, and such law became the foundation of the religious and political system of government, as well as civil jurisprudence established in this country. He restored the classic name of Britain, or Britannia, to this island, which the Saxons had abolished, and which first appeared in his coronation service. The various kingdoms of Europe, at that remote period, were divided into baronies, or *fiefs*, which were also subdivided into *mesne fees*, or *arrier fiefs*. The barons who remained faithful to William of Normandy, after the death of his father, and who accompanied him to England, knew no other form or rule of civil or Christian government. The king became supreme lord of all the landed property and manors, and all who enjoyed the revenue or fruits of any part of them, held them either *mediately* or immediately of the crown—the lands themselves were considered only as *benefices*, and the vassal in return owed stated services to his baron, as did the barons for their lands to the king.

The condition and constitution of the baronial courts, were similar to those of the king in the great council of the state, who always presided therein, and which, for the first time, and not before, assumed regularity and the name of *parliament*, in the reign of Henry the Third, who revised and confirmed the laws of his predecessors.

The archbishops, bishops, abbots, and barons, formed the constituent members of the national council, in conformity with the feudal law, or as having possessed that privilege throughout the whole Saxon Heptarchy, and by the right of *baronage*, as holding of the king in *capite*, by military service for the crown [1].

The commons of England formed no part of the great and ruling council of the nation, until several ages after the king held the rule of monarchy by right of conquest, aided only by his ecclesiastical and lay barons, and the immediate *tenants* of the crown alone, composed the supreme legislative assembly of the land; and their tenure was that of immediate dependence on the sovereign, the lands being represented by the baron, who, by the fictions of feudal law, was presumed to possess the right of property therein, by his tenure, suit, and service.

The fourteenth article of the great charter of English liberty, which was *conceded* to the firmness and patriotism of the military and civil barons, sufficiently establishes the correctness of these views of the origin of British representation, and popular influence in the councils of the government,—therefore, the power of creating such popular representation did not rest in, nor with the *people;* and, had they assumed such a power, the principle itself would have been an act of usurpation, for, if even they had ever possessed it, (which history shows they did not) even in the Saxon ages, it be-

[1] Thirty bishops sat in the House of Lords, not purely as the members of a religious body, but as *lay barons*, from the time of the Conquest. From Ethelbert, in the year of our Lord 605, till the death of Edward the Confessor, in 1066, they always sat in the national councils, under their authority, "ratione officii et spiritualis dignitatis et tenuræ,"—in regard of their apostolic or episcopal *precedency*. Vide HEYLIN, "*De jure Puritatis Episcoporum.*" Edit. 1681. p. 158.

came lost to them by right of conquest, and was only legally recoverable against tyranny, by an *universal consent* and appeal to arms, had King John refused to guarantee to the privileged orders in the state, the full permansion of those ecclesiastical securities and civil liberties, which his predecessors the sovereigns of England, under the Heptarchy, and after the conquest, had sworn to maintain and to perpetuate.

The admitted principle of right of conquest, and the confirmation of *established law* in the land, gave to the barons, as the first privileged class in the state, an authority based on the security of their lives and possessions; thus, when they found John inclined to infringe on those safeguards, which even the conquest itself had secured to the estates of the people, they resolved that their liberties and securities should be finally defined and guaranteed by a *charter;* and they thereby rendered an appeal to *arms* unnecessary, affording a splendid specimen of the inherent force and intrinsic value of the privileged body in the history of the British monarchy. Thus, after reciting the various religious covenants, tenures, laws, and feudal franchises, existing between king and people, of ancient establishment in this realm, the seventy-second clause of the *original charter* concludes,—"All the aforesaid customs, and liberties (or franchises), which *we* have *conceded*[1], are to be retained in our kingdom, so far as belongs to us, towards *ours* (or our descendants), all men of our kingdom, clergy as well as laity, and shall be observed by them, so far as belongs to themselves, towards theirs[2]."

Had it not been for the wisdom, firmness, and moderation of the privileged classes, this charter would never have been obtained, which so fully defines and establishes the land-marks

[1] "*Quas rex concessit.*"—Vide Blackstone's Commentaries.

[2] Vide copy *British Museum*, also Thomson's "Historical Essay on Magna Charta," &c. &c. 1829.

between the sovereign rule, as the first instrument of the law and the rights, liberties, and securities, of the entire people. Indeed, it may with truth be said, that no monarchy, ancient or modern, ever produced a document combining greater morality of principle and utility of design, than this single charter possesses.—The *Code Napoleon* presented within itself many beauties, and fundamental safeguards, which amply pourtrayed the touches of a master mind, and the anxious desire to avoid in the *legislative power* that risk of unsafe controul over the *executive*, which the learned Montesquieu deemed the only vulnerable part of our free constitution; but the latter was an entire code of laws, and adapted to restrain the restless licentiousness of an ardent people, recently emerged from the mire and tumultuary rule of one of the most immoral and barbarously conducted revolutions, that blacken the pages of ancient or modern history,—whereas the former was conceded as the foundation of *law* and *liberty*, to a people jealous of their just privileges, but who had made up their minds to be governed by civilized Christian rule, and that only!

The commoners of England, in the first ages of the constitution, as before shown, were those only who held manors, or *Thaneships*, under the king, because the government was not then supported by general taxation on land, or other property. The expenses of the king's court were alone maintained by the produce of his demesne lands and feudal tenures. It was not till population became more extended, and taxation on a more general principle was rendered needful, for supplying the wants of the state and the support of foreign wars, that the *citizens* and *burgesses* obtained the privilege of representation for themselves. From the privileges that the municipal bodies and corporations for many ages had sworn to maintain, the rights of *freemen* took their rise, and they were solely indebted to the privileged classes for their advancement in

civil liberty. Until the first sovereigns entered into a special covenant with the privileged classes, as the three estates, there was neither settled order, law, nor established custom in the land, for the security of either life or property. It must therefore be manifest to every unprejudiced reader, that the entire *liberal* part of the constitution consisted, in the first place, of privilege,—from privilege arose property, and from property population, and its more general diffusion. To return, therefore, to the *first principles* of the constitution is strictly to return to the *source* from whence those privileges arose, a point apparently totally misunderstood by the mass of modern politicians who clamour for reforms!

Liberty in an individual is the empire of sound reason, directing its possessor in the path of social duty; but in a state, liberty is the empire of the *laws*,—that principle so strikingly maintained by Cicero, already quoted in chapter the second, page 43 :—neither is it the mere theoretical institution of the estates of parliament, as privileged classes, which presents the great bulwark of English liberty, and the counterpoise of despotism, but the diffusion of their moral influence and authority amongst all classes of the people, aided by the independence which the corporate bodies originally derived from the crown. This led to the appointment of civil offices, the trial by Jury, the right of petition, the *habeas corpus act*, &c. Junius, the most liberal writer on the principles of the English constitution, went no further.

The history of the English monarchy amply proves, that it was the authority maintained by the privileged bodies, which alone repelled foreign invasions, and kept in subjection the power of the crown; at one time standing between arbitrary rule and popular freedom, at another restraining the encroachments of that freedom on sovereign rule. A more striking instance of the truth of this position cannot be adduced, than that already given by the grant of *Magna Carta*,

which the English barons obtained from King John at Runnymede,—those privileged men, who assembled in a manner worthy of the occasion, and who in a voice of thunder proclaimed, they "would not have the laws of England changed, nor the civil rights of Englishmen infringed." This charter, and its provisions, *Magna est vis vetustatis et consuetudinis*, was not obtained by what is improperly termed *the power of the people*; but by their *recognition* of an antecedent authority, founded upon the original Christian contract between king and people.

In progress of time the three estates became more fully established, and their powers developed themselves, the constitution gradually and almost imperceptibly adapting itself to the wants of the state. The animated picture, drawn by Lord Bacon, of the condition of government and people in the reign of Elizabeth, powerfully illustrates the great moral advantage of cherishing a state religion, by which king and subject become identified in one common bond of interest, mutually protecting and protected!

The legitimate rights of mankind are ever sacred possessions, and if any infringement on these rights takes place, by any public usurpation, or act of tyranny, or mischievous tendency (legislative or otherwise), the objection thereto should be fatal, even if no *charter* existed; but the charters of John and Henry the Third, and the Bill of Rights, have so anciently established the just foundations of Christian as well as constitutional liberty, its property and effects, that no misconception of their essential qualities can well arise with sensible minds: and when these rights are affirmed and secured by *defined* covenants, laws, and provisions, against the exercise of undue power and authority by one body in the state, to the prejudice of the other, under written and positive engagements, their value is proportionately enhanced. Thus they partake not only of the full sanctity of the objects they secure, but they involve the sacred honour of *public faith*,

for their due observance and protection, in a corresponding ratio. The proper distinction between *right* and *power* is lost in a state, when these principles are deserted.

Magna Carta was renewed and confirmed by Henry the Third at Oxford, A.D. 1222, who summoned what about that period, for the first time, was denominated "*a Parliament*,"—an appellation of French origin, in contradistinction to *Synods*, which had reference solely to affairs of the Church. Such State Councils in those ages were also the *King's Councils*, for there was no separate Privy Council, the king having been looked upon as *supreme trustee*; and such was the capricious or optional power exercised therein occasionally, that the laws of those days seemed practically to require the confirmation of each successive monarch to secure their validity and permanence. Thus we frequently find the words "*probatum est*," "*confirmetur*," &c, appended to ancient charters and ordinances; and one historian expressly states, that "*Magna Carta* was confirmed no less than thirty-two times!" In return for its renewal, the Parliament of Henry the Third granted (as a *quid pro quo*) an Aid, amounting to a *fifteenth* of all moveables; and in the writs issued to enjoin the observance of this very renewal, the remarkable clause was inserted, that those "*who did not pay the fifteenth* should not be entitled for the future to the benefit of those liberties, franchises, and free customs."

The first precedent of an English Parliament after the Conquest was taken from Charlemagne: the Supreme Council of the ancient French kings was of that nature. "*Le Parlement de Charlemagne fut une assemblée des grands du royaume, soit ecclésiastiques, soit militaires, pour juger quelque affaire considérable.*" Thus, according to L'Abbé Velly, "*Charlemagne tint trois Parlemens dans la méme année.*" This shows at a glance the constitution of our first Parliaments under the

Norman dynasty, the entire principle of which was preserved and put in practice by Edward the First. If we look into the history of Scotland, A.D. 1286, we are informed, "at that period Alexander, the third Scottish king, died by a fall from his horse, without leaving any descendant except his granddaughter Margaret, born of Eric, king of Norway, by Margaret, Alexander's daughter, who, through her grandfather's care, had been recognised the lawful *heir* of the kingdom by the *States*, and was accordingly acknowledged queen of Scotland. Edward the First of England, considering this the most favorable opportunity (during the minority of the princess) to unite the whole island into one *Monarchy*, by the marriage of Margaret with his eldest son, proposed it to the States of Scotland, who readily assented to it. But this project, so happily concerted, failed of success, through her death; and the succession to the *throne* became matter of dispute amongst many powerful pretenders." After various conflicts it ended in the *entire conquest*, by Edward, of the Scottish Government and Monarchy, which, centering in him, he brought from the ancient kingly palace at Scone the celebrated patriarchal stone now appended to his chair, used in the coronation of our kings at Westminster. But the most remarkable event of the latter period (1301), was the extraordinary claim exerted by Pope Boniface to the sovereignty over Scotland, in his remarkable letter to Edward, "exhorting him to put a stop to his oppressions in Scotland," asserting himself to be "its liege lord,"—a claim which he further asserted to be "full, entire, and derived from the remotest antiquity;" and the still more remarkable reply of Edward to the Pope's pretensions, by a *roll* or *deed of Parliament*, signed by the king and his barons, one hundred and fourteen in number, who with him concurred in disputing the title of the sovereign pontiff. This singular document commences with a most

solemn appeal to the Almighty, "the searcher of all hearts," for his own full persuasion of the justice of Edward's claims to the right of *sovereignty* over Scotland, evinced by *historical facts*, deduced from the period of *Brutus the Trogan*, who, he therein asserts, "founded the whole British monarchy, in the age of Eli and Samuel," &c. &c. When it is considered that this proceeding was a solemn deliberative act of Parliament, and that one hundred and fourteen barons, assembled at Lincoln, unanimously affixed their *hands* and *seals*, in support of the validity of the king's pretensions, in those very remarkable terms, and that the Pope did not further dispute them, it affords a choice specimen of the proud independence of the ancient English nobility, as well as being a valuable state relic, with regard to the original construction of an English Parliament, and the mode of its proceedings.

The transactions of the British kings of the Conquest abundantly display the perpetuation of the Christian Covenant. The *Charters*, as well as the *Statutes of Mortmain*, enacted by Edward the First, fully guaranteed to the ecclesiastical body in the State, the integrity of its possessions and privileges; neither can any valid distinction be made between an unjust invasion of the rights of the laity, and an unfair infringement of the rights of the clergy. One of these unrepealed statutes expressly provided against the increase of spiritual corporations or *revenues*, thereby fully acknowledging *pre-existing* possessions, and guaranteeing them. It will therefore be matter of great difficulty to define in what the *surplus revenues* of the Church of England are said to consist in the present day, and to show by what *precedent* the *State* can legally or equitably claim or apply that declared surplus, in opposition to the sacred obligations and principles which the sovereigns of these realms have so long observed, and the estates required at their hands.

The privileges of the ecclesiastical bodies are indeed sacred possessions, and stand far above the level of the chartered rights of the *laity*. The Church alone possesses the inherent right of reforming *itself*, or giving its *assent* to such alterations in its internal government as the wants of mankind require; for it has been rendered independent of the State, and can only *tax itself*. Any proceeding in opposition to this course, would be an act of usurpation and of violence, unsustained by any legal or constitutional authority. When a contemporary peer addressed Lord Bacon on the question of Church Reform, his reply was, "My Lord, the subject we talk of involves the *Eye* of England. It is the light of the whole body politic—we have no *right* to extinguish it."

Those great public instruments have fully, and without reserve or qualification, established a principle, acknowledged by the sovereign power in the State at first, and subsequently recognised by public faith, the cementing bond of every national contract; and although "*Might* may be made the Lord of *Imbecility*," for the purpose,—to annul or invalidate that principle would be nothing more nor less than to destroy the outward supremacy of the Christian Church, which is her pre-eminent right,—to remove from its centre the key-stone of the political arch which sustains the Constitution of England,—to give the ascendency to *infidelity*: and by such act of violence, or usurpation of authority, have a direct tendency, but not a legitimate power, to unfetter the conscience of the monarch in an affair of the first magnitude connected with the sacred obligations imposed, and the civil trusts reposed in him by the solemn act of consecration, were he to permit it. It behoves us to reflect seriously—to pause, before we give way to that spirit of unreasonable irreligious innovation, which, consulting the temporal and temporary interests of mankind alone, would tamper with tried securities which had their

origin in a Christian foundation, as they have their end in the general welfare of the people in time, and their safety in eternity!

The approaches to tyranny in a state, once rendered free and enlightened by good laws, must necessarily be circuitous; but they may nevertheless be equally certain. In proportion to the strength of the citadel, and the judgment displayed in its construction, as a means of protection and defence, will the energies and assaults of the enemy be varied, crafty, and unremitting. It becomes the duty of those "who keep the watch-tower" well and truly to perform their task, that the expectations of the liberal reforming public may be tempered by discretion, and its inconsiderate acts controlled by Christian feeling—that it may be liberal, but modest and just in its pretensions.

If the sanctity of all moral obligations be withdrawn from the fundamental rules by which *Christian privileges and possessions*, have heretofore been held sacred in this country, and the subjects of a Protestant monarch should be induced, thus unjustly and illegally, to absolve themselves from those responsible and inseparable duties which are the boast and honour of *Gospel freemen*, then will perish all the securities by which the *chartered rights of mankind* have for ages been upheld in this kingdom. The bare possibility of such a dilemma, is in itself sufficiently painful for contemplation; but when the probability of the catastrophe is rendered daily more apparent to our conception, by the impure doctrines which are promulgated, we indeed have great cause for fear, and little ground for hope, save in the mercy of God, and the improving judgment or deliberating sense of the people.

The bold assertion made by a noble and learned lord[1], that

[1] Vide Lord Brougham's speech in the House of Peers, session 1834.

"the State has a right to dispose at its pleasure of the surplus revenues of the Church—it has a right to *divide* what shall be accounted surplus revenues," betrays a total want of knowledge of the origin, uses, and construction of Church property; whilst it has indoctrinated a principle absolutely unknown to the Constitution and the law of the land at any period of their history, unless the *spoliations* of Henry the Eighth are to be adduced as precedents, which were in the teeth of those covenants, and the resulting tenure under which the kings of England from the earliest times have held the Crown and its responsibilities. With those who possess slight scruples of conscience, precedent and custom may be of small moment; but it is the duty of statesmen to be careful how they trench rashly on accustomed national privileges. In the entire history of the English monarchy it will be found, that the ecclesiastical bodies in the realm were always held *exempt* from any other than *voluntary taxation* for the support of the State, even at the most despotic periods; and in proof of this assertion, and the established principle it sustains, the ministers of the second Charles entered into a formal negociation with the Church for *permission to tax ecclesiastical persons.* It is therefore the duty of the spiritual barons strictly to investigate, how far such an *assumption* of power, as that which is claimed as a *right*, is compatible with the entire foundation of the Church possessions, and their importance, and consistent with the proceedings by which her property became severed and vindicated, as an *inalienable right*, from papal domination, and the inhabitants of this Protestant kingdom released from obligations, alike inadmissable with their reformed religion, their civil customs, and their social independence.

If the spiritual guardians should become guilty of *Apostacy*, the climax will be grave indeed; but we must suppose such an event impossible, in the present state of Christian know-

ledge, whether weakened by prejudices and fears from within, or constrained by the pressure from without; for unto them is appointed a *Kingdom*, and much is required at their hands. They have to stand in the conflict between Christ and Belial, for *Religion*, and her treasures; to choose between Socrates and Aristophanes in *morals*—the one esteemed for his wisdom and virtue, the other flattered for his *wit;* to uphold, unflinchingly, the pre-eminent rule of that Holy Faith, the *integration* of which their Divine Lord and Master declared perfect for salvation, as the crystal spring of human hopes, rising in the bosom of his Church,—its limpid waters, in their irrigating course, producing the fruits of eternal life;—to preserve, as a sacred trust in their hands, the means for extending the salutary influence of the Gospel dispensation—the perpetuation of the *Christian Covenant* in these kingdoms, and its propagation over the whole earth to the end of time! These indeed are equally solemn and important duties; but they will be sustained in them, if they buckle on their armour as becomes the cause; for that power must be bold and tyrannous indeed, which would attempt to deprive them of an authority that is far beyond the prerogatives of earthly power. As an intellectual and spiritual body, let us fully hope, that in this onerous struggle it will be said of them, with becoming exultation and truth, on behalf of our National Church, her honour, and her usefulness—ET SI CONTRISTAMUR DE ALIQUIBUS PURGAMENTIS, TAMEN CONSOLAMUR DE PLURIBUS ORNAMENTIS!

If the intelligent Christian members of an English House of Commons, in the nineteenth century of the Christian era, could possibly allow themselves to be led away by that spirit of irreligious wit and sarcasm, which is exultingly brought into play by the enemies of religious worship in every form, they would fall far below the level of that heathen virtue they are accustomed to applaud, as the polar star which directed

the government of ancient Rome. Juvenal, a moral heathen, whilst lashing the follies and vices of his degenerate country, under the electric fire of his vivid imagination, and hurling at them the piercing darts of his refined sarcastic genius, left both her religious superstitions and her altars untouched! It is the duty of Christian legislators to denounce with determined dignity the propagation of all loose principles, with regard to *religion in every form;* and much more their duty to uphold that worship, which is the honour of the State they represent. They owe it to their God—they owe it to their country—they owe it to themselves!

To those noblemen and gentlemen, who, possessing the purest intentions, and the best sentiments in design, for the improvement of Christian discipline, and the correction of those abuses which ever will become appended to institutions controlled by human agency—but who, nevertheless, may be inexperienced in the duties of legislating for even the *temporalities* of our Christian Church—the opinions of that orthodox and learned divine, Bishop Davenant, on Church Reform, translated by a pious friend, exclusively for this work, are respectfully submitted for consideration:—

WHO MAY UNDERTAKE TO REFORM THE CHURCH?

TRANSLATION OF QUÆST. XII. FROM THE "DETERMINATIONES" OF BISHOP DAVENANT.

The people may not attempt the Reformation of the Church against the consent of the Magistrate.

"He is called the *Magistrate* in whose power is the *right of the chief rule in the State;* and all who are subject to this magistrate are included in the epithet *the people.* We therefore defend this position. When the magistrate refuses it, it is not *lawful* for the people to go about to reform the Church by *conjoined force,* though it may be in the greatest need of reformation."

First. This is especially against it, that by divine, as well as by human right, the supreme magistrate himself is appointed to manage this business. In the Scriptures, 1 Kings xv. and xxii. it is the express eulogy of the good kings that *they took away* the high places and removed the *idols;* on the contrary, it is the perpetual stigma of the bad ones that they did *not* take away, did not remove them: 2 Kings xviii. and xxiii. It is also a regal duty to rebuke careless priests, to set aside the bad, to visit the *idolatrous* with condign punishment; which is easily collected from a variety of passages in the Books of Kings. Hence it is evident from whom *God* expects the reformation of the Church and of religion. The heads of the Church, worthy to be venerated, assembled in the councils, confessed this same thing. In the council of Ephesus they thus addressed the emperor,—*We entreat your Majesty that you would ordain the faith to be kept untouched.* In that of Chalcedon, *thou hast corrected the Church, thou hast confirmed the orthodox faith;* and in the same strain Julius Fermicus spake to the two Cæsars, Constantius and Constans:—*Upon you, ye august Emperors, is imposed a necessity of avenging and punishing idolatry, and this precept is enjoined you by the law of the great God.* Lastly, Aristotle himself, in Politic. 3. 11. has remarked, that the king ought to be τῶν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς κύριον, *the chief governor of those things which relate to the divine worship.* The Church, therefore, hath her censor pointed out, upon whom this office of reformation is imposed by the hand of God!"

"Secondly. As the authority of reforming the Church is imposed upon kings, so it is removed from the *people.* For where the vocation is wanting, although the thing which is done, considered in itself, be laudable, yet it is blameable in the *agent,* on account of the *defect of lawful power.* To offer sacrifices to God was a work in itself pious and religious; but in Saul, who was by no means called to this office, it was impious and sacrilegious. 1 Sam. xiii. 13. By a like reason, to reform a corrupt Church is a noble and laudable work; but not in those persons *whom God never constituted reformers of the Church.* Search the sacred Scriptures, you will find the people of God every where blamed, because they wor-

shipped the golden calves, by the example and the command of the idolatrous kings; but never censured by any prophet, because they did *not* remove idolatry by force of arms against the will of their kings. Therefore, that this work does not belong to the people the prophets taught by this their silence; as Augustine has clearly and expressly affirmed [1]; *No private person whatever may order idols to be removed:* the truth of the matter is, the act of public reformation requires an *author* who has the power of just revenge against the disobedient; which neither centres in any *private person*, nor an *assembled multitude of private persons.* If, then, the people, fired with a preposterous zeal, attempt any thing of this kind, we must bring against them the admonition of St. Paul, (1 Thess. iv. 12.) *Study to be quiet, and to do your own business.* We must also inculcate the counsel of Peter, (1 Peter iv. 15.) *Let no one of you suffer as an evil doer, or as a busy body in other men's matters,* ἢ ὡς ἀλλοτριοέπισκοπος [2]. Truly it is not reported to have ever been heard, that the common people was appointed bishop of the Church of God: but we read in the life of Constantine, in Eusebius, that the Emperor enjoyed this title."

"Thirdly. Even suppose that kings, or other chief magistrates, were deficient in their duty; do not purge the Church from heresies or false worshippers, nay, what is worse, countenance *corruptions* by their authority; yet, in this state of things, the duty of reforming the Church by no means devolves on the people.

"1. Because God himself, content with the other duties, does not require this work of reformation from the people. But what then, are these duties? I answer, to beware of bowing down before idols, not to destroy the idols; to avoid heresies, not to extirpate them by force of arms; to bewail the corruptions of the Church, not to remove them; in one word, to suffer the utmost punishments inflicted by the magistrate, rather than desert the true religion; not to force the magistrate to introduce true religion. (1 Kings xix. Ezek. ix.) Thus were the three youths men-

[1] Cont. liter. Petilian. lib. 2. cap. 92.

[2] Literally, in another man's superintendency, or bishopric.

tioned in Daniel animated (Dan. iii. 18.); so the whole nation of Christians under idolatrous emperors. *If so be religion must be defended by all private persons, it is not by slaying, but by dying; not by severity, but by patience; not by wickedness, but by faith;* as Lactantius has admirably said. *Instit.* 5. 20.

"2. Moreover, it is wicked in the people, when the magistrate refuses it, to put their hand to this business; because under whatever pretext it be cloaked, it involves the crime of *rebellion.* For he who undertakes to reform religion, when the magistrate is reluctant, first *dethrones* the magistrate himself, tramples upon him, and must necessarily reduce him to the *common level.* But we are not to do evil that good may come; nor must we attempt rebellion to establish religion. The language of the Scripture is, *Blessed are they who suffer persecution for truth and righteousness sake,* Matt. v. 10.; *but cursed are they who stir up rebellion under the cloak of these things.* It is a maxim of lawyers, *Par in parem non habet potestatem—an equal has no power over his equal:* how much less, inferior over superior; the people over the prince? Therefore those reformers of magistrates, assume whatever mask of piety they please, will be more suitably listened to by the *Albiniani, Nigriani,* or *Cassianites,* (alias Infidels, Radicals, and Heretics,) than by *Christians*[1].

"3. Besides, any utility from this popular attempt cannot redound to the Church; but infinite disadvantage may, and is wont to spring from thence. For at the very threshold, whilst they commence to reform the Church, *they necessarily lacerate the State.* Since, indeed, all those who think with the magistrate, will never suffer that religion, which they cherish to be oppressed with impunity; or that a *new one* to which they are opposed be established, especially by those whom they look upon as armed with *no legitimate or public power.* But let us suppose that these reformers so exceed in strength that they may terrify the magistrate refusing them, with all those that are with him: I ask, with what *instruments,* by what means will they establish among us what they call their *reforma-*

[1] Vide Tertull. ad Scapulam, 3.

tion? They cannot sanction it by the laws, because the legislativ power is not in their hands. Those who resist it cannot, either b pecuniary or corporal punishments, submit to their reformed religion, because it is the *prerogative* of the magistrate alone to impos punishments. Finally, they cannot remove heretical minister from their duty, nor substitute orthodox ones in their places, becaus such power over their priests was never given to the *people* from above!

"Lastly. If they possessed all other rights, yet there is wanting to a people (unskilful) the very knowledge itself for rightly reforming. It is not the duty of every unlearned *empiric* to undertak to cure the diseases of the body; because if he should do it although health might ensue by accident, notwithstanding, by the opinion of the most learned theologians[1], he fastens guilt upon himself. Who then shall dare to assert, that it is the duty of the vulgar to heal the diseases of the Church[2]? For although, in thi their rash undertaking, they may produce some effect of true reformation, yet they do not avoid the sin of impious presumption. I thus sum up all: equity does not allow it; necessity does not require it; utility does not advise it; therefore it is unlawful for the people, against the consent of the magistrate, to attempt the reformation of the Church[3]."

The whole body of professing Christians in this kingdom is interested in the important view of the question which is

[1] Silvest. verbo *Medicus*.

[2] "Those who quit their proper character," Mr. Burke has since well observed, with a reference equally as applicable in the case above—"those who quit their proper character, to assume what does not belong to them, are, for the greater part, ignorant both of the character they leave, and of the character they assume. Wholly unacquainted with the world in which they are so fond o meddling, and inexperienced in all its affairs, on which they pronounce with so much confidence, they have nothing of politics but the passions they excite."—*Burke's Reflections on the Revolution in France*, p. 13.

[3] This elegant translation is furnished by the Rev. J. Allport, Minister c St. James', Birmingham, and author of a Translation of Bishop Davenant' Exposition of the Epistle to the Colossians, dedicated to the King.—*Author.*

here propounded,—all who value the preservation of their faith and privileges, are vitally and immediately concerned therein: it forms not a subject for speculation, nor is it made the ground-work of mere declamation,—the authorities adduced, and the deductions drawn therefrom, are of no common origin, nor expatiated upon by any ordinary capacity; and their value is doubly enhanced, by their having been written at a most important period of English history, when the very existency of the Church was assailed by puritanical and papal influence on the one hand, and the hope of her destruction hastening by the arbitrary and uncompromising conduct of Archbishop Laud, on the other,—at that unhappy period, when every religious and civil question became a subject of embittered contention between opposing factions in the State, the Church gasping for existence in her struggles with enemies in every form, under the pretext of reforming her discipline and government, which ended in the sacrifice of her king, and the suspension of her forms of worship! The value of Bishop Davenant's opinions and conclusions are yet more unexceptionable, as they were not framed to gain the favour of the court party, for his plainness and candour had offended his royal master; and his biographer[1] says, that "his death was hastened by the melancholy forebodings of his mind, as to the sad prospects of the nation, at a truly convenient season; that he might not see nor suffer those bitter calamities which speedily overwhelmed both Church and State!"

The present clamour for Church Reform, and the hostility to the payment of Church rates for her maintenance, has arisen in this country with the openly avowed enemies of the Gospel dispensation, the daring disciples of *infidelity*; and

[1] Vide Allport's Davenant, and Bishop Godwin de Præsulibus—Richardson's.

the cry has been taken up by an unthinking portion of that body which dissents from her system of state authority and forms of instruction. Have the latter reflected on the character of the association with which they have thus fully identified themselves, or have they considered the consequences it leads to?

The dissenting Christians of the United Kingdom, who rashly enter into these and similar views of dissatisfaction, should remember the awful responsibility they incur,—they may contribute to raise a storm, which will at least involve the *temporal* security of that faith they profess so ardently to cherish, without their designing it! "*Ne de nobis, mutato nomine, fabula narretur.*" As to the voluntary system, it is equally inconsistent with the safety of a national Church, as it affords no adequate security to those who may dissent from it; but this is more fully discussed in a succeeding chapter.

In times like the present, the advantage of purely conservative principles may be maintained with confidence,—they will, if duly sustained, carry the ponderous vessel of the State, however heavily she may be laden, through the troubled waters of political strife; for strictly religious strife (Ireland always excepted) is not a feature of the present age, which may be attributed to the general diffusion of Christian knowledge; and its ascendency should be vindicated at all hazards. The preservation of the blessings of a pure and consoling religion, the sheet anchor for a free and great people, are identified with the maintenance of our ancient forms, or principles, in the system of government, by whatever name they can be defined—that preservation has no other foundation to rest upon than the retention of virtuous conservatism in the State, for protection against the storms which agitate its repose, and disturb its prosperity. The Christian patriot has also to make his election, whether he will chuse that human philo-

sophy shall control the dictates of faith, with regard to the government and discipline of his Church, or whether philosophy shall remain dependent on the *Christian covenant*, subject to Christian rule and authority, and guaranteed by civil legislation, for general protection! If he be the true friend of his country, and not even a professing Christian; but a legislator alive to the sentiments of *public ethics*, he will defy intimidation, and act under the influence of that noble sentiment expressed by Horace,—"*Non ille pro charis amicis, aut patrid timidus perire*," and without *dying* for it, merit the gratitude of his fellow-citizens.

National virtue can neither be formed without religion, nor be maintained in the state without equitable laws, administered with impartial integrity; and, standing singly amongst European nations, Great Britain has alone possessed such laws, from periods anterior to all records, and should still retain their original principles, defending the just rights of all classes of the people; as well as those of private individuals, against oppression, whether contemplated by the king on the throne, or conceived by any subordinate member of the community.

Under the law of nature, and by the authority of *revelation*, depend all just human laws, enlarging the privileges they confer, according to the knowledge which a people may possess of, and their conformity to, the sacred obligations they owe their Creator, in the first place, and society secondly; and their consequent responsibility to both. The chartered rights of Englishmen are nothing more than their natural possessions, modified by wisdom, and their forms regulated by experience; and this constitutes the *acme* of their political liberties. Thus, the *common law of England* has belonged to its people as a birthright, from time immemorial. Long before the institution of any *records*, the nation possessed the law of

custom, derived from remote antiquity; and which becoming appended to the Christian covenant, substantially composed the foundation of the constitution, the principles of which were retained through successive alternations of dynasty, power, and circumstances. Neither the Danish nor Norman conquests disturbed the sacred character of the ancient laws; and although often outraged, they were never suffered entirely to perish. True it is, they occasionally slumbered, under the tyranny of invading conquerors, but they rose again with renewed vigour, and with increased usefulness, in proportion as the influence of religion revived in the state.

The necessity for a Christian oath, in connexion with the revived covenant, has been fully shown to be essential for the maintenance of a Christian form of government; and it is agreed by all the old English and foreign historians, that the nations which migrated from the north-east of Asia, and peopled this part of Europe, brought with them the patriarchal customs, or one form of civil regulation,—a chief, elders, and one legislative assembly, consisting of the eldest born males, chosen from amongst the first possessors of the land. The peculiarity of our insular situation has enabled us to preserve the veri-similitude, with the least essential variation in this ancient style of government, under our Christian compact.

The perfect constitution of the upper house of parliament is not well understood by a great number of persons of ordinary reading, even in this age of boasted intelligence, who thus are ever ready to propound schemes of reformation, or rather of untried structure, perfectly incompatible with established usage and state principles,—whilst others, with little regard for the truth, mystify facts, for the purpose of advancing their own objects.

The House of Lords, as an estate of Parliament, has been expressly constituted from its first formation, to " deliberate

with, and to defend the king," in the exercise of all his prerogatives[1], and state duties; and it retains the plenitude of its powers and authority. It is under the legal contract which the oath of fealty, taken by the peers at the coronation, secures to the three estates of the people, that all manorial rights and privileges are preserved as before noticed, in reference to the king's prerogative.

By the authority it conveys, the peers, as a judicial assembly, form the highest legal estate and court of appeal in all civil cases—their position renders them the most important, and, at the same time, the most valuable part of the constitution,—they are trustees of its most ancient privileges and laws, as well as the independent representatives of national interests, and of bodies, otherwise unrepresented and unprotected in the state. Thus the situation of the lords of Parliament, as a *privileged order*, is such as to render revolutions and violent innovations, of every kind, objects of just dread to them. Their obvious interest, therefore, as well as their duty, constitutes them an essential, a salutary barrier, against the restless spirits which move perpetually in the political arena, in quest of perfection; and against the inconsiderate spirit of democratic change, or republican ascendency.

The throne of a Protestant monarch will ever find substantial support in a body, which participates with itself in the highest honours and prerogatives; and which, consequently, will be always ready, on principle, to defend the *monarchy*, and preserve the state from dismemberment! It is in this truly conservative, judicial, and moral power, that the intrinsic

[1] This is fully substantiated by Lord Coke, and the original terms are also quoted by his Grace the Duke of Newcastle, in his ably written publication on the Kingly Prerogative, and the Constitutional uses of the English Peerage, 1832.—*Author.*

value of the English Peerage exists, under our own limited monarchy.

A great outcry having been made by a most unreflecting portion of the people, especially by those of the sister kingdom, and many among the dissenters from the Protestant Church, against the bishops retaining their station, as *lay* and spiritual peers; the principles of the earliest foundation of the constitution, before illustrated, amply establish, that the peerage itself, as an hereditary body, cannot possibly be continued without them. The most ancient summons to Parliament, according to *Rymer*, is that wherein the spiritual barons are immediately concerned, and that is the summons *ratione specialis dignitatis et tenuræ*. Their anciently acknowledged superiority of rank over their *lay brethren*, and their reception into this kingdom by its first kings, as the successors of the apostles, fully confirms this assertion. The most eminent law authorities admit, that they alone, by their sacred authority at the coronation, create that *mixta persona*, which the sovereign becomes, under their *investiture* into the kingly office. By the oath itself, they have the *precedence* in parliament. The spiritual barons are equally essential, in their *lay capacity*, for the preservation of the Church in its temporalities, which afford the requisite security for the continuance of the priesthood, and the preservation of her worship and solemn ceremonies. From them also, "the necessary lawful authority for all judicial oaths proceeds,—the forms of judgment in cases of Life and Death are rendered *legal*; and the preservation of property to its lawful possessors; and securities connected with the Christian Faith become affirmed."

If we need the support of Scripture in sustenance of our position, the sacred calling and importance of the priesthood, in all matters of Christian government, we need only once

more refer to the descent of the Holy Spirit at the anniversary of the feast of *Pentecost*.—Here there is another instance of the providential design, that the primæval government should be restored, and that the patriarchal customs, applicable to Christian rule, should again become universal for mankind.—"The great characteristic of the Christian faith," says Silver, "is the gift of the Holy Ghost, which was given on the feast of Pentecost. This festival was instituted for the Christians to acknowledge Jehovah, not only as their God but their *King*, subject to all the religious opinions which the patriarchs avowed, when they sacrificed; and which the Jews always made when they offered their *first-fruits* at this solemnity.—But, when the Holy Ghost was given at that feast, not only the inhabitants of Judea were present, but devout men from *every nation under heaven*. These men could not offer on account of lands in *Judea*, but for their possessions in every nation under heaven, placing themselves, with regard to God, in the same circumstances, now that the earth was peopled, as Noah and his sons stood, when, after the burnt-offering, they received the blessing and restoration of those institutions which the rebellion at Babel broke through." It does not, then, appear presumptuous, after the great miracle wrought on this manifestation of God's love, and which the Redeemer promised to his apostles, as an evidence of the power and authority with which he was invested, and had confirmed to them, to conclude that the patriarchal and Jewish form of tenures should become universal; and that the offerings of these devout men, in token of their earthly dependence, were the first-fruits of their *lands*, as belonging to the several nations they represented, who, in the course of time, should receive the Gospel dispensation, and hold their continued possession, subject to the same principles. It was upon this footing that the laws of ALFRED were compiled, and it is upon

this footing also that all the succeeding Christian Monarchs of England, down to the Brunswick dynasty, have conceded the right of pre-eminence and precedence to the Church, in matters of high state legislation. The learned authority before quoted, remarks further—"It is certain that these opinions have been acted upon in most of the Christian countries of Europe, and especially in our own, in which *all the tenures are Christian*[1], subject to the acknowledgment of the faith; and held under a king in whom the right is vested of granting out all lands to his subjects, and receiving from them (as a matter of form) their homage and fealty for these lands, when he has sworn to the obligations contracted at his consecration. The nature of these vested rights and privileges, the duties he assumes, and expects in return, can be clearly ascertained from the ceremony itself; and it amounts to a recognition of, and investure into, an office, by virtue of which he becomes the head of a feudal system, *the prototype of which is to be found established in the institutions of Jehovah!*" It becomes, then, the solemn duty of a Christian people, to watch narrowly the policy and principles of those who are, from time to time, by the forms of law, or the arrangement of state duties, appointed to the ostensible office of *keeper of the king's conscience;* and it is equally incumbent on every one so situated, to be well-grounded in those original and sacred truths, on which the religion and the laws of this highly favoured land have been based from her earliest history.

"The religious and moral sense of the people of Great Britain," said a former chancellor[2] of England, "is the great anchor which alone can hold the vessel of the state amidst the storms which agitate the world; and if I could believe,

[1] Vide Lyttelton's Tenures. [2] Erskine.

for a moment, that the mass of the people of this country, were to be debauched from the principles of that religion, which forms the true basis of the humanity, charity, and benevolence, that has so long been the national characteristics; instead of mixing myself in political reformations, as I have done, I would rather retire to the uttermost corner of the earth, to avoid their agitation; and would patiently bear not only the imperfections and abuses complained of, in our own wise establishment, but even the worst government that ever existed in the world, rather than aid the work of reformation, with a multitude set free from all the charities of Christianity!"

The payment of *Tithe*, for the support of the Church, forms another feature in the constitution of Church and State in this Christian kingdom. This also is of patriarchal origin, for the tithe was paid to the government, and not to the priest alone, by Abraham; and it is on this principle that it became part of the British constitution, embracing partly the maintenance of the poor and infirm, from the earliest periods: neither was it received by the Anglo-Saxon kings solely on the Levitical principle, nor by Edward the Confessor. Under the system established by him, the relief of the poor formed an important part, and according to that most ancient book of law, the *Mirror of Justices*, express provisions were made on this head,—hence the act of 42d *of Elizabeth*, was not the *first* measure of a public or state nature on this subject.—"It was fully ordained," says the Mirror, "that the poor should be sustained by parsons, by rectors of the Church, out of the tithe, and by the *parishioners*, so that none of them should suffer, or die for want." Again, in the reign of *Edward the First*, the laws relating to *villainage* had the same tendency, and show that all the lower classes were provided for by benevolent poor laws; which appear to have been appendages

to the first Christian governments—and it should be borne in mind, that the *lords spiritual* were then the only *rectors;* and the large grants made to them were for the express support and furtherance of the Christian Church, on a principle of pure independence. Tithe was originally of universal institution, and it existed in the endowment of many of the ancient Greek temples, and occasionally in those of *Asia;* indeed, by reference to the Old Testament, it can be proved to have originated from the ordinances of God himself, for the maintenance of his Church, and the preservation of her clergy, and forms of worship!—Its importance, as an appendage to the Christian dispensation, must therefore be sufficiently manifest to every unprejudiced person.

This short elucidation of the principle on which the institution of tithe became part of our system, sufficiently illustrates the grounds on which the majority of the peers, in the recent discussion of a bill, which, although offering a *bonus*, went to infringe on the original rights of the whole clerical order in Ireland, came to the determination of rejecting it. Believing that they did so, *in foro conscientiæ*, and in the exercise of their right, as a deliberative assembly, and supported by the clergy themselves, their precaution on this head is perfectly justifiable, by the peculiar circumstances under which the Church of Ireland is at present placed; and this, even on the ground of *retardation* alone; for no measure of this kind should be passed precipitately, especially under the influence of a combined and regularly organised system of resistance, setting law, custom, and authority, at utter defiance.—If the peers of England shall ever be brought to act under the influence of intimidation, or the positive domination of that spirit of agitation which has been set up; or yield to the threats on the one hand, or, on the other, to the insidious advice held out to them, by the declared enemies of the Protestant Church,

which it is their first duty to protect, they will indeed present an instance of mental imbecility, a departure from moral courage, unparalleled in the history of the world, excepting that of the peers of France in 1792, who were the authors of their own premature and ignominious downfal! The lords may possibly be censured for paying veneration to ancient rights and prescriptive usages, by the uninformed and unreflecting,—by those who aim at levelling all distinctions in the state, and setting up the empire of unbridled tyranny and fanatical licentiousness on the desecration of religion, and the ruins of substantial liberty; but, with all good men, the censure will be alike honourable to their consistency, as it will present another memento of their virtue and their value.—"*Deliberare utilia, mora est tutissima,*" said the great Lord Bacon,—so also Lord Digby, in the reign of the first Charles,—"Upon the respect we show to former acts and customs, depends the security of our own measures *in futuro*,—the honour of former acts must be upheld, because all the reverence we are entitled to expect from future times, for our own acts, &c. depends on our supporting the dignity and integrity of former Parliaments, and long established laws, as well as civil customs."

If we study the principles and practice of the English constitution, we shall find that the general concurrence and the single rejection of the *three estates*, of any new propounded measure, were devised for the best purposes by that constitution,—the impossibility of making any change therein, which all its three distinct powers should not approve. Thus, if the commons should *reject* a measure sent down to them by the lords, their numbers cannot be increased, but the mere option of a change of men is afforded by a dissolution of Parliament, as the only constitutional course for the procurement of a majority, and to remove factious opposition, subject to the

general voice of the nation, not the solitary approbation of the king, although he freely exercises his prerogative, nor of his ministers for the time being, equally freely chosen.

If the king should think fit to reject a measure propounded to him by both the other estates, his *veto* cannot be *annulled* by the creation of another power in the state to control it,—neither, if the lords should reject any measure transmitted to them as the *conservative estate*, from the commons, although it should even be sanctioned by the king, can the prerogative of creating additional peers on this "fundamental principle" (to use the words of Burke) be constitutionally exercised for the avowed purpose of outnumbering their votes to carry such particular question; because the recognised independence of the Peers, the highest judicial assembly, and the final resource by *appeal*, and the supreme court in the state, to which the king himself is amenable, would virtually be destroyed under such proceeding; and the prerogative in this respect, is only granted in the original contract to confer *honours* for individual merit, and important services previously rendered for the national benefit, and for the preservation of that independence.

This position fully illustrates the grave importance of the solemn obligations imposed on the sovereigns of England by the *coronation oath*, as well as the extent of the responsible trusts reposed in the crown for purely state purposes, with regard to the creation of peers. It is one thing to maintain that the constitution has given the king a certain prerogative, and another that it may be exercised for the avowed purpose of controlling an estate of the realm, which, under that constitution has become independent of the crown, as it always was of the third estate. The general outcry against the lords controlling the commons, is founded in gross ignorance of the privileges of the former; and we should, with far greater

reason, guard against the king's controlling the lords under the influence of the commons, for such would, in fact, be nothing less than a perversion of his power; and the prerogative never was intended to be exercised for such a purpose, but for the sustenance of the estates collectively.

"The constitution," says Blackstone, "declares all the three estates co-ordinate in power, though different in rank," and thus equally disclaims the *supremacy* of any one of them distinctly. The people, as they stand represented in the commons, are an estate of *Parliament*, and the last in degree; whereas the lords, by their original constitution, their creation, and hereditary descent, are an estate of the *realm*, older than the monarchy itself, as at present constituted, although the act of consecration gives to the king the needful pre-eminence for the chief magistrate, ruling over Church and state. The constitution of England, established by law and custom, gives no right to any two estates to control the third, nor to any one of them to control the remaining two; and there is no fourth power existing amongst the people[1], excepting under an act of flagrant and direct usurpation, by which such can be effected[2]."

The spiritual jurisdiction existing in the person of the king, was fully recognised by the *Act of Supremacy*, passed in the reign of Henry the Eighth, the first clause of which is nearly a recapitulation of the ancient prerogative detailed by *Prynne*, already cited, and having direct reference to his authority for the correction of abuses in Church discipline. Here the re-

[1] "The people are free to choose and to recognise; but there are some powers they can neither create nor extinguish, and these are the guardians of substantial liberty; between these our historians recount perpetual struggles; but they only show and prove the efficacy of the privileged orders in securing the state, by the powers balanced between them."—*Silver*.

[2] These opinions are corroborated by Glanville, Reeves, and Blackstone.

form of the *finances* of the Church is also vested in the chief magistrate, as the head of it, and to him should all petitions, having in view the removal of grievances, be addressed by the clergy, "which by any manner of spiritual authority or jurisdiction, ought or may lawfully be reformed, repressed, ordered, redressed, corrected, restrained, or amended, most to the pleasure of Almighty God, the increase of virtue in Christ's religion, and for the *conservation* of the peace, unity, and tranquillity of this realm; any usage, custom, foreign laws, foreign authority, prescription, or any thing or things to the contrary hereof notwithstanding."

In the hands of a just and patriot king such powers cannot well be misapplied; and the issuing of the royal commission, which is the only strictly constitutional course, may be taken by all parties, as an earnest of his majesty's intentions in the exercise of this most important part of his authority, that of the supreme conservator of the Church in the state.

The writings of a reverend author[1], on the question of Church reform, taking a middle course, may be read with advantage by those who *dissent* from the Protestant Mother Church, and who object to contribute towards her support, by the payment of *tithe* or Church rates. An avowed reformer of admitted evils, he cannot fairly be accused of undue partiality, when he ably illustrates, that "the matter of tithes lies between the *Church* and the *state*,—that they are the instituted provision for the clergy,—that their abolition would merely put into the landlord's pocket what it would take from the parson's,"—and ingenuously asks, "can the state devise any better method for the maintenance of the Church? Does not the earth give back thirty grains for one? Will not the

[1] Ten Letters on Reform, by the Rev. C. Girdlestone, A.M. Vicar of Sedgley. 2d edit. 1831.—Letters on *Church Reform*, *Tithes*, &c. Appendix, 1833. London: J. G. and F. Rivington.

toil of one labourer feed three? Does not this *surplusage* support the farmer, the capitalist, and the landlord? Can *one-tenth* of it be better bestowed than on the ministers of religion? Are we not your countrymen, your kinsmen, your friends? Do we all eat the bread of idleness? Who, then, teach in all your schools? Who labour in all your parishes? Faintly indeed, and insufficiently, but faithfully, for your good. This we do in return for *one-tenth* of your produce; I fain would know what you get more for the other nine in proportion!"

The O'Connellite faction will undoubtedly sneer at questions like these, but that neither lessens their point, nor defeats their application. The question relating to Church property in Ireland, with reference to tithes, is of paramount importance. In a preceding part, the institution of tithe has been shown to be one of the earliest connected with Church government; and that upon its ancient principle alone it became identified with the reformed Christian Church of England, for the maintenance of her clergy, and the perpetuity of her faith. The payment of tithes was also established by the Roman Catholic Church herself, on the authority of her *fathers*, notwithstanding the clamour loudly raised against it by the late Dr. Doyle, and others. By the thirteenth and fourteenth canons of the council of *Tribur*, held A.D. 805, express provision was made for their payment, the council, by an ordinance, justifying their existence, and claiming them as a *right* on behalf of the Church, in the full exercise of her spiritual authority[1], over all other Churches and religious bodies; which authority *Augustin* and his followers exercised to the *letter* in this kingdom, over those who professed primitive Christianity, and ultimately established their connexion with the state,—nor did she relax in her exactions over all classes of persons, on account of nonconformity to her doc-

[1] "To preserve the *Tithes* to the ancient Churches," &c.—*Du Pin.*

rine and supremacy; but, on the contrary, more rigidly enorced them during successive ages. Where, then, exists the justice of those who now object to pay that provision, for the maintenance of a state religion, established on a principle fully recognised by the councils of their own Church? Would not the Church of Rome, if she obtained the ascendency, assert her *right* and claim to the universal payment of *tithe*, under the authority of those very councils? Undoubtedly she would!

The persecution to which the Church of Ireland and her clergy have been subjected, by an unchristian faction, in consequence of their exerting their fair pretensions to the continuance of this provision, is hardly paralleled by the history of any former period. This impious opposition, in defiance of law, custom, and Christian duty, arose with the very Christian Pastor, the late Dr. Doyle, who, in his pastoral address to his deluded followers, says, "may their hatred of *tithes* be as eternal as their love of justice." This fulmination of vengeance, of course, applies exclusively to the Protestant clergy, the objects of denunciation. If the *love* of *justice*, and its *extent*, are to be taken as the *limit* of hostility, its duration would be short indeed, for justice is abjured in the entire spirit, and the advised proceeding of the worthy doctor's becoming advice; but, he is gone to his rest, and must give an account of the *ten talents* to Him who is no respecter of persons!

The question, however formidable, resolves itself into a narrow compass, (a single point or two) whether the constitutional law is to be maintained, which has guaranteed the rights of the clergy, under the express oath and covenant of the king; or whether an *individual agitator*, bearding the executive power in the state, and setting that law at defiance, shall be permitted, with continued impunty, to exercise an

imperium in imperio,—to set up a government of irresponsible tyranny—a positive *dominatio plebis*, in the sister kingdom, supported by the lower orders of that people in the Roman Catholic faith; and thus put at issue the pre-eminence of the king's councils, and his majesty's supreme recognized authority in Church and state, of which Ireland forms an integral part; thus virtually dissevering that portion of the united kingdom from its lawful obedience! The Protestant Church has not secured her temporalities by any special sanction or authority, emanating from her own councils exclusively; but has committed them to the protection of those general laws of the land, under which the indefeasibility of all other public and private property is sustained.

Archbishop Williams was fully borne out in his declaration in the House of Peers, in a former age, that "the civil power is a Divine Ordinance, set up to be a terror to evil doers, and an encouragement to good works." This is the whole compass of the civil power, and according to Bishop Davenant[1], "to repress *sin*, and punish sinners,—that is to

[1] "Determinationes Quæstionum quarundam Theologicarum," 1634.—The works of this eminent divine cannot be too highly appreciated at this period; and an able translation of his Latin Exposition of the Epistle to the Colossians, with a Biographical Memoir, and also a translation of his "*Dissertatio de morte Christi*," has recently been published by the Rev. J. Allport, of Birmingham *. To those who value the fundamental principles of Christianity, this work is invaluable; nor indeed should any divinity student or Christian library be without it. Davenant was Bishop of Salisbury, and Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. His researches into the writings of the ancient fathers, and his profound erudition in classical and logical reasoning, have never been exceeded. The present venerable superior of the diocese of Sarum presents another instance of the value of the English episcopal bench. His writings on the Antiquity of the Church of England, and its State Connexion, cannot be too widely disseminated—they justify, to the fullest, the high eulogium paid by the late Rev. W. Thorpe, (the independent

* See Review, Protestant Journal, 1833, pp. 91. 156. 237. 327.

say, to exercise in a moderate manner civil jurisdiction, whenever the sovereign shall require it." If religion, then, be withdrawn from the state support, it follows that the authority of the law must inevitably cease, or be placed upon a footing perfectly incompatible with the original design, the established principle, and the uniform practice of the British constitution.

The great principle on which that constitution became finally settled at the Revolution of 1688, was primarily and essentially *Protestant*. This became *necessary*, to put an end to civil war, and to preserve the rights of property. "By the Revolution of 1688," says Thorpe, in his 'Destinies,' "and the *Bill of Rights*, under the temporal DELIVERER, WILLIAM HENRY THE THIRD, the fatal chain seemed for the first time completely and for ever severed; Protestants of all denominations rejoiced exceedingly, they called it 'the Glorious Revolution;' the joy and triumph of Protestant commentators was still more excessive." Now, the records of Parliament show, that the subsequent enactments passed with regard to the exercise of the Roman Catholic religion, were *protective*, not *proscriptive*; and the Toleration Act subsequently gave to all, the exercise of unbounded liberty of conscience,—neither were the Test and Corporation Acts introduced with the view of creating invidious distinctions; but for the sole purpose of maintaining the original principle in the constitution, it having been found from previous experience, that uniformity of rule and action could not otherwise

divine) in his "Destinies of the British Empire," to the Protestant Church and her Clergy—"The doctrines of the Church of England, as expressed in her Articles, her Homilies, and her Liturgy, are entitled to our highest esteem, support, and veneration, for they are the doctrines of the apostles—many of her enlightened and pious clergy are the glory of the nation, the latchet of whose shoes, I frankly and freely confess, I am not worthy to unloose."—Pages 72, 73.

be preserved, nor the integrity of the Church itself sustained; but, if any objection existed in latter times, in a civil point of view, the repeal of those acts, which have removed civil disabilities, should for ever set the question at rest with rational dissenters from the Church of England.

It is boldly asserted, that the intelligence of the *present age* is opposed to these views. This can only be partial,—its general application is inadmissible, unless the nation itself, as a body collective, has resolved to abandon its religion, its Christianity, and first principles. The contrast would, indeed, be most extraordinary; and the declaration, that there is at the present period a divided feeling on the subject, arising from a desire to favour popular ideas of liberality, would be far more ingenuous—the assertion that such an extreme case as that alluded to exists, is perfectly hypothetical. It is certainly anomalous that the entire policy of the Whig party, which constituted the government of William the *Third*, should have been decidedly the reverse of that which influenced William the *Fourth*, both liberal sovereigns, and both declaring the same objects and strong attachment to the fundamental interests of the constitution. The policy of the highly-gifted counsellors of King William the Third, was based on *necessity*,—that of the Whig Cabinet of William the Fourth rested on *expediency*, to meet this alleged spirit of the age, and by expediency it perished. Contempt of religion itself, always follows contempt of those who are at the head of the Church, and direct the affairs of religion in the state. If this be the spirit alluded to, it neither augurs well for the good feeling nor the understanding of the age, leaving discretion out of the question, which was Bacon's test of knowledge! Here, then, we may renounce purely moral philosophy and human skill, and declare, with *Justin Martyr*, that "neither poets nor philoso-

phers are fit authors for instituting civil rule by a state religion, but God alone by revelation;" or of *Prudentius*, (in lib. 2. cont. Symmach,) where he so beautifully illustrates, that human reason must inevitably fail in its unassisted attempts to fathom the mysteries of the Most High!

William the Third, although he had an austere duty to perform, was one of the most tolerant princes that ever sat upon the throne of these realms; fully sensible that civil government, in every Christian state, must necessarily be subject to the *supremacy* of *Christian rule*, his sole ambition rested in the adoption of measures, which, whilst they tended to secure the monarchy, and perpetuate the Protestant succession, should, at the same time, secure the religious and civil liberties of the whole people. His was the attachment of principle; and the reverence which thousands of good and learned men, statesmen and divines, have since shown to his memory, and the institutions he established, are, indeed, a record *in perpetuam rei memoriam*, even of that prince, of whom one of the leading men of his day thus elegantly expresses himself,—

> "His government was without tyranny;
> His justice without rigour, and
> His religion without superstition!"

> "King, queen, or potentate!—I never saw,
> So just, wise, honest, valiant, as *Nassau*:—
> He was—but words are wanting to say what;
> Say all that's great and good, and he was that!"

Such, then, was William the Third, Prince of Orange, to whose genius and firmness, and that of his followers, we owe the regenerated constitution, which *Bertrand de Moleville*, a foreigner, but reported by Napoleon, in his declaration to M. de Angeais, to "possess all the elements of a keen and

cautious statesman," has handed down to posterity, in the terms expressed in the note at page 258.

It becomes us, Englishmen, seriously to consider, at this crisis, what the means should be to attain the end, which all rational men are desirous of seeking; and which we should exert ourselves to obtain, as an united and not divided people.

Thus the Christian religion having been made the basis of the state in the constitution of Great Britain, no correct *reformation* can be performed therein, without direct reference to the original superstructure; for to *reform* is not to *destroy;* and there is a marked difference in reconstructing a system, and entirely subverting it, by the production of one in another form. If the state is to remain *Christian*, the authority of God must be preserved therein, as the first Lawgiver, by its positive not by its abstract connexion. The Jewish kings held their authority direct from the Almighty, representing the higher power; and this alone secured to them the divine presence, or SHECHINAH, manifested by the *Urim* and *Thummim* [1], worn on the breast-plate of the High Priest who offered the sacrifice of the burnt-offering, as typical of the incarnation of the God of the Christian Church—under this arrangement was the Almighty consulted by the High Priest alone, in all matters of state importance. It is agreed that this mode of consultation was only had recourse to in affairs of very great moment: that the High Priest was the only officiating minister in this ceremony; and that he was to be invested in all his sacred or pontifical habits, particularly his breast-plate; and, lastly, that he was not permitted to perform or require this

[1] Urim and Thummim, literally, *light* and *perfection*, or, according to St. Jerome, "doctrine and truth,"—to the LXX declaration, "manifestation and truth;" and, by other learned theologians, as comprehending "JEHOVAH."—Vide Exod. xxviii. 30. Levit. viii. 8. Numb. xxvii. 21. Ezra ii. 63.

solemn consultation for a private individual, but only for the king, for the president of the council of the *Sanhedrim*, for the general of the army of Israel, or for other public functionaries, to whom were assigned high offices; and even then not upon affairs of a *private nature*; but for matters that related to the public interests of the Church and State. Although the divine presence, or authority, under the Urim and Thummim became lost to the Jews, it was restored by the VOICE OF GOD to the Head of the Christian Church, even before his death and resurrection, at the baptism of Christ, and at his transfiguration on the mount[1]. After the destruction of Jerusalem it no longer remained with the Jews, but became deposited with the apostles, under the promise, "and lo I am with you always," &c.

After this scriptural elucidation, which may be taken, *rei difficilis explicatio*, to worldly minds, but to them alone, will any Christian man assert that it is not upon this foundation that the model of our free constitution, and the power of the people under it, are established,—or, will any body of Christian men in the state, deny to those who represent the *apostolic succession*, the power to convey that right, under the Christian covenant; and support such denial against the declared authority of the Most High, in his revealed word, and in the teeth of its denunciations, for rebellion against that authority.

"Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth, for the Lord hath spoken: I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me," Isaiah i. 2.

It is only by virtue of his authority as an anointed Christian king, that the sovereign of these realms holds the tenure of his crown; and thus only, as Lord Coke has beautifully expressed it, does he "of *right* become the *Caput et princi-*

[1] Matt. iii. 17. and xvii. 5.

pium et finis of the three estates, which comprise the whole system." Hence in the British monarchy (however repugnant such a principle may be to the spirit of the age, or to the views of *liberalism)*, "arises a right divine, hereditary and recognised, in which the several contracting parties mutually agree, and virtually acknowledging first principles, make the SUPREME BEING the pre-existent authority, and the *first party* to their religious and civil compact."

Hence we find all that is wise and rational, or worthy the acceptance and confidence of a Christian people, has been duly considered and moulded into form, in the superstructure of the British monarchy; and nothing short of the general apostacy of the people of England, and their breach of that covenant, which has bestowed on them all the practical blessings of rational freedom and religious security, can deprive them of its advantages. The Word of God—the poets and sages of antiquity—the concurrent testimony of illustrious Christian men, whether divines, historians, philosophers, or statesmen; and though divided by distant ages and conflicting opinions, in their laudable desires to promote the moral welfare and improve the civil condition of mankind,—the history of empire itself, all contribute, and give united testimony in favour of that institution of government, which centuries have owned and wisdom venerated, as THE CONSTITUTION OF ENGLAND! *Esto perpetua!*

CHAPTER VII.

THE SUPERIORITY OF CHRISTIAN LEGISLATION, CONTRASTED WITH VOLUNTARY RELIGION, AS A RULE OF MORAL GOVERNMENT.

"Judges and officers shalt thou make thee in all thy gates, which the LORD thy God giveth thee, throughout thy tribes: and they shall judge the people with just judgment."—*Deut.* xvi. 18.

"Hæc stultitia parit civitatis, hâc constant imperia, magistratus, religio, concilia, judicia,—nec aliud omnino est vita humana quam stultitiæ lusus quidam."—*Erasmus, Dissert. de Civitat. &c.* (Cantab.)

In tracing the origin of human government, it is absolutely necessary to commence with the primitive condition of man, as a being designed by Providence for the performance of duties of a higher grade, and of a highly responsible character; although by the circumstances of his creation, and subsequent fall, he became, in a state of nature, and under his early wants and increasing necessities, totally unable to originate or devise means for his proper regulation and security, in a social capacity. To meet that deficiency, which the fall had occasioned, notwithstanding the original rebellion against his Maker and heavenly Parent, the Almighty, with kind solicitude, again revealed himself to man; and, in the

first ages of time, began to develope that system, which resulted from the promise, "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head." It could not have been expected that God would direct that line of promise to pass through a race, or generation of people, sprung from a common ancestor, who had set his authority at defiance, and who followed the steps of their progenitor; therefore, all the subsequent misfortunes of national or civil government, which assailed mankind from the foundation of the world, arose from *rebellion* against that authority; and the consequent introduction of infidelity and wickedness, when "Cain went out from the presence of the Lord[1]." Thus Cain lost the privileges of his birth, and they descended to his younger brother, *Seth*, although the Almighty spared the life of the former, and forbad any one killing him by a special denunciation.

It is of the first moment, that the discussion of a subject of such weighty importance as that, connected with the councils of The Most High, should be conducted by Christian and educated men, under feelings of rational moderation, and dispassionate propriety, contradistinguished from the human infirmity, which called forth the finely expressive lamentation of that good man, whose piety and learning have added unfading honour to the university which elected him as her own[2], and justly treasures the opinions of one of the brightest stars of the Reformation; whose lustre was splendid, yet unassuming; and whose example is worthy the imitation of every champion of the Church of England, whenever her honour and her privileges, her faith and her possessions, are assailed by the enemies of God and his truth, and the ordinary disturbers of State repose!

From the compact of religious government, we must neces-

[1] Gen. iv. 16.

[2] Lady Margaret's Professor, Cantab. 1511.

sarily except and exclude the *unbeliever* of every *caste*, who is seldom susceptible to the influences of fair argument and honest conviction,—who has, either from ignorance, prejudice, obstinacy, or ambition, formed abstract notions of his own, for the direction of his conduct; and who claims the right of asserting a system of *purely moral rule*, which is not capable of being deduced from any source, beyond that of a positive *denial* of the interposition and supreme direction of an eternal principle, and the needful dependence thereupon!

In a state of nature, and without protection, man was totally incompetent to form any scheme of social polity for himself, until the earth by its increase enabled him to acquire the means of establishing an adequate independence: hence, from the earliest periods, before the flood, land was allotted as the means of his support; and, after the flood, and the restoration of the patriarchal covenant, under the institution of an *aristocracy* in the first-born, the rights of landed possessions always took the lead over all others; and, in this respect, the Lord "divided the *nations* in their *lands*, and the *people* in their *inheritance*." Thus the law, in a free country, is or ought to be determined by the fair majority of those who have real property in land, because it formed one of the *first gifts* of the Almighty, and is not liable to the fluctuating vicissitudes and variations, which are attached to or dependent on commercial enterprises, however extensive or successfully conducted. The interests of the possessors or inheritors of landed property, are always identified in every country with the fundamental interests and best securities of the State: and although, in representation and civil distinction, we should always be ready to grant the fair share of power and influence to those who are the possessors of variable property, acquired by honourable industry, that influence in a well-regulated state, and with a people who know how to appre-

ciate the value of *stationary possessions*, both on a religious and civil foundation, will never be allowed to preponderate to the disadvantage of the holders of real property.

Bishop Butler, in his Analogy of Natural and Revealed Religion, has abundantly shown the fallacy of those arguments, and the emptiness of that sophisticating philosophy, which would vainly attempt to establish an *equalized community of interests* in the distribution of property. There exists no just medium for regulating the affairs of mankind under that aerial speculation in human policy, which stands alike opposed to the constitutional law of nature, and the revealed authority of the Christian religion — the original principle laid down in the historical and prophetical part of God's word;—by that word, the disciples of *Spence, Paley, Bentham*, and *Bowring*, stand morally convicted of ignorance of first causes,—ignorance of those sublime principles which inculcate the application of things to their origin, and which point to their end, as they are displayed by nature herself, in the entire government of creation; developing through extending ages the mysterious determinations of a common Parent, or universal Providence, who, in his revealed word, has propounded those maxims and laws, which are best adapted for the perishing existence of his creatures, and who gave the first basis for directing the social energies, and establishing systematically the universal reason of mankind There can be no fair community of interests established by man, in direct hostility with the proclaimed law of God :—

> The sacred law which moulds a tear,
> And bids it trickle from its source;
> That law preserves the earth a sphere,
> And guides all nature in her course!

One of the earliest acquisitions of human life was the pos-

session of landed property; the moral and physical advantages of which, as a principle of power, and the foundation of those means which supplied the medium of mutual protection and general commerce, existed even before the deluge, progressively becoming applicable to all the purposes of human government, and but for the positive violation of that obedience, which man owed to his Maker, the advantages that resulted from its possession, might have been continued and extended to the human race on a far more expansive scale, than that afterwards determined, under the regulations of the moral law. But man, in his natural, or fallen state, became too imperfect a creature for the exercise of salutary restraint over his ordinary passions and evil propensities; and even the admonitory warning given by the Almighty to Cain,—"If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest *not well*, sin lieth at the door," was lost upon him; for forthwith he went from the divine presence, and, in a fit of jealousy, abusing the authority delegated to him, shed his brother's blood: by this foul crime, Cain lost his right of primogeniture and temporal rule; for God immediately changed the *dynasty*, and the authority for earthly rule was given to the line of *Seth*, whose descendants "began to call upon the name of the *Lord*."

Although the severe denunciations of Scripture were subsequently levelled against those vices, which succeeded the accumulation of property amongst *heathen nations*, its rational use was not only allowed to the chosen people, but it formed a prominent part of their sacred possessions. The uses and the value of landed property became apparent, in proportion as civilization proceeded down the stream of time; and this knowledge was unquestionably designed by God, as a beneficent addition to all the other means supplied in the shape of provision for the accumulating wants of man, and his increased

comfort, when his primitive condition became changed, by the extension of his species, and the altered nature of his circumstances, habits, and associations. But the sacred writings are particularly explicit with regard to the distinction and distribution of God's bounties, and the duties assigned under them;—thus, "*the land,*" is frequently coupled in Scripture with the "*inheritance,*" and positive suppression of "*idolatry,*" together with a rigid compliance with his laws and ordinances, the conditions of their *tenure*. Man was thus, as a subordinate being, made acquainted with the value of landed possessions, as the means of extending his usefulness and power, and increasing his own security by a provision beyond the *necessities* of his existence. It is from this period that we must date the rights of conquest and possession,—the establishment of the law of *primogeniture*, and the institution of an *aristocracy* under the protection of God!

With the Greeks and Romans, the most enlightened of heathen nations, the uses and value of property and landed possessions were well understood; and, in the days of their greatness, they applied them with equal advantage to the advancement of their domestic prosperity, and extension of empire at home and abroad, through several ages. The wisdom of their legislators, in their views of its government, united with civil policy in general, and connected with its influence on society, may be said to have supplied the basis of our best social institutions; the superstructure reared upon them having been consolidated by the connexion of Christian obligations in the state system. There remains, then, no ground to dispute the fact, scripturally, that the *unequal* distribution of property, with the precedency given to that of *land*, is ordained for the benefit, and not the injury of mankind; and that it should ever remain subject to such controlling regulations, as the safety and repose of society render

necessary in all ages; the legislative protection for which has been duly established by our own free constitution.

The author has not founded these views on an hypothesis of his own, unsupported by powerful testimony,—their analogy may be traced in far more impressive terms, and their justice is sustained in strength of language and reasoning eminently superior to any thing he feels at present capable of advancing, in "Addison's Christian Evidences," Southey's "Vindiciæ Anglicanæ," Mason's "Defence of English Orders," and Adam's "Christian World Displayed," any, and all of which, may be consulted with advantage, by those who think the fatigue of travelling through ancient authors too imposing, and who are not inconsiderate enough to take the *ipse dixit* of less worthy reasoners, as conclusive evidence on the subject.

The connexion of religion with civil legislation, or human government, was revived under the renewed covenant and especial promise for perpetual generations, made by God to Noah[1], that connexion having been forfeited by the sin which occasioned the deluge, and the consequent destruction of all those who were participators in the first rebellion,—neither, can government long exist in a state without religion, nor religion long remain perfect without the protection of government; thus they are essential for the support of each other, because, singly, they are destitute of those relative qualities which are necessary for their preservation in large communities; but, when combined, each is supportive of the other. In a state of *separation*, neither the one nor the other could act for the certain welfare of mankind, and the interests of one so situated, would be opposed to the interests of the other: conflicting opinions, jealousies, and controversies, would arise, the discussion of

[1] Covenant with Noah and his sons, Gen. ix. 8, 9. 11, 12, 13, and 16.

which would inevitably lead to rancour and hostility, both in theory and practice, whilst there would remain no security for the due maintenance of a Church, on any rational foundation. When the government party decided on the necessity for war, the religious would declare for peace,—the authority, trusts, and uses of the kingly office would become a *nullity*, or be set at defiance,—to recover back that authority, and its prerogatives, an appeal would most probably be made to *arms*, and whichever party gained the ascendancy, the liberties and privileges of the other would be curtailed, or entirely destroyed. This is not a mere figure in rhetoric, the like has occurred before, even in our own history, and its results are recorded in characters of blood! Under a limited monarchy, like that of England, it is absolutely impracticable; and those who urge it, whatever *visor* they assume, advocate the broad principle of a *Republic*, the dismemberment of the empire, or a stipendiary government!

Hence the reflecting portion of the better informed people of this kingdom view, with just apprehension, the intermeddling policy with regard to our ancient institutions in Church and State, the interests and principles of which have hitherto been discussed in the *reformed* House of Parliament, with a haste and *légèreté*, perfectly incompatible with decorum, and the grave importance of the subject; as it is at variance with that sober discrimination, which is the result of elaborate research into the history and design of our Christian Constitution. Strictly political conservatism, may be reproached with an undue attachment to worldly objects; but Christian conservatism imperatively demands of the Christian statesman, that sober attention to the solemn duties, which are inculcated by the ordinances of the Divine Founder of the world, and established by the Gospel covenant.

These circumstances, so momentous in their import, make

little or no impression on the minds, or direct the conduct of men, who cannot weigh events with reference to first causes,—who are unable to distinguish in their operation abstractions from realities, words from substances, and who take the symbol of legislation for the reality,—who pervert reason, neglect truth, and sacrifice honour and consistency at the shrine of ambition and self-interest.

> " ——— incerta hæc si tu postules
> Ratione certa facere, nihilo plus agas,
> Quam si des operam, ut cum ratione insanias."

In the consideration of a vital question, whereon hinges the fate of empire, and wherein the religion, public liberties, and private fortunes of a whole Christian people are involved, the most calm deliberation, becomes not only a paramount duty, but it presents the only rational means of preventing those *catastrophes*, which are the concomitant attendants and succeeding consequences of rude and ill-digested measures, the very expediency of which cannot be illustrated, and the necessity whereof is negatived by matter of fact circumstances.

It may, by some, be objected, that the sentiments here expressed, and the doctrine inculcated, are designed to sustain, exclusively, the interests of the established Protestant Church, or that principle which has been invidiously, and not very classically, denominated " *Church of Englandism*," by one or more of our *popular* representatives, under their oratorical display in the senate and elsewhere, at the expense of the clergy, and to the derision of religion. To these gentlemen, who are, at best, but a sorry specimen of what should constitute that justly proud, independent, and intellectual body, known as the *Commons of England*, called together under the writ of summons, issued by the authority of a Protestant king, for the sole purpose of advising him on matters connected with the general interest of the empire; we would

offer for consideration the well-known *apophthegm* of Dr. Johnson, that "irreverence towards the clerical order, is but *one step* removed from irreverence towards *religion itself*." It should also be considered, that it is incumbent upon those, who are appointed to ecclesiastical dignity, not merely to discharge quiescently the duties of the religious office, but to defend the authority and respectability of that office when needful, against all schismatical revilers and levellers; as St. Paul himself claimed *apostolic dignity*, not through a desire of creating self-importance, but lest contempt for his authority should bring into contempt that of the Church, and even of its Divine Founder!

The paramount necessity for maintaining the pre-eminence of our national Church, under any reform which may be made in her discipline, appointments, or funds, has been so ably vindicated by Dr. Chalmers, that his words are worthy of being recorded; and their gigantic force impressed on the mind of every man who is engaged within the senate, or without, in propelling the machinery of innovation on our ecclesiastical system,—*Justitiæ partes sunt, non violare homines, verecundiæ non offendere!* "To take down the *Establishment*, whether in England or in Scotland, would be to desolate the land of far the greatest amount of its religious instruction; and the cause of sound Christianity is exposed to great danger from the rude and unpractised hands which are put forth in the work of reforming, or *remodelling*, our *ecclesiastical institutions*. The popular and prevailing cry at this moment is, for the exclusive application to the support of the *working clergy*, of all the revenues of the Church, as well as those of higher ecclesiastical endowments, which, however they may have provoked the hostile feelings of those who do not calculate upon all *the ends of a Church*, and upon all the designs of its sacred institution, (because not aware of them)

are nevertheless indispensable to that leisure, and independence, and sufficiency, without which a thorough professional education can never be obtained nor administered, and a thorough professional education can never be upholden."

"I say, then, that the danger is lost, in the blind impetuosity—I had almost said the *frenzy*—of Reform,—under it the Church may be deprived of its best capabilities for the support of an order of men profoundly conversant in the *credentials*, and qualified, by their profound acquaintance both with Christian antiquities and the original language of the *holy Scriptures*, to expound and to vindicate their contents, as the substantial ingredients and the primary elements of our faith. There is in this age such a demand for mere menial and personal labour, accompanied with such a total insensibility to the prerogatives and necessities of mental and intellectual labour, as involves the momentous risk that the *law of theology* may be altogether despised. Not that we look upon a highly erudite Scripture criticism to be indispensable as an instrument of discovery into the sense and plain meaning of the Bible; but we look upon it to be absolutely indispensable as an instrument of *defence;* and we feel quite assured, that if the wealth which is still held in reserve for the reward or the sustainment of an elevated scholarship be enervated, or even *transferred*, to *the Church's humbler and homelier services*, then will England cease to be that *impregnable bulwark of orthodoxy*, which she has hitherto proved, in virtue of her many ecclesiastical champions, amongst the nations of *Protestant Christendom!* I speak of that wealth, not as an instrument of discovery, but as an instrument of *defence* against the inroads of false doctrine. In the peaceful and ordinary seasons of the Church their services may not be needed, but when danger threatens, and when an attack is feared from heresy and false doctrine, then the Church does, with her

critics and philologists, what the state does with her *fleets* that are lying up *in ordinary*—she puts them into commission, and prepares them to pour forth their dormant thunder. And to these lettered and highly accomplished ecclesiastics, much more than to any blind or hereditary veneration on the part of the people, does she owe it, that both the *Arian* and *Socinian heresies* have been kept without her borders. And here I am reminded of one of the noblest passages in the whole recorded and masterly eloquence of *Canning*, who, in his speech to the corporation of Plymouth, adverting to the objection of a *navy* being preserved during peace, alluded to the mighty power which lay up in reserve in those enormous floating masses assembled at that port, forming one of the most glorious and the most valued of our national spectacles. 'Our present repose,' said he, 'is no more a proof of our inability to act, than that state of inertness and inactivity in which I have seen those mighty masses that float in the waters about your town, is a proof that they have no strength, nor are capable of being fitted for the most important service. You well know how soon one of those stupendous machines, now reposing on its shadow in perfect stillness—how soon, upon any call of patriotism or necessity, it would assume the stern likeness of animation—of a being instinct with life and motion,—how soon it would ruffle, as it were, its swelling plumage—how quickly it would put forth all its beauty and its bravery—collect its elements of strength, and awaken its dormant thunder.' Such is one of those magnificent machines, when springing from inaction to a display of its might. Such is England herself, whilst, apparently passive and motionless, she silently concentrates the power which is to be put forth on an adequate occasion. And such, I would add, are the *Churches* and *Colleges of England*, in which, though they have been falsely termed the *dormitories*

of literature, is fostered into maturity and strength, almost all the massive learning of our nation. In these venerable *institutes* there lies up, if not a force in *action*, at least a force in *readiness*, and at command. This is the age of hostility to Christian endowments, and more especially so when the alleged wealth and the alleged indulgences of our established dignitaries are looked at with an eye of *evil*. But to the Church and Universities of England, the theological literature of our nation stands indebted for all her best acquisitions; and we hold it to be a refreshing spectacle at any time, when the genius of our Christianity, or the doctrines of our pure faith, are either insidiously invaded, or openly attacked and defied, to behold an armed champion come forth in full and bright equipment from some high and sheltered retreat of her noble *hierarchy*: nor can we grudge her the wealth—the alleged and *coveted wealth*—of all her sacred endowments, when we reflect how well, and how successfully, under her venerable auspices, the battles of *orthodoxy* have been fought—that in this holy warfare they are *her* sons, and they *her* scholars, who are ever foremost in the land, ready at all times to face the threatening mischief, the embittered storm, and by the might of their ponderous erudition to overbear it. May no weapon that is ever found against them prosper, but, purified though not destroyed, may they ever remain the venerable and pure fountains of the nation's learning and the nation's Christianity."

Any commentary upon sentiments like these would be matter of supererogation; let it suffice, that they give that sure and candid testimony of the *truth*, which clothes itself in all the loftier advantages of Christian feeling—displaying the attributes of that Divine Pastor and Bishop of souls, who emphatically enjoined upon his disciples to " do good unto all men, but especially unto those who are of the household of

faith." Under this spirit Dr. Chalmers indeed shows himself, to be one of the ablest living defenders of the Gospel dispensation.

In a strictly moral sense, and with a people, who being removed from the light of Christianity, do not acknowledge the interposition of an eternal direction in the temporal affairs of man, the principle of exclusive popular power, *creating a compact, and an arbitrary fiction, without religion* may be admitted; but with a professedly Christian people it cannot be received, and this constitutes the fatal error of Paley, who draws an invidious conclusion, and makes no distinction in his moral philosophy, between the just authority of *religion*, and the simple contract which an idolatrous people may enter into with each other; and whilst he admits that the civil magistrate may interfere (as a matter of right) in all concerns which involve the general good, or the repose of the state, his theory, however plausible it may appear at first view, is like "the baseless fabric of a vision," and absolutely untenable, as a principle of legislating power; for it is *irresponsible*, and destitute of an *authority*. The mere circumstance of a social contract, creating an "*arbitrary fiction*," (taking his own words) conveys no authority beyond that expressly stipulated for, and which one portion of the people has as good a right to contest, as the other to originate; and a government thus instituted must necessarily, sooner or later, terminate in despotism! So much for this liberal writer's views of moral government, and its stability, independently of the control of religion, and its influence on the general conduct of mankind.

Such a system as that propounded by Paley, and advocated by some of the popular dissenting ministers of the *Congregational Board*, is at variance with the Scriptures of truth, and with custom. When our Saviour so impressively said to his disciples, "Render unto Cæsar, the things which are

Cæsar's; and unto God, the things which are God's," he merely referred to Cæsar in his *temporal* capacity as a heathen potentate, who had neither by himself, nor by his people, entered into any acknowledgment of the covenant with the God of the Jews, or of the intended Christian Church; but who, conformably with the regulations of the moral law, remained undisturbed in his temporal possessions; and the time had not yet arrived when the prophecy of Isaiah should be fulfilled by the Gospel propagation,—"*The Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising*[1]." By the decision, the Redeemer gave a splendid specimen of his own obedience to law, custom, and government; and a lasting monition to his followers. But what is the denunciation of the same portion of Scripture against those who refuse to acknowledge the glory and pre-eminence of God's Christian Church, after the coming of that *light?* "*And the sons of strangers shall build up thy walls, and their kings shall minister unto thee.*" And again, "*For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee, shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted.*"—"The last business of wisdom," says Davenant, "is not to refuse, even unto unbelievers and Pagans, the obedience due to them, whether by divine or human right. It is therefore the duty of a Christian, walking wisely, even to honour heathens and unbelievers invested with power, to pay them tribute, to yield them obedience, and to do all those other things to which they are bound by laws, not directly opposing the divine laws."

Cæsar's compact with his Roman subjects might justly have been viewed by Paley as an *arbitrary fiction;* but it is widely different with the Christian compact. The rule of Augustus, although tempered with the spirit of justice, could

[1] Isaiah lx. 3. 10. 12.

only have been considered by the Son of God as a compound heathen and civil institution; for the Romans attributed the essence of all their fundamental, or *state laws*, to the inspirations of the *augury*, and the approbation of *Jupiter*, their presiding deity, which Pliny so fully establishes; yet, to this very system, as a legal contract, did Jesus enjoin obedience in all matters of customary right! The earliest fathers of the Christian Church maintained the same views,—the first Augustine expressly says,—[1] "*The king is always to be honoured, if not for his own sake, yet on account of his station*;" —and again, "*The power of ruling is not given to the wicked, unless by the providence of the Most High God, when he judges human affairs worthy of such matters. He who gave the kingdom to a Christian Constantine, he also gave it to an apostate Julian.*" Tertullian, the renowned Presbyter of Carthage, in his "Apology," addressed to the magistrates of the Roman empire, in vindication of the Christians, eloquently sustains the same views, and proves their adherence to the state regulations, which for a long time mitigated the angry feelings of the Emperor *Severus* towards them.

The Christian contract between the state and the people, was placed on a very different foundation by Constantine, retaining the spirit of the ancient Roman law, the principles of which he had imbibed in his father's court in Britain; and such principles, in a great measure, became amalgamated with Christianity in Britain; but, in both instances, the arbitrary fiction instituted by heathenism fell to the ground: and here it is advisable again to refer to the remark, that Paley makes no clear distinction in his writings between the government of *idolatry*, and the government of a *Christian Church upon earth*, holding the sceptre of righteousness, and to which

[1] Quæst. 5. et N. Test. quæst. 35. De Civit. Dei, lib. 5. cap. 19. & 21.

the Gentile nations, one and all, in the fulness of time, are commanded to pay obedience[1]. Paley says, "The acts of the legislature, the edicts of the prince, the sentence of the judge, cannot affect my salvation; nor do they without the most absurd arrogance pretend to such power." To this Dr. Silver has admirably replied,—"The acts of the Legislature may establish idolatry, and burn men alive, as Nero did, if they refuse to obey them: or, they may furnish the means of *Christian instruction*, and remove all *temptation inconsistent with Christian conduct!* Do not all these acts powerfully affect the salvation of men under their influence? He that is not for Christian government, must be against it; for men's minds cannot remain *void*; and the tendencies of our very nature will certainly introduce some other system, that is opposed to it, and that will ultimately persecute it. The Church was never secure from persecution, until she *secured the seat of government*; and the principle of self-defence alone would establish her *right* to the power: *three hundred years of persecution will convey an undeniable right to take possession of the position from whence that persecution issued!*" What *liberal*, in the teeth of his own professed principles, will deny the truth and justice of the premises here adduced? They form an unanswerable conclusion to the shallowness of Paley's doctrine, in a Christian light; and even as a point of *expediency*, where the temporal interests of mankind are *morally involved*, their utility becomes manifest. It is indeed lamentable to find professing Christian men, in the nineteenth century of the rule of the Christian Church, advocating principles diametrically

[1] "We, however, who have rejected this theory, because we cannot discover any actual contract between the state and the people, and because we cannot allow an *arbitrary fiction* to be made the foundation of real rights and of real obligations, find ourselves precluded from the distinction."—*Paley's Phil.* vol. ii. 331.

opposed to God's word; and leaguing themselves with confederates who practically deny "the evidence, which God has given of his Son,"—whose only aim is political power, or the unrestricted freedom of licentiousness. In reference to the present political system of our French neighbours, the doctor judiciously apostrophises,—"How must the present government of that country affect the religious feelings of the young and thoughtless, which admits *all systems of worship upon equal footing*, after an exclusive patronage of the *Christian faith* for so many centuries!"

However desirable it may be, in a political point of view, to retain our amicable relations with the French people, to display to them, on all occasions, the kindlier feelings of the Christian spirit, the fairest feature of the British character, let not our Christian pastors, nor our Christian statesmen, take the *impress* of their principles from the *dye of revolutionary freedom*; nor barter the loftier characteristics of Christian authority, which flows through the superstructure of our institutions, with the specious policy which is recommended by one or more of our popular authors, who have recently visited that country, and who archly suggest the advantages which may result, from the application of some of the regulations of the existing civil policy of France, to our social system, which is the ostensibly professed object in view [1]. We have, for ages, flourished as a nation of Christian freemen, and should prefer the retention of those pure principles of freedom, that result from a truly Christian education, and its happier associations, its moral influences, for the advancement of the national prosperity, and the permanent security of her liberties, to the substitution of foreign systems and untried theories, however plausibly they may be introduced to mislead the judgment,

[1] France, "Social, Literary, Political," by H. L. Bulwer, Esq. M. P. 1834. Colburn and Bentley.

amuse the imagination, or gratify the senses. *La vérité ne fait pas tant de bien dans le monde que les apparences y en font de mal!*

These views of moral obligation, dependant on Christian rule, were propounded and defended by the first fathers of the primitive Church, long before the Church of Rome assumed the decided characteristics of arbitrary power, in connexion with the absolute authority of the Pope, as established by Charlemagne in the eighth century; and this single fact affords another triumphant answer to those, who pertinaciously assert, that the principle of *divine sanction* was first introduced by priestly influence, for the purpose of fettering men's minds, and favouring worldly designs of ambition. "The generality of Dissenters," says Priestley, "allow the propriety and use of some *establishment of Christianity*, and formerly they were universally of this opinion." On what grounds do they at present rest their advocacy for the separation of religion from the state, superior to those which existed in the days of the long parliament, when Doctor John Owen, the intrepid champion of republicanism, so zealously maintained the necessity for its connexion? "If it once comes to this, that you shall say, you have nothing to do with religion, as *rulers of the Nation*, God will quickly manifest, that He hath nothing to do with you as rulers of the nation. Certainly it is incumbent on you to take care, that the faith which was once delivered to the Saints, in all the concernments of it, may be *protected, preserved, and propagated*, to and amongst the people, over whom God hath set you. If a father, as a father, is bound to what answers to this in his own family unto his children; a master, as a master, to his servants; if you will justify yourselves as fathers and rulers of your country, you will find in your attempt, all this to be incumbent upon you." Thus far for Doctor John Owen's honest declaration to the long parliament, and its present application.

It should be remembered, that this question for Great Britain, does not involve the beginning of a new system, but the positive overthrow of one already established, which may safely be improved, but which nothing short of consummate folly or wanton depravity would set aside. And on what palpable grounds is the change proposed? Solely, because it is asserted, that in America the *voluntary system* has succeeded, or principally, because in England dissent has gained ground, under the protection of the Establishment? But what says Doctor Dwight, the most celebrated of American divines,—"If it be admitted, as by the sentence of both reason and revelation it ought to be, that a legislature has *a right to establish the worship of God;* it will also be admitted, that the legislature of Connecticut has adopted a wise and liberal system for this most important purpose." Again, "St. Paul (1 Cor. xvi.) has determined, that a *tax* is the right and proper manner of doing all this[1]." In the second verse he recommends the Corinthians "to lay by them somewhat," as a contribution to the relief of their fellow-Christians; "every man as God hath prospered him." "Between contributions for their fellow-Christians, and contributions for Ministers, there is no *moral difference.* The contribution of a sum in proportion to the prosperity God has given men, is *a tax;* for a tax is nothing but *a regular and* proportional contribution." What is *tithe and Church-rate,* more than a regular and proportional contribution for the support of our Christian Clergy, and the main-

[1] Here the Doctor, whose Book should be carefully read by every English Dissenter, specifically alludes to the means by which Churches may be built and ministers supplied in *America;* and powerfully shows the *fallacy* of all attempts to attain that object in small towns, or populous villages, under the *voluntary principle,* so strenuously advocated of late, by a section of the dissenting interest in this kingdom. Dr. Dwight, instead of advising a *separation* from the *state,* recommends in the strongest terms *the state to provide* for the increased service of religion, rendered necessary by the *increase of population!*

tenance of Churches, wherein the Gospel may be preached, and Christian instruction perpetuated? If, according to Doctor Dwight, there exists no *moral* difference between a tax, and a voluntary contribution for this important and necessary object in a Christian State, where is the religious, or even the moral obligation of those who have associated with men, who deny the necessity for the existence of a Church altogether, in their refusal to make such contribution? This learned Divine, of the non-conforming or presbyterian Church, adduces the most unanswerable proofs of the inefficacy of the *voluntary*, when compared with the *involuntary* system in America; and concludes on this head,—"a sober man who knows them both, can hardly hesitate, whatever may have been his original opinion concerning this subject, to believe, that a legislature is bound to establish the public worship of God." If a practical proof were needed, in support of the justice and reason of this conclusion, the recent proceedings in one of the newly enfranchised metropolitan boroughs, in this country, stands prominently forward; whilst the Apostolical decision, (proportionate to the *means*,) the doctor's arguments, and the sober views of Christian policy and duty, establish the necessity for preserving to *property* its rightful privileges in the State [1]. Our Christian

[1] At a late meeting of the parishioners of St. Mary, Lambeth, held for the purpose of considering the propriety of granting a very small rate in the pound for repairing the Church, &c. one of those disgraceful scenes, which stamp the *spirit of the age*, took place, in the furious opposition set up by the majority of inhabitant householders, or rate-payers, including, of course, men of every shade and party in politics and religion, as well as those of *no religion*. On a division, the numbers against the rate appeared as three to one, but on a *poll* being demanded, and taking place, the question was decided in the affirmative, by a full majority of the holders of property, on their *extra* or *entitled votes*. This affords a practical illustration of the peremptory necessity for maintaining the *conservation* of the Church, in the hands of those who display themselves her guardians and her friends, under the injunction given, in defiance of inconsiderate clamour.

ancestors foresaw the stern necessity for securing, in their enactments, the means of coping with *infidelity:* and, as it appears that popery, infidelity, and dissent, have now leagued themselves in an unholy alliance against our Christian system, established by law for many ages, it becomes more imperatively the duty of our Legislators, in their reform proceedings, to shape their course with extra discretion, *verbum sapienti!*

But, the section of the dissenting interest alluded to, by one of its ostensible organs[1], says, "We claim to be released from all compulsory payments towards the support of a form of religion from which we conscientiously dissent; to be relieved from the hardship and *stigma* of exclusion from the universities, the national fountains of education; and to be permitted to bury our dead according to our own method, and by our own pastors, *in the parochial cemeteries.*" The first part of the claim is exceedingly modest, considering that these gentlemen are always ready to share the protective privileges of the Establishment, in its connexion with the State; nor do they show any desire to relinquish them. The second part, betrays total ignorance of the constitution of our public universities, which in legal strictness, are not *national,* any further than their foundation rests on charters involving the faith and responsibility of the *Crown,* and the due application of the property invested in their endowments, to the specific uses, ends, and purposes, for which the grants were made. Thus, a foundation for the perpetuation of a strictly protestant scholarship, cannot be invaded for the purpose of favouring objects at variance with the intentions of the founder, any more than the rights of a private dissenting Charity can be infringed by law, contrary to the intentions of the devisor[2]. *Exemptions*

[1] Rev. A. James, Birmingham—"Pastor's Address," &c.

[2] Vide the recent decision of the Vice-Chancellor, in the case of Lady Hewley's Charity.

from the destruction of the chartered rights of our two leading universities, were specially provided for, even under the Reform Bill; and, if the grounds of those exemptions were made known, it might possibly lead to the conviction, that there exist the most valid reasons for continuing the exceptions. The Colleges of England are chartered corporations of the most sacred character, based on the integrity of *kingly faith*; and the power under them has been granted to individuals for a national benefit, on the funds originally bestowed by private persons, and reference must be had to their object; that object is primarily and fundamentally connected with the advancement of the faith of the Protestant Church of England, under express conditions, in the great majority of instances, not the propagation of the principles of *dissent* from her doctrines. Such a principle of unqualified admission, as that pretended to, would virtually subvert the pious intentions of the founders. The rule does not always furnish the exception, but in this instance it abundantly does. What community of interest or participation have the dissenters a *right* to claim in the *Arcana Collegii* so *excepted?* The *perpetuity* of all corporate bodies, is a principle especially recognized by the English law, as emanating from the grants of the earliest kings, supported by the *statutes of mortmain*; and their identity, property, and privileges, are irrevocable, unless an adequate compensation is afforded: and where exists the intention or the means of compensation, for the breach of faith proposed so unblushingly, by these truly liberal, and sentimentally just, renovators of our ecclesiastical system? Let those amongst the dissenters (in the aggregate a sensible and truly respectable body,) who object to the system, as it stands, found extra Colleges for themselves; for surely it is preposterous to demand an *association* with an institution, from the principles of which, with the same breath, they unhesitatingly declare,

they *conscientiously dissent;* and to whose *principles of government* they are avowedly opposed!

The third part of the claim is involved in hostility to the proposition contained in the first; for, with what justice can the Dissenters demand or claim admission to "bury their dead in the parochial cemeteries," whilst they seek exemption from the payment of a compulsory rate for the maintenance of those very cemeteries. This is in perfect keeping with the reasonable quality of their other demands; and which, if acceded to, would soon give the people of England a Church without *religion*, and a government without *law;* an alternative, which, under the finest feelings of Christian charity and brotherly love, we have no right to concede to our dissenting brethren, *credat qui vult!*

It is disgraceful to the assumed intelligence of the times, and the morality of the age, that men of influence or education can be found assembling in vestry meetings, for the express purpose of fulminating the grossest calumnies, the most unblushing misrepresentation, with reference to the entire constitution and application of Church property, for the ostensible purpose of separating the existing state connexion; repeating the delusive and vulgar story, that the expence of the Establishment is grievous to the people at large; whereas the contrary is the fact. The Church has her own property, the same as any other independent body in the State. It was set apart for religious, and cannot be applied to other purposes. It continues separate, and never formed a part of the wealth acquired by the remaining portions of the people. The right to its retention, is older than the titles of those who possess the land from whence the right itself is derived. The services therefore, of a large proportion of the ministers of the Church of England, is independent, and in free Churches, perfectly gratuitous.

In this condition of things, nothing can justify the rulers of the people, in rashly abandoning principles already established; which, it is evident, from both facts and reasoning, they should strenuously maintain, as the foundation of Christian rule in the state. The people at large, are not dissatisfied with the forms which the laws have so long sanctioned; nor can they separate the line of duty. The education which Christian rulers should provide for the people, is the extension, not the diminution of Christianity in the state—the increased supply of the means of grace, the want of which is far more manifest, than the necessity for abandoning it to the capricious views of men, who disagree with the established Church in nothing essential, and who can agree amongst themselves in nothing non-essential; or of others, who with one eye can behold nothing but injustice, tyranny, corruption, and inefficiency; and with the other can see nothing but the household of perfection! We must have a Church sustained by religion in the state, and a government of law, founded upon it,—the interests of all classes of professing Christians render this indispensable.

St. Paul, a Roman, maintains this principle strictly, and shows, in the most impressive terms, the proper foundation for a Christian Court of Judicature—"Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints?" The authority he furnishes for Christian kings and magistrates, is even yet more peremptory, —"Know ye not that the saints shall judge the world?" Thus Christians are strictly prohibited against seeking redress for injury before any other than acknowledged Christian tribunals,—now this could not possibly be sustained under a dissolution of the first compact in the constitution; for a court of justice, or *rule of law*, might very soon be formed on principles entirely opposed to the Christian faith; and the

legislature might as well at once, pass an act for abolishing Christianity in the state, as a leading feature of its system, as to sanction measures which must speedily lead to that end.

It is not possible to furnish an argument in terms more conclusive, than those supplied by Dr. Silver, in his judicious observations on the uses and application of the kingly consecration; the ability with which he treats the subject warrants the repeated allusion to his name; neither, can he, as a professor of civil law[1], be accused of clerical predilection, or self-interested opinions. "It is one of the many advantages attending the Christian religion, that it makes men sensible of the corruption of their own nature, and consequently of the necessity of government. There is a natural affinity and a moral attraction between certain principles of government, and the truths of revelation; as there is, on the contrary part between modern philosophy and infidelity. The perfectibility of man, the sovereignty of the people, and tenets similar to these, are generally found leagued with *religious scepticism*. But it may very reasonably be doubted, whether a modern philosopher, as he *recedes from revelation, does not in equal proportion become incapable of legislating for man*. He cannot form any correct notions of the being for whom he has to provide laws. He will not allow, and, consequently, he cannot guard against, the evils with which human nature is surrounded. He is ignorant of the elements of which man is composed, of his real position as a creature, in the scale of being, and of the peculiar circumstances in which he is placed. Amongst other blunders, writers of this description are continually imputing the miseries of mankind to the errors of government, when, in truth, the faults are mutual; and a corrupt people necessarily produce a corrupt government.

[1] D. C. L. of the University of Oxford.

This view of human life, drawn by philosophy, excites an intercourse of perpetual agitation and jealousy, in which its business is conducted, as if one class was necessarily in a state of natural hostility with another, and that they were ordained to hate and prey on each other; but these angry feelings are of modern date, and they are the result of the false view of their own circumstances, which the writers of the present day hold out to the people; but the subordination of former times was ready, cheerful, and even affectionate. 'In all classes a *dignified submission was to be found*,' to use the language of Burke, 'which was produced by the nature of the feelings from whence it arose.' "

A great handle continues to be made of the *allegorical* declaration of the blessed Redeemer, "*My kingdom is not of this world;*" and even some apostate Divines of the Church of England, in their popular displays, have propounded the most incorrect notions, and drawn the most false conclusions on this remarkable reply of our Lord and Saviour to *Pilate*, who was totally ignorant of spiritual things, and before whom he was arraigned on a charge of rebellion against Cæsar's authority, who asked him if such were true:—"Art thou *king* of the Jews?" In reply to the arrogant assumption of these sophisticating reasoners, we will commence with Mr. John Locke, a layman, to whose liberal authority they will perhaps pay some respect.

"As the lively oracles, the Holy Scriptures, are confessedly an immense blessing, and inexhaustible treasure, which the divine wisdom and bounty, have adapted to all the purposes of a holy life, directing us to a cure for every disease of the soul, *considered both in a moral and theological sense;* the displaying the authority, use, and excellency of them, must have a direct tendency, not only to excite our curiosity, but to animate our desire and impatience to be thoroughly acquainted

with the contents of them."—" We may affirm of the Holy Scriptures, what St. Paul attributes to his own preaching (Acts xx. 27.), that in them is declared *all the counsel of God's will;* viz. that instruction in faith, and that *regulation in practice*, which is able to make us wise unto salvation, and throughly furnished unto all good works," 2 Tim. iii. 15. 17. " The knowledge most mysterious and profound, is there exhibited to us: the truths most useful and necessary, are there unfolded to us: the precepts most pure and perfective for mankind *(of which the great sectaries of nature, in their four thousand years improvement, give us little besides blunders and blotted paper)*, are there recommended, nay, and demonstrated too, as they are exemplified in the conduct of all those, who have had the common understanding and the grace to be governed by their directions: so that the *Sciolists* and *Empirics*, who have sifted their sufficiency, and, in contradiction to St. Paul, (1 Cor. i. 25.) say, ' The foolishness of man is wiser than God,' are of all creatures the most ridiculous! But the great antipathy which a thoughtless tribe amongst us (for simple apprehension is at best a very metaphysical kind of thinking,) professes against the authority of the Scriptures, is best accounted for from hence, because they make us acquainted with *ourselves*, and teach us sundry *unfashionable duties*, which they are determined never to copy after; and therefore, as it happens in too many other cases, the Scriptures being against them, they are against Scripture. They will not wash in Jordan. Apollos, the eloquent Jew, was mighty in the Scriptures, knowing only the baptism of John. (Acts xviii. 24, 25.) *But these men reject the counsel of God against themselves; being abominable and disobedient, and to every good work reprobate. So that those who disguise, or disesteem the Holy Scriptures, may be listed under some of these denominations, the proud, heady, high-minded, superficial*

boasters; the low, carnal, indolent, heavy sensualists; the confident, malicious, raging, wicked hearts of unbelief!" What! the liberal Locke, the logician of freedom, so express himself, and quote the authority of Scripture in support! Yes, verily, the liberal Locke, whose writings on civil government have immortalised his name and genius, does thus convey his opinions of the true qualities of *Liberalism*, unbridled by the word of God! Mark this, you who are levellers of Church and State, enemies of Christian distinctions,—you will find them in his Introduction to the "Common Place Book of the Bible."

As these gentlemen quote *Scripture*, in justification of the opinions they advance, by Scripture shall the merit of their logic, and the value of their pretensions be judged. The devil himself quoted Scripture when he tempted the Son of God! But, as many amongst the Dissenters from the reformed Church of England, (whom it would be invidious, and even uncharitable, to include in Locke's denunciation,) have found in the Saviour's answer to Pilate an authority for arguing the propriety of dissolving the Church and State union, so long established in this country, little considering the consequences to themselves, and their own profession, which must inevitably result from the perpetration of such a measure, it is best to grapple with them on this, their favourite foundation, one of those accommodating phrases, which are continually sounded forth without due regard to truth, reason, or investigation. They, of course, contend for the perfect application to a *spiritual kingdom*, or dominion, and a positive abstraction from all governing connexion with the *world*, (i. e. the mass of human beings existing in time!)—Here, then, we are at issue; and, with the authority of the unmutilated word of God, and without any torturing of Scripture for the purpose, deny the premises!

If the Saviour's mission to this world, or, more correctly, to the *sons of men*, is to be taken as a purely spiritual visitation, and having no *moral* object connected therewith, for the temporal regulation of mankind, then would the Scripture be made to abrogate its own testimony, and the mission of the Son of God become a *fallacy*; but, as the Scripture itself, in its entire context, positively declares a moral rule for the government of Christ's Church upon earth, and that such government is to have the *pre-eminence*, it is our duty to inquire and to consider, how that rule is to be conducted, so as to act without tyranny, as a restraining principle, for controlling the wayward propensities and unscriptural passions of mankind. Now such an object *(a priori)* could not possibly be attained, without a positive connexion with human government in some form; for man will not be regulated, even by divine things, without the exercise of authority and example; it only remains then to consider the form of government best calculated to produce that state of things, which shall operate as a permanent auxiliary to Christ's kingdom, or the reign of godliness, and the practice of moral obligation in the minds of the people, as opposed to idolatry, infidelity, and general vice.

In the first place, the Holy Scriptures furnish abundant authority for the institution of government upon such a principle, from Genesis to the Revelations. In the next, the Jewish dispensation, having terminated with the denial and crucifixion of the Messiah, it is impossible that any government can be acceptable to God, which is not based on the Christian Covenant; and, thirdly, we have to show that the forms of the established English constitution are placed on this foundation, not as taking the lead in directing the affairs of the *Church*, in its state connexion; but, as being subject to, and regulated by those principles and those laws, which Christ himself ordained for the preservation of his Church, or

kingdom, in the world; for the Church of Christ, in Scripture, is typically represented as a *kingdom*, and as holding the *sceptre* upon earth, deny it who will!

The kingdom of God, or the *kingdom of Christ*, or the kingdom of heaven, in sacred Scripture, denotes many things; but whenever it is expressed, with a reference to the government and discipline of Christ's Church upon earth, it implies, in the fullest sense, a moral as well as scriptural jurisdiction over the minds of men. This was fully established by St. Paul, before King Agrippa, in the explanatory words,—"To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan, (or unbelief,) unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me." This is Paul's declaration of the *authority* with which he was invested; and so convinced was Agrippa of the perfect propriety of such a system of moral obligation, as that imposed by Christ's Gospel, that, sitting in judgment, he said, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian;" and, consulting with Festus, further said, "This man might have been set at liberty had he not appealed to *Cæsar*." Acts xxvi. 18. and 32. Therefore, we must, in the first instance, become translated into this kingdom upon earth, as a necessary medium of our acceptance into the heavenly kingdom. In the Scriptures we are strictly admonished to leave one kingdom, and to go into the other; because we cannot possibly at the same time inhabit both, whilst they are governed by opposing laws,—this illustrates the figurative application of the Saviour's reply; and yet it is strictly conformable to a moral rule, but not in the literal form the Jews chose to set forth in their allegation of Christ's rebellion against Cæsar's authority; nor in the sense which the enemies of our establishment unjustly attempt to fasten upon it; for Christ's kingdom was opposed to the Pagan

Altar, not to the *Throne* of *Cæsar*; and this is a distinction which many worldly-minded persons do not, or will not, understand.

In the next place, the kingdom of Christ, in Scripture, is meant to express the promulgation and knowledge of the Gospel, to which is appended a decided *moral law*, or system of regulation for human affairs; and, agreeably with his own declaration, that he "came not to destroy, but to fulfil," &c. and, as our good King Alfred interpreted, when he framed his code of laws, the justice, purity, and security of which, have been so ably illustrated in the writings of that learned Englishman and unprejudiced historian, Sir Francis Palgrave. This is further elucidated by the parable of the sower, and the production of fruit, in proportion as it was distributed on good ground, or with circumspection; but the authority for regulating the distribution of Christ's kingdom, was expressly delegated to his disciples, or spiritual members —"To you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given." Matt. xiii. 11. Again, after the denunciation against the barren fig-tree, and the parable of the rejection of the lord of the vineyard's son, when addressing the Chief Priests and Pharisees. "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a *nation* bringing forth *the fruits thereof*." Matt. xxi. 43. Here is the moral rule of the Gospel explicitly implied; it is the external and apparent state of Christian government, existing in the world or time; and, in this sense, with the strictest propriety, does the Church of England entertain it. The reformed Church of England has never attempted the exercise of a *despotic* rule, under any authority to which she is entitled in virtue of her spiritual jurisdiction.—She became united to the state by the express authority of the earliest fathers of the apostolical succession, who came to the nation and

destroyed idolatry, as the first evidence of Christian rule; and they furnished the chief magistrate with those powers which were deemed essential to the formation and execution of a system of just laws, founded on the principles contained in the Bible: yet, the institution of civil government, framed under their auspices, and improved by the hand of time, has been found, of all others, from the very circumstance of its religious association, most calculated to extend and preserve true liberty.

In this instance, at all events, the Dissenters, who are sticklers for an exclusive *spiritual* application of the Redeemer's words, "see as through a glass darkened." In his remarkable reply, "My kingdom is not of this world," Jesus spake emphatically, in terms applied to the existing generation of the Jews, who expected *a purely temporal deliverer*, as well as to the *heathen world*, which was under the bondage of idolatry, and certainly not likely to be claimed as his kingdom,—neither, was his answer enigmatical, it had direct reference and application to the *age of his earthly mission*, the time, "when he was rejected of men;" and such application, in a figurative sense, was perfectly correct; but it was not applicable prospectively to that Christian era, when faith in his *Gospel*, should become the rule of men's conduct, and the foundation of civil government connected therewith, or regulated thereby: the whole Scripture positively negatives such an assumption, and the sublime illustration of the Revelations, denoting its power, is in point,—"*The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ!*" The generation, or *world of men*, (for world, in the figurative language of Scripture, was then a very common expression, as it is in the present day, when applied to human existence, and its predilections, as the "fashionable world," the "literary world," &c.) existing when the Saviour so expressed

himself (including Cæsar and his Roman subjects), was, with the exception of the Jews, strictly *heathen*,—therefore his reply was both satirically rebuking, and rhetorically proper; for the *agreement of his temple was not with* IDOLS, *nor his concord with* BELIAL! This is Scripture authority.

But the declaration of Christ, as a King, has not the intention assigned to it by those worthy logicians, who obstinately interpret that literally, which he applied to a form of government he had determined for mankind, should neither be Jewish nor Heathen: the Jews, in their blindness and unbelief, as well as the Heathens in their total ignorance of divine things, could not comprehend the meaning of his words, and he was not bound to answer to a charge, of which he knew himself guiltless, in any other form. If the first part of the declaration is to be literally applied to his repudiation of an *earthly kingdom*, then are the Dissenters, as well as ourselves, by their own showing, condemned thereby. To judge of the question properly, we must take the whole context of the lengthened reply, made by the Son of God to Pilate, to its conclusion. "If my kingdom were of this world, (i. e. *of this generation of men)*, then would my servants *fight*, that I should not be delivered to the Jews." Why does Jesus here so expressly mark his delivery to this particular people, if he had not a *distinct* government in his eye, well knowing their intention to crucify him? "But now is my *kingdom* not from *hence*." What is to be understood by the words "not from hence?" Why, not from henceforward, or from the *time present*; but, after my resurrection, when all shall be fulfilled! Mark what passes in the next verse,—"Art thou a King then?" Jesus answered and said, "Thou sayest that *I am a King*. To this *end* was I born, and for this *cause* came I into the *world*, that I should bear witness to the *truth*," &c. Here Christ first puts the words into Pilate's mouth that he is a

King,—secondly, that he was born to reign as such,—thirdly, that he came *into the world* to "receive for himself a *kingdom*," and, to return,—fourthly, that he should bear witness to the propagation of his Gospel, which declares the truth of that *kingdom* to mankind, i. e. the *world*, figuratively!

We now come to the next point, the condemnation these assertors of a purely spiritual kingdom pass upon themselves, as well as those with whom they contest the propriety of the retention of a temporal authority, supported by the state, for the perpetuation of Christ's Church on earth. No man, at all acquainted with Scripture, will deny, that the Jews looked for a temporal kingdom in the person of their expected Messiah, invested with worldly pomp, to reign at Jerusalem, who would restore all their ancient ceremonies, and with the arm of human power destroy all their enemies of the heathen world. Now, the kingdom of Christ, being the kingdom of regeneration in the soul, mind, and heart of man, unto a new and holy life, destroying the superstitions of the one, and the immoral propensities of the other, was to the obstinate Jews, in spite of all Christ's teaching, indeed an *enigma*; and thus they accused him of an attempt to usurp Cæsar's authority, because his doctrine and promised kingdom was to them of an unsavoury character, and not such as they had expected; and moreover, being opposed to all their habits, they resolved to make direct war upon it, and its Divine Founder! The answer given by Christ to Pilate is conclusive, against their ignorance and folly; and, although it became needful that earth's great tragedy should be fulfilled, and the "Son of man" offered up a sacrifice for human frailty, the whole of his reply to the judge, establishes both his character and his quality as a *King*, invested even with temporal power; and that it was decreed that he should *receive* the kingdom, or power and authority, of establishing his covenant with mankind, and

his Gospel government upon earth, in opposition both to Heathenism and Judaism; and to return *in veritate victoria!*

Will any rational Christian man deny, that the victory of Christ, is a *moral conquest* over the propensities of time and sense, those sins which impair the body and destroy the soul? Does not the apostle expressly say, "Who hath *delivered* us from the power of darkness, and *hath* translated us (in time) into the kingdom of his dear Son?"—nay, rather hath taken us by *force*[1] from the rule of *idolatry*, and the power of the evil one reigning in the world? A kingdom indeed, Christ, as the *Messiah*, came to establish upon earth; not a kingdom by the authority of the sword, but the dominion of his Gospel, and the power of his apostles to proclaim it, *in all the world*, and to the kings of the world, who are to be governed thereby, in their civil conduct towards their subjects. This is the light in which most Christian princes have received it, and acted upon it.

It was never designed by God, nor contemplated by Christ, to reign as an earthly king at Jerusalem, with the forms of earthly pomp; but that offers no valid reason, why the kings of the earth should not obey those rules for the government of their subjects, which he propounded to his disciples before his Crucifixion, and to that divine authority, which he gave his Apostles after his Resurrection, when it was no longer compatible for him to act in a human capacity. As a heavenly Lawgiver, Christ calls upon the kings of the earth to abolish idolatry, and he calls upon his Apostles, and those who represent the Apostles, to aid them in that object, by preaching and persuasion, as well as by their counsel and moderation;

[1] "Not simply liberavit, sed *eripuit* (ἐῤῥύσατο.) The word signifies by main force to *deliver*, or pluck away, even as David pulled the lamb out of the bear's mouth."—*Leigh's Critica Sacra*. And also ἐῤῥυσάμην, ω, ατο, I caught hold of, I drew forth, or I grasped with power, &c.—*Author*.

and even as good subjects, to pay heathen kings tribute, when placed in power. There is no infringement of command, no usurpation of authority in the kings of the earth claiming a right to *establish* Christianity, because Jesus said, "my Kingdom is not of this world;" for it might with as much propriety be argued that they have not, because they happen to be placed in authority, a right to *adopt* Christianity for themselves or their subjects; for by such adoption, they would virtually set up Christ's Kingdom, and thus infringe on his presumed intention.

But the most preposterous and irreconcileable part of the story has yet to come. The Dissenters *demand admission to state offices*, and to the benefits of a perfect system of *state equality*. Is this possible, in the very teeth of their own choice position? verily it is, and matter of fact too! Now, if Christ's Kingdom is "not of this world," in the sense they interpret it, the king is justified in withholding from them any further interference in *state duties;* and he would even be justifiable in taking from them that right of interfering therein, which, under the Christian law, has been conceded to them; so that their argument refutes itself, and their practice entirely nullifies the value of their assertions, *credat Judæus Apella!*

Our opponents might with equal propriety assert, that no king has a right to abjure idolatry and become a Christian, subject to divine authority; to acknowledge or protect Christians as his subjects, or members of his State by *law*[1]; and that no Christian man, whilst living in time, and having the grace of God directing his moral conduct, should even in temporal matters, acknowledge himself the subject of an earthly

[1] What security would be afforded to Dissenters for their chapels, their endowments, their charities, or the salaries of their ministers, if the Christian authority were taken from the law? What would become of the acts of parliament passed by a protestant Legislature for their protection?—*Author.*

sovereign, solely because his *Lord* and *Master* said to Pilate, "My Kingdom is not of this World." With the kindest feelings of Christian Charity, towards our dissenting brethren, their position is weak, fallacious, and ridiculous.

When the Scripture speaks of the Redeemer's mission to the *World*, it has direct reference to the *human race;* for surely no logical reasoning can be adduced to show its application to the inanimate world, or the mere duration of time. Thus Jesus, when he first sent out his disciples, explicitly directed them: "and as ye go, preach, saying 'the *Kingdom* of heaven *is at hand.*'" Now, in what other sense can the latter part of the injunction be taken, or applied, than to the speedy exercise of the authority of that kingdom upon earth, in a temporal as well as spiritual form; and it cannot be supposed that the "Kingdom of Heaven," (i. e. the Gospel dispensation,) was to terminate with that generation of men to whom it was first preached; for, in the first place, he distinctly commanded them not to go to the Gentiles (or the heathen world,) but to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel," (Matt. x. 5, 6, 7.) But, subsequently, when the Jews rejected the testimony, Christ ordered them to preach that Gospel to *all nations;* and as the Apostle expresses it, in terms that cannot be mistaken, "which is come unto you, *as it is in all the world;* and bringeth forth fruit, as it doth also in you, since the day ye heard of it, and knew the grace of God in truth." Here is the scriptural authority, and the practical working of Christ's Kingdom, not amongst stocks and stones, nor even *spirits*, but the world of *men*, declared by Saint Paul. To whom else but men, were the disciples commanded to preach the Kingdom of Christ upon earth, who were to be bound by it? It is, therefore, a perfect *paralogism* to assert, that the Kingdom of Christ is not one of temporal, as well as spiritual dominion. Every well informed Christian knows and admits, that the

Kingdom of the Son of God in the world, is the regeneration unto a new and holy life, existing in the minds of men, as contradistinguished from the reign of idolatry, of unbelief, and general wickedness; and the attempt to give that a literal interpretation, which had only a figurative application, is only an addition of one more to the many schemes to mislead the unwary and the ignorant, who will not or cannot inquire for themselves.

When Christ is spoken of as a *lawgiver*, in prophetic Scripture, the appendages of kingly authority are always assigned to him; thus, "There shall come a star out of Jacob, and a *sceptre* shall rise out of Israel." Numb. xxiv. 17. Gen. xlix. 10. "Yet have I set my *King* (or mine anointed) upon my holy hill of Sion; I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance," &c. Ps. ii. 6. 8. "Unto us a Son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulders," &c., "of the increase of his government there shall be no end; upon the throne of David and upon his Kingdom to order it," &c. Isaiah ix. 6, 7. "Behold, a *King* shall reign in righteousness, and *princes shall execute judgment*." Isa. xxxii. 1. "Behold, I have given him for a witness to the people, a leader and commander to the people." Isa. lv. 4. "The Messiah the Prince." Dan. ix. 25. "Thou, Bethlehem, &c., out of thee shall he come forth that is to be *ruler* in Israel." Micah v. 2. "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Sion, for thy *King* cometh," &c. Zech. ix. 9. Again, the unbelieving citizens, "We will not have this man to *reign* over us," &c. Luke xix. 14, 15. "But if I, with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the *Kingdom of God is come unto you*." "He that is not with me, is against me, and he that gathereth not with me, scattereth." Luke xi. 20. 23. Again, a most important part of the New Testament Scripture is that, wherein the Holy Ghost is promised, and the three distinct offices so conclusively pointed out, in connexion with

the Christian dominion upon earth. "And when he is come, he will reprove *the world* of sin, and of righteousness, and of Judgment; of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; of Judgment, because the Prince of *this world* is judged." John xvi. 8, 9, 10, 11. Will any logician pretend, that the reproof to the *world*, of "sin, of righteousness, and of judgment," does not distinctly imply, and apply, to the human inhabitants of the earth, in the entire context? And what is the "Prince of this World" to which Jesus alludes, but the rule of *Satan*, and of unbelief in the minds of men, which is judged by his Gospel? For shame, ye shallow expounders and would-be interpreters of God's Word,—ye blind leaders of the blind, who would mystify the truths of God, and give to that, a literal interpretation, when the *letter* of the entire Scripture so completely negatives your premises. But we must yet travel a little further into this question, which is put forth as the great stalking-horse for effecting the dismemberment of our Christian compact in the state. "Be of good cheer, I have overcome the *world*." John xvi. 33. To what or to whom does Jesus apply the word "*overcome?*" Surely not to the earth, to the sea, nor the *inert* materials of which the globe itself is composed; nor to its perishing nature, which would be a *fiction;* but rather to that dominion of darkness and evil over the mind of man, which had preceded his advent upon earth. Did he not exercise temporal authority, when, with a *scourge*, he drove out the money-changers from his earthly house? Who disputed that authority? If, as the Psalmist beautifully expresses it, Christ is to have "the uttermost parts of the *earth* for his *possession*," it follows, as a natural consequence, that his dominion must extend to, or over all those who inhabit that earth, otherwise the possession would be valueless, and the Scripture itself hyperbolical! Will our dissenting friends

contend with us under such a deduction from God's authority to grant that possession?

It is possible that our antagonists may dispute the application of the selections from the Old Testament to the point at issue; we will therefore proceed with the *New*. The Kingdom of Christ is the supreme rule of his Church upon earth, sustained by his Gospel, and that law he came to fulfil, not to destroy. "He is the head of the body, the Church, &c. that in *all things* he might have the pre-eminence." Col. i. 18. "Who hath delivered us from the powers of darkness, (i. e. *unbelief*,) and *hath* translated us *into the Kingdom of his dear Son*." Ver. 13. The Apostle was living in the flesh, as well as those to whom he addressed himself, when he thus wrote and used the word *translated*; and to show its application, *morally*, immediately afterwards adds, ver. 21. "And you that were some time alienated and enemies in your *mind* by *wicked works*, yet now hath he reconciled." And in verse 23., "If ye continue in the *faith* grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel," &c. To what else save a temporal rule, and moral subordination, can this possibly apply? Before his betrayal and Crucifixion Jesus said to his disciples, "Ye call me *Master* and *Lord*, and so I am." John xiii. 13. "And his dominion shall be from sea to sea, and from the river even unto the ends of the earth." Zech. ix. 10. Here the prophecy has been literally fulfilled, by the preaching of the Gospel, and its power to destroy idolatry. The very name of CHRIST implies an anointed King, or messenger of peace; the Gospel is the declaration or *manifesto* of his Kingdom. Isa. lxi. 1, 2, 3. "And hath put *all things* under his feet, and given him to be *head over all things* to the Church." Eph. i. 20. 22. "Him hath God exalted to be a *Prince* and a *Saviour*," &c. This declaration was made by St. Peter and his associates, before the Council, when they were accused of

proclaiming Christ's Kingdom; and who, although punished and warned, ceased not so "to preach and to teach daily in the temple." Acts v. 31. "Blotting out the hand-writing of *ordinances* that was against us, which was contrary to us; and took it out of the way, &c. and having spoiled *principalities* and *powers*, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it (or in himself) by his authority as a lawgiver." Col. ii. 14, 15. "There is but one *Lawgiver* who is able to save, and to destroy." James iv. 12. "Thou hast put *all things* in subjection under his feet." For in that he put *all* in subjection under *him*, there is *nothing* that is *not* put under him. To make the Captain of their salvation perfect, &c. Heb. ii. 8. 10. "Even as I also overcame and am set down with my Father on his *throne*." "These shall make *war* with the *Lamb*, and the Lamb shall overcome them; for he is the LORD OF LORDS, and the KING OF KINGS." Rev. iii. 21. and xvii. 14. If *all things* are put in subjection under Christ, as the head and founder of the Christian covenant, made with man, it follows, that his government must have a temporal, as well as spiritual jurisdiction, over the inclinations and actions of mankind; and how is that jurisdiction to be maintained in the world, i. e. in the regulations of civil policy, dependent on Christian rule, if the *pre-eminence* of Christian authority is to be dispensed with in the state?

There is no ambiguity in the meaning, nor the application, of the texts of Scripture, which have been selected for the purpose of showing, at a bird's eye view, from the word of God, that Christ could not have intended a literal interpretation in the form asserted, should at any time be given to the first part of his reply to Pilate's interrogatory, "My kingdom is not of this world,"—the whole tenor of his life and conduct negatives such a conclusion, as does even the very circumstance of his commanding obedience to governors, and

the laws imposed by Cæsar. But Christ's conclusive declaration, in its true definition, is applicable now as it was then, *to the corrupt state of the earth*, i. e. man's unregenerate condition, under which he sets up his own authority against the divine authority; whereas "the grace of God, that bringeth salvation," is the establishment of Christ's kingdom in the heart of man, and producing the rule of moral conduct, the evidence of that kingdom in the world, or in *time*, although not *(à priori)* of *an earthly rise, form, or tendency:* but, as St. Paul beautifully expresses it, "Teaching us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, *in this present world.*" Titus ii. 12. Therefore, is Christ's kingdom of necessity of this world, in the outward form, under the New Testament dispensation, and which kingdom, or rule of *grace, bringeth forth fruit* and *increaseth*, in proportion as his Gospel is preached, and his faith maintained, *thirty, sixty, or a hundred fold!* This is no other than that very kingdom which Jesus *appointed* to his disciples—"I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me." And mark the consequences of its rejection—"And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your word, when ye depart out of that house or city, shake off the dust of your feet. Verily I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for that city." Matt. x. 14, 15.

In the full and comprehensive application of Scripture, Christ's words are powerfully illustrative of God's *universal dominion over all things;* and, even in this sense, were appropriate to his own dignity and station, as the Son of God, arraigned on a false charge before a human tribunal, exemplified by his subsequent warning to Pilate, "Thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above." John xix. 11. Such universal dominion is,

with strict propriety, called *kingdom*; God, as the original founder of the universe, thereby governs, preserves, protects, gives laws to, and regulates all his creatures, and dispenses judgments or favours, or withholds them at his discretion. "Thine, O LORD, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty: for all that is in the heaven and in the *earth* is thine; thine is the *kingdom*, O LORD, and thou art exalted head above all." Will any Christian man advance as a position, that God has *resigned* such, his prerogatives, or any portion of them, except permissively, into human hands, for the regulation of earth's transactions? Thus, the visible Church of Christ, is his kingdom upon earth, which he foretold should come, after his death and resurrection; and those who deny, or attempt to deny, the exercise and moral rule of that kingdom, as well as to declaim against the necessary means for upholding it in the world, are in a state of *rebellion* against that Omnipotent Power, which founded it, and that Saviour who purchased it with his blood!

For the purpose of illustrating the moral power, which Jesus designed to establish in the government of his Church upon earth, it is not possible to select a more striking portion of the New Testament, than the nineteenth chapter of St. Luke's Gospel. In that beautiful parable, wherein the Saviour describes himself as a *nobleman* going into a far country, to receive a *kingdom*, he declares the *occupancy* and the duties of his servants; he describes also the opposition and rebellion they will meet with,—"we will not have this man to reign over us." And, in proportion as those appointed servants exert themselves in establishing his Gospel, and propagating the fruits thereof, will he reward them with authority over *ten* or *five* cities; but what are the consequences to those who question his authority and power, and who have the

temerity to represent him as a *despot*, or who neglect to execute his mission,—their charge is to be taken from them, and given to those who shall have exerted themselves to the utmost, for the increase of his kingdom! And again, mark the sequel to the rebellious citizens,—"But those mine enemies, which would not that I should *reign over them*, bring them hither and slay them before me." Now the time and the circumstances connected with this parable, must be fully considered, to enable us to judge fairly and correctly of its application of a temporal authority for that kingdom, which the Son of God decrees (in the latter part of that chapter,) should be established on the destruction of Jerusalem, as the consequences of her unbelief. Jesus, as foretold by the prophecy, was proceeding to make his last formal entry into the devoted city, armed with the authority of a *lawgiver*, and language can but faintly express the tender lamentation of his mind, whilst he proclaims the final and awful doom, the literal extermination of her *law*, her archives, her temple, and her people! And how does he manifest his authority? —by going into the temple *personally*, and declaring it to be *his house*, and turning out those guilty of immoral practices therein!

Another striking instance of the distinction which Christ made between his *spiritual state*, and that of his earthly kingdom, or *dominion* over the minds of his followers, is his remarkable reply to the dying thief, who implored his favour and protection. It cannot be presumed that either of those unhappy malefactors, who suffered with the Saviour, had any correct knowledge of divine things, or of the true objects of his mission; and one of them manifested the grossest ignorance, by railing on him in his agony; but the rebuking reply of the penitent thief, indicating that they were both *Jews*,

"Dost not thou fear God?"—and his concluding words, have a direct moral application [1],—they were offenders against the moral law—not so with *Jesus*, who had not infringed that law; and to show that this man entertained a latent hope of Christ's power to release him, and probably at that moment expecting (in common with others of his nation) an earthly manifestation of that power, under the awful demonstration of the *elements*, he exclaimed, "Lord, remember me when thou *comest* into thy KINGDOM," (βασιλείᾳ), or, in other words, *when possessed of thy power, or dominion*, which, when applied to God, both the Greek and Hebrew text would justify [2]; but mark the reply—"To-day shalt thou be with me ἐν παραδείσῳ,"—in PARADISE! Thus drawing a marked distinction between his spiritual rest, and the kingdom of *his* Church, "the *world to come*," and the full manifestation of which was not to take place until after his resurrection and the descent of the Holy Ghost!

And here we must also consider the transactions, that took place after the resurrection of Christ from the dead, when appearing to his disciples he expressly told them, "that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning him [3]." Now, if all things, so written, were to be fulfilled, the rule and authority of a lawgiver upon earth, is both distinctly expressed and

[1] Luke xxiii. 41.

[2] In Holy Writ, whenever *kingdom* is coupled with *God*, it signifies *might*, *power*, *majesty*, or *dominion*; the ablest commentators assert the correctness of this application,—others have maintained, that "comest into," and "art *possessed of*" ἐγκρατὴς, or ἐπίβολος, are equally applicable to this important text, the terms of which denote the hope or expectation of *something coming to pass*, not the *going* to a *settled* place of rest, or glory; but the latter of which the Saviour, by the use of the word *paradise*, demonstrated to be distinct from his kingdom of the Gospel dispensation. For further elucidation, vide *Leigh's Critica Sacra*, &c.—*Author*.

[3] Luke xxiv. 44.

implied in those various authorities, especially the last, (*Psalm* lxxii. 8, 9. 11. 17.) and verified by his own declaration,—"All power is given unto me in *heaven* and in *earth*."—"Go therefore and *teach all nations;* teaching them to observe *all things* whatsoever I have commanded you," &c. Matt. xxviii. 18, 19, 20.

The glories of Christ's kingdom, and its administration in *time*, are ostensibly set forth in the forty-ninth and sixtieth chapters of Isaiah, the perfect identity between God's promises, and the last acts of the Redeemer, having been established by himself.—"And I will preserve thee, and give thee for a *covenant* of the people to establish the *earth;* to cause to inherit the desolate heritages." Isa. xlix. 7, 8, 9. "Him whom man despiseth, *kings* shall see and arise, *princes* also shall worship, because of the Lord that is faithful," &c. Isa. lx. 1, &c. to the end. These texts of Scripture, coupled with Christ's authority to "teach all nations," are conclusive as to the right of a Christian king, a Christian nobility, and a Christian legislature, by their conjoint efforts, under a free constitution, to establish and to maintain Christianity in the state. The right of the people to choose their own political form of government in the first place, and to append it to the Christian covenant, no liberal man will dispute; but, having made their selection, it is for the privileged classes to maintain the compact; for, under the English constitution, it is the privileged classes which constitute and comprehend the entire nation. The religion of the state is pre-eminent, it takes the lead, and is superior to the law, for it is the foundation of the law,—not in the form of the Jewish *theocracy*, but holding the earthly sovereign responsible to the heavenly King, for all public or state acts, affecting the general condition and morals of the people, and, above all things, the eternal safety of his subjects, which involves the Christian

government upon earth. "Kings," saith St. Augustine, one of the earliest fathers of the Church, "in this serve God, as *kings*, if by virtue of their royal power, or authority, they command good things, and prohibit the bad,—not only things which pertain to human society, but to all those especially which pertain to divine religion[1]."

The obedience paid by our Saxon ancestors to the ancient common law, the *lex non scripta*, is evidence of the superior virtue which then existed in the state; that law was based on the principles here illustrated, and it was rigidly respected; religious authority, not mere expediency, was its foundation. The right to unite the will of the people with the will of God, under the authority of Holy Writ, is equally manifest. From the foundation of the World, or the commencement of time, the Almighty, as the supreme Ruler, has originated, approved, and sanctioned, a certain system of government for mankind, by his pleasure and presence; and parts of that system still remain unbroken, and applicable to all the purposes of existing society. The commands of the Son of God are explicit[2],—his kingdom commenced at *Jerusalem*[3], immediately after his resurrection; he commanded it thenceforth to be proclaimed in *all nations*; agreeably with that command, the first proclamation was made by the Apostles immediately after the descent of the Holy Spirit, and the feast of Pentecost, he having previously breathed on them, and imparted once more the divine authority. Christ's Kingdom, by virtue of his supreme authority as a lawgiver, was also proclaimed in all the world, and its power to displace idolatry sufficiently explained by *Justyn Martyr*[4].

[1] Augustine in Epist. 2. p. 324. Gaudenti, lib. 2. cap. 17.

[2] "This Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in all the World."—Matt. xxiv. 14.

[3] "*Hierosolyma*," the city of *Melchisedec*.—Josephus.

The power of Christ's Kingdom upon earth, as a system of moral rule, is unparalleled in the whole history of man, evidenced by the first promulgation

"And from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, and the first-begotten of the dead, and the *Prince of the kings of the earth.*" Rev. i. 5. Of whom the Angel of the Lord also bears witness, "having the everlasting Gospel to preach unto all them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people." Rev. xiv. 6. The happiness of mankind in the present life, is essentially dependent on the principles of its government, and the regulations of its civil policy, as well as upon the moral conduct of those who administer the one and regulate the other. The all important objects of the Gospel dispensation, as they relate to a future state, are necessarily combined with moral obligation, and moral rule; nor can we fairly presume, that in the comprehensive designs of Infinite Wisdom, these emergent considerations have been passed over. Under the authority of the Mosaic Law, which Christ himself declared *imperative*, with the exception of its *ceremonials*, the same system has been re-established and improved under the Christian covenant; and we may, without presumption, conclude, that those nations and people who have adopted such parts of it as are most appli-

of his Gospel (which is the Christian law,) to the Gentiles, or heathen nations; and, as an able commentator has justly observed, "all felt that the morality of their Religion was a fixed and imperative rule, and not like the *ethics of philosophy*, mere reasoning, often too vague and imperfect to convince, and always too destitute of authority to command." "We," says Justyn Martyr, "who formerly rejoiced in licentiousness, now embrace discretion and chastity: we who resorted to magical arts, now devote ourselves to the rule of the Son of God, the God of Goodness; we, who owing to diversity of customs, would not partake of the same hearth with those of a different race, now, since the appearance of Christ, live together in harmony, sharing our property with the indigent, and praying for our enemies, endeavour to persuade those who unjustly hate us, that by leading a life conformed to the excellent precepts of Christianity, they may be filled with the good hope of obtaining the same happiness with ourselves, from that God who is Lord above all things." Need any rational man feel repugnant to become a member of this Kingdom, if even enforced by a Christian King?

cable to their social rule, have so far established their institutions on principles, which rest on the approbation and the will of God; for it is utterly inconsistent with the immutability of the divine nature, and the objects of Christ's mission to mankind, that the Deity should enact in one generation, laws, which are to bè abrogated in another, when the same necessity exists for the retention of their fundamental principles throughout all time!

In arguing for the preservation of a pure and well-defined system of religious instruction, for a free people, we are fully enabled to maintain its moral advantages, when compared with those of mere philosophy, which, in every Christian state, should be held dependent on the rules of faith; for surely, we are not prepared to urge the inverse rule, and insist that religion should be held dependent on philosophy, and the uncertain support of voluntary attachment, in opposition to the judgment and opinion of the best informed amongst those, who are not of the communion of the Church of England, as established by law. The able writings of Dr. Dwight, the American traveller and Presbyterian divine, abundantly show the injury which the voluntary system of religion has already produced in that republic, which boasts of the freedom of its institutions, and the unshackled liberty of its people; but has neglected the proper connexion of religion with the state, on a fundamental basis; and if laxity of morals, and neglect of religious cultivation prevail among the people of America, in this early day of her political history, in what condition of mental degradation may she not be placed a century hence? Dr. Dwight writes as follows on this subject:—"The legislature of every state is the proper superintendent of all its domestic concerns. It has not only a right, but is obliged by an authority, which it can neither oppose nor question, to pursue every lawful and expedient

measure for the public welfare. To this great purpose *religion*, in every country, is not only useful, but indispensable; but religion cannot exist, and has never yet existed, for any length of time, without *public worship*. As every man ought therefore willingly to contribute to whatever increases his own prosperity, he is, by immovable consequence, obliged to support the religion which, by increasing the *common prosperity*, increases of course his own." And further,—"Should an advocate for the doctrine which I oppose, demand *proof* that religion is indispensable to the welfare of a free country, this is my answer. Morality, as every sober man, who knows any thing of the subject, discerns with a glance, is merely a branch of religion: and where there is *no religion* there is *no morality!* Moral obligation has its sole ground in the character and government of God; but where God is not publicly worshipped, his character will soon be disregarded, and the obligation founded upon it unfelt and forgotten. No duty, therefore, to individuals, or to the public, will be performed or realised. Justice, kindness, and truth, the three great hinges on which free society hang, will be unpractised, because there will be no motive to the practice, of sufficient force to resist the improper passions of man! *Oaths of office and of testimony alike, without the sanctions of religion, are solemn farces.* Without the sense of accountableness to God,—without the realising hope and belief of a future retribution, they are employed merely to insult the *Creator*, deprave the *juror*, and cheat our fellow men! The sense of duty they involve, nothing but religion can inspire or preserve. With the loss of religion, therefore, the ultimate foundation of confidence is blown up, and the security of life, liberty, and property buried in the ruins! Again, finally, the legislator is to be informed, that it is wiser, more humane, and more effectual to prevent crimes, than to punish them. He is to be

told, what he cannot deny, that religion is the only great preventive of crimes; and contributes more, and in a far more desirable manner, to the peace and good order of society, than the judge or the sheriff, the gaol and the gibbet united. He is to be reminded that mankind, with all the influence of religion, added to that of the *civil government*, are still very imperfectly governed; are far less orderly, peaceful, and friendly to each other, than humanity must wish; and that, therefore, he who would willingly lessen this influence is a fool, he who would destroy it a madman!" Let the reader mark one more passage from this animated author, which places the doctrines of Paley, and the whole train of modern philosophers, in the shade of merited insignificance. *Dans les conseils d'un état, il ne faut pas tant regarder ce qu'on doit faire, que ce qu'on peut faire;* and it is in the power of every legislature to provide for the spiritual instruction of a free people. "In the history of the globe," says Dr. Dwight, "there is recorded but one attempt, seriously made, to establish a free government without religion. From this attempt has sprung new proof, if any were wanting, that such a government, stripped of this aid, cannot exist. The government thus projected, was itself never established; but was a mere *abortion*, exhibiting doubtful signs of life at its birth; and possessing this dubious existence only as an *ephemeron*. During its diurnal life it was the greatest scourge, particularly to those for whom it was formed, and generally to the rest of mankind, which the world has ever seen. Instead of being a free, just, and beneficent system of administration, it was more despotic than a Persian aliphate; more wasteful of human life, and all its ties and blessings, than an inundation of *Goths* and *Vandals*. Those who lived under it, and who either originated or executed its measures, were the authors and perpetrators of more *crimes*, than any collection of men

since the termination of that gigantic wickedness, from which nothing short of a *deluge* could cleanse a polluted world!" This is good testimony in support of a national principle of religion, so fully identified with the welfare, and imperatively necessary for the maintenance of the liberties and social comforts of a free people. It should be with *morals* as it is with *religion*, that the rules which guide the practice of the one, should influence the conduct of the other; and that certain rules may be established, consonant to the social ends and purposes under which society may become amalgamated in harmonious compact; and sufficiently defined to act as mutual checks, for the adequate security of mutual happiness and national prosperity, under the characteristic designation of civil government."

It may, by some readers, be considered that this subject has been freely enlarged upon; but every real friend of the Church of England must also admit, that it involves a question of too much magnitude to the temporal interests of that Church, and her faith, to allow of its being treated superficially. We have to contend for her ascendency, and for her doctrine; for, if the one becomes impaired, the other will inevitably suffer in proportion. Against the *quadruple crusade* we are bound to erect the standard of Christ's kingdom, and fearlessly to defend it at all hazards; nor do we impair the labour of Christian love towards our dissenting brethren, by opposing their unreasonable demands,—they should remember, that the wisdom of philosophers does not extirpate vices, but that it tends to conceal them; whilst the precepts of the *Gospel*, duly maintained, change the whole character of man, casting out his evil propensities, and rendering him a new creature, at all events, a good citizen, as depicted by the prophet Isaiah, under an elegant similitude,—"As the rain cometh down from heaven, and returneth not thither again, but

watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud; so shall my word not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it." Isa. lv. 10. Christ's kingdom increases in the world, in proportion as the number of those increases who embrace the Christian faith; and, as mankind is greatly influenced by example, especially when exerted by those in power and station, the religious authority of a Christian king, under our own free constitution, has been aptly described as "a sacred fountain, which has poured from its high elevation similar streams on all the lesser powers."

There are three things indispensably requisite, attached to the office and government of a good king,—piety towards God, justice towards his subjects, and care of the public safety. Separate the sacred office of the earthly king, as a Christian legislator, his responsibility to God, as chief magistrate over Church and State, under the Head Supreme of that Church, and it would indeed be rendered an earthly kingdom, "without God, and without hope in the world!" But every kingdom which has embraced Christianity nationally, and made it the foundation of the national system of government, comprehending the laws and civil policy, may fairly be said to have perfected the prophecy of Scripture, and become "the kingdom of our Lord, and of his Christ." If, by the kingdom of Christ, it is intended purely to designate a spiritual dominion, then is the sense of the word at variance with the prophecy, and the prophecy itself a nullity, whilst yet the means for extending that kingdom, by human legislation and protection, are of the earth, under the primary influence of example and precept, in the correct view and interpretation of Scripture; nor should it ever be forgotten, that the eastern *Magi* offered the ingots of gold to the *Messiah*, in token of

their submission to his earthly authority, who in all the higher attributes, is represented as a King and a Lawgiver!

Whilst the Dissenters appeal to the authority of our established courts of justice, for the protection and security of their own lives and temporal possessions in the State, they stand involved in that very guilt of presumption they condemn,—of relying for such protective aid, as to *spiritual things*, on human authority, comprehended in the civil power, and the law of the land. Is the whole frame-work of our judicatory system and study of jurisprudence, to be changed for the purpose of meeting their views? or, do they expect that separate courts of justice shall be instituted for their accommodation and protection? They object, under alleged scruples of conscience, to the solemn and sacred ceremonials of the Established Church, with reference to baptism, marriage, burial, &c.; but, will they, under similar scruples, be satisfied with the decisions of our courts of law and equity, as at present constituted, on questions arising out of these very subjects, in the event of the proposed concessions being made to them? It behoves the legislature, especially that portion of it existing as the highest judicial estate, to weigh this subject seriously; and it would even be desirable, in a national point of view, that a specific understanding should be had with the dissenting body on this point. The Presbyterian Protestant Church of Scotland, under the *Act of Union*, expressly stipulated for the full preservation of her rights and privileges, under her proposed alliance with the State, and that guaranteed by *the king's oath*, whilst yet the government was essentialy *Protestant*, in its entire constitution. It is equally paramount, that the *Establishment*, under the withdrawal of those legal enactments, passed for her preservation and state connexion, should be placed on a well-defined footing of adequate legal

security, on all the chief points which are likely to arise under the proposed changes. Without such salutary precaution, a system of perpetual innovation will be urged on Parliament, by the political portion of the Dissenters, and their self-interested friends; neither, can the points so connected with, or dependent upon them, be satisfactorily anticipated in argument. Thus, it will be essential for the peers and commons of Parliament to create adequate securities, in proportion to the extent of the concessions sought for, if the judicial business of the state, in all its higher departments, is to be preserved on its present fundamental basis, and ancient principle of religious pre-eminence.

The progressive, and progressing, efforts to establish a voluntary system of religious rule in the state, are not matters of trivial import; they must be met by measures at once prompt and decisive; and it is equally the duty of a Protestant people, to sustain the labours of a conservative government, when pledged to the restoration and improvement of our best institutions, not their entire annihilation! It would be a lengthened, and, after all, a difficult task to define, *in detail*, the provisions which should constitute those safeguards, that are become indispensable for maintaining the integrity of our venerable Church, in the just plenitude of her authority and her possessions. A vast deal must necessarily be left to the wisdom, virtue, and discretion of her appointed guardians; but the *principle* on which they should be framed, ought to be sufficiently obvious to every Christian patriot; and may be reduced to three leading points, under one general head—*the controlling influence of religious authority*. First, that the supreme direction of the affairs of state, shall be continued in the hands of men *confessedly Christian*,—secondly, that no public measure, affecting the interests of religion, or the morals of the people, shall be passed in violation of the higher

principles contained in the Word of God,—and, thirdly, that the chief magistrate, as a consecrated king, acting under God, as the representative of the laity of a kingdom professedly Christian, and sworn to act in all things for the promotion of the Gospel faith, shall be sustained in all his prerogatives as the head of the Church, consisting of the *clergy* and the *laity;* and justly so, because, being the head of the State, when meeting in council for temporal matters, he is also the head of the same body, when assembling for purposes purely spiritual; and the trustee of both, under the Christian covenant. It will not be matter of difficulty for Christian statesmen, nor for a Christian people, to make their deductions from a basis so constructed, the foundation on which our ancestors, looking to futurity, raised the constitution of England.

The first Christian rulers and elders of the Church were duly sensible of the important fact, that although the Scriptures declare an "*eternal kingdom* to the Messiah, whenever reference is made in them to the preaching of the Gospel, and its power to salvation, it is the government of moral obligation, and practical obedience to the truths contained therein, on the part of mankind," which is implied. It is also remarkable, that immediately after the birth of Christ the Jewish civil polity was abolished in Judea, and that of the Roman substituted in its stead, by the authority of the Emperor Augustus; and the power of *life* and *death* was now entirely taken from the Jews, and lodged only in the *Roman Procurator* and his Justices. It is related by Flavius Josephus, that Augustus sent an express command to *Publius Sulpitius Cyrenius*, at that time governor of Syria, to take possession, in his name, of the kingdom of *Judea*, and annex it to the province of *Syria;* and that *Coponius*, a Roman, of the equestrian rank, conveyed the decree of Augustus; and

moreover, that he was authorised to accompany him, and remain governor of Judea, but subordinate to the president of Syria. Whilst these proceedings were in progress, Christ being then in the twelfth year of his age, according to his human nature, appeared at Jerusalem, where he at once shone forth in his twofold character, the prophetic office and that of a *Lawgiver*, asserting the authority of God, declaring his truth, and claiming the temple as "his Father's house," in his disputation with the most learned doctors of the Jewish church. This was the first manifestation of his earthly authority, as the great Minister and Mediator of the new covenant, whereby eternal life and salvation were offered and revealed to men, as his coming was foretold by the Prophet *Malachi*: "Behold I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple; even the messenger of the covenant," &c. And hereby was the grandeur of the latter temple rendered infinitely more splendid than that of the former, as had been prophesied by *Haggai*, ch. ii. 9.

At this time, also, began to be fulfilled that remarkable prophecy of *Jacob*, "The *sceptre* shall not depart from *Judah*, nor a *lawgiver* from beneath his feet, until *Shiloh* come." Gen. xlix. 10. By *Shiloh* is understood the Messiah, or the *Saviour King*, in the judgment of the Jewish doctors, as well as all learned Christians. The *sceptre in Judah*, expressly denotes the supreme power, which was first exercised by Moses, Joshua, and the Judges, and afterwards vested in their kings. By *the lawgiver from beneath his feet*, is meant the administration of justice, by their own countrymen, and conformably to the law of God; and these undoubted marks of sovereignty the house of Israel enjoyed, from the time of the departure out of *Egypt*, until *ten* of their tribes were swallowed up under the Assyrian monarchy, and the permanent

captivity imposed on them; for they were immediately deprived of their sceptre and laws; and their fellowship with the Pagans soon occasioned the renunciation of their name and nation. But the tribe of *Judah*, although they also had the misfortune to be driven into captivity, yet they retained their name and laws, and were afterwards permitted to return to their own country, and became reinstated in all their former *royal privileges;* and from that restoration downwards (with the solitary exception of the three years of *Antiochus's* persecution) to the birth of Christ, and the promulgation of the edict of *Augustus*, they continued without any direct breach on their constitution, and were governed by their own princes and their own laws.

Thus was the authority of a temporal kingdom fully sustained in the line of promise until Christ's coming, when he at once commenced with the declaration of a new order of things. Herod reigned only *one year* after the birth of Christ, and, on the testimony of their best historian[1], under Cyrenius and Coponius, the Jews were only allowed to have a sanhedrim, or national council, together with a high priest; and within sixty-two years after the first declaration of Jesus in the temple, and his earthly manifestation, were they entirely dispersed by Titus. This great change in the temporal state and political economy of the Jews, or more properly, God's dispensation, happened exactly according to the prophecy, at the time when our Saviour first appeared in Judea, as St. Paul describes, *in the last of the ages*, (Heb. ix. 26.)—which is the correct interpretation of the Hebrew and Greek texts, according to Dr. Hudson, but, in our English vernacular translation, rendered "*in the end of the world;*" but even if such were the precise terms used by St. Paul, (which

[1] Josephus. Greek Supplement, containing the Lives of the Herods, &c. to the death of Vespasian.

the genuine idiom of the Jewish or Hebrew tongue shows it is not,) the common application of them, to the several economies or dispensations, which had taken place in time, as to *so many ages*, by the Jews, shows that the reference is to that generation, which existed at the period of our Lord's appearance, and considered by St. Paul, and all the converted Israelites, *the consummation and full accomplishment of all ages*; and beyond which, in time to come, there could not be expected any dispensation, which should entirely subvert the authority of Christ's kingdom in the world!

And here it may be noticed, that the same idiom is observed in the sacred writings with reference to the Gospel dispensation, or kingdom, where it is therein called, or described, as *the fulness of the times, the last days, the last times*; and, by St. Paul, *the completion of the ages*: all of which several phrases, give us fully to understand, that the times of the Gospel[1], or, which is the same thing in meaning, the appearance and revelation of Christ's kingdom, should be the last age of the Jewish dispensation, and conclude all pre-existing systems of government, acknowledged by God, as well as preclude the reign of heathenism, wherever its power became established.

On the authority of Josephus, we are informed, that the Jews grievously resented the new aspect of affairs, one party complaining that their being subject to Roman laws and *tribute*, was a public badge of servitude, and a gross violation

[1] According to Josephus, John the Baptist carried on the ministry of the Gospel for three years and a half; on John's being cast into prison, Christ appeared himself, after his baptism, and personally officiated in it, precisely three years and a half more, to the time of his crucifixion. Hence it is evident, that the united term made exactly *seven years*, and thereby fell in exactly with the *seventy weeks* in Daniel's prophecy, according to the prophetical computation of a year for a day, making four hundred and ninety years.—*See Lives of the Herods*, also DANIEL ix. 24.

of those principles which led them to acknowledge God alone, for their King and Master, as necessarily required them to cut their way to freedom by the sword.—A second faction pretended that it was a manifest breach of their law, (which commanded them *not to set a stranger which is not of their own brethren to be king over them,*) Deut. xvii. 15.; to submit so far to a foreign king, as to pay taxes to him; and thus they shortly afterwards endeavoured to entrap *Jesus* into an act of hostility towards the Roman authority, by asking him, "Is it, or not, lawful to pay tribute to Cæsar?"—which furnished the grounds of his memorable reply, showing that they were deprived of their temporal power, through their blindness and unbelief; and which may fairly be interpreted, render to Cæsar his due; but unto Me and my Father, that obedience which is enjoined *by the law and the prophets!* The leading object of a great party amongst the Jews, was that of raising a rebellion against the Romans, on account of the payment of *taxes,* and in this they were headed after *Judas* of Gamala, by one *Sadoc,* a Pharisee, to whom were joined all the Pharisees, as well as many others; and who, looking with abhorrent contempt on all those of their own nation, who condescended to take upon themselves the office of *Publicans* (collectors of the Roman imposts,) they carried their aversion to them to the highest pitch, even whilst lawfully engaged in their office, painting them as renegades to their faith, and renouncing all fellowship with them; and this is the sole cause why, in the Gospels, we so frequently find the opprobrious epithets "Publicans and sinners." In this opposition Christ would not join, and the cause of the malignant feeling of the Pharisees towards him, is at once rendered apparent. This hostile feeling continued to rage till the last year of the reign of Augustus, or the termination of his fourth lease of ten years, being the *sixteenth* of our Lord's preliminary ministry, and the four-

teenth of the vulgar æra, when this emperor, who had reigned so long, by the importunities of the Roman people, sunk under age and infirmity; but the obnoxious feeling of the Jews to the taxation, continued in the reign of his successor *Tiberius*, and was carried to such a height, that *Valerius Gratus*, the governor of Judea, even deposed *Annas* the high priest, from his office [1], appointing *Ismael*, the son of *Fabus*, in his stead, and subsequently *Eleazar* and *Simon*, who were also speedily dismissed, and Joseph (surnamed *Caiaphas*), elevated to the office; and these very men were the same high priests who were afterwards so violent in their unjust persecution of the Son of God!

It was in the thirty-first year of our blessed Lord and Saviour, and the fifteenth of Tiberius's reign, that *Valerius Gratus*, the governor of Judea, and who had during his eleven years' administration preserved peace, and given no obstruction to the Messiah's progress, was recalled, and Pontius Pilate, a man of cruel disposition and violent temper, a perfect representative of his master, appointed his successor; and who, by his rapacity, created tumults and commotions in succession, which were not entirely terminated until the final destruction of Jerusalem. These formed an opportunity for instituting unfounded accusations against Jesus, and the objects of his ministry, which had been so clearly declared by John the Baptist, and also by the Prophet Daniel.—"And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a *kingdom*, which shall never be destroyed. And this *kingdom* shall not be left to another people, but it shall break in pieces and consume *all these kingdoms*, and it shall stand for ever." Dan. ii. 44. "And there was given to him dominion and glory, and a *kingdom*, that all *people*, *nations*, and *languages*,

[1] See Flavius Josephus, *Lives of the Herods*.

should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his *kingdom* that which shall not be destroyed." Dan. vii. 14. Here, then, may we boldly assert, that our Messiah's kingdom commenced in the establishment of his Church on the earth, under his own immediate auspices; for then not only the whole Mosaic economy ended, but the Roman empire, the last stronghold of learned heathenism, (as had also been foretold by Daniel, chap. ii.) began sensibly to decay, after his condemnation; nor was Constantine permitted to extend its preservation even under the Christian form.

The resurrection of Christ from the dead, is the foundation of the whole Christian religion; during his sojourn with his disciples, he frequently told them, that he should suffer death, and within three days rise again, Matt. xvi. 21. xvii 23. John xvi. 16.; and he also rendered it a signal demonstration that they should be convinced of his power, under the promises of God, John ii. 19. He likewise referred the Jews to his resurrection, as the infallible evidence of his being the Christ. Matt. xii. 39, 40. And, accordingly with his promise, at the end of three days he appeared again to his disciples, under a *substantive*, (not a spiritual form, and continued with them during forty days, giving them such confirmation and incontestible proofs of his entire nature, as could alone have proceeded from Divine power: nor did he translate them with him into a heavenly, or *spiritual kingdom*, when he departed, but left them *upon earth* to perform the duties—to complete in the world, and in their *human nature*, the final objects of his mission and government!

It is admitted by Josephus, that the *Roman custodia*, or threescore soldiers, with the centurion, who guarded his sepulchre, were witnesses of the whole transaction of Christ's rising from the tomb, that they were sensibly affected by the

great earthquake which took place; and that they saw the angel descend from heaven, and roll the stone from the door of the sepulchre, which terrified them almost to death; and that Pontius Pilate transmitted an account of the *passion* and resurrection of our blessed Saviour to *Tiberius*, together with a report of his miracles, and those of his disciples in his name, which he had collected; and adding, that by multitudes he was worshipped as a God! *Tiberius* becoming alarmed, made a report of this to the senate, desiring that he might be placed amongst the gods, whom the Roman empire adored; but the senate strongly opposed it, on account of an ancient law of the twelve tables, which forbad them to introduce foreign deities amongst the number of their gods: however, in this instance, *Tiberius* passed an edict of his own, pronouncing it death to those who should unjustly injure the Christians[1]. But he was a worthless and capricious wretch, and any boon, from such hands, can hardly be considered as the fair homage rendered by vice to virtue, but the result of fear, or a desire to cloak some ignoble purpose,—some object of the baser passions. We know, however, from history, that it was customary for the several governors of provinces, under the Roman state, to keep an account of all the remarkable events that occurred during their administration; and thus the learned apologist, *Justin Martyr*, who lived within little more than a century after the resurrection of Christ, in his *Second Apology*, tells the Romans, that they "need only consult the public acts, made under *Pontius Pilate*, to know and be satisfied, that Jesus really wrought those very miracles, which he had before told them of, and that he rose from the dead after his crucifixion."

Thus, if it were needful, we have both heathen and Jewish

[1] Lives of the Herods.

testimony, in support of the Gospel history; but the truth of that Gospel is founded upon such proofs, as are, of all others, the most irrefragable and convincing,—that attestation of it, which nothing but ignorance or wanton depravity can except against. Will those amongst our non-conforming brethren, who differ from our established Church Communion, on points which are *non-essential*, willingly aid the progress of infidelity, in opposition to the decree of God, under evidence so conclusive? What have been the effects of the preaching of Christ's kingdom in the world, and which remain singularly conspicuous to this very hour, wherever it has been upheld? What have been the opposite effects, where Christianity and law, under its authority, have been neglected in states and kingdoms, whether by government, by people, or both? Has not the providence of God, even in latter times, been signally interposed for the propagation of our Lord's empire over all the world? And would they, whilst urging the promulgation of the Gospel Church in foreign nations, yet ignorant of its truths, lessen its importance, by declaring it to be inapplicable to the principles of civil government, or the real liberty of man in their own? The disciples of infidelity are less exceptionable in their attempts to obtain power, than are the professors of religion, who wittingly lend their assistance to the progress of principles and measures which are contrary to the revealed will of God. There is not one man amongst us, who denies the authority of the Christian religion and its practical application to our entire social polity, who would not have stuck to his infidelity, even if he had seen Christ himself perform those miracles which infallibly vouched that he was the Son of God! Such persons ever will reject the counsel of God against themselves; companionship with them, even in the ordinary transactions of life, is always hazardous, and the bond of moral obligation will be ever uncertain, which

is not secured by religion. Whilst our Saviour remained upon earth, the miracles he performed, and his practical morality, gained him an universal reputation and esteem, even amongst the Jews [1]; and it was the purity of his doctrine, its application to social purposes, the opposition he showed to their traditions, and the severe reproofs he gave them for their ungodliness, hypocrisy, pride, and covetousness, that alone caused their elders to reject, both his authority as a lawgiver, and his great salvation, as the Messiah of the covenant! There is no moral difference between the Judaism of old, which rejected Christ's kingdom, and that *practical Judaism*, amongst men denominated *Christians*, who advocate the superiority of voluntary religion, as the guide of their conduct in the present age. It was wisely said by Cicero, that "*falsehood* is so nearly allied to *truth*, that a prudent man will be cautious how he approaches the dangerous precipice." *Illa finitima sunt falsa veris, ut in præcipitem locum non debeat se sapiens committere.* Ill would it become educated Christian men, to suffer themselves to fall below the level of that conservative virtue, so elegantly depicted by the Roman orator!

This indeed is a mighty subject, applicable to all states, and to all ages, and the permanent preservation of the best interests of man. It has not been recorded of ancient Rome, with all her admired grandeur, and the excellence of her moral virtue, that she either founded an hospital for the sick, an asylum for the destitute orphan, or endowed an almshouse for

[1] *Suidas*, out of *Theodosius*, (a learned Jew) states, that on account of his wise answers, Christ was entered amongst their priests as "JESUS *the Son of God and of Mary*,"—and, that by their own *Talmud*, which was not finished till 500 years (P. C.) they really considered him the *Messiah*. In commenting upon that part of Zechariah, chap. xii. 10. "And they shall look upon me whom they have pierced;" it subjoins the following most remarkable words, viz. "*Peace be to him who hath said that these things are to be understood of him, the Messiah, the son of* JOSEPH, *who is slain.*"—*Josephus, Lives, &c.*

the aged and the helpless! These, Christianity, are thy offspring, they are thy bloodless triumphs! These unostentatious monuments of thy gentle dominion, disarm the sophist, disconcert the levelling philosopher, and astound the infidel! Shall we, in exchange for thy "pearl of precious price," seek an *ephemera*, which passing into oblivion thy holy ordinances and solemn truths, would leave us the sport of chance, without the security of peaceful possessions here, or the rational means of seeking an inheritance of inestimable value hereafter! But, alas! for religion, for morals, the *quadruple union*[1] arrays itself against all that is sacred in the one or valuable in the other, deriding even Roman virtue in its inconsiderate career of levelling infatuation. How many, even amongst the educated portion, seem ignorant of the admonitory sentiment of the learned Roman, or forgetful of its importance; yet the Christian patriot is not without hope in the world,—relying on the promises of his God and Saviour, he prepares himself to meet the storm,—the assaults of the enemies of his faith, —he sees, in spite of the ravings of this evil spirit, the workings of a mysterious Providence,—he beholds his Church endangered, and, reviewing her fairer pretensions, discovers in her tribulation the features of renewed beauty, and inestimable worth!

> "She, in her unpretending loveliness,
> Looks calmly on the hour of her distress!
> For knows she not, the Wise and only Good
> Permits man's evil? but his holy-rood
> Has taken root, and buds like Aaron's rod:
> From fear of Man shall she distrust her God!"

Having so far concluded the scriptural view of the value and propriety of a Church and State union, it will here be

[1] *Popery, infidelity, radicalism, and dissent!*

advisable to take a discursive notice of the political, as well as moral consequences to society, in the united kingdom, connected with the reform proceedings of the present government, in those matters assimilated with this momentous subject. The debate in the House of Commons, on the question of the appropriation of Church property in Ireland, to purposes of declared general instruction, stands first in importance, and requires to be treated both in a religious and political form; whilst it affords another splendid memorial of the fallacious grounds on which arguments are bolstered up, to favour the views of ambitious leaders, and to foster the prejudices of party men, without any one correct feeling for the higher claims of religion, or even the display of ordinary knowledge of her more exalted principles and their purer objects! The propagation of evil, in the aggregate, may always be estimated in equal ratio, with the station of those who lend their talents, their name, or their *rank*, to accelerate its progress in society: when that association takes place in open opposition to the best interests of the Christian religion, the responsibility incurred is tremendous indeed; and the understanding of those engaged in it should be commensurate with the importance of the subject, its complicate bearings, extent, and magnitude,—proportionate with the measures they have the temerity, the confidence to propound. Events are always to be measured by their consequences, where honour, virtue, or discretion are consulted; but, in this instance, of all others, the contemplated assault on the property of the Church of Ireland, neither has the spiritual interests of that Church been considered, nor the hitherto recognised principle, *salus populi suprema lex est*, for a moment been respected. The first object of every just government, is the promotion of the welfare and protection of the property of the governed,—the maintenance of established order, and the adequate security

of person, right, and admitted privilege, in every form. It is unblushingly proposed that all this shall be abandoned, and forsooth for what? Purely to serve the purposes, to advance the selfish objects of a *faction*, amongst the people of Ireland, whose aim is *power* and *dismemberment*; and under which, not even the prospect of relieving the actual distresses of the Catholic population is presented, on the plausible pretext of affording *instruction*; but from which the pure influences of the Gospel religion are to be excluded! *Mus in pice*, body, legs, and *tail*, may justly be applied to this undertaking,—it is sufficiently expressive of its developement! Now to the *merits* of the proposition, and its Christian foundation.

Lord John Russell is reported to have said:—"*He had felt attached to an established Church, through a conviction, that it was conducive to internal peace, decency, order, and conducive to the general advantage of the kingdom, as a Protestant country*[1]." Has my Lord of Russell, the great champion of Dissenters from the Church of England, and their presumed rights, arising from conscientious Christian scruples, no *higher* motive, then, for the professed attachment to an *Established Church*, superior to the purely moral benefits, and worldly considerations here declared? If he has not, his attachment, and its principle, is far more applicable to a Mahometan or Heathen system, than to the revealed religion of the Son of God, and his expressed commands! The rule would, in every point of view, more forcibly apply to a Mahometan kingdom, or the moral government of the Hindoos, if the temporal advantages of the State, are indeed the *primary* objects of his Lordship's solicitude. His Lordship further adds,—"BUT *he would put the case of Ireland, and ask if the same results had followed from the establishment of a Protestant Church in that country?*"

[1] Vide, *Times and Herald, report, Mar.* 31.—Verbatim et literatim, as reported.

This point is put in rather ambiguous terms; but its *object*, the utter destruction of the ascendency of the Church of *Ireland*, and of her Gospel ministry, is by no means ambiguous! Now the Protestant Church of Ireland was not established for the mere purposes of *internal peace, decency, order*, or *temporary advantage*, but for the sacred object of sustaining a Gospel ministry for the salvation of *souls*, and from which *moral rule* must result, in proportion as that ministry should be upheld [1], and under which principle she alone became identified with the *State*, as the Church of England had previously done, in right of her apostolical succession, by authority of which the kings of England also obtained the power of presiding over the temporal and spiritual interests of the Church of Ireland; and this right existed even before the Act of Union: under it William the Third laid anew the foundation of the Protestant Church of Ireland; and the Act of Union has but served to increase the authority and power of the Crown, to preserve the integrity of the Church possessions in that country. If the Roman Catholic population of Ireland, blinded with bigotry and prejudice, *like the Jews of old*, would not benefit by the state provision of a Gospel ministry, but rejected and despised that provision and ministry, as well as a Protestant Church, that is not the fault of the State, the Church, or her ministry; nor does it offer any valid argument, why the latter should yield up her property, or be compelled to dismember her *possessions*, set apart originally for purposes of higher moment, than appear to be understood or admitted by modern liberals; and in violation of God's commands. We must take our impression of the religious feelings of men, as well from their *avowals* as their *actions*; if Lord Russell's religious feeling carries him to no superior objects, than those

[1] For corroboration of these views of the effects of genuine Christian instruction, vide note, p. 369.

of his own declaration in this proceeding, the *conscientious* Dissenters of the united kingdom have but little reason to feel proud of his championship. His Lordship's argument is in *direct* contradiction to the purely *spiritual* kingdom assigned by a portion of the dissenting body to the *Redeemer;* and it must be difficult for the sages in politics, and the logicians in religion, to divine, for which *contending faction in the State* his Lordship feels the greatest sympathy—the assertors of a mere moral kingdom, and its *philosophic pearls*, or the reign of purely spiritual obligation, which few can be presumed to feel, and still fewer to comprehend!

In support of the fallacious position propounded, Lord Russell quoted the authority of Archdeacon Paley.—"*He would, in corroboration of his own opinion, as to the merits and requisites of an Established Church, refer to the opinion of Archdeacon Paley, who states, in his admirable work on Political*[1] *Philosophy, as follows:*—'The authority, therefore, of a Church establishment is founded upon its *utility;* and whenever, upon this principle, we deliberate concerning the form, propriety, or comparative excellency of *different establishments*, the single view, under which we ought to consider any one of them, is that of *a scheme of instruction*—the single end we ought to propose by them, is the preservation and communication of religious knowledge,—every other idea, and every other end that *have* been mixed with this, as the making of the Church an *engine or even an ally of the State*, converting it into the means of strengthening and diffusing influences, or regarding it as a *support of regal, in opposition to popular forms of government*, have served only to debase the institution, and to introduce into it numerous corruptions and abuses.'"

Paley, in this passage, more than any other in his writings,

[1] Quere "*Moral Philosophy.*"—*Author.*

displays gross ignorance of the principle by which the Church of England became united to the State, in these realms, from the very foundation of the *monarchy*, (see chap. V.) The State being *regal*, claimed obedience on the grounds of *Christian communion*[1], and obtained it; and the rulers themselves acted upon the motives they required in others; thus they claimed a *religious* as well as *civil* service, and the public duty was thereby more faithfully performed in consequence. "Oaths of office and of testimony alike," as Dwight has well observed, "without the sanction of religion, are solemn farces." Thus far, indeed, has the Church become an *ally of the State*, for the purpose of enforcing good government; and preserving moral obedience to the laws, having in design the protection of society in the aggregate. Under this

[1] Under the *Saxon* and *Norman* laws, the Christian marriage*, baptism, the rights of primogeniture, and the *Christian oath*, were held indispensable to the tenure of property, and the exercise of all offices of trust and authority in the State, and the principle has been retained in the constitution, under the union of its powers, for more than *a thousand years;* and, until this age of political confusion, arising from the desertion of ancient principles, and the desire of establishing new systems, it received and gave confidence to all classes at home, and obtained the respect of the civilized world. Human institutions are necessarily uncertain, but the antiquity of our own, and the state of prosperity to which, as a people, we have arrived under them, justifies the conclusion, that their value has been proportionate with their duration. We behold, in their working, the influences of a Religion, which time shall not destroy; and it is our duty, as a professing Christian people, to offer the homage of our gratitude, to that Supreme Being, who has favoured us with a foundation, eminently superior to all the schemes of imperfect humanity!

* "*Let the priest be present at the marriage ceremony,—he by law must be present to bless the marriage.*"—LAWS OF EDMUND. "*Who giveth this woman to be married to this man.*"—SAXON MARRIAGE LAW. "*And I decree that all my barons shall observe the same conduct towards their sons and their daughters' and towards the sons, and daughters, and wives of their men.*"—HENRY THE FIRST.

view, as a support of regal authority, its influence became justifiable, by the express regulations of Scripture; and that, even in opposition to *popular forms of government*, destitute of religious foundation, which appears to be *excepted*, or not considered, by this learned divine, in his general application of the theory he propounds, with regard to the duties of a Christian Church, necessarily established by law. Religion may, with greater facility, be made the engine of corruption and abuse, under a *republican*, than under a *kingly* form of government, or a limited monarchy, as was the case with the fanatical commonwealth of Cromwell; and the *tirade* against the Church is thus rendered perfectly hypothetical. The claim of a religious, as well as civil obligation, in all departments of the State, formed the basis of Christian instruction, a *scheme* of moral government, which Paley either does not comprehend, or does not think proper to discuss, on fair open principles, in his Philosophy, but assails it, as it were, by a side wind. Lord Russell, however, a constitutional author, ought to be fully aware of this, and, presuming that he is so, his evasion of it is neither ingenuous, just, nor dignified!

Having thus far taken, *in limine*, an objection to Paley's doctrine, (who, by the by, admits the right of the *majority*, in every state, to prescribe the *form* of its leading religion,) the great sheet-anchor of Lord Russell and his party, some other points present themselves equally open to animadversion. In this memorable passage, Paley has advanced further towards asserting a purely temporal authority, for a system of religious instruction in the world, by means purely human, than has ever been pretended to or exercised by the Protestant Church or her ministers—but, assuredly, not the *kingdom of Christ*; for religion is here rendered entirely dependent on philosophy, (i. e.) men's pleasure and man's judgment, instead of being

considered, what it really is, an emanation from the Word of God. Christianity is, in fact, thrown overboard, and the fundamental object of the Gospel dispensation, the authority and the source of all religious principles, and their moral uses, cast into the shade. The pre-eminent and pre-existent appointment, made by the Son of God, and forming in itself, under the control of his ministers, an uniform system, described by Locke to be applicable to all the purposes of human life, and the eternal salvation of man, "his instruction in faith, and his regulation in practice," is treated with a levity which would be derogatory to a subject of ordinary gravity, totally abstracted from a religious connexion and a religious object. The mere authority for a Church Establishment is here founded on its bare worldly utility, in other words, its *expediency;* and with equal accommodation of religious feeling, is argued the propriety of establishing a *scheme of instruction* on the single basis of the comparative form, or excellency of *different establishments*—the single end, the preservation and communication of *religious instruction*. Now, all this sounds exceedingly fine to superficial understandings—to men who are ignorant of the great design of human redemption; but where is the basis for the *security* of religious instruction under this elegantly rhetorical, or richly emblazoned moral compact? And where is the assurance for the perpetuity, or even the temporal advantages of this assumed scheme, destitute of a directing principle, or unprotected by the presidency of a conscientious system in the State? Are these the only arguments, which, on the *ipse dixit* of a solitary Protestant divine, can be put forward, in opposition to the wisdom and experience of ages, for the purpose of dissevering the bond of Christian unity in this kingdom? This has been termed "a vital question."—Verily, the weakness of *vitality* was never more conspicuous, than under the display of intellectual imbecility, on one of the

most important subjects connected with the temporal interests and the eternal welfare of man, as well as the prosperity of Ireland, and the peace of the United Kingdom. The admirers of such logic may with propriety be asked—is there any scheme of religious instruction superior to that, which Christ himself laid down for his Apostles, under solemn injunctions to fulfil and to perpetuate it? In what respect does the Church of England, in her doctrine or her ministry, differ from the authority so delegated?

As a counterpoise to theories so illusory, and principles so pernicious to the State, the refined logical reasoning of Silver is offered for consideration.—"In all systems of substantial liberty the privileged orders are strongholds, built against the despotism of one or of many. But in this country, and in a greater or less degree in all Christian countries, those privileged orders support the interests of the Christian religion, and are identified with it; and if they mean to exist, they must support it in truth and in faith, and it will most certainly maintain them. So long as they support their sovereign in those vested rights conveyed in his consecration, and suffer no unhallowed interposition to betray them, they will find a spiritual influence extending over the different classes of the community, which will rise to defend their just liberties and long established usages. But if they mean to avail themselves of the support of constitutional subordination, they must fairly avow the principles upon which it was originally granted: they cannot hope to retain the distinctions, if they renounce the public principle upon which they were conceded. These privileges must not be considered as merely personal, private, or family rights, but rights established for the great and noble purposes which all Christian governments embrace; and there is as yet too much proper feeling in the nation to refuse support to its ancient opinions and laws, if it is claimed on these

their proper grounds." The duty of the King and the Peers of England is here pointed out. The consequences of desperate innovation become hourly more manifest to every unbiassed mind. There is no time for deliberation when the enemy is at the gate, and ready for the assault. They must be prepared for the defence as true patriots, and worthy of their honours, in the emphatic words of *Junius*, to "perish in the last dyke," ere they tacitly surrender to any questionable design, or ignoble purpose, any portion of that uncompromising independence which the Constitution of England requires for its preservation. Supported by such feelings, and such views of statesmanlike honour, they may proudly exclaim,—"*Ego hoc animo semper fui, ut invidiam virtute partam, gloriam, non invidiam putarem.*"

When the two great parties that divide the State have come to an open rupture, without any hope presenting itself of forming a *third* with better principles, to balance the others, it is the duty of every man, who is a real friend to his country, to support that party which aims at the preservation of the original principles of our constitutional government; and all pretences to neutrality may be justly considered as standing opposed to the ethics of patriotism. This was the opinion and the practice of the latter Cato, one of the ablest and most honourable of the Roman statesmen. In such an extremity as that which is now before us, it is in the power of individuals, if possessed of only a common share of intelligence, to render their country a signal service, by applying that intelligence for the purpose of eliciting truth, and moderating, on the one hand, the violence of party spirit—"the madness of many for the gain of a few;"—and, on the other, exposing, without fear or favour, the intrigues and iniquities of faction, which, distracting the councils of the state, disturb

the judgment and paralyze the energies of its more enlightened and efficient conservators. There is a marked distinction to be drawn between reformation and destruction. It is sufficiently open to every man of common capacity to act upon that distinction for his country's weal, if he will only allow himself time for the exercise of deliberative reflection.

At the *Restoration*, the Presbyterians, Anabaptists, Independents, and other sects, all united against the Church of England, who, without regard to their several distinctions as *separatists*, treated them all as enemies of her apostolical creed. These religious sects, joining with the clamorous party of politicians in the State, created a furious faction against the existing government, and rendered the passing of strong measures absolutely needful for the preservation of the Church. Thus, the dissenters of the present day, who seek political power and influence, more than the advancement of Christ's kingdom, join in with the liberal Whigs, who profess moderation, disclaim persecution for conscience' sake, and declare it unjust that those who differ only in a few *ceremonials* and speculative opinions should be denied the privilege and profit of serving their country, even in the higher departments of State! Upon the same grounds do atheists and libertines, despisers of religion and revelation in general—all who pass under the character of *free-thinkers*—associate themselves with the dissatisfied and ambitious portion of the dissenting body, preaching up similar principles of moderation, and who are not over tenacious in distinguishing between unlimited liberty of *conscience* and unlimited privilege of *opinion*. These united, in England, form the general array, *le mouvement*, not only against the Protestant Church, but the entire design of the established form of government, for the sole purpose of supplanting it by a republican institution, and a voluntary

system of religion, or, rather, no acknowledged form of religion whatever! In Ireland, there exists a *fourth* party, under its religious profession the most despotic in principle and exclusiveness upon the face of the earth; but setting forward with the bold effrontery of avowed *liberalism*, as the covert means, the mantle of deception, under which it wends its way to that point, when it shall be enabled to destroy the last remnant of Protestant control; and then away with the mask of dissimulation, the *auxiliary precursor* to a reign of unbending intolerance, of persecution, and of bloodshed! This view is not denunciatory of the whole Catholic body in Ireland, but of an arrogant, selfish, and dominant faction in that country, whose principles and actions are a perfect burlesque on liberty, liberality, and Christian legislation.

On the side of the Church of England, the Tory or Conservative party stands prominently forward, as it has done for more than a century and a half, the consistent advocate of an apostolical institution; whilst its aversion to, and distrust of, those sects and those principles, which justly lie under the imputation of having *once* destroyed the Constitution, are less the fair subject for reproach, than are the proceedings of their hasty opponents, who, by an indiscreet zeal (as was the case before), bid fair to destroy the ancient rights and primitive model of the Reformed Church. United with this party, on general principles, is the *remnant* of the *old English Whig interest*—that honourable association of men, who may, in our history, be justly characterized as the standard of British politicians, whose number or power, as a body, does not enable it in the present day, to wield the machinery of government; but whose independence, moderating between the extremes of the high principles of ultra-toryism and radical innovation, is of the highest importance to the State at this juncture. Veneration for monarchical government, in the regular course of

succession, regard for an Established Church, and hatred of republican schemes, have hitherto distinguished it as a party, which will never suffer under the taint of *political dishonour*, except from the individual imprudence of its own members.

With little reason, and with still less justice, have the extremes of *Whig* and *Radical* drawn *religion* into their controversies, wherein it is sufficiently evident, *neither* have much concern for godliness; but it is also evident, that both have borrowed one leading principle from its open abuse—aye, the violation of its sacred character—the perversion of its holy purposes; and that is, to have built up their several systems of political reform, not upon the result of inquiries founded in *truth*; but upon abstract notions of the science of government, and opposition to those who direct the affairs of state, and upon gross calumnies upon the ministers of a faith, which necessarily disclaims their association, by the declared will of God!

There are unhappily numbers of professing members of the Church of England who ought, as such to believe in a God, and acknowledge his power and providence, together with revealed religion, and the Divinity of Jesus Christ. This may seem paradoxical; but when it is considered that many thousands *practically* deny all this by their individual immoralities—that there is no small portion who, in their conversation and writings, directly or indirectly, labour to overthrow it—it is manifest, that an individual reform of men and manners is equally essential with a reform of the institution itself, which has no power of inflicting *penalties* for moral transgressions, and only enjoins *obedience* to the Gospel truths on pain of incurring God's displeasure. Yet all these place themselves in the list of our national Church, and, as may rationally be expected, are great sticklers for liberty of conscience, without any fair pretensions to its virtue: whereas a truly conscientious mem-

ber of the Church has a just and rational veneration for the established form of ecclesiastical government; and although he does not pretend to determine whether *episcopacy* be or not of divine right, he feels assured that it is most agreeable to primitive institution, and fittest of all others for the general preservation of property, purity, and moral order; and even under its present regulations, allowing for admissible improvements in discipline, and equalization of benefices, best calculated to promote the welfare of our civil condition. Under these views, he rightly considers any attempt to abolish the integrity of the Church in her possessions, and to lessen the honour, dignity, and usefulness of her priesthood, in their important office, would not only prove a scandal to our Christian faith and morals, but destructive of the entire foundation of the monarchical form of government with which she is identified.

With reference to the Liturgy of the Church of England, the doctrines of which (with very few exceptions), as Thorpe has well remarked in his *Destinies*, "are the doctrines of the Apostles," it is possible some modification might be made in its *letter*, without in the least deteriorating its *spirit*; and this with the view of uniting Christian minds on points, which few even of her ministers deem essential, as they are more matters of form than of faith. But this could not be effected without the sanction of a *synod*, or convocation of her *clergy*, and the approbation of the legislature. Neither, can we justly blame either the one or the other on account of their tenacity, or their unwillingness to consent to such alterations as are arrogantly dictated to them by persons, who abjure her purer doctrines for the sake of matters of mere ceremony; nor is it by any means certain, that benefit proportionate to the hazard would result. There is only one condition under which it would be either just or prudent to the interests of the Church,

for the clergy to comply in altering the *ceremonial*, and that condition would be an Act of Parliament consequent on such measure, the provisions of which, as far as possible, should strictly and effectually interpose to prevent the further increase of *schism*, and the spreading of new sects after such concession, or there would be no end to the succeeding schemes of agitation and innovation which would be proposed. Without such salutary precaution, the Church would be rendered little else than the creature of man's fancy—a temple of human ingenuity, the ornaments of which would be put up and taken down just as it should suit the capricious opinions of those who from time to time should claim the *right* of repairing and remodelling the building, until at length it would be utterly destroyed!

There does not appear to be any sound reason in statistics why sects of an *opposing description* are tolerated in any state, except, that through some laxity of the original principle, and conduct of the government, they are already formed, and that it is difficult to control their inconsistencies and to regulate their irrational desires; nor would it be just or politic, under our liberal Constitution, and the Christian feeling of our Reformed Church, to adopt arbitrary measures against numbers of infatuated and deluded people, as well as those who conscientiously dissent, on the grounds of sole accountableness to God, so long as in their profession and practice they do not put to imminent hazard the constitution and safety of either. Reflecting on the general disposition of man, unrestricted by fixed principles, there can be no assurance, without *positive legislation*, that any compliances, which may be made with regard to the forms of worship of the Protestant Mother Church, will remove the evil of *dissent*; or that any scheme can by possibility be devised that will satisfy all classes of persons, whilst the privilege remains of professing any or various opinions,

without limitation. And this alone affords a valid reason and sufficient apology for the Church of England withholding her assent to inconsiderate changes. Let us freely, and on safe premises, tolerate the various sects now admitted; but not leave it in their uncontrolled power to precipitate the ruin of that, which has for ages been established; and which, however severe the conclusion, it is natural for all dissenting sects to desire, which dissent they cannot justify on any principle, divine or human, nor by any plea of truth and consistency, if they do not labour to effect, even at the risk of introducing anarchy and confusion. If they dissent conscientiously, this is due to their faith; if from factious motives, they are unworthy of protection and consideration; and in either case, the Established Church, by her antiquity *de jure*, and by her long-established customs *de facto*, is justified in retaining to the last the strongholds of her power.

The most essential and rational reform which the peers representing the clergy can aim at, is the *amelioration* of their own temporal condition amongst their poorer brethren, to preserve the honour and dignity of the priesthood, and in order that its services may be rendered more efficacious, in this age of licentious liberality and philosophic scepticism; together with due acquiescence in all such reasonable equalization of property and improvements, as the other portion of the peers may recommend; in which course there exists little hazard, considering that more than four-fifths, at least, of that illustrious body are bound up, in principle and practice, as well as honour and conscientious attachment, to the Protestant institutions of this country. The Christian peer and legislator knows and feels, that the *eternal* happiness, as well as the *temporal* comfort of thousands of his fellow countrymen, is involved in his decision; and he moreover feels, that he has a double duty to perform, in which the monitions of both conscience and pride

impel his actions; considering his obligation to God paramount to mere views of popular favour, or even personal advantage, he labours for the preservation of a Christian system in the State, and acts under the noble impression, that honours, and the advantages of birth, wealth, or station, are comparatively valueless, unless sustained by corresponding deeds. He feels even further, that he has a duty of the highest kind to perform to his *sovereign*, under the obligations of a *Christian oath*; that the King, in every great State emergency, is entitled to expect and to receive the support of his peers; and that, in a great measure, he is bound to act upon their judgment, deliberatively exercised.

Thus, when the great national question of Church Reform shall come before their lordships, it may fairly be inferred, that, acting in the deliberative capacity, for which, as a body of intellectual gentlemen, they have hitherto been pre-eminently distinguished in their country's annals, they will not only weigh the evils—the immediate *perils* of temporary clamour, and the speculative objects of those who create it; but they will, in the discharge of a sacred trust, also fully consider the remote consequences and perplexity which any proposed great change of principle may lead to, if applied inconsiderately; and will also, in their high station, as senators, whether spiritual or lay peers, poise the scale of threatened public and personal inconvenience, with the preponderating weight of future good, which will result from their withholding their assent to measures, pregnant with danger to themselves, to the whole fabric of *Church government*, and to the national weal. Let them "be just, and fear not,"—let them acquit themselves to the honour of God; and for the benefit and satisfaction of that intelligent portion of the entire British people, the judgment and support of which will assuredly be their own—the inevitable result of a proper

diffusion of liberality, fairly secured. In the end, they will triumph over the ephemeral prejudices of the ill-advised popular opinion, always rash and unstable; and to measures of real utility, or prepared with the sole object of remedying the evils complained of, they will, in the perfect spirit of Christian statesmen, let them pass; and none but the calumniator, or the man of unsound principles, judging from his own impure feelings, will assign to them other motives!

With the design of precipitating measures, utterly incompatible with our national system, habits, and manners, the practice of the Americans is often quoted, in proof and celebration of the astounding advantages arising from general liberty of conscience. But why should their political system be deemed a fair precedent for us, either in religion or government? England differs from America in every possible form, comprising country, soil, climate, and the productions of nature, independently of her peculiar locality and proximity to old established monarchies, saying nothing of her own ancient kingly system and scriptural foundation, as a Christian State. America is, on the contrary, a commonwealth, founded on a sudden, by a desperate effort in a desperate moment, not formed or digested into a regular or defined system by mature thought and reason; but huddled up under the pressure of sudden and momentous exigencies, calculated for no long duration, and subsisting hitherto by her being remote from contending powers; and by her deficiency of pecuniary wealth, as well as objects of incitement for ambitious leaders. She had no alternative, but the formation of just such a system as she possesses, between anarchy and submission to a state of dependence,—monarchy she could not have erected; but if the *seat of empire* shall ever become established in the western hemisphere, which America flatters herself it will, under her own auspices, it will be by the in-

stitution of an absolute or limited government, founded upon the model of one or other of those the world has already seen. The deficiencies alluded to, serve to preserve her from ambition, and those great corruptions which her new and imperfect constitution would otherwise subject her to, during a long interval of peace; for she possesses within herself at present no stimulus to enthusiasm, and the laxity of her religious and moral system, retards her progress to the state and authority of a great nation. The Americans are a fortunate, but by no means a philosophic or *puissant* people,—that confluence of persons to her territories, in an age of political speculation, and of political persecution, as to a place of *refuge* from the turmoils of European contention, and the mismanagement of European governments, puts them to the necessity of *trading*, to which they wisely give all care and encouragement; and if we would imitate them in this respect, we should show our wisdom; and the impolicy of encouraging foreign competition in our own markets, to the injury of our own manufacturers, would be avoided. With regard to *religion*, that sheet-anchor of the soul,—the angel-spirit of earthly happiness, alas! for America, she has nothing to offer us,—she claims an *irresponsible* authority, as her *right*, and consequently disclaims that *covenant*, which God, in the person and faith of Christ, has tendered to the children of men! What, then, have we to gain from copying America?

It is now sufficiently evident, that the *modern Whigs* might easily have procured and maintained a *majority* amongst the clergy, and perhaps in the universities also, to aid them in rational measures of Church reform, if they really held such in purity of intention; but the intemperance of their conduct, their flagrant desertion of all those higher principles of propriety and of right,—their violence of speech and writing, together with their association with a faction in the State,

which, for years past, has been engaged in urging forward systematic clamour against the persons and offices of the priesthood, and the *revenues of the Church*, as well as scandals on the universities, have one and all been sufficient to alarm the pious, the considerate, and the upright portion of the friends of order, and the Christian religion. Thus, it became perfectly natural for all those who held the charge of religion and education, to apprehend some general design of altering the constitution of both; and this roused the indignation of those schools of learning, which have hitherto proved the honour of England, and the mainstay of her Protestant Church. The ever memorable Declaration of the Laity of the Church of England, would not have been called forth in the past year, had it not been for the gigantic efforts made by the enemies of our Protestant faith, aided by that spirit of conceding liberality to dangerous theories, that knuckling to popish domination, which distinguished the ephemeral reign of the liberal Whig ministry, distracted its councils, and finally sealed its political doom;—a ministry, which commenced with the support of a great portion of the learned bodies, and, step by step, by its own acts, lost its hold upon their confidence, as well as that of the reflecting portion of the people of England in general, not biassed by party feeling and party influences. The assertion is vainly futile, which sets forth the present House of Commons as representing *fairly* the *intelligence* of the united kingdom,—such is not the fact: the *artificial* coalition majority of that House is made up of the union of three factious parties,—*the liberal, the dissenting, and the popish interests*, united, on this occasion, into one *gorgon* phalanx, against a Protestant government and a Protestant Church,—the *real majority* is that of the Irish Catholics, and accommodating liberals, the avowed, open, uncompromising enemies of a Gospel ministry, and a

Gospel faith! Such a coalition, and such tactics, for a similar purpose, are not without a precedent in English history.

We are, under God, solely indebted to the constancy of the clergy of the Church of England, and to the uncompromising devotion of one of our vituperated universities, for the Revolution of 1688. It was the firmness and the reasons adduced by the *Caput* and *Fellows* of Magdalen College, which furnished the declaration of William Prince of Orange, with such powerful arguments in justification of his ascension to the English throne. It should never be forgotten by Protestants, nor by Protestant Dissenters, that whatever opposition was made to the usurpations of King James, and his papal supporters, it proceeded entirely from the Church of England, her bishops and her clergy. Did not James, in the first place, apply to the Protestant Church, and upon its *refusal* to fall in with his measures, then make a similar advance to the Dissenters of all kinds? Must that portion of the dissenting body, now clamorous in their association against the Church and our Colleges, be reminded, that the Dissenters readily and almost universally entered into his views, and complied with his Anti-Protestant wishes, adopting in their numerous pamphlets and addresses, the form and style, "*our brethren of the Roman Catholics*," whose interest they affected to place on the same footing with their own? Did not some of Cromwell's officers take posts in the army raised by James against the Prince of Orange? Was it possible for that Prince, or his Protestant *Whig* counsellors, to repose confidence in those who had thus openly committed themselves? And, are not the Protestant clergy and the universities, in the present day, justified in proceeding with due precaution, when a similar desertion of religious faith and principle manifests itself, under a more aggravated form? Let the associated political and religious enemies of the Church of England answer these points *seriatim*,

and satisfactorily, if they can. Cicero's reproof to Catiline, the Roman conspirator—*unguis in ulcere*, is applicable to their patriotism!

The spirit of the age, with too many, delights in scandalising the clergy in general, which, independently of the degradation it produces to religion, in every form, casts an ignominious slur upon the entire character of the nation, which it does not merit. Those who labour to degrade the nation's religion, degrade the nation itself which upholds it! We are not enabled to form the priesthood of materials superior to that which constitutes the ordinary composition of human nature; and naturally corrupt and impure as that composition is, in all its parts, those who receive ordination for the ministry, must necessarily retain some portion of that infirmity which is attached to the whole mass,—and thus, this disreputable *penchant* for the injury of individual reputation, is satirically degrading to human nature itself, which seems not to have entered into the fertile brains of its votaries! Ambition, and the love of power, is not more justly chargeable to the clergy, than to those who labour to obtain power by the propagation of calumny and falsehood; for that would be to make religion, even Christianity itself, and the best institution of Church government under it, that could possibly be formed, responsible for all the errors, the imperfections, and depravity of human nature; an *alternative* which our most zealous reforming logicians, Whig or Radical, would neither adopt, nor attempt to justify for themselves!

It cannot be denied, that during the last three centuries, temporal power, in almost every form, has been wrested from the Church, and even a great portion of its ecclesiastic authority and property, the justice of which has never been defended; but, on the contrary, the legislature in Queen Anne's reign, under conviction of the injustice, remitted the

first-fruits, of which it had improperly been deprived. The infringements on the Church possessions, by *Henry the Eighth*, were always considered acts of oppression and usurpation, not warranted by any thing he had done, for the restoration of the primitive forms of worship and discipline. The Church having given up the greatest portion of its ecclesiastic, and all its temporal power, to the law, has a right to expect from the State and the law, in return, that protection to which all corporate bodies are entitled, as well as the inalienable security to all her possessions, connected with private grants for purposes purely ecclesiastical; and this shows the injustice of parties, who continually reproach the Church with the possession of that wealth, which existed on a more extensive scale, and in a more comprehensive form, during nearly *seven centuries* of papal intolerance!

We may not be justifiable in considering every schism of that condemning nature, which some authors have represented; still less, is it rational to adopt the modern argument of its general admissibility, on the score of conscience; for that would be tantamount to a declaration against God's consistency and fixedness of purpose; and expressly against the teaching of the apostles. But, to such gross inconsistencies and absurdities are men carried, by vanity and ambition, that they would lead us, if possible, to imagine that the Almighty, who has laid down certain comprehensive rules for his service, consonant with Gospel faith, is as much delighted with the variety in forms of worship, as he is with the varieties in the beautiful constitution of nature, the purposes of which are so entirely dissimilar. This is the result of free-thinking, the effect of that accommodating philosophy, which talks largely of the prejudices of education, the contractedness of religious instruction, and the advantages of education by *moral rule*, without reference to Christian obligation,—doctrines which

may seem very desirable for the mental improvement of mankind, with those who deny the *divinity* of Jesus Christ, but inadmissible with real Christians, and utterly at variance with the principles hitherto professed by the Church of Rome! It is therefore manifest, that with those of the latter creed, this relaxation is connected with worldly objects, and worldly objects only, taking just so much, *pro tempore*, as it is possible to obtain, by playing the game of hypocrisy. Let any man turn to the pages of Lord Clarendon's History of the *Rebellion*, and he will find that the *Puritans*, as the Dissenters were then styled, had previously pastors of their own; yet those very pastors had received episcopal ordination, possessed preferments in the Church, and were occasionally promoted to bishoprics; and both with them and Roman Catholics, a breach in the general form of worship, was considered so dangerous and sinful, as to be held utterly inadmissible; nor was such a thing as voluntary religion, or voluntary support for the clergy, ever contemplated. The detection of falsehood has been said to constitute the first step towards useful knowledge,—*Gradus primus sapientiæ est falsa intelligere.* If this be true, useful knowledge must needs progress with rapid strides; for, as *Sallust* said of the state of society in degenerate Rome:—"Instead of modesty, instead of temperance, instead of virtue, *effrontery*, *corruption*, and *avarice*, prevail,"—these are the ominous qualities, which herald forth to us the empyreal reign of political harmony, rendered still more bright in prospect by the desecration of religion in the state!

The Duke De Bouillon [1], one of the old noblesse of France, entertained free thoughts on the subject of religion; but was particularly tenacious in compelling the rigid attendance of all his household and dependents to religious duties: when an

[1] Uncle of Rear-Admiral the Duke de Bouillon, formerly of the British navy.

English gentleman expostulated with him on his apparent inconsistency of conduct in this respect, his reply was,—" My good friend, you have not considered, that *religion* is to them what *depth* of philosophy or *high* moral feeling is to us, well-educated beings,—they understand the one, but never could be made to comprehend the other; and without this salutary check upon their passions, we should have no security for our throats." This original anecdote, forcibly illustrates the opinions of a great character, on the moral value of religion, (without reference to its higher purposes) in protecting the interests of society by its salutary restraint.

It is matter of history, that whenever schism proceeds to any length in a state, a controversy will arise both as to its causes and its objects; but a prudent man, who wishes well to the sacred cause of religion, will consider well, before he lends himself to aid the progress of dissension, what may be the more than probable consequences of his advocacy, to religion itself, and good government resting upon it. Without entering into contention on the arguments adduced by the defenders of schism, who generally evade the main point by the adoption of that very convenient apology, " the liberty of conscience;" it can easily be shown, that schism itself, on the general principle, is *indefensible*, under the moral law as well as the law of the land, except so far as it is tolerated *in a free State;* and that the guilt lies on that side, which opposes itself to the religion of the State, and the just purity of which, by the very act of schism, it impugns. Independently of the dangerous consequences of schism to mankind, as a spiritual evil, so unequivocally condemned in the apostolical writings, its temporal dangers connected with the repose of society, should ever form a subject of grave consideration, with those who direct the affairs of government;—that government must be rashly lax in wisdom and principle, which

would by its acts, directly or indirectly, connive in the progress of schismatical opposition, for the mere object of courting popular favour; and the still less honest end of obtaining, by aid of such laxity of moral duty, popular support. The common principles of our nature are first to be considered, and any great separation from the national form of religious worship even to one, were it possible, more pure and popular, might, by unavoidable consequence, endanger the security of the state, lead to a furious civil war, and the certainty (under such an extremity) of the successful party establishing despotism! Do our liberal philosophers calculate on such an issue? Have they considered, that in every such instance there must always remain a reserved body, ever ready to follow some discontented leader, to act again upon the plausible declaration of *liberality*,—the fair pretext of advocating true religion,—opposing undue exaction, error, and intolerance? Are political, or *religious* enthusiasts, confined to any one age or generation of mankind, or to any one object or principle of action? These are points, which men, professing religion, and veneration for its higher objects, in their advocacy of rights, purely popular, and often purely *imaginative*, should determine, before they propound schemes of *instruction* which are irreconcileable with the design of sound government, and the advancement of social order!

Under the philosophic ethics of heathenism, it was a maxim of *Plato*, that "men ought to worship the gods according to the laws of their country;" and in his last discourse he introduces *Socrates*, utterly disowning the crime laid to his charge of introducing new divinities or modes of worship. Thus, we fall miserably short of the virtue practised by Heathens, in our feelings and conduct towards the religion of Gospel Christianity; and the philosophy of that education must be shallow indeed, which soars not to the level of Heathen pro-

priety! It may be said that such devotion was the result of superstition; but the sense of obligation, under superstitious rights, is eminently superior, in every sense, to the caprice of free opinions, and the rule of licentiousness; and so thought the wisest of the ancient Greeks, the admirers of liberty, and the devotees of republican policy!

The *Huguenots* of France, and the *Puritans* of England, were alike made the tools of ambitious leaders, in their fanatical crusades for pretended religious purposes, dependent upon *freedom of conscience*.—The result with the former, was the sacrifice of thousands of innocent human beings by the sword! In England, the latter became, under the guise of religion, the perpetrators and abettors of the worst description of crimes that could blacken the character and debase the name of man! Under leaders, whose first object was the destruction of consistent religion and government[1], those who enrolled themselves for the sake of religion, sacrificed to their *idol* with human blood! Step by step, for the avowed sake of religion, and her *pure* objects, they fought in arms *(unlike Infidels)* against men of their own nation, their very kindred; and, pursuing the career of infamy to its utmost limit, to its goal, desolated the hearths of the helpless, who resented it, carrying war and anarchy into the fairest quarters of the land; and, as a final climax, crowned their labour of religious, of *brotherly love*, by the *murder* of a Protestant Christian King, and the usurpation of his throne and office! The philanthropist and the philosopher, for the sake of human nature, would fain indeed, draw a *veil* over deeds so unnatural, so revoltingly atrocious; but the Christian historian, and the Christian commentator, has a higher duty to perform to his country,—these acts, were promoted and perfected on English ground, by English hands, and

[1] Vide, "History of the Rebellion, 1642."—*Earl of Clarendon.*

stand recorded on the authority of a name, the reputation of which will descend, in virtue and in honour, as well as state wisdom, to the latest period of England's history, a *beacon* for her statesmen,—a memento, left by that master mind, which, as the result of its experience, could declare, that, "*where sects are tolerated in a State, it is fit they should enjoy full liberty of conscience, and every other privilege of free-born subjects, to which no power is attached: and, to preserve their obedience upon all emergencies, a government cannot give them too much ease, nor trust them with too little power!*"

It does not seem probable, that any reasonable concession, on the part of the government, is likely to satisfy the unreasonable expectations of the dissenting body, as appears by a petition addressed, by a portion of that body, from Manchester, to Sir Robert Peel, in reference to the "Dissenters' Marriage Bill."—Nothing short of "*separation of Church and State,*" will satisfy the easy consciences of gentlemen, who, claiming protection from the State, are yet resolved, if possible, to contribute nothing they can avoid, or evade, towards its support. Thus, they refuse to perform that towards our Christian institution, under which their conscientious separation, their religion, their lives, and their possessions, have been, and are still protected,—which Christ, to whom they owe obedience, assigned as the due of a Heathen potentate! Use what subterfuge they may, the veil of sophistry is too flimsy to conceal the fact, that, although they profess to disown *a kingdom of this world,* the *mammon* of this world is the object they wish to reserve to themselves! Surely the sentiments expressed by these religious politicians, convey no external mark of becoming Christian feeling, or subdued impartiality of soul,—nay, rather, is such zealous partiality purely characteristic of the unhallowed interest felt for *this world's goods,*

—no motive, short of it, could possibly tempt them to commit themselves so glaringly, by an avowal in their own address, of the very sin of *selfishness*, they so charitably condemn in their denunciation of the national Church! This is, to say the least of it, and in all charity, most unbecoming, on the part of the professing friends of *order* and liberal Christian government. The course they venture to prescribe to the *king*, as the trustee of a Christian Church, and to his responsible ministers, is too bold, too irrational, against the sense of right and justice, and the intellect arrayed against it: mere public opinion *(en masse)*, if even it were with them, would not warrant an expedient so truly hazardous; such proceeding, would be attended with more irremediable evil to the Dissenters themselves, than an absolute refusal of any ameliorating regulation whatever, beyond their present privileges, possessed in common with all other classes in the State! Have they already made up their minds to abjure the monarchy altogether? Have they reflected, that the same inconsiderate spirit, which now aims at the introduction of changes into the fabric of our government beyond all precedent, at any one period of its long history, must naturally extend itself to the upper House of Parliament, the members of which are the legislative trustees of all religious interests whatever in the State; and without whose control and protection, forming a judicial body, there would remain no security for the vested interests, the chapels, and the ministry of Dissenters, any more than for those of Churchmen? Have they considered, that if the HOUSE OF LORDS should ever once become *democratic*, that the phantom of such a reform could only ascend one step higher,—that an *elective monarchy* would terminate the march of liberalism, or introduce a *republic*, with an annual president, a pensioned monarch, or a

dictator; and any one of which, leading to its certain end, a military despotism [1], would pave the way for its possessor, (disdaining the restrictions of republican bounty) in asserting the claim to unreserved dominion, or the subversion of the newly established order? Finally, are the conscientious Dissenters, with their eyes open, really prepared to advocate, and to precipitate all this? "*To your tents, O Israel.*" Let them remember the commands of God to the Jews of old, when they exceeded the limits of their prescribed duty! The last depicted result of rash innovation is not to be considered mere speculation of opinion, or hypothesis, if we reflect on former tragic events, which have blackened the historical page of nations, and once, at no very remote period, that of our own! Indulgence in visionary and selfish hopes of the personal benefits, which may possibly be derived, from the proposed changes in our ecclesiastical system of government, and the application of the Church funds, estrange men from the duties of social life, the bonds of friendship, and the sacred obligations imposed on Christians! And here we may cite the severe, but just sentiment of *La Bruyere*, which, conveying a censure so appropriate, is strikingly impressive, as applied to persons, whose every day practice contradicts their professions; for, to what extremes and excesses are not men carried, by imaginary views of the interests of religon—of which, alas! they have, in fact, so little knowledge, and which they practise so badly!—"*Jusques où les hommes ne se portent-ils point, par l'intérêt de la religion, dont ils sont si peu persuadés, et qu'ils practiquent si mal!*"

Having so far considered the evils of dissent in the abstract, it is of equal moment to show the gross dereliction of religious

[1] "*Le premier Roy était un soldat heureux*,"—a favourite phrase with *Napoleon*, who so fully verified its *point* and application in his own person, and his triumph over republican France!—*Author.*

principle, which has actuated the policy of those, who represent the dissenting interest in the House of Commons [1]; and the practical injury, which such conduct is calculated to produce to true religion, by embarrassing the best designs of the government, for the furtherance of prudential measures, under an alliance so unnatural, with the avowed enemies of the primitive Gospel dispensation. This will best be effected, by an illustration of the religious, and political systems of *popery*, which abundantly display the utter inconsistency, and impropriety of any association on the part of Dissenters, with the latter, against the established Church,—advancing nothing on the score of ingratitude, for the debt they owe to the Duke of Wellington's administration, and its individual members, for the *repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts*, whereby they became admissible, with Churchmen, to a free participation in state privileges, without legal restrictions upon conscience!

The religion of the Church of Rome, in its very character and constitution, essentially despotic, can never be controlled under a limited monarchy, without positive legislative restrictions. The fundamental principle of her communion, and of her worldly system [2], is that of inviolable uncompromising SUPREMACY, *wherever it is possible for her to establish it*,—under it she holds her followers and dependents, in eternal subjection to her authority; and her priests even justify *mental reservation* in its aid! As well might we expect that Church to relinquish her *auricular confession*,—her entire faith, as to resign this pretension; and no honourable, ingenuous, nor *conscientious* Roman Catholic will deny it,—it forms a vital point in his creed, which he is taught to lisp in his cradle, and

[1] Mr. Fowell Buxton's votes in the *majority*, on Lord John Russell's motion, &c.

[2] Vide, Mendham's Literary Policy of the Church of Rome. London: Duncan. 1830. 2d Edit.

the prospects of which, form the *aspirations* of his dying hour! Popery, in its spirit of direct intolerance, is the same in every state and age, where its authority can possibly be exerted, whether it be in Italy, Hungary, Spain, or Ireland. If any man should doubt the correctness of this view, or imagine it to be the declaration of illiberal prejudice, which the *apologists* for all religions set forth in the present day, and not founded *in fact*, let them attentively peruse the *Romish Confession of Faith, imposed on Proselytes*, in Italy, Hungary, &c. to its Creed[1],—and this precious document, consisting of *twenty-two articles*, will afford him ample materials for reflection, as it shows the impossibility at one glance, of rendering any system of education whatever harmonious to, or compatible with, the faith and views of the Church of Rome, that does not directly aid *both*, in reference to both temporal and spiritual obligation: and let it be borne in mind, that the Catholics of Ireland owe the foundation of their Church to that very *papal authority*, which is so fully enforced in this catechismal confession!

ARTICLE THE SECOND. "We confess and believe, that the Pope of Rome is the *Head of the Church, and that he cannot err!!*"

ARTICLE THE THIRD. "We confess and believe that the Pope of Rome is the representative of Christ, and has full power to *forgive and to retain sin, arbitrarily*, and to *cast into hell*, and to excommunicate whomsoever he pleases!!!"

ARTICLE THE FOURTH. "We confess, that every new thing instituted by the Pope, *whether it be contained in the Scriptures or not*, whatsoever he has commanded, is true, divine, and saving, which the common man has to value more than *the commandments of the living God!!!*"

[1] Vide, the "*Urania*," of the Rev. J. W. Dieck, published in German, at *Berlin*. 1829.

ARTICLE THE FIFTH. "We confess that the most holy Pope, is to be honoured by every one with *divine honour*, and with the profoundest reverence, *just as it is due to the Lord Christ himself*[1] ! ! !"

ARTICLE THE SEVENTH. "We confess that the *reading of the Holy Scriptures*, is the cause of *all corruptions and of all sects, and the fountain of all blasphemy* ! ! !"

ARTICLE THE ELEVENTH. "We confess that the Pope of Rome has the power to *alter the Holy Scriptures*, and to *add* and *diminish* as much as he pleases ! ! !"

ARTICLE THE EIGHTEENTH. "We confess that the Holy Virgin Mary is Queen of Heaven, *who governs together with the Son, and according to whose will the Son must do all* ! ! !"

ARTICLE THE TWENTY-SECOND. (Conclusion.) "We also *swear*, that so long as we have a drop of blood in our body, we will *persecute the cursed evangelical doctrine*, and eradicate it *secretly* and *publicly*, *violently* and *deceitfully*, with words and with deeds, *the sword itself not excluded*. Finally, we swear before God, before the holy angels, and before you here present, that in case of a change (in Church or State) we will never, either from fear or complaisance, depart from this saving true Roman Catholic, and Divine Church, nor turn again to, nor embrace the cursed evangelical heresy ! ! !"

Only the shortest articles of this extraordinary *Confession*, have here been selected; but the remainder, throughout, breathe the same spirit of fiery intolerance—of superstition—of bigoted persecution, and of bloodshed, to all those who differ from, or oppose the doctrines of the *Romish Mother Church*; and indeed this spirit is entirely in unison with the decrees of the Romish Pontiffs and Councils, on the same subjects, which unequivocally declare, that no faith is to be kept with

[1] The original of this sentence is,—"*Mit tiefsten kniebeugung.*"—Literally, with the deepest *genuflexion*, or bending of the knee!

those whom they are graciously pleased to denounce as *heretics;* and who, by the "Catechism of the Council of Trent," are excluded from her pale,—and belong to her only as *deserters!* Thus, in the authorised translation of the Catechism published under the sanction of *James the Second,* it is positively declared, "they are in the power of the Church, (page 90,) inasmuch as they are liable to have judgment passed on their opinions, to be visited with *spiritual*[1] judgments, and to be denounced by an *anathema.*"—*Non negandum tamen, quin Ecclesiæ* POTESTATE *sint, ut qui ab ea in judicium vocentur,* PUNIANTUR, *et anathemate damnentur.* Trid. Cat. ad Par. cum Priv. Pii V. P. M. Rom. 1566. p. 66. The massacre of the *Albigenses;* that of *Paris* in 1572; and that of *Ireland* 1641, sufficiently demonstrate (without prejudice) what the Church of Rome understands by the word *puniantur,* and how she applies it, when permitted! Are not the candidates for the Romish priesthood in the college at *Maynooth,* in Ireland, expressly instructed that "the *Church* retains its power over all heretics, apostates, and schismatics, though they may no longer belong to its body,—as a general may have a *right* to inflict punishment on a deserter, though his name is no longer on the muster-roll of the army,"—and does not this appear in the College Class Book[2]. Let Mr. O'Connell, with all his specious sophistry, deny this if he can; and explain, for the satisfaction of the Protestants of Ireland, and for the exculpation of the liberal party, who have so nobly identified themselves, and their policy, with his objects, the distinction which the Roman Catholics of Ireland, and their priesthood, make between *tenets* they profess, and the *doctrines* here propounded, as the doctrines of the *universal Church,* of which they are a component part! The gauntlet is thrown

[1] Quere, *literal* punishments, as under the Inquisition?

[2] *Tractatus de Theologiâ,* cap. 8. de membris. Dublin, 1795. P. 404.

down to him,—*vestigia nulla retrorsum!* Here we have the authorised Hungarian Popish Confession, the Tridentine Catechism, and the *charge*, or instruction, in the Class Book of Maynooth College, *(tria juncta in uno)*,—and, as the liberal advocate of *appropriation* of that, which never belonged to the Roman Church, may stand in need of a *fourth* auxiliary, the earned and inexorable champion of that church, *Bossuet*, is here presented, without any torturing of text or subterfuge of argument, when illustrating the exercise of the *power of the sword* in matters of religion and conscience, he unequivocally lasserts, that "*it cannot be called in question without weakening, and, as it were, maiming the public authority or power;* so that there is no illusion more dangerous, than to make *toleration* a characteristic of the true church:"—*Chose aussi qui ne peut être revoquée en doute, sans énerver et comme estropier la puissance publique; de sorte qu'il n'y a point d'illusion plus dangereuse que de donner la souffrance pour une caractère de vraie Eglise*[1]. If the Catholics maintain religious scruples, they are bound to maintain all this, or their practice and their faith must contradict each other; but religious scruples, under no creed save their own, would justify an invasion of the *rights of others*. "The holy and inflexible incompatibility" of the Roman Church,—*sa sainte et inflexible incompatibilité*, in the words of the same author,—"is this indeed which renders her so unconciliatory, and consequently so odious to *all sects* separated from her; most of which, at the beginning, desired only to be tolerated by her, or at least not to be *anathematised* by her."—"But her *holy severity*, and the holy delicacy of her sentiments, forbad her such *indulgence*, or rather such *softness*." *C'est en effet ce qui la rend si sévère, si insociable, et*

[1] Hist. des variations, liv. x. sect. 56. Œuvres, tom. iii. p. 411, *(Bossuet,)* à Paris, 1747. See also the admirable writings of his learned antagonist, *M. Jurieu*. "*La plus intolérant de toutes les sectes Chrétiennes.*"—Sixième Avertissement, sect. 115. Œuvres, tom. iv. p. 425.

ensuite si odieuse à toutes les sectes séparées, qui la plûpart, au commencement, ne demandoient autre chose, sinon qu'elle voulût bien les tolérer, ou du moins ne les frapper pas de ses anathémes. Mais, sa sainte sévérité, et la sainte délicatesse de ses sentimens ne lui permettoit pas cette indulgence, ou plutôt cette mollesse. (Ibid. p. 426.)

Here, then, we are fairly at issue with our popish brethren in Ireland, on the *possibility* of adapting any system of *moral* and *religious* instruction to the general population of that part of the united kingdom, which is not fully compatible with the principles illustrated: and this at once shows both the fallacy of Lord John Russell's motion, and the futile character of all the arguments by which it has been defended and carried, by a fictitious majority, created by some *fifty* interested Irish members, putting the injustice and the ruin of her Protestant Church, and her *hierarchy*, entirely out of the question! The unanswerable exposition of Sir Robert Peel, on all the leading points connected with this question, politically and morally considered, as they regard the vital interests of Ireland, and her connexion with this, her parent country, leaves little room for further commentary; and it would be foreign to the design of this work, to enter into a lengthened detail of the facts, in support of the truth and justice of the premises he has so ably set forth; still, the religious part of the question admits of discussion *ad infinitum*, for Protestants can permit no *truce* with a power so tyrannous, as that which aims at the destruction of all that is dear to them as men, and as Christians!

That admirable writer, Dr. Phelan, in his *History of the Policy of the Church of Rome in Ireland, from the Introduction of the English Dynasty to the Great Rebellion*[1], has pertinently observed, at the outset, and in the Introduction, that "the great source of Irish misery has been, not the power of England, *but*

[1] London edit. 1827. Cadell, &c.

its want of power,"—and this important truth he abundantly illustrates from the whole history, although the case is so grossly misrepresented by interested priestly and political writers[1]. The history commences with declaring this important position—" The connexion of this country with the crown of England, originated in a compact between Henry Plantagenet, Pope Adrian the Fourth, and the Irish Prelates of the day." Now, it must be understood, that this very Pope Adrian was an *Englishman;* and the only one of that nation, except *John the Eighth,* of English extraction, although not born in England, who ever attained to that dignity! Both Adrian, and the two other parties who figured in the transaction, in the true spirit of *catholicity,* vied with each other in the depth of the design and the iniquitous hypocrisy under which it was perfected,—thus this " *Saxon* crusade against the independence of Ireland," borrowing Mr. O'Connell's words, was headed by parties *strictly papal!* It follows, that whatever of calamity, of misery, of anarchy, which has or may become entailed on unhappy Ireland, by this act of her elder sister,—to popery and to popish treachery is due the homage and the *undivided* honour, the praise, and the admiration of Irishmen, for having inflicted them,—for having destroyed her primitive system, which she possessed from the earliest promulgation of Christianity in these islands! There was no *heresy,* even in the sense which the Church of Rome defines it, here at work; for *Protestantism,* that virgin spirit of the reformation, had not yet shone forth upon the earth, arrayed in the mantle of the Gospel. This deed of infamy to Ireland, which robbed her of her inheritance, which polluted her altars, and which seized upon her *hearths,* was the work of papal hands! If the fountains of her independence ceased to flow,

[1] As a counterpoise to which, Mr. Inglis' Travels in Ireland, recently published, may also be read with advantage.

—if the crystal springs of her liberty rose no more, who else but Catholic brothers polluted the one and dried up the other? Rich in her poverty, and pure in her simplicity, she needed not the gilded trappings of a Romish *hierarchy*, nor the infallible protection of a Roman Potentate, to save the souls of her sons from damnation! But, alas! for Ireland, she fell prostrate at the feet of the "mistress of the seven hills," no longer *imperial* Rome! Thus, there is not a single misfortune, from the period when Ireland was basely betrayed into the hands of the Romish Church, which has befallen her, that is not directly attributable to the sinful compact, which took from her sons the state of freedom, and gave them nothing but a *ghostly phantom*, rich in priestly chains in return!

Let us now take Mr. O'Connell's statement of the fact. "Internal traitors led on the invaders—her sons fell in no fight—her liberties were crushed in no battle: but domestic treason and *foreign invaders* doomed Ireland to *seven centuries of oppression.*" Admirable! Who were the traitors? Mr. O'Connell tells us not! Who crushed her liberties? Mr. O'Connell says not! Who were the *foreign* invaders? Still silent—mystery sublimely pathetic—silence awfully obscure! Well, as it is a Protestant duty, the learned gentleman must be extricated from this labyrinth of Christian charity, in the *deep* and *dark* recesses of which he could not safely, or for mercy's sake, pronounce the true quality of the *delinquents*, nor their *religious association*, for eloquence itself was dumb! Not so Dr. Phelan. "*The independence of Ireland was not crushed in battle, but quietly sold in the synods of the prelates, those internal traitors to whom the orator alluded, but whom he was too prudent to name!!*" Thus far, for a specimen of Roman Catholic candour, and political liberality. The extraordinary document, the letter of Pope Adrian[1], by which he

[1] Vide Phelan's History.

delivers over to his "dear son Henry" the "Emerald Isle,"—"the oppressed"—"the robbed"—"the wronged"—"the insulted," and "the persecuted," will well repay Protestant readers, who have not seen Dr. Phelan's work, (who unfortunately died before a second edition could be published,) the trouble of a perusal. The conveyance of Ireland was shortly afterwards repeated by another *Pope*, and confirmed by a *synod* of the Romish clergy, held at *Waterford;* and on which occasion *Henry* was formally proclaimed liege lord of Ireland!—"From that period to the Reformation," says Phelan, "the English monarchs, and the little *Parliament of the Pale*, (a small circle around Dublin,) unable to maintain their pretensions by the *sword*, appealed to the *sacredness* of those papal grants; and thus gave the weight of four centuries to an authority, which was ultimately to be turned against themselves."

The whole machinery of the Church of Rome requires to be investigated, and well understood, by Protestant Christians in this age, when that church, aided by the policy of Liberals, and the inconsiderate apathy of those, who are vitally interested in the fate of the Church of England, is making such active exertions to propagate her doctrines, to the injury of the latter; and to throw off all restraints upon her system of temporal domination. The popish hierarchy have not relinquished their grand reserve, that sweeping clause, "*Salvo ordine* EPISCOPALI," whenever the authority shall be required for its exercise; and against which nothing *secular* can stand, for a moment, when the laity are to be set upon aiding the design for grasping *power*. History is replete, nay overcharged with proof, that *opportunity* is all, is every thing with the Church of Rome: let that but fairly arrive, and all the rest may fully be expected to follow in rapid succession of incident: and, what is more, the liberal portion of those who

compose her own communion, must become either the willing instruments, or the unwilling victims, in pushing her objects; for, in such an extremity, she never has paid, and never will pay, respect to persons, who do not entirely fall in with her views. Charity therefore is lost, in a condition of things, where religion and faith, are the objects first to be secured or sacrificed; and we are bound by the claims of both, resting on a solemn duty to God, to act upon the defensive. What sympathy ought not a British Protestant public to feel, on a subject in which its choicest interests are intimately associated with those of its persecuted brethren in the sister kingdom? On what plea can we, as a people, or Christian nation, possibly justify an avoidance of direct support in every possible form to those who so much need our assistance? The existence of the Church of England herself, as an independent Church, is involved in the present nefarious attempt to despoil the Church of Ireland of her inheritance; and of which it may be said, with sympathetic truth, by all classes of English Protestants,—

"JAM PROXIMUS ARDET UCALEGON!"

It is useless to mourn over that parliamentary *evil*, which has taken place—perhaps fatally and irrecoverably performed—by those who must render unto God hereafter, an account of their stewardship; but, leaving them to follow up, as may seem desirable in their own eyes, their *suicidal career* so recklessly begun, it is, nevertheless, our bounden duty and our privilege, as Protestants, to show forth the unprincipled policy which has engendered this opposition to rational measures of relief,—its selfishness of character, and its consequences to the people of Ireland, *en masse*. "There is nothing," says an elegant writer on Ireland, "in her fertile soil, in her verdant fields, her romantic glens, her magnificent mountains,

and expansive lakes,—there is nothing in her dewy skies, her temperate clime, and gentle alternation of seasons—to mould her children into such shapes of depravity, or to engender a virulent intellectual poison, where every species of animal venom has been so wonderfully excluded!" Why will the wealthy Protestants of Ireland permit the unfounded obloquy of natural cruelty, of natural human deformity, to rest on their beautiful country,—ay, and too often join in the aspersive cry, when even a glance at their own homes might convince them, that the moral blight exhales not from the innocent bogs of poor Ireland, but is wafted thither from the spiritual pest-house of Rome? Is this picture true, or is it false? The most unprejudiced will declare it to be true! What then is the duty of Protestant legislators and instructors? Is it not to wrest this power from the Romish priesthood? And what are the most ready, and at the same time the most powerful means for attaining that object? *Of all the means which may be devised for the* EDUCATION *of the poorer classes in Ireland, none will ever come up to that which shall furnish them with* SCRIPTURAL INSTRUCTION *in their native or Celtic language.* But, the Protestant clergy may justly reply to this, by asking, "How are we to provide instruction for the people, in their native Irish, or the means of educating schoolmasters for that purpose, when we are to be deprived of all funds over and above those, which may be deemed necessary for our bare *subsistence*, or spiritual vocation in the Churches?" Let Parliament directly meet this objection or defect, when the control or application of any *surplus*, which may be declared, is taken from the Protestant Pastor, by giving him still the privilege of claiming the *aid*, and of *superintending* both moral and religious instruction in the native Irish, wherever it may be admissible. Let an equal number of Protestant Pastors, or if not an equal number, at

least, a number sufficient to guard the interests of *Protestantism*, be added to any educational board composed of *laymen*, which may be instituted, under an express provision, that, in any system of education, which may be laid down, instruction in the *Celtic tongue* shall form a component part of such system. By this means, in process of time, the poorer portion of the Irish will learn to read, or to understand the *Scriptures* in their favourite dialect; and that which now forms one of the greatest auxiliaries of the Romish priesthood, in its unnatural alliance with the former, against the Protestant Church and State, will be rendered nugatory.

The supine negligence of Protestant landlords, and gentlemen of property in Ireland, to this most fundamental object, is inexplicable. The very tenacious adherence of the lower orders of the Irish to their native language, is carefully encouraged by the priests, for the most unhallowed purposes of mystery, prejudice, bigotry, and deception,—it forms an engine, immediately available to the furtherance of their own selfish objects; but any attempt to introduce amongst the former *the art of reading it*, is at once resisted, as forming a direct blow at the very foundation of their power! This fact speaks volumes, and ought to open the eyes of all those who are interested in improving the mental condition of the Irish population.

We should regard the papal system in Ireland, with direct reference to its political character; but that political character is derived from, and dependent upon, its religious faith, based on a principle of deadly hostility to all other systems whatever,—it is impossible to sever them, and the moral effects of its civil policy are accordant with, and do but re-echo the other. Were it not for this, as Protestants and Christians, it would be unjustifiable for us by any earthly power (politically) to interfere between God and man, in a matter of con-

science, except by providing Christian instruction,—so, without developing the religious system of papacy to view, it would be equally impossible to show its political bias, its bearings, its objects, or its moral consequences. Every *exposé* of the former is therefore justifiable, is imperative, as tending to prove that, as a matter of *faith* and of *duty*, with the Catholic, the political system of the Church of Rome cannot be fairly established any where, without first destroying the liberty of the people, and the *virtual independence* of the republic or the monarchy, in every free state!

Englishmen can form little conception of the thraldom in which the unhappy peasantry of Ireland are held spell-bound, by the deceitful practices of the majority of the Romish Priests. The poor Irish peasant is born into a family, where all the extravagancies of ignorant superstition and its delusions are held forth, on the authority of an *infallible Church*, —he may be said to draw them in with his mother's milk,— from his birth he is rendered the creature of prejudice and of suspicion; and every sound which assails his ears, every subject which is placed before his eyes, in succession, tends but to confirm their impressions! When reason begins to exercise the limited functions permitted to her, he faintly comprehends the outline of that specious tale, which cunning imprints on the active brain, and the sanguine heart of the native Irishman. Just so much information is imparted to him as shall tend to keep him in a state of fearful, of abject dependency, and no more. His instruction amounts to this,—that *popery* is the religion of his fathers, and had been that of his race and country, from the days of the *Apostles*, until the heretical Saxon-English invaders, having, by mingled fraud and force, obtained a footing in his "father-land," added to their other acts of injustice and oppression, the never pardonable crime of having despoiled its Church, wrested her lands

by force and arms, levelled her ecclesiastical houses, and perverted her revenues to *the maintenance of a religion which Satan invented, and Luther, an accursed heretic, preached!* Moreover, he is taught, that his father is rightful lord of the soil on which his wretched cabin stands: that the rent hardly earned by labour, should be *received*, not *paid* by him: that the *proctor* who comes to collect the Protestant minister's *tithe*, is the very representative of the *devil*, robbing the true Church of God in the persons of her clergy; and that the extortionate demands of the priest, against which the needy must necessarily complain, are solely occasioned by the usurpation of these sacrilegious intruders, whose *expulsion* alone will ever relieve himself or his country, from their burthens, and his kindred from their injuries and sufferings! He is taught to look with the eye of envy and deadly enmity on the "lordly mansions, the spacious abodes of the landed proprietors, their commodious equipages;" and to execrate them as Englishmen, or contaminated Irishmen, who have sold their country, and only worthy to be considered heretics and oppressors, the legitimate objects of his distrust and hatred! He is cautioned, perpetually, "to put no faith in heretics," though they should even offer him *peace* and *friendship*; and assured, that such are only the plausible means used to disarm his just anger, his duty to his own—to withdraw him from that holy faith, wherein alone he can be saved;—that he must confess all his thoughts and transgressions to the Roman priest, on pain of incurring the most deadly penalties: and, by aid of these, and a multitude of similar methods, he is *rivetted* with a yoke, from which, for want of proper cultivation, he is unable to extricate himself, or even to understand that it is his duty to do so. Thus he becomes, against his natural inclination, which is free, impetuous, and generous, a creature of deadly passions, replete with even murderous

zeal, under the ardent belief, that, by exterminating the Protestant members, and their faith, he is doing God a service; whilst he hopes thereby to improve his own temporal condition, and to establish his country's independence! Here, then, is a being ready formed, in every respect, to do the work, to attend the bidding of the demagogue and political agitator, whoever he may be, stepping forward for his own selfish purposes, who, knowing the importance of his spiritual coadjutor, links him into his purpose, each party flattering himself he may be able to deceive the other; whilst their conjoint efforts, under this unholy alliance, for a worldly object, form and propel the gigantic mass of ill directed spiritual zeal, political turmoil, and physical violence,—all alike corrupt and perverted, under an organization so dark, a compact so unprincipled[1]! Who, then, can wonder at the state of party feeling, or feel surprised at the debased moral condition of the greater portion of the ill-fated population of Ireland?

When Pope *Adrian the Fourth*, by his unprincipled *bull*, surrendered over to the tender mercies of his "dear son Henry," that country, which he justly characterised as *resisting his authority*, it was not in the power of England to impart any spiritual aid to her ill-fated neighbour, for she was herself still deeper sunk in the depths of popish subjection; nor was

[1] These facts are carefully passed over in a Roman Catholic publication, entitled "THE GARDEN OF THE LORD," in which *Garden*, just so much *light* and *air* are introduced, as shall make the scenery cool and pleasant to those strangers, who are invited to walk therein. As this book has gone through several editions, and is designed as an easy apology for *Catholicism*, those who wish to learn the true character of popery, and its present system in the world, should read the records of the Protestant Journal, for the years 1831, 1832, 1833, and 1834, published by Whittaker and Co., Ave Maria Lane, London; Currie, Dublin, and Reid, Glasgow. Also the publications of the "Reformation Society."—*Author.*

Ireland, at the period of the *Reformation*, aided as she ought to have been, with the means of scriptural instruction. A fierce rebellion raged throughout the isle, and between the contest for territorial possession and the struggle for the menaced authority of the *English Crown*, the spiritual welfare of the people was entirely overlooked. At a subsequent period, it is true, an effort was made in a truly Christian form, and one of all others most adapted to improve the moral condition, and to secure the affections of the Irish people,—to obtain that from their hearts, which the sword or gibbet, with all their terrors united, could never have gained from their native mental independence. This was the *state enactment*, by which every parish church was to be furnished with a copy of the Holy Scriptures, in the Irish, or Celtic tongue, and by means of which, in a language intelligible to the common people, the unsophisticated tidings of the Gospel kingdom were to be proclaimed and expounded. But, alas! through the subsequent neglect of the Irish legislature, this boon was misapplied, or never zealously imparted, to those for whose benefit it had been so wisely designed.

In process of time, this grand Christian auxiliary to a *moral regeneration* of the people of Ireland was altogether withdrawn, without any adequate provision of instruction to supply its irreparable loss,—the field, in fact, was left open to the crafty designs of the Romish delegates, who, having no other resource for the advancement of their temporal objects, mystified the truths declared by God to man, for his salvation, imparting just so much in a foreign tongue, as would serve to complete the purposes of that worldly system of control, for which the Church of Rome is pre-eminently distinguished in the annals of the world. We are now, in the nineteenth century of the Christian era, justly suffering under the consequences of a neglect of Christian duty, a marked derelic-

tion of state wisdom, and a desertion of the cause of true philosophic philanthropy! What are the rational, the practical remedies, which now suggest themselves to a Christian legislature? Assuredly, they are not comprehended in the contemplated measures of those liberals, who would thereby deprive the Protestant Christian Church of Ireland, of the last means possessed by her pastors, for affording Gospel instruction, without an adequate provision to supply the deficiency!

No man in his senses, capable of reflection, will attempt to deny the awful importance of this juncture, nationally: two powerful parties in Ireland, necessarily, for ages, nay, centuries, separated from Christian communion, by an impassable barrier, are now arrayed in violent political opposition to each other; and one will yield to no measures of amelioration that are not based on a footing, which, fostering the extensive prejudices of the one, shall be utterly subversive of the vital faith and those securities which animate the other. To this irrational, impolitic, and unjust *proposition*, as a state proceeding, the opposition liberal parties in the House of Commons, have lent themselves, *for the alleged purpose of establishing a* PRINCIPLE, *rendered necessary by the present condition of things in the Sister Kingdom*[1]; but ostensibly, under the hope and prospect, of so far embarrassing the conservative government, as to compel it to relinquish the charge imposed upon it, under the full sanction and confidence of the crown, as well as the confidence of the intellectual public, throughout the three kingdoms, arising from the rational measures of practical reform it had propounded! It may justly be viewed as a *national calamity*, that this association of incongruous elements, for an ignoble purpose, unprecedented in the constitutional history of Britain, has, to a cer-

[1] Fallacia alia aliam trudit!—*Ter.*

tain extent succeeded, by compelling the resignation of an honourable, straightforward, and *united* administration, possessing within itself a rare combination of talent and promptitude of purpose.

This event powerfully illustrates the *point* of the Duke of Wellington's interrogatory, made in the House of Peers, on discussing the *principle* and effect of the Reform Bill,—"But, my lords, how is the king's government to be conducted under the proposed change?" There is no blinking the fact, —by the constituency created under that measure, and its *delegates* from Ireland, has the king's government been defeated, by a *small majority, on an abstract valueless question, in the House of Commons, anticipatory of its propounded measures, for the relief of the Catholics of Ireland from an admitted burthen,* and against the sense of *three hundred* of its own independent members, representing the intellect—the wealth —the discretion, and the Protestant feeling of the entire English people! Such a defeat, and in such a cause, may, in itself, be deemed glorious, and, under any other circumstances, might be claimed as a triumph; but, with reference to the interests of the nation, and the nation's Church, it is pregnant with momentous issues!

As a counterpoise to this evil of popular ascendency, over reason, argument, and sober judgment, the people of England can only look for a remedy, at once constitutional and effective, to the firmness and devotion of the House of Peers, as the last stay of the monarchy. Never, on any former occasion, in the history of that monarchy, has there been such an urgent necessity for the display of noble and inflexible patriotism, combined with the exercise of that refined moderation, which, in periods of national danger, is the greatest attribute of statesmen; (for to be moderate amidst the extremes of party contention, presents no ordinary share of for-

bearing virtue,) and the prompt adoption of measures, having for their sole end, the maintenance of established principles, connected with the exercise of kingly faith, the security of property, and the integrity of the Church possessions in the State. Should the Peers, in their judgment, and under the circumstances of this crisis of public affairs, not deem it expedient to address his Majesty, for the purpose of restoring his late ministers, or that, a desideratum so ardently wished, by the expressed sense of the nation, should not be carried into effect,—the Peers of England will yet remember, that they form the *conservative estate*; and although—*nec quærere nec spernere oportet honorem*,—they will know how to maintain them, by a just devotion to their king, and to the principles of that constitution, under which they enjoy them!

The three gigantic evils of Ireland are *popery, distress,* and *ignorance.* Whatever shades of party feeling exist, or however diversified are the complicated ramifications of that subordinate machinery of factious violence, and deadly hostility to the Protestant Church, which distract the councils of the government, and disturb the repose of society, the prolific source of all, is to be traced to this *triumvirate hydra!* With reference to the immediate safety of the Church of Ireland, and the security of British connexion, three remedial measures at once simple, yet effective, appear to be imperatively necessary to meet the impending danger, which an association of such extensive magnitude, holds over the destinies of the state; nor should any one of them, in the present condition of affairs, be deemed *impracticable*, without a trial, or at least, a fair discussion of its merits. For brevity sake, they may be comprehended under the three following heads,—*legislative state provision for the Roman Catholic Priests; a state provision for the actual poor; and a state provision for the general instruction of the Irish population, moral and religious,*

in the language most accessible to its common understanding. This forms the basis of a system at once comprehensive, and powerfully formidable, to that array of intolerant insolence, which for years past has arrogantly bearded the *executive power*, under successive administrations, and now threatens the dismemberment of the empire!

The objections and prejudices which hitherto have existed on the part of landed proprietors, and local interests in Ireland, should give way to a common object, or a *common ruin* awaits their retention. To avert the evils of a civil war,—to preserve property to its rightful owners—to ensure the safety of human life—to retain the blessings of a pure religion—to maintain the inviolability of the laws, sacrifices of opinion must be made, and union of sentiment established in the legislature, as well as amongst those, whose personal influence and co-operation are indispensable for carrying into effect the means of protection and relief. Had the government, on the passing of the Catholic Emancipation Bill, made a provision for the maintenance of the *popish clergy*, it would not now be arrayed against the state, and the Protestant connexion; but leaving it dependent on the voluntary support of a population, to which an extension of political power was granted, has occasioned its closer alliance with that population, for political objects, at once incompatible with the reign of Protestantism, and subversive of all those principles, under which Ireland became a component part of the British dominions. The argument is fallacious, which asserts the inconsistency of instituting a state, or *parliamentary provision*, for the support of a religion which the state *disowns*, or only *tolerates*, because it already exists. This is viewing the question contractedly, and with glaring impolicy. Popery would not increase one whit the more, on account of such provision for

the priests; but, on the contrary, whilst the cause of envy, the bickerings, the rancorous feelings of a prejudiced priesthood, and the dissatisfaction of an oppressed peasantry, would be generally, or entirely removed. We must take the population of Ireland under the actual circumstances in *which we find it*, possessing for centuries a system of Roman Catholic instruction, which system has always been at variance with a Protestant institution. By the Act of Union, Ireland became an integral portion of the British empire,—her entire population is, therefore, identified with British interests, and British connexion; and, although we would not encourage popery, *for the sake of popery*, we should take care that popery is deprived of its *sting*, and the means of ruining our Protestant Church and Clergy, through the prejudice it excites amongst the whole Catholic body, for the want of such provision. This, therefore, is a matter which the State should take into its own hands; at the same time, taking care to establish an adequate competition, by the due protection of the Protestant faith. Nor would the Protestant Clergy of Ireland, injured, oppressed, and degraded as it is, object to such an arrangement, at the hands of Parliament; for the security of their own lives, and the lives of their families, their possessions, and last, not least in their estimation, the advancement of their spiritual objects, would be enhanced thereby.

The second proposition involves a legislative provision for the actual poor and destitute, and the means of employment for the industrious and efficient portion of the Irish peasantry; and whilst there are *four millions of acres* of land in Ireland capable of being put into cultivation, in one form or other, it is perfectly paradoxical to argue, that these means are not available immediately on the spot, or that the remedy is impracticable, producing even a benefit to the *landowner*, after the experience

of its effects on the properties of Lord Clonbrock, and others[1], and the moral improvement in the conduct and independence of those to whom it has been extended. Under the protection of government, moral, as well as religious instruction, might be provided in new stations, or colonial villages, and a practical system of loyalty, sobriety, and virtuous industry encouraged, even by the aid of Catholic Priests; and numbers of the Irish peasantry, who now annually emigrate to this part of the United Kingdom, to the injury of our own domestic peasantry, would thus find employment at home, and the means, by their own frugal industry, of making provision for their families, without being burthensome to this country. But no measure of this kind, however beneficial, can be carried into effect, to any extent, without the interference of Parliament.

The third proposition is one, the importance of which, in a statistical point of view, is paramount for consideration, as it embraces the object, and with the object, the prospect, that by the means of *Education*, properly conducted, that cloud of ignorance,—that compact of mental hallucination, which, for ages, has overshadowed Ireland, may be dispelled; *but, a truly moral regeneration of the disaffected Irish population, is not to be obtained, by the infusion of political learning into the scheme of instruction;* nor by the means of *political knowledge societies;* for the consequences of such instruction, to a peasantry, and general population, whose habits and excitability of character, render them the easy dupes of ambitious leaders, and political adventurers, would be a hundred times more mischievous than the evils which education is designed to remove! And here the philanthropist, the moralist, and the Christian, have indeed a fine field, and a luxuriant soil

[1] Vide Mr. Birmingham's Report on the *Home Colonies* of Castle Sampson, Iskerbane, Roscommon. London: Richards, St. Martin's Lane. 1833.

before them to work upon, if they enter upon the duty with firmness, and with discretion. The statesman, if possible, has yet a higher, a wider range, for the exercise of his refined feeling, or even of his philosophy,—he has now the opportunity for performing one of the most important functions connected with his station and office—that of legislating for the improvement of the mental, and benefit of the temporal condition of human beings, *in futuro*, by which he may hope to live in the hearts of a grateful posterity; and, as Cicero has so beautifully expressed it, "become ennobled even after death."

It is hardly possible for the Christian community in this country to be more grossly misinformed on any one subject connected with the state of religion in the world, than it is with reference to the subterfuges and schemes, to which the Catholic Priesthood in Ireland at present have recourse, for the purpose of extorting a provision, or maintenance, from their poor flocks; (for a voluntary system to the support of the Church of Rome, is a perfect anomaly with its constitution and its practice,) yet this subject has, more than once, in the late Parliament, been urged on the attention of the House of Commons, by that patriotic Protestant member, Mr. J. E. Gordon. The darker hues of superstitious bigotry, which pervade the popish system in Ireland, compared with that of England, is usually charged upon the inherent national characteristics of the poorer orders, in the former; who are represented as communicating to the true faith, which they profess, that dark tinge of ferocity, that scowl of impenetrable obduracy, that recklessness, fanaticism, and wild prostration of intellect, which lead men on to deeds of desperation and blood! This is palpably false; it is a gross calumny on Ireland, and on Ireland's sons. The people act as they are taught to act! Why is it, that in the north of

Ireland, murder, robbery, arson, and rioting, are comparatively unknown, whilst, in the south, these crimes are every day's practice? Are they not native Irishmen, who inhabit the north as well as those who inhabit the south? The fault is in the system, not in the individuals; for, in comparison, out of the two or three hundred thousand poor Irish, supposed to be distributed throughout England and Wales, and part of Scotland, there is less crime of an aggravated description prevailing, than amongst an *equal number* of the poor native inhabitants; and the records of justice verify this fact! Who are more industrious in the very drudgery of labour in our streets and public works? Who more submissive under employment? Who more honest in places of trust? Is not a great portion of our domestic police force composed of Irishmen? These facts should open the eyes of our legislators,—the practical illustration is daily, nay hourly, before them. Let them exert themselves to remove from Ireland this moral stigma, and remove her threatened infidelity, her rebellion to England's crown, by removing the propelling cause.

Those who have studied the native Irish language, concur in declaring it to be both richly and powerfully figurative, and impressive; and in every respect perfectly calculated for the purposes of useful instruction, whilst the fond attachment of the natives to its use, is a powerful inducement to their attention, and this forms a cogent reason why it should be made the leading vehicle for removing their prejudices; and it is a known fact, that where instruction has been conveyed under it, accompanied with scriptural elucidation, there the power and the influence of the priest have tottered. But under *legislative provision*, the priest would have, at all events, no *worldly motive* for practising deception, as he has at present; and we all know how far, under every profession, and form of religious worship, imperfect human nature will sacrifice

conscience, and even risk futurity for self-interest, or worldly necessities!

In Munster, Connaught, the western parts of Ulster, and the south of Leinster, the ancient Celtic dialect is most extensively spoken, and although foolishly held in contempt by the more polished part of society, is esteemed beyond measure by the poorer orders: and whilst most of the native Irish understand sufficient of the English vernacular to use it for the purposes of ordinary business or intercourse, yet it is in their favourite secret *Celtic* that they think, through which they feel, and by which they impart to each other, as in an *unknown tongue*, their deepest thoughts, their hatred and purposes of present revenge; and their hopes of future triumph, over those they have been induced to look upon as their ungodly tyrants and oppressors! The Romish Priests are fully aware, that scarcely any vestige remains of those monkish stores of Celtic literature, with which Ireland once abounded; and although they generally learn sufficient for all their own purposes of communication, they entertain the most decided *hostility* to its going beyond a certain limit with others; because they know, that the active mind of the inquiring Irish peasant, when he is once taught to *read the language which he so ardently and fondly cherishes*, must of necessity lead him to that object, alike terrible to a popish priest, and hateful to an infidel politician—*the unmutilated Word of God* —that independent treasure, which, single-handed, has grasped the loyal and enlightened Protestant from the dominion of superstition, raised him from the lowest level of human degradation, to his conscious eminence over the disaffected Papist, and the impious rebel,—has given him that moral independence, alike subversive of impure spiritual tyranny, and revolutionary intrigue,—that which the designing Romish priest knows and feels to his heart's core, if it

could once be fairly propagated through the land, would tear asunder, and for ever, the *massive chains of his iron-bound despotism*,—would expand like refined oil upon the mental billows of its restless and sanguine population, softening their turbulent feelings, dispelling their suspicions, and lulling their angry passions to rest in the calms of Christian peace and brotherly love! The nation may possibly have an opportunity for seeing, how far the united phalanx of opposing liberal politicians, will carry into effect these principles, and their objects, in the measures they propound.

The recent proceedings of the ultra liberals can only be viewed by impartial men, as a direct attack on the *kingly prerogative*, rendering its exercise nugatory. It forms a *problem* for statesmen to solve,—how far there can be any utility in granting that prerogative to a limited monarch, if its exercise is to be impeded, on abstract principles, for the mere purpose of supplanting an administration, under the cover of a vote in one of the Houses of Parliament, anticipatory, and in the teeth of actual public measures recommended for adoption by the crown! The unfettered exercise of the royal prerogative is involved in *the hereditary right existing* in the *person of the king*, which, as our monarchy is constituted, renders such hereditary right and privilege far superior to that which would exist under a monarchy by election. Under its free exercise, the principle of government is so regularly disposed in all its parts, that it almost executes itself, whilst any factious attempt to interrupt its progress, may, if successful, impede the whole course of government; and thus render the prerogative valueless. Thus, upon the demise of our kings, the administration goes on without interruption or delay: so, for the same reasons, we have little to apprehend, either from the weakness or ill-feeling of our monarchs, who have responsible councils to guide the one, and laws to re-

strain the other. And, therefore, this hereditary right and prerogative, should ever be kept so sacred, as neither to impede the succession, nor frustrate its objects, unless where their *preservation* and *exercise* can be proved liable to endanger the constitution, to interrupt the due course of the government, or the execution of the laws. None of these contingencies existed to justify the abstract question brought before Parliament, by the noble leader of the opposition, who must well know, that the prerogative of choosing his responsible advisers, is not given to the king for any intrinsic personal merit, benefit, or any inalienable family right or party advantage; but for the good of the State, in the exercise of which, the legislative powers of the constitution are to be preserved, against the ambition of factious competitors. Here we behold the distinguished advantages of our constitutional system, over those uncertainties to which elective kingdoms are exposed; and which are the obstacles to their arriving at perfection in government; and hence the manifest absurdity of that distinction, invidiously created by some liberal politicians, between *a monarch de facto* and a *monarch de jure;* for every limited sovereign is *a king de jure,* because he governs and exercises his prerogative by the consent of the body of the *three estates,* which is sufficient authority to abolish all precedent right: so also, if a king comes into power by right of conquest, as was the case with William of Normandy, he is no longer a *limited monarch;* but if he afterwards concedes his right, and consents to limitations, he immediately becomes, under the same reasons, *a king de jure.* This is precisely the position in which his present Majesty stands with his people, as the administrator of the supreme power; therefore the obstruction to the free and full exercise of that prerogative right, is an obstruction to the authority of the whole nation, from which it is derived! Let those who pretend to assert

the *inviolability* of constitutional law, prove it otherwise if they can.

It is presumed, that the constitutional freedom of the British nation, consists in an absolute unlimited legislative power, wherein the whole body of the people is fairly represented and protected, and in an executive duly limited and empowered; but the restrictions on the latter, may be carried to a dangerous extent, as well as its power to improper extremes. When there exist two opposing parties in the State, nearly balanced in power and pretensions, it has been, and is, the opinion of the ablest writers on religion and government, in which Locke himself joins, that the king ought not, in any instance, to be under the direct influence or guidance of either; because he would, in such case, decline from his office of presiding over the whole State, and become thereby the *head of a party*, which, besides deducting from the dignity of his station, would render him more or less responsible for all public mismanagements, and their consequences, a position in which the constitution cannot place the king; and, whenever such a state of things arrives, it must result from weakness in the power of the crown, or the ministry, *or the former must be too much controlled by the legislature, in the use of its prerogative.* But even in such an extremity the king may, with all prudence, and with perfect good conscience, adopt the alternative *of approving the professed principles of one party of men, more than the other, according as he thinks them calculated to promote the interests of Church and State, with the preservation of which he is identified, in person and office;* and this without being swayed by either passion or interest, to advance an opinion, merely because it should happen to be that of the party whose conduct he most approves, or in whose discretion he is disposed to place the greatest confidence. Thus, in every point of view, statistical, moral, and political, it is the

duty of the English people, in the present crisis of national affairs, to sustain their sovereign in the legitimate exercise of his high functions; and, by upholding him therein, they will participate in that moral victory, which reason and deliberative judgment cannot fail of obtaining, over the tumulutous influences of clamour and faction!

The present contest will probably end in determining the true springs of power; but the sober sense and high Protestant feeling of the nation has responded, in a voice at once prompt and intelligibly decisive. It proves, that the laws made by the supreme power in the state, cannot otherwise than by the supreme power be annulled, without positive and immediate violence to the whole established system:—that this, consisting of a king, lords, and commons, whereof each possesses *an independent and negative voice*, no one or two of them, can either repeal or enact a law, without the consent of the other two, or of the remaining third,—much less, can any one of them be shut out surreptitiously, or excluded entirely from its due share of power or component part of the legislature, by a mere vote of the other, even for a constitutional object, still less, by a manœuvre to obtain from the House of Commons *a pledge to an abstract principle of assumed advantage*, because any proceeding to be founded thereupon, must necessarily be *in the form a bill, to pass the two houses, subject to the royal approval and assent;* and this even sustained by the asserted authority of those, who disclaimed the Revolution principle of 1688, under a plea of conscience, as non-jurists,—*Ignorantia juris quod quisque tenetur scire neminem excusat!*

The tripartite powers of the English constitution are sustained by the king *in his own right*, under the threefold character of his office,—*hereditary*, because the custom of the country has always limited power to one family,—*elective*, because the personal title is incomplete, until it has been

recognised in his consecration, for the perpetuation of a Christian compact,—and *divine*, because the assenting parties, forming the estates, have sufficient Scripture authority, and a sacred precedent, for appointing a supreme head, who should hold such powers for the security of the Church, as those held by the chief of the patriarchal government, or subsequently the Jewish King, who, in a more limited sense, or restricted state of society, succeeded him; which is the only equitable right a Christian nation can, in strictness, claim. These several *authorities*, although separated by time and space, or distinguished by peculiar forms, have always had one common object and duty assigned to them, in all Christian states; and by the people of England especially, from the time of the Romans, and previously from the Cymri, in the patriarchal feud or family head, as well as from the Saxons and Normans, with modifications in latter periods, rendering them more comprehensive. Such powers, in the judgment of the ablest lawyers of our history, have been deemed the needful guardians of the solemn truths of revelation, on which the law and the *right of all power is founded;* and the nation stands publicly pledged to God to support them! Political power, abstracted from religious authority, and such political power used as a *monopoly*, to the prejudice of religion, is not the natural right of man: and it is equally sophistical and fallacious to call those privileges, the chartered rights of men, which are turned to purposes contrary to the objects for which the charters themselves were granted; but which are made, by faction, to suspend the natural rights and privileges of the entire body. In the formal *recognition* of sovereign power and prerogative, for state uses, the original right has been admitted, *de facto*, and comfirmed by the practice of ages; and can never be subverted by any one of the states, *singly*, but by rooting up the entire holding, the whole principle of the

government, and the foundation of Christian society in this united kingdom. In no other way can power be equitably exercised, for the full benefit of mankind, even admitting the principle, that all political power, which is set over men, and all privileges claimed or exercised in exclusion of them, is *artificial*, and, as such, to be ultimately exercised for their advantage; but the trust can never be performed, if the powers with which it is invested, for a public or national benefit, are to be rendered subservient to the views of a party, or section of a party, or paralyzed to suit the ephemeral projects, or policy, of two or three popular leaders, who may arrogate to themselves the right of dictating the affairs of state, in open hostility to the just powers invested in the highest hands; and which, where religion is concerned, derive not their holding from any human authority whatever! It is, therefore, entirely preposterous, that a faction, composed of the Irish Roman Catholic, or *liberal* members, headed by Mr. O'Connell, or influenced by Dr. M'Hale, the Romish Archbishop, and in breach of their oaths[1], should stultify the votes of the independent portion of the English House of Commons; and thus subvert the design, nullify the powers, and destroy the uses of the constitution, by legislating despotically, for the sacred possessions of a whole Protestant community. It is by no means dubious that these proceedings in their entire confederacy, if not repelled with becoming

[1] Previously to the meeting of the great Lateran Council, held A.D. 1215, men were at liberty to think and act as they pleased, regarding the divine presence in the *eucharist;* but it suited the council to add this, with *eleven* other dogmas, to the original faith of the Apostles' Creed. With reference to mental reservation, the following extract, from a papal bull, dated and issued March 13, 1835, is important. "The fathers of the Council of Lateran have wisely said, '*That we ought not to consider as an oath, but rather regard as a perjury, every promise that has been made to the detriment of the Holy Church, and against her traditions*"!!!

energy, will not only bring the Church, but the State itself, into danger, or rouse the just indignation of the members of the former, and, at length, to avert the consequences of a civil war, put the senate to the necessity, and the trouble, of passing *another securing vote*; for if the proper business of the nation is to be impeded in its course, and every barrier broken down, by which life, property, and possessions, are held secure, there is no remedy, but in the *exclusion of those*, who, having been admitted to enjoy the privileges of the constitution, are bent upon its destruction; and any such measure will be perfectly justifiable, which, in a statistical point of view, can be shown to be necessary for the preservation of the union of Church and State. The legislature has, in reality, little more to do than to follow the practice of the constitution for nearly *a thousand years*, and honest reformers to fill up the outline, and to maintain the principles which have been illustrated in the preceding chapters, which are applicable to every state of society, and condition of men, in this country; but the Christian spirit, which has animated and sustained them throughout, must not be tacitly sacrificed at the shrine of infidelity, nor laid prostrate at the altar of popish supremacy, although even Mr. O'Connell should fulminate political *anathemas*, and Dr. M'Hale prognosticate, "from the signs of the times, the approaching downfall of Protestantism in the State"!!

It is, indeed, truly lamentable to witness the great degeneracy of public men, and the more than gradual extinction of those loftier views of state policy, which signalized the lives and proceedings of our ancestors, particularly in that portion of the legislature, where, amongst the natural guardians of English liberty, and clothed even in *Whig apparel*, they should ever be held most sacred; whilst confused views of freedom, and the love of party contention, are encouraged to

supplant them! The Roman Catholic representatives, who are now assiduously labouring to destroy the connexion of Religion with the State, should remember, that the House of Commons itself, in which they figure so ingloriously, would never have existed, if the idea of representation had not been furnished in the model afforded by the ancient *procuratores clerici;* and if the spiritual commons, by their residence in the monasteries, their attention to agriculture, and the studies of law, literature, and civil order, had not given the middle and lower classes, progressively, the means of acquiring wealth and political advancement. Here, then, we have the authority of the Roman Church herself, who, even in her degeneracy, maintained the principle; nor will we, as Protestants, admit to her the precedent right of the institution; but maintain the *affirmative* of our history, and pre-existent establishment of a Christian Church, identified with the government, from the first general promulgation of the kingdom of our blessed Lord and Saviour in these Islands [1]. On the authority of the Roman Catholic historian, *Dupin*, we find that by the last canon of the famous synod of Cashel, held A.D. 1172, for the purpose of uniting the hitherto independent Church of Ireland, to that in England, then a dependent upon the See of Rome, the following decree was passed,—"That divine service shall be celebrated in all the Churches, according to the rites and customs of the Church of England." —Thus were the rites and ceremonies of the Irish *primitive Church*, as they had been in use from the days of the *Culdees*, and continued on the foundation of the *primitive bishops*, Aidan, Finan, and Colman, (mentioned by *Bede,)* whose apostolic authority extended also over Scotland, that author calling it "the united Church existing in *Hii et Lindisfarn*,"

[1] See Chap. V. pp. 219, 220, &c.

and in other places "*Iona*," which would not acknowledge the authority of Austin, in any form; so that we have the admission of the Romish Fathers themselves, that for the first time, in the latter part of the twelfth century, was the practice and usages of *Catholicism*, according to the regulations of the Popes and Lateran Council, applied to the Church of Ireland. How different the apostate conduct of those prelates from that of the bishops and monks of *Bangor*, who preferred *death*, to the spiritual dominion of the *two swords*, or the authority of the Holy Father of the Vatican! These certainly were "internal traitors" in aid of the Church of Rome; and as that Church herself furnished the precedent of having been a participator, or prime agent, in the *treason*, for the purpose of establishing her own doctrine, and her own temporal authority, the reformed Church of England had a right, openly, and without the aid of internal traitors, after three centuries of persecution, bloodshed, and intolerance, to re-establish, in Ireland, a form of worship, consonant with the primitive teaching of the apostles, and of exploding the twelve dogmas of the Lateran Council of 1215;—and further, William the Third, by right of conquest, or success in arms, and supported by the previous premises, had an additional right, against an *armed rebellion*, and sustained by a British Parliament, to secure to the reformed Church of Ireland, those grants and privileges, of which, by the aid of internal treason and papal influence, she had been robbed in the twelfth century, *parcere subjectis et debellare superbos!*

As the religion of the State in England, ceased to be *Roman Catholic*, the State had a right to assimilate the faith of the Church of Ireland, as that of a conquered country, with its own, even before the *Act of Union;* but that act, having confirmed and consolidated the Protestant religion, as the established religion of the Church of Ireland, and rendered it

an integral part of the Church of England, in faith and practice, as well as identified in interest and communion, they must be equally protected, and rise or fall together:—well, therefore, may Mr. O'Connell and his party labour to destroy that connexion, which is the greatest obstacle to the re-establishment of the *papacy*, as the state religion of Ireland;—but there are no internal traitors now to be found, ready to sell the Protestant Church, or to surrender it ingloriously into papal hands,—therefore, the assault on her position must be carried on in another form,—she must be first assailed in the English Parliament, (that is, in the House of Commons, where the Catholic members shall, one and all, vote for her spoliation, without waiting any report of her resources,) and the authority of that Parliament obtained for the appropriation of her funds, then for the tug of war,—the repeal of the legislative union, and the establishment of a *Convention* in College Green, which shall put the finishing blow on her existence, she having first been deprived of her independence. Can it be possible, that an English Parliament, or any government that can be formed, will lend itself to all this? Can it be possible, that the English nation will submit to it? Never! These proceedings are nothing more nor less, than a series of systematic attacks upon the essentials of the Christian Religion, by a confederated association of men of all creeds; by authors and politicians, who profess to promote the civil liberties of mankind; but having, in fact, the perfect design to enslave them. Under what other auspices than Gospel Christianity, have the lost or subverted liberties of mankind in former ages been re-asserted? By what other zeal, but the warm zeal of devoted Protestant Christians, have English liberties been redeemed, and consecrated by English blood? Under what other sanction has the Gospel dispensation of liberty and happiness been extended, wherever the

British arms, or the British authority, has been conveyed? Compare this with the proceedings of papal power, for the advancement of freedom! The persecutions of Catholicism, and its supporters, have far exceeded all the persecutions by *Heathens*. In no one age or country, of equal extent with France, was there ever so much real misery produced, by any one of the Roman emperors, including Nero, Caligula, Domitian, or Tiberius, as was occasioned by *Lewis the Fourteenth*, for the avowed purpose of extirpating, what he was taught to consider *heresy*; and the reputation of which, rendered the very name of religion odious to the period of the Revolution!

In what land have not the cruelties of popery been inflicted? "The principle of persecution," says that talented writer, the Rev. E. Nangle, "is not only entwined with the very heart-strings of popery—'tis not only inwrought with the vital principles of her constitution, but its actings have been exhibited, wherever scope was afforded for its practical development." This is not mere assertion, for all the powers of his pen, combined with the energies of an enlightened Christian mind,—however expansive the conception, or wide the range of thought, he would yet be unable to do justice to the picture of horrors, which the Church of Rome herself, when in the plenitude of her power, has painted on the canvass of human sacrifice! Out of what portion of the sacred word of God, can her priests, or her advocates, justify the principle of *literal* punishments for matters of religious faith, or conscience? Is she, or is she not, the same immutable, infallible, universal Church, who justified their infliction? If they were considered *essentials* to the preservation of her faith and discipline, by her Councils of *Lateran* and of *Trent*, and acted upon by her to the *letter*, in the sixteenth century, in what has she changed her principles, but in the restrictions which have been put upon the exercise of her power, and her

cruelties? And what is to prevent her claiming the right, and the precedent, for their revival, should she succeed in the efforts she is now making for the re-establishment of her temporal power? Does not Morery tell us, that "she endeavoured to set up the tribunal of the *Inquisition* wherever her authority was established or acknowledged," esteeming it, as the Cardinal of Lorrain, her own dear son, expressed, "LE PLUS EFFICACE DE TOUS LES REMEDES CONTRE L'HERESIE?" What was the object, or the practice of this Christian court? Let us take the statement of *Llorente's* history for our answer, —this work is the most authentic extant; for when the French army took possession of Spain, Llorente obtained the privilege of examining all the *archives* of the Inquisition, and of publishing them under the sanction of Napoleon and his brother Joseph. We here again discover what the Church of Rome means by the word *puniantur!* Llorente states as follows, the number of victims to the judgment, or sentences, of this holy court.

Condemned and burnt	31,912 ! ! !
Burnt *in effigy*	17,695 ! ! !
Placed in a state of penance, with *rigorous punishments*	291,450 ! ! !
For Spain and Portugal, total	341,057 ! ! !

Well, indeed, might Napoleon denounce such an institution, in his speech to the *Corregidor* of Madrid, after his triumphal entry, in the remarkable words,—"*I abolish that court of blood, the endurance of which has been the stain of Europe, and the disgrace of civilized ages!*" When Jesus Christ was upon the earth, he neither ordained gibbets, racks, nor tortures, as the means of ensuring his faith; but preached peace and brotherly love to those who followed him. It is the duty of priests to lead the minds of men; but they have no right to exercise

temporal jurisdiction, much less to inflict cruelty for scruples of conscience! I gave to France the Concordat, that all parties might worship God after the dictates of their consciences. Henceforth, let every man return to his home in peace, and obey the laws. *I say, this court of death is abolished, but the memorial of its deeds shall remain!*"

From the year 1540, to the year 1570, comprehending only the space of thirty years, no fewer than 900,000 Protestants were put to death by Papists, in the different countries of Europe; amongst whom were 235 barons, 148 earls, and thirty-nine princes! In the time of Paul IV. whose pontificate lasted about four years, the Inquisition alone (in different countries), according to the testimony of *Vergerius*, destroyed 150,000! According to the calculation of some, the whole number of persons massacred, on account of religion, since the first rise of the papacy, amounts to upwards of fifty millions[1]! This will, of course, include those destroyed in the crusades, and the wars undertaken by French and other kings, either for the promotion or resistance of the papal authority[2]. These things, then, are matters of history; and without wishing to encourage any embittered feeling towards our brethren of a faith, which would justify such excesses, we must necessarily disclaim the communion, the doctrines, the ascendency, and the policy, of a Church so intolerant; especially when we find the same spirit of perse-

[1] Free Thoughts on Popery. Edinburgh, 1781. P. 127.

[2] Bellarmine himself, the great champion of the Church of Rome, enumerates eighteen Popes, who attempted to despoil fifty-one princes, and sixteen or seventeen kings, or emperors, whom they strove to despoil of their *crowns*.—Every one should know the bull "*Clerici Laicis*," and the bull "*Unam Sanctam Ecclesiam*," wherein it is commanded to believe, *on penalty of eternal damnation*, that "every human being is subject to the Pope!" Chap. I. *De Majorit. et obed.* inter extrav. com. The Glossa, c. 6. d. x. concludes, that the papal dignity *is forty-seven times greater than the imperial!*

cution existing, as far as it is possible to exert it. They are introduced as beacons to warn the unwary, whilst they show the utter fallacy of the doctrines of those liberals, who would persuade us, that by giving increased power to the Roman Catholics of Ireland, by a curtailment of the rights and privileges of the Protestant Church and Clergy, we should remove those causes of umbrage which at present exist, whilst history and practice belie the premises! And yet, this is the medium of power, the equality of liberty, the whirlwind of popular strength, on which the modern Whigs would ride, direct the raging storm, preserve the repose of the State, and regenerate the constitution! O, Englishmen, beware!—you stand on the brink of a dark and dreary precipice, which yawns beneath your feet. Let these facts speak to your better judgment—to your courage, to your hearts!

With the manifest design of revolutionizing the State, the eye of envenomed envy is pointed at the British Peerage, which, presenting the greatest barrier to the designs of faction, and the inroads of popery and schism, becomes at once, from its exalted station, and judicial office, the fair mark for the unremitting assaults of calumny and detraction. It is evident, that those marvellously profound pamphleteer writers, the favoured *twin croakers* of the Edinburgh Review, or rather, the erudite Cynic, who so conspicuously figures under the twofold classic cognomen of "Isaac Tomkins" and "Peter Jenkins," is either pitiably ignorant, or willingly unobservant of the fundamental principles of the English constitution, which he so arduously labours to destroy in a hodge-podge medley of weak common-place *satire*, or scurrilous invective, on the social qualities and political bias of the hereditary peerage, and its influences, with which are associated the *aristocracy*, by ties of blood, generally, and its supporters,—of the former, this generous *censor morum*,

who, soaring to loftier heights, seems to entertain little veneration for the *jus divinum* of religion, or solicitude for its state protection, will find an adequate reproof in the elegant satire of Cicero [1], who was not only an able judge of what should constitute the basis of social liberty, but was equally acquainted with the true principles of government and public order,—if the latter, the scorpion sting of a malignant genius, being palpably visible, yet contemptibly innoxious in the powers of argument, the *appeal* to the passions—to the *ignobile vulgus*, which stamps the merit of these acrid effusions, neither redounds to the honour of the writer's head, nor to the credit of his heart,—it bespeaks the predilections of an illiberal soul, —it pourtrays the sentiments of a narrow mind, a splenetic disposition, and a disappointed spirit—false in the premises—unjust in the conclusions; for what right has he to attribute to the peers, either a deficiency of mental energy, or moral worth, as a body, or to impute to them, as a class of English citizens, individually, sordid motives for the government of their social relations, or the exercise of their political opinions—principles, which he might well indeed feel ashamed to avow for himself? This *anonymous* impugner of the qualities of the most liberal aristocracy in Europe, will need to repolish his sentences, ere they shine forth again,—to furnish them with a new dress, and with materials more congenial to the literary taste, the enlarged comprehension, and the sound political understanding of the British nation,—to repose from his mighty labours, until the *great star of knowledge*, which occasionally illuminates the northern hemisphere, shall have passed its political obscuration, and furnished another *new*

[1] "Through ignorance, or want of discrimination, between the things which are *beneficial* and those which are *pernicious*, the life of man is replete with vexation."—*Ignoratione rerum bonarum et malarum, maximè hominum vitam vexari.*—CICERO.

light, to guide the cloudy judgment, and enlighten the vapid imagination of those astounding state quacks, "Isaac Tomkins" and "Peter Jenkins,"—*et id genus omne!* Let this learned moral castigator reflect, that the habitual satirist is never an estimable, much less an useful appendage, to an enlightened community,—that he is generally the unjustifiable enemy of all human nature,—that satires upon individuals, of whatever station, are libels upon mankind, and only justifiable in cases of positive *criminality*, which the law, or the admonitions of religion, are unable to control; and then not permissible to assail the domestic repose of *private life*,—that the man who thus indulges his illiberal propensity, whilst pretending to liberality, is seldom his own friend, but rather his own enemy; for he who maliciously wounds the public reputation, or the private feelings of any class of men, for a manifest *sinister object*, meets with his just punishment in the natural contempt of mankind, at least its better portion, upon a principle of retributive justice! Irony may possibly create surprise, or produce awe with the ignorant, but never will command the respect, nor ensure the confidence of the enlightened. Those who indulge in it, have no right to claim exclusive perfection for themselves, although enjoying the blessings and privileges of a free constitution, they should even become noble or learned!

The investigator of the social relations, and political predilections of the Peers, who also, with equal effrontery of criticism, exercises the notable office of declaimer of their moral influence on society, has boldly assumed the right of questioning the value of the hereditary peerage; and, by *inuendo*, leads us to suppose, that the House of Lords, composed as it is of men of a certain age, generally, is valueless to the State; and, moreover, that having led easy and inactive lives, they are, for the most part, ignorant of the condition, the under-

standing, and the utility of their fellow-men of the popular classes; and consequently, from ignorance or prejudice, *or both*, are the natural enemies of the extension of their privileges. He is understood, and so is the general scurrility of his remarks, and the deductions of his associate reviewer,—*mais n'importe.* We are also led to understand, that the Peers being mostly men of large possessions and hereditary rank, at the heads of their respective families, are all prone to self-opinion, and unbecoming self-confidence of purpose; but, from inherent weakness, decrease of mental resolution, when approached,—attached to antiquated legal rights, and supporters of ancient privileges and prescriptive usages, (as a judicial body,) with a lack of mental energy to enforce them; and, consequently, possessing decided antipathy in their persons and families to all state reforms, &c. This constitutes the *essence* of the premises, selected as the weapons of attack on the hereditary peerage, and includes the *gravamen* of the offence, with which their lordships are charged, as a body, throwing aside the tortuous sophistry of the argument, and its embellishments. Had the just repugnance of the Peers to *revolution*, and unjust invasion of the rights of property of every kind in the state, combined with a proper jealousy of the attempts to interfere or dispense with the *kingly prerogative*, been stated, in either of the three lucubrations of wisdom, under notice, something like truth and candour might have been urged on their behalf!

The smaller surrounding circles of descriptive imagery are equally the language of a calumniator; and, in truth, it would not probably be found, that one existing Peer of the realm, holding his honours by hereditary descent, merits the slanderous description. Confessing the inactivity of some Peers, at an advanced age, the censure inaptly applies to the aggregate proportion; and even to those of diminished physical

powers in riper years, we are still indebted for many valuable services, and particular exertions for the welfare of the state. To *merit* more than to *descent* we owe the Peerage; and the gratitude of the descendants of noble families, will always stimulate its members, more or less, to the imitation of those deeds, to which original promotion has been generally ascribed. Thus, have we security in a succession of families, where patriotism has secured title and advancement, and succeeding emulation may fairly be expected to seek it. The highest elevations may be attained, even by the humblest in rank; and though detraction will pursue in the rear of promotion, and the advancement of merit, it cannot interrupt the course of determined utility, where the Peers are sensible of their own importance, individually, and of their value to the State, as a body. A distinguished moral Peer of humbler origin, in a former reign, obtained his title after long and arduous labours in the service of his country,—his selected motto was—"*Palma non sine pulvere*,"—and, indeed, it was highly modest, yet becomingly appropriate to his public services and their success. A would-be witling of the day interpreted the phrase,—"He got his honours by dirty work,"—the sarcasm sprung from malignant envy, and was marked by that public odium, its worthlessness deserved! It may become applicable in the present day, and is here instanced to show, that *satire*, like praise, may be both ill-timed and inappropriate.

The Peers have no distinct interests—no powers—no enjoyments—no privileges, and much less antipathies, incompatible with the general welfare of the community. They form an integral part of the State, as constituted of *King*, *Lords*, and *Commons*,—and, as they stand on the *second* grade, have an undoubted right to the exercise of vigilance and circumspection; and to guard, in their official capacity, against encroach-

ments, which, if permitted to assail one branch, would naturally be led by success to attack the others. And if the Peers of Parliament, individually, are not prone to activity, in the prevention of evil, on account of a reserved liberality, rather than an austerity of character, they cannot now, as an aggregate body of English Protestants, be justly charged with indifference, or inattention, to what is about to be done by others,—they are bound to remember what was once effected by a schismatical and infidel House of Commons, which, under an association at once unnatural, as it was infamous in design and execution, destroyed the birthright of Englishmen, and set up an unhallowed despotism under the visor of religious zeal! It will be well, if their decision shall confirm to them the title of *Conservative State!*

The influence of the peerage, it seems, by implication, is admitted to be considerable in the Church, the Army, the Navy, and the Law; but is plainly accused of being interested in the retention of existing corruptions, or abuses of patronage in the first, and its political influence in the three latter is neutralised, in the law especially, by the *analysis* which is furnished, and wherein the assumed intelligence of the middling classes is set forth as more than a match for the understanding, the interest, and the station of the Peers; and we are thereby led to infer, that they have fallen far below par in the scale of useful intelligence, as well as in the importance, which should result from their own individual and collective popularity, held out as their peculiar safeguards, and their best securities, to meet the altered condition of the times, or *the improved wisdom of the age*, rather than the reverential deference formerly attached to the person and dignity of a Peer, which, it is more than insinuated, has been progressively lessened, by the increased general diffusion of intelligence and independence of the people, in that glorious march

of intellectual vision, where, in general, the descendants of the aristocracy have supinely lagged behind, or have been passed over by its influence; and whereby it is inferred, with becoming arrogance of conception, that much of the affection and respect, as well as confidence of the community, has become alienated from the *nobles*, and is transferred to the *commons*.

Here we collect the ordinary cant of superior attainments, the offspring of industry, literary and mechanical classic lore, united—men of political enterprise, eminently gifted by *talent*, and expanded with *reform*,—the increased extension of circulating literature, and the progress of liberty, by aid of *free-thinking*,—extended education, upon new foundations, and philosophical institutions, the machinery and rail-roads, to perfection in arts and sciences; and, in short, the whole combination of *materiel* for perfect wisdom in the use and application of *government*, (exploding the learning and discoveries of ancient times,) with superior means for their exercise, without the aid of *religion*; but accompanied with all the soothing calms of progress, which assurance of success can inspire, or confidence impart, and finally prepared to discharge, as their artillery, the thundering echo of Lord Bacon's dictum, that *Knowledge is power!* Alas! as Fisher Ames has said, these illusions are "thin as the gloss on other bubbles;" but they find votaries in the unthinking multitude.

The disputed value of our peerage, as a component part of the State, derives its most important consequences, and spreads its derivative benefits, from its original source, the power of a limited monarch to grant, and to extend rewards and favour. The effect of benefits so derived and extended, must always tend to secure a deference for the Peers, and a solid basis whereon to establish their authority. And with the assurance of such a title, it may indeed be admitted, that

the best safeguards, for their continued possession of rewards and ascendency, are their individual and collective popularity; but not in the invidious or derogatory sense implied by the Edinburgh Reviewer!

Rewards established on the foundation of ancient and well-tried services rendered to the State, and ascendency created by the benefits which will continue to flow from elevation to honours, and exercise of virtuous actions,—popularity of this description is peculiarly due to the Peers of the united kingdom, as a body; and, as it was well defined by Lord Chief Justice Mansfield, is entirely distinct from the ephemeral popularity of modern times. This eminent lawyer and scholar presided in the Court of King's Bench, when Wilks's outlawry was the *text*, of which constitutional liberty was the *theme*, and at a crisis when public excitement, as well as popular resentment, were in array to await decision, a sense of public duty and upright determination prompted the judgment. He animadverted on the audacious addresses in print, and certain reasons of state policy, which had been urged from imagined danger, by commotions, and delivered himself in the following powerful strain.

"I honour the king and respect the people; but many things acquired by the favour of either, are objects not worth ambition. I wish popularity; but it is that popularity which follows, not that which is run after. It is the popularity which, sooner or later, never fails to do justice to the pursuit of noble ends by noble means. I will not do that which my conscience tells me is wrong, to gain the huzzas of thousands, or the daily praise of all the papers which come from the press. I will not avoid doing that which I think is right, though it should bring down upon me the whole artillery of libels,—yes, the *mendax infamia* of the press, with all that falsehood and malice can invent, or the credulity of a deluded

populace can swallow." Again, in the case of Privileges of Parliament abrogated by *statute* in 1770, he further said, with equal independence of soul,—" I pity those noble lords, who may be led by *vanity*, to mistake the shouts of a mob for the trumpet of their fame. Experience shows, that many who have been saluted with the applause of a crowd one day, have received its execrations on the next; and many who, by the popularity of the times, have been held up as spotless patriots, have, notwithstanding, appeared upon the historian's page, after truth has triumphed over delusion, the assassins of liberty!" Under such impressions the consistent and independent Peers will act, with reference to those important questions, on which hinge the fate of the English monarchy, and the preservation of the Protestant Christian Church of England. And they not only present a subject sufficiently dignified and important, to neutralize the poisonous pedantry of " Isaac Tomkins and Peter Jenkins," in their undignified vituperations against the honour and the utility of the English peerage; but they will amply justify the application of exertions, which the Peers may deem necessary, in vindication of their own insulted character, as well as the assertion of principles of *right* and *justice*, against that combination of men, whose reputation will only be known to posterity, on account of their unstatesmanlike and party opposition, to the *measures* of rational and practical reform, introduced by one of the greatest statesmen of modern times, who may look down upon them, from his lofty eminence, and, claiming his debt of gratitude from the Peers themselves, exclaim before an approving nation, with Horace,—

> " *Falsus honor juvat et mendax infamia terret,*
> *Quem nisi mendosum et mendacem !*"

It would be a task of little difficulty to answer the multitu-

dinous points urged by the *trio* of commentators on the aristocracy, and its associations; but, as they all tend to one general point, it becomes unimportant to do so, notwithstanding the *but* and *however* of the arguments, or the *I*'s and the *if*'s, monosyllables and trisyllables, which require no direct criticism. The extent of the *commission* for investigating into the constitution of their Lordships' House; and that of acting the part of an *inquisition* on their private actions, and social relations in life, is not made known to the public; although it is probable that it resulted from a grave consultation amongst the *wigs*, where the genius of both the Scotch and Irish *heads* and *tails* assisted; for, true it is, there is nothing English in its composition, at least of refined English feeling, much less of the sober reasoning of Caledonian discretion, or native Hibernian wit and honour,—it is the essay, the *manifesto* of an unprincipled-unwhiggish association, against that which is honourable, dignified, and useful in the state, and will be received as such by all upright and sensible minds, free from faction and party trammels,—as resembling the production of the equity draftsman, more remarkable for *verbiage* than point!

As there is something of the *malevolent* in the bare assumption, that the members of the hereditary aristocracy, a body of highly educated gentlemen, are either, from the course of nature, or the circumstance of high birth, deficient in intellectual attainments, or moral energy, when placed in competition with their fellow-countrymen of the popular class, or that in the grand intellectual march they only have been left in the *rear*, it may be advisable shortly to sift its pretensions. In opposition to such a position it may be urged, that the greater portion of English noblemen have obtained their mental cultivation in the highest schools of general and classic learning of their country, and have improved it by foreign travels, as well as by general intercourse with men of talent

and station in various parts of the world, possessing retirement, and the opportunities for study and reflection, with the auxiliary aid of extensive and valuable libraries, the depositories of ancient lore and modern information. Many have acquired high honours in those Universities, where the true principles of her constitution and government, her religion and laws, are most perfectly taught and soberly acquired,—whilst others have derived advantages of very superior attainment, from deep study and long practical experience, in the superior courts of law and equity; and great constitutional information from their rigid attention to, and full performance of important duties in a legislative capacity, as members of the popular senate. Others, again, have risen to offices of the greatest trust in the State, from the arena of the House of Commons; whilst the agitation of subjects and questions of the highest legal and constitutional interest in the House of Peers itself, as a judicial assembly, must have tended to consolidate the information previously acquired. Thus far for the personal claims of the Peers individually, and the fallacy of the argument, which attempts to disprove their individual intelligence.

In the "Thoughts upon the Aristocracy," the right possessed by the hereditary Peers to the exercise of the powers of a legislative assembly, is introduced with a sneer, but no one valid reason adduced for the discontinuance of the principle, although the design of converting the House of Peers into an *elective senate* is the drift of the theme. The ignorance of constitutional law, or perhaps its *avoidance* for present objects, is still more apparent. A house of *senators* by election, without the advantages resulting from rewards and favour, could never preserve an equiponderent power in the State,—thus the *improver*, who pleads for an elective assembly, displays, unwittingly, a lamentable deficiency in discriminating the essen-

tials of the science of government. In the preceding chapters, the grounds on which the House of Peers has been constituted a legislative assembly, *by hereditary descent*, are abundantly shown; and nothing short of the dissolution of the monarchy itself, must result from the change of principle, Under its present constitution, the members are specially the protectors of chartered rights and privileges, because they are personally interested in them,—also in the due preservation of corporate immunities and public institutions, including the national universities; and all vested interests of whatever kind in the State, held under the faith and guarantee of the Crown, made with the Peers originally. Can it be possible, that any man, practically acquainted with, and desiring to improve the advantages of the constitution, and at the same time to preserve it, would give advice so preposterous? Rather, is not the object to raise a clamour against the peerage, because it is known to present the most effectual barrier, supported by the intelligence of the nation, against a levelling factious democracy,—for what other end or use is such an impassioned appeal? Let the Peers of England beware of the insidious advice,—their interests are identified, are interwoven in their entire combination with the integral rights of the nation, with the nation's Church and Religion:—to yield a portion inconsiderately, might endanger the loss of the whole.

Admitting the necessity of constitutional reformation of the Church, or even that of municipal corporations, every attempt at argument on the expediency of conceding extreme measures, by holding up the foreboding terrors of brute force, should be spurned, as incompatible with the attainment of the object, which all rational men will accede to. Though the clamour from without should demand, wisdom from within should unflinchingly resist, and this on the principle of adminis-

trative justice, wherein the Lords are specially a *conservative body*, and the highest judicial authority. It is, therefore, the peculiar prerogative of the House of Peers, as a deliberative power of superior control, to require submission to its judgment, when fully exercised upon considerations, wherein the safety and welfare of the kingdom are involved; and this without any reference to the intervention either of the *Usher* or the *Master of the Black Rod*, who has already shown his *front*, and assumed the right of dictating to the Peers. Indeed, it having long since been announced to them that "the schoolmaster is abroad," we may expect his attendant usher to appear with a new task for their lordships' study; but the noble scholars, knowing their duty, and upholding their station, are not likely to rashly sacrifice the one, nor ingloriously compromise the other, through any *puerile* terrors from the dread of *such a birch*, the qualities of which, having lost their talismanic charm, are now sufficiently understood and duly appreciated,—nay, restrained, by the law maxim,—"*Furiosus furore suo punitur*," arising from the *furor loquendi et scribendi, et cetera*, which has afflicted certain parties!

No terrors—no intimidations—no threatened tumults—no personal menaces—no indirect, or direct insults—no public *party* addresses—no private communications,—and, least of all, the dread of *popular commotion*, should operate upon any portion of the legislative body of a free country, so as to sway the judgment or vary the decision. If a portion of the people, led on blindfoldedly by an ambitious faction, is bent upon impeding the whole course of right and justice, established for the entire body politic, until it shall become confused and huddled, as it were, in a *cul de sac*,—the office and the duty of the Peers are obvious,—they have to interpose a power equally formidable, and decidedly constitutional, *by the rejection of measures forced upon them, against the judgment*

of the nation, notwithstanding the assent of a majority of the other branch of legislative and constructive power. Without the exercise of this discretion, in cases of national emergency, the House of Peers would be valueless indeed!

The specious inventions of calumniators, the lies of projecting and presuming advocates of pseudo-patriotism, however thickly applied to assail public or private integrity, must be resisted by the armour of conscious right, and unerring duty: and in the peerage, as hitherto constituted, we may fairly pronounce any decision of the House of Lords *independent*; and such decision, or verdict, from a body of gentlemen, by habit, *under oath*, to be so far unbiassed, as to need no other reward, nor require no other confidence, than that which always attends the consciousness of doing right from *principle;* and such will not only obtain the mede of approbation from the well-informed community of England, but afford satisfaction to the world. From a House of Peers acting upon such principles, and governed by such considerations, the people have nothing to fear, but every thing to hope for; and this at once shows the inherent value of the British Constitution; for, if at any time the popular senate, unmindful of its duty, or forgetful of its station, should suffer its decisions to be swayed by tumultuous influence, or biassed by the machinations of faction, and the intrigues of party,—the House of Lords, standing aloof from such impetus, and by its station and dignity, has the power to avert the threatening evil. Could this be effected by an elective senate, a house of senators dependent upon popular favour, or the influence of a minister of the crown for the time being?

Sustained by an honourable opposition in the House of Commons, which the importance of the occasion demands, the House of Peers will be justified in hesitating, without adopting, any bill for the alteration of the present provision

made for the spiritual uses of the Church of Ireland, which may be sent up to it, *founded upon the resolution of that house*[1]; but their lordships will probably, to meet the wishes

[1] The first motion of Lord J. Russell, made on the 30th March, involved an *abstract proposition*, that any *surplus* which should be found, over and above the sum actually required, for the support of a Protestant Minister, in any parish in Ireland, should be applied to the purposes of *moral* without reference to *religious* instruction. No explanation whatever was given as to the mode of carrying the motion into effect, practically; nor was it shown, in the absence of the Report of the Church Commission, (Ireland,) that any surplus whatever existed for appropriation, but, on the contrary, it was urged, that for the general wants of the Protestant Church, there would be found *no surplus*. To a question from Sir Robert Peel, Lord J. Russell refused to add the words,—"and to no other secular purpose whatever,"—but he said, "he would exempt from the operation of his proposed measure, *endowments by persons, of purposes strictly ecclesiastical*." In the event of the success of this motion, he further intimated his intention of following it up by an *address to the Crown*, recommending its adoption. After four nights debate, in which the impracticability of the design, and its injustice, in principle and operation, were fully proved, the House divided, when the motion, as a resolution, embodying the principle of *appropriation* referred to, was carried by a majority of 322 to 289. No opposition was made to the committal of the resolution by Sir Robert Peel, nor to the receipt of *the Report;* but Sir Robert, for himself and colleagues, disclaimed all participation in the proceeding, and the principle it involved. The House again divided in Committee, (Ap. 6.) and *affirmed* the resolution, by 262 to 237. Lord J. Russell then gave notice, that on the following day he would move as an addition, "that no measure upon the subject of tithes in Ireland, *(nullifying* the ministerial Tithe Bill,) can lead to a satisfactory and final adjustment, that does not embody the principle of the foregoing resolution:"—on this, after an animated debate, in which Sir R. Peel, in an unanswerable speech. Sir H. Hardinge, Lord Stanley, Sir J. Graham, and others on the part of government engaged, the House again divided, on the 7th of April, when the resolution, in the *arbitrary form*, was carried by 285 to 258. On this occasion Lord J. Russell *confirmed* his previously declared intention *of addressing the Crown;* and, in answer to Mr. Sinclair's direct question, said, "it was not his intention to communicate with *the House of Peers* on the subject of the resolution;" but intimated, that he would allow it to stand as an affirmed principle of the House of Commons, for any tithe measure which might be introduced, &c. In each division, the English Radical, the Dissenting and Roman Catholic members, voted with the *majority;* and thus, by *anti-*

of the nation, endeavour to qualify by amendments, those provisions which may be deemed *exceptionable;* and their reasons for so doing will also be most likely to satisfy every true subject of this mighty empire, and reconcile him to the objections. Subject to such amendments or modification in committee, should the Peers admit *the general principle of a bill* so framed, (which at present appears *impossible*, without sacrificing the entire independence and security of the Protestant Church), the House of Commons, even as it is now constituted, may feel itself called upon to pass it, under the expressed feeling of the property and intellect of the three kingdoms; and which of itself should be sufficient to overawe the factious propensity, which has lately distinguished a section in that reformed house, which professes to represent, *not a party, but the people of England!*

The apprehensions of danger from *collision* [1], or from any

cipation, rendering nugatory the bill proposed to be introduced by the government *for the reduction of tithes in Ireland to 75l. per cent. on the actual produce of the land, &c.* This led to the resignation of his Majesty's ministers; for further information on which, see the "Mirror of Parliament," &c. The future historian and politician will be enabled to determine the true character, the virtue, and the objects of an opposition so framed and so conducted.—It follows, that under such a resolution, if acted upon, although, in some parishes in Ireland, on account of the limited number of Protestants, a *surplus* may possibly be found, —in others, *an absolute want of the means of Protestant instruction exists;* and thus, where the aid is most required, it would be irretrievably withheld; and also, on the general principle, the entire objects of a Protestant Church and Mission be frustrated, to aid the views of Roman Catholic destructives, and free-thinking English liberals! "*Appropriation*," was the watch-word first issued by Mr. O'Connell at the Russell dinner. *O tempora! O mores!*

[1] With the alleged motive of preventing "a *collision* between the two houses," a writer in the Edinburgh Review says, "it would be desirable to admit a free conference of the members of both, and both to debate and vote together,—the *absolute* majority to decide the question." It is evident that the writer is totally regardless of, or unacquainted with, the true constitution of the House of Peers, —as well as of its real position in the constitution. Such proceeding, even by

meditated attack, or impolitic and unjust attempts to interfere with the constitution and proceedings of the House of Peers, cannot reasonably be expected to influence a decision, on a question of such moment to the interests of the empire, as well as to the feelings of the majority of its population, of all classes.—Thus, should the lords, in their deliberative capacity, or their conservative character, be convinced, that it would be impolitic, even as affecting their own body, by indirect injury, to permit that unreasonable concession, which directly tends, not only to disturb, but *endanger the prerogative of the Crown*, and therewith the safety, peace, and prosperity of the community at large; they will be constitutionally bound to *reject* a measure, founded on a resolution, so fraught with difficulties, as that which the Irish Roman Catholic members and English liberals, have forced on the House of Commons, under the leadership of Lord John Russell; setting aside its injustice to the Protestant Church of Ireland, and the evil, prospectively, to that of England. This alone would justify a *rejection*, if the bill cannot be so qualified, as to meet and remove the objections; and there would need, in such case, no consideration of ulterior arguments, as to the preservation of their lordships' consistency, or claim to the gratitude and thanks of a Protestant and sensible people, who will be ready to support them, with the revived spirit of their forefathers, upon this just foundation. Such a decision would

consent of their lordships, might be drawn into a *precedent*, which would ultimately merge the two houses into *one legislative assembly*, and finally destroy the *balance of power*, which the independent voice of the Peers at present retains.—Does the writer seek this object?—As at present constituted, and voting independently, that independence preserves the constitution, on the one hand, from the undue power of the *Crown*, and, on the other, from the dangers of a *ruling democracy*.—The House of Lords cannot possibly succumb to a *domination*, alike unknown to the constitution and the law of the land!—*Author*.

not only be due to their own consistency, but to State conservancy.

The *tocsin* is now sounded, and the Commons of England, *collectively*, have a right to expect, as the people have to hope, that every Peer will indeed do his duty!

> " Are they not dangerous, and to be abhorred,
> Whose specious zeal some darker object shows,—
> Who rail at power, *then stoop to flatter crowds;*
> To glut *ambition* risk their country's fall,
> And call their *private ends*, the good of all?"

It is quaintly said, by our immortal bard, " Beware of quarrel, but being in, conduct thyself so that thine enemy beware of thee."—This contest for ascendency will prove *the test of the Lords*—the threatened forewarned epoch approaches, let them beware! As hereditary Peers, they have strenuously to do their duty, as did *the barons of Runnymede*, ere they strip off their robes, or desert the foundations of the English throne, or yield up tacitly the constitutional prerogatives of a consecrated Protestant king, claiming support under their *oath of fealty*,—they must, in sustenance of their own honours, equally perform their part towards their country, by a vigilant attention to their parliamentary duties,—by so doing they will imitate the noble conduct of their progenitors, —that fortitude, which, more than once, saved the ancient constitution of their native land from premature separation of its parts;—conceding liberality without breach of faith, or injustice, either of moral or political principle, they will defy their enemies, by showing, that they are stimulated by brighter views, and nobler feelings, than those which result from a vindictive appetite, and the desire to subvert valued institutions by the aid of scurrility and falsehood!

It has been customary with men of letters and prudent statesmen, in every age and country, to value the recorded

opinions of the illustrious dead,—they are treasures preserved through all time and posterity, and seem to have been designed by an Eternal Providence to illuminate as it were, with a refulgent ray, the dark and uncertain paths of our political journey, illustrating to our ideas the force and effect of passed and passing events, in the chain of human incident —the provisions for human security, and their silent monitions rise superior to the assaults of party feeling, to the madness of succeeding party prejudices; and thus, by analogy, are we enabled to trace and test the importance of *men* in the scale of being, the value of *measures*, the result of their policy. As the antidote should ever follow the poison, in its application, let the admirers of the Edinburgh Reviewer, take a lesson from the opinions of that illustrious genius, the standard of an English politician, who commanded within himself a display, which reflected honour upon human nature —lustre upon letters—renown upon Parliament, and unfading glory upon the British nation. Shade of the immortal Burke, dost thou respond to the call? Where is the comparison with thy patriotism? Where did thy mantle fall? Where that sublime senatorial philosophy—that manly eloquence—that uncompromising virtue, which stood unmoved by the frenzy of revolution, and unswayed by the din of popular infidelity, in support of *religion*—of legitimate rights, and Christian institutions—of a government of King, Lords, and Commons,—the menaced constitution of England? Alas! such qualities shine not in the ranks of the modern Whigs!

"By a constitutional policy, working after the pattern of nature, we receive, we hold, we transmit our government, and our privileges, in the same manner in which we enjoy and transmit our religion, our property, and our lives,—the institutions of policy,—the goods of fortune,—the gifts of Providence, are handed down to us, and from us, in the same

course and order. Our political system is placed in a just correspondence and symmetry with the order of the world, and with the mode of existence decreed to a permanent body, composed of transitory parts;—wherein, by the disposition of stupendous wisdom, moulding together the great mysterious incorporation of the human race,—the whole at one time never old, or middle-aged, or young; but in a condition of unchangeable constancy, moves on through the varied tenure of perpetual decay, fall, renovation, and progression! Thus, by preserving the method of nature in the conduct of the *State*, in what we improve, we are never wholly new,—in what we retain, we are never wholly obsolete. By adhering in this manner, and on these principles, to our forefathers, we are guided, not by the superstition of antiquaries; but by the spirit of philosophic analogy. In this choice of inheritance, we have given to our frame of polity the image of a relation *in blood*;—binding up the constitution of our country with our dearest domestic ties;—adopting our fundamental laws into the fond bosom of our family affections;—keeping inseparable, and cherishing with the warmth of all their combined, and mutually reflected charities, our *State, our hearths, our sepulchres, and our altars!*" Here we have a Christian senator, speaking from that sepulchral tomb, he has himself so beautifully described,—let Isaac Tomkins[1] and company hide their diminished heads,—already has too much importance been attached to their vapours,—here let them sink into merited contempt and eternal oblivion!

Thanks to God, we live not in an age of *idolatry*, although the proceedings of some of our reforming brethren savour strongly of that principle; whilst the measures of others, are calculated to introduce the fanaticism of a *presbytery* for

[1] "Thoughts upon the Aristocracy." London. 1835.

England, and the domination of the *papacy* for Ireland. If contest there must be, why should compromise be asked, when of such a nature as not to be conceded? If the cholera exists, or there be spots in the sun, why exchange a bad disease for a worse, or why submit to the *eclipse*, which must inevitably result from a perseverance in the measures proposed? The malady is not incurable in the hands of judicious physicians,—the sun of England's Protestantism is not set! The total reduction of tithes, or the appropriation of whatever the liberals may think proper to deem a surplus, to *civil instruction*, are the avowed objects of the trained bands, arrayed in the march of intellectual advance to improvements in Church and State. Submission to either of these measures, without another struggle in the House of Commons, where the Church has yet so many able friends, would not only be a political, but a *moral "felo de se:"* it would be a denial of deliberative capacity; an abuse of constitutional discretion, and a dereliction of parliamentary duty, most assuredly indicative of *folly*, the worst of all exigencies, and the last to be found amongst the learned of our colleges, or the independent of our English gentry, though it may be very desirable to those who are pressing forward in hope of reaching the goal of spoliation, and regardless of any association, or any means to attain the object. Thus, an unprincipled opposition, engenders the very corruption it pretends to destroy; whilst a great portion of the nation, infatuated with the gong music of the aspirants to all the *talents* in political harmony, are brought to question the value of their best institutions! The arguments used by them, in relation to the futility of resistance, and the expediency of making concessions to Roman Catholicism, and its arrogant pretensions, have both one aim, —that of exciting fear,—and tend to one object—the hope of getting into power, and retaining it, upon this footing, hope-

less indeed to them on any other foundation. Thus have we an inglorious *coalition*, formed in the British House of Commons, once the most independent assembly in the world,—an infatuated faction of apostate Whigs, preparing to wield the destinies of the British nation, aided by all the perturbed spirits of the three kingdoms; and though idolized in their own eyes, distrusted by the intelligent, and disclaimed by the majority of the truly religious and the virtuous, from the Land's End to John O'Groat's!

It is, indeed, an ungracious task to pronounce judgment on any body of public men; but, in this free country, and in this age of freedom of thought, sentiment, and discussion, public men are public property, and responsible to public opinion for their actions, for their policy, when they assume the control of the affairs of State; and are to be judged by their measures and their associations. Thus, it becomes the duty of every man, in the station which God has appointed him to fill, to perform his part, to do his duty manfully, and without fear of reproach, or personal consequences, on behalf of his common country; and in support of those fundamental principles, which are alike her glory and her honour, and the desertion of which would prove her inevitable shame, her ruin, and her remorse.

Disclaiming individual scrutiny, which might not only be deemed invidious, but unsuited to a work of this description, which is not written to favour the views of party, but comprises an humble effort to vindicate the constitution of England, and to sustain the Protestant faith, connected therewith; it may be observed, that the tried mental or statesman-like qualities of the Melbourne cabinet, (carrying on its *forehead* the bump of *destructiveness,)* which has supplanted the administration of Sir Robert Peel, may be put in comparison, with the glimmering of a taper, to the glare of the solar ray.

—politically it may be said to have *sealed its own doom*, and numbered its days, under the declaration of its chief, in the House of Peers[1]; but although glaringly defective in the entire *materiel*, requisite for such a crisis, and unsupported by any sound principle of policy to carry it through the arduous task, it has taken upon itself, to its own honour, or the nation's safety and satisfaction, it may, nevertheless, under the committal imposed on it, possess the power, or rather the opportunity, of doing incalculable evil. We are told, that "nothing will be hazarded, but in prospective," as regards our national securities, under the proposed measures of Church reform! Will any prudent man feel satisfied to rest under such uncertain stability? A precarious assurance is, of all others, the most to be deprecated; and the principle of such a change of system, as that proposed, once admitted by *Parliament*, that principle would assuredly become *progressive*, and the *trusteeship of the State itself* be driven before the winds of popular sufferance. That uncertain tenure can never pass for constitutional security, which may fall instantaneously by the mere change of men, and the consequent change of measures,—such a tenure would, in fact, be but the mere suspension of the evil results to be apprehended, and consequently avoided. Here is a principle propounded, replete with anomalous and confused impediments, carrying on its face a glaring violation of every rule of law and equity, —a principle which leaves no deed, title, privilege, or property secure, on any rational foundation; and it is only

[1] On the 20th April, in his place in the House of Lords, Lord Melbourne, in reply to the Duke of Buckingham's question, as to the intention of the new ministry towards Ireland, on the Church question, arising from the vote of the House of Commons, explicitly said,—"*I do not hesitate to say, that I am bound, and consider myself pledged to act on the resolution of the other House.*"—Vide *Parliamentary Report.*

astonishing that any party of educated Englishmen have been found to swallow the bait so greedily,—and further, only to be accounted for in the desire of change, so prevalent in the aggregate proportion of the human species. It must be obvious, that the party advocating such a despotic abstract proposition, in the House of Commons, have indeed engaged in an arduous struggle, and not only to lead, but *command* the public opinion, so as to influence the *decision* of the other branch of the legislature!

The vaunted liberality of the present Whig ministry—the marked obliquation of its foundation—its deference to the obtrusion of parties, whose ulterior views are entirely irreconcileable with the retention of the legislative union of the two kingdoms, and a Protestant institution;—sufficiently deduct from the possible value of any measures it may propound for the purpose of supplanting those conservative arrangements for reform, designed by the late administration, even admitting the possibility of removing thereby the evil of popular resistance in Ireland to an indefinite period; for whilst we see men omitting no effort for obtaining power and ascendency, we assuredly only rest under the bare suspension of that power, which is the suspension of despotism in disguise. Thus, as rational beings, consulting the common evidence of our understanding, we are not only justified, but bound, to view with every feeling of distrust, that government, which acts under the *covert pretext of extending the public liberties*, whilst it grasps at every opportunity and every means for consolidating an unnatural accumulation of political strength within its own hands, by the aid of *one estate*, under its intricate policy. Without the application of an unbecoming figure in rhetoric, the government which upholds and defends such a system as that described, aims *a death-blow at the independence and permanence of the Constitution;* and fall that Constitution inevi-

tably must, unless duly sustained by the unremitting assiduity the unflinching labours of an intelligent and virtuous opposition in the House of Commons, and a determined devotion, on the part of the peers, to maintain the prerogatives of the Crown and the interests of the Church. *Are the consequences of positive evil to the State to be avoided,* if a ministry, forced upon the King by a section or a party, is permitted to have the power of *garbling,* as it were, a House of Commons, or driving every independent opponent of its own abstruse policy therefrom? Is the Constitution to be preserved, in spirit as well as in law, by the retention of its connexion with aristocratical wealth, which enables it to maintain and extend the fullest share of freedom and prosperity, under the incertitude of modern whig policy? Are the interests of the opulent and powerful—the mercantile and middle classes of the country—of the poor, as a needful portion of the social family—to be blended thereby? Are the protective powers of free government, the blessings of the Constitution, to be extended safely, and the dark designs of its avowed or secret enemies, to be frustrated under it? These are vital political points, independently of the sacred claims of *Religion,* which should be fully and satisfactorily determined, before the Whig cabinet, as it is at present constituted, can fairly set forth any pretensions to stability or *national* confidence. Hitherto has it failed, in all the fundamental essentials, for the government of a great nation, both as regards its domestic and foreign policy, *upon its own showing;* although much has been said, much written, and more promised, for carrying out the great principles of the Reform Bill, *sed spectemur agendo!* "There are many things in reformation," said Burke, "which would be proper to be done, if other things could possibly be done with them; but which, if not so accompanied, ought not to be done at all." The English Constitution must be viewed in its entire con-

struction and its objects,—as a series of counterbalancing powers, designed to regulate and to control each other, as the means of preventing State convulsions. This is genuine *whig conservatism*—a principle which, it seems, is expunged from the political vocabulary of the Russell school.—"*On prend le peuple par les oreilles, comme on fait un pot par les anses,*"—says the French proverb!

With the perfect evidence of inflexible hostility to the ancient institutions of the land, which pervades a party, powerful in numerical strength, and the reckless determination, on the part of speculative individuals, to trample on those rights, which no independent body can relinquish; the real representatives of the wealth and intellect of the nation, must feel the duty of putting forth their energies—of assuming the armour and attitude demanded by the force of events, and corresponding with the national spirit, its judgment, and expectations. In this feeling, the members of the old constitutional whig party, always identified on *principle* with the *preservation of the monarchy and its appendages*, will assuredly join; and such junction will be a junction of honour and consistency, which they can defend with credit to themselves *as a party*, and with sterling benefit to the public at large. It is thus they will assist real reform, and avert revolution, securing the principle of correct power, *ut ne quid detrimenti respublica capiat*. The *modern Whigs* have, in the ever memorable words of Burke, "before them, their *constitutional ancestors*," in the sentiments here expressed; "they have also the daring philosophers of a novel school of politics, who have taken the impress of their principles from *a foreign die*." Will they identify themselves, to their everlasting shame, with that "*new order*," and thus, in the nineteenth century, labour against fact and circumstance, right, justice, and truth, "to establish *as dreams, those political principles which their upright*

forefathers worshipped as realities?" Or will they listen only to those who flatter their vanity, lull them with the false hope of submissive confidence, and, Judas-like, betray them with a kiss? They are warned; let them mark the consequences —the eye of England itself is upon them!

When the views of true, of conservative policy (for Christian toryism is purely conservative), are sufficiently known, and maintained with dignified firmness by the legislative powers in the State, the march of intimidation will be easily arrested in its wayward course; and that dignified submission to the rule of constitutional law and moral obligation, which distinguishes morality itself, will result, not so much from mere popular instruction, as from the inculcation of sound principles, stedfastly exercised, and strenuously asserted, without reference to party objects or party feelings. Will any man in his senses pretend that the Christian religion, duly inculcated, tends to the subversion of political order? Does it not rather bind men who are true Christians to the correct performance of state duties, if even a heathen king should reign over them, as Cæsar reigned over the Jews, and to whom the Divine Founder of the Christian religion decreed moral obedience? If the obligations of Christian law, and the terrors of an offended God, are not calculated to restrain the evil propensities of man, what other motive will? If the duty of Christian servants is not absolved towards heathen masters, unless in matters which entirely fetter the conscience towards God, has not a Christian king the right of claiming a becoming moral obedience, from all classes of his subjects, to a system of established Christian law in the State[1]? Are the principles of government to be adapted to the views of those

[1] On the nature of moral obedience, and the duties of good subjects, the beautiful drama of *Sacontala*, performed at the court of an *Indian monarch*, celebrated for his love of letters, *a century before Christ*, throws our purely

dissenters who argue, that all human authority whatever is opposed to evangelical liberty, *even of Christians over Christians?* Are we to yield, on the other hand, to the impudent doctrine of the *papists*, who arrogantly pretend, *that the authority of kings over their subjects is so far dissolved by heresy, as to absolve them from moral obedience, save under positive compulsion or necessity?*

We may look in vain for a satisfactory answer to these queries, from those who have assumed the reins of power, if they follow up their professed principles; and remain in the dark as to the superior reconciliation of *their moral system*[1], unless, indeed, like the humble expectant, "Daniel Wilkins," we, the people of England, seeking knowledge[2], are content to wait for an additional illumination, as the favoured class of intellectual beings, for whom, the *admired* of the Edinburgh Reviewer, entertains such high veneration and loving solicitude. It would be well if some of our reforming senators would regulate their feelings and their public conduct by the example which ancient Rome always presents to them, in the day of

moral learning into the shade. So much for the progress of human wisdom.—See *Code of Gentoo Laws*, and writings of *Sir William Jones*.

[1] At the recent election for Nottingham, Sir John Cam Hobhouse is reported to have said, in his congratulatory address to the electors, in allusion to Sir R. Peel's administration—"*I considered their existence as a ministry, not only highly detrimental to the public service, but a stain on public morals.*" After this gross attack and foul calumny from a *Liberal*, and a *reformed Whig*, on an entire body of honourable men, whose deeds deny the justice of the assertion, we may expect something from Sir John Cam Hobhouse and his colleagues, which will not only electrify the whole English nation, but astonish the world.—*Credat Judæus!* The glorious minority of "*three hundred*" is, however, a sad obstacle!

[2] Vide an Anxious Appeal from "D. Daniel Wilkins" to "Isaac Tomkins" and his *Patron*, in the form of a Letter, dated from "*Cimmesii*, April 24, 1835," and published at length in the *Times* Journal of April 27th.

her moral degeneracy, when the domination of the tribunes, urged on by a factious populace and its aspiring associates, paved the way for her destruction, and thus verified the predictions of Scipio Africanus. Such a course would test their sincerity as patriots, and not the mere hypocritical assertors of freedom, only worthy of being assigned over to marked contempt. Whether the liberties of a great people become lost to them, by the absence of sterling merit, deficiency of honour and principle, or from an ill-judged impunity on the part of the people themselves towards their managers, those who assume the direction of state affairs, are equally responsible for the consequences to their country.

With those who imagine the progress of human events to be directed by a species of fatalism, rather than dependent, under God, upon the contingencies of social life, its laws, necessities, and morals; and fully capable of being regulated by a wise and discreet policy, the interests of a nation approaching its ruin, present only a contracted scene for contemplation; but, whenever a concatenation of unfavourable circumstances, both within the *Senate* and without, arising from the loss of public virtue in the State, contributing to that end, is not met by corresponding ability—by an inflexible promptitude of moral purpose, on the part of that body which holds the reins of government, the equilibrium of power (*la balance de la liberté*), the subject becomes entitled to grave consideration, if not to melancholy reflection. We must not yet despair, although *Voltaire's brilliant*, set in new foil, should sparkle in the land, and, dazzling short-sighted individuals, even be prized where it should be most disowned; and which, alas! is too much the case with others who clamour most loudly for reform—*cherchez le bijou—vous le trouverez partout!* Hence the attempts to dismantle the Church, *non obstante* the

sacred obligation of an *oath*[1]. Hence the desire, as in revolutionary France, to despoil the hereditary nobility of the land —to destroy its State utility—to establish the left-handed equality of civil rights—to give to pedantic *utilitarianism*, the places and offices occupied by religion and rational philosophy. "Depression of the nobility," says Bacon, "may make a king more absolute, but less secure;—the masterpiece of superstition is with the people; and in all superstitions *wise men follow fools*, as is commonly the case in ill purgings, when the people

"I, A. B., do swear, that I will defend, to the utmost of my power, the *settlement of property within this realm, as established by the laws;* and I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any intention *to subvert the present Church Establishment, as settled by law, within this realm;* and I do solemnly swear, that I never will exercise any privilege to which I am or may become entitled, *to disturb or weaken the Protestant Religion or Protestant Government in the United Kingdom.* And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words of this oath, *without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatever. So help me God.*"—Form of oath taken by Roman Catholic Members in the House of Commons.—Vide Act of Parliament, cap. 7, sec. 2, 10 Geo. 4.

Motion of Lord J. Russell, March 30, 1835:—"That this House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole House, in order to consider the present state of the Church Establishment in Ireland, with the view of applying any surplus of the revenues, not required for the spiritual cure of its members, to the general education of all classes of the people, without distinction of religious persuasion." Thirty-four Roman Catholic members voted for the preceding, creating the actual majority against the Protestant Church. *O pudor! O pietas!*

In addition to the decree of the Council of *Lateran*, before noticed, p. 448, by further decrees of Popes Gregory the Ninth and Innocent the Third, "*All oaths taken contrary to the interests of the holy Roman Church,*" are declared *perjuries, and not to be considered as oaths.*" An *oath* is the only *security* to the Protestant Church at present existing, under the "Roman Catholic Civil Disabilities Relief Bill."—See APPENDIX, at the end.

act the chief physician." Such were the views of that master-mind, whose opinions, thus elucidated, show the error to be decisive, where the conclusion is drawn from the assumed possession of *knowledge* without the exercise of its accompanying advantages.

The members of the retired cabinet, with their Right Honourable Chief, may well feel proud, under the puny attacks of individual calumniators, though sustained by high morality[1]. To the former, in the words of an address from the gentry and inhabitants of *Builth*, in Wales, "belong the congratulations due to a triumph of the purest kind,—numerical force, shamelessly arrayed against force of argument—falsehood against facts—personal malice against public virtue; which may achieve a disgraceful victory, but the triumph remains with the vanquished!" To Sir Robert Peel, individually, (*ex debito justitia,*) without reference to party feeling, the tribute of learning and the homage of genius, will descend, in its unbiassed judgment, to posterity; and, supported by truth, deserves to be recorded, were it only for its classic elegance and lofty sentiment, expressed in the conclusion of the address of the Heads and Members of Trinity College, Dublin :—"*You fall but with the ruin of our Constitution and our Monarchy;*" and, only equalled, by one of the greatest statesmen of modern times, may, adopting his quotation from the Roman senator, repeat, "*Cæteris semper bene gestæ, mihi uni conservatæ, reipublicæ gratulationem decrevistis!*" "You can only be conquered, when the rank, the property, the intellect, and the religion of Britain, are overborne by ignorance, by numbers, and by infidelity!"

[1] The unprincipled nature of the opposition to the conservative ministry of Sir Robert Peel, was manifested from the first vote, on the question of the *Speakership*, to that which occasioned its resignation,—engendered in personal rancour; and under the mask of "vindicating a great public principle," *perpetrating*, in the words of Lord Stanley, "*gross injustice!*" *On a découvert la moralité!*

Political distinctions and differences have ever, since the organization of society assumed a systematic form, been multifarious and contradictory; and in proportion as states became civilized, and human intelligence progressed by aid of learning, the conflicting influences of opinion have prevailed, in proportion to the real emergencies, the necessities, or the imaginary wants of mankind; but the opposition of the present age, has principally arisen from a vain predilection in favour of the doctrine of *abstract rights*, and an overweening partiality or apostate inclination towards irreligion and modern philosophy, as opposed to the pure influences of religion and genuine morality. It now becomes the duty of the Christian legislator, to be doubly on his guard, lest by conceding to the specious sophistry of *sceptics*, on the one hand, or the rude voice of clamour, on the other, in favour of untried theories, he may barter the safeguards which are essential to the repose of the State, and the fabric of society itself in these kingdoms, under established law; whilst it is his bounden duty, and should be his inclination, deliberating for a nation of freemen, to assist with due precaution, in adapting the elasticity of our justly prized Constitution, to the exigencies of the times, and the altered condition of the people, ever keeping in view those great, and wise, and vital principles, on which the faith and monarchy of his country have been laid down, for the equal assurance, the mutual benefit, and the independent protection of all classes of its citizens.

In conclusion,—the momentous circumstances of the times, including recent parliamentary events, having occasioned the extension of this chapter far beyond the limits originally intended, an apology is tendered, grounded on the importance of the occasion; for the Author, any more than the public, and probably many of the Peers, did not contemplate, under late arrangements, the prompt necessity for an enlarged dis-

play of his very humble services, in vindication of the House of Lords, upon constitutional grounds; but rendered indispensable, by the proceedings of a factious party in the other House. As a commoner, and a member of the British community, he claims an excuse, upon public grounds, for attempting a task so *onerous*, impelled by a sense of Christian duty, and he feels, that the grave magnitude of the subject will aid his appeal. Every Christian Englishman, should have a vicegerent ruling within his own bosom, for conscience seldom slumbers without peril. There is a stage in revolutionary proceedings, at which it becomes every honest man to pause—to reflect—to make up his mind—*utrum horum mavis accipe*, when placed between Religion and Infidelity,—*the Gospel Kingdom of Christ upon earth*, and the arbitrary rule of *an infallible Papal* Church. In joining the standard of *Order*, he possesses the proud satisfaction, that however humble the advocacy—however inadequate the persuasive weapons he brings to the conflict, he has enlisted on the side of *Truth*—enrolled under the standard of Him, of whom the Psalmist emphatically says, "THE LORD *of Hosts is with us*—THE GOD OF JACOB *is our refuge*,"—the measure of faith and of hope, which is the stay of the Christian Protestant, and the citadel of his Church!

APPENDIX.

A COMPREHENSIVE history of the illusions and deceptions practised by the Church of Rome, in every part of the world, for the establishment and extension of her despotic power, would fill more volumes than any history extant. Wherever we trace her progress, we find her clothed in the same *mantle*, pursuing the same objects, and maintaining the same character, given her by *Bossuet*, one of her own dearest champions,—"*La plus intolérante de toutes les Sectes Chrétiennes.*" Whether in Italy, the seat of her usurped dominion—in Germany—in Spain—in France—in Ireland—in America, or in India, the religion of the Papacy is the religion of curses—of penalties—of excommunication—of auricular confession—of indulgences, penance, *absolution*—of Saint-worship, superstition, infallibility, *supremacy! Semper eadem*, with this Church, whenever her position enables her to assert "*her holy severity, and the holy delicacy of her sentiments*," under these, the essentials of her creed. Her political principles are founded upon them; and when she cannot exercise *authority*, she has recourse to sophistry, to dissimulation, and mystification. Well, indeed, may the Papal Church desire to draw a veil over her own misdeeds —to blot out, or obscure from the light of day, those records, which have, in an involuntary form, been furnished by her own sons, completing the colossal monument of iniquity she has vainly attempted to break down.

"When a dogmatical point is to be determined, *the Catholic*

Church speaks but once, and her decree is irrevocable. The solemn determinations of General Councils HAVE REMAINED UNALTERABLE, *and* WILL EVER BE SO."—*Walmsley's Gen. Hist. of the Church*, chap. ix. p. 224.

Taking it for granted, that this is the true recorded practice, as well as the principle of the Church of Rome, all astonishment must cease with sensible minds, however glaring the immorality, the sin of such delusion—the baseness of the subterfuge, of doing *evil*, that *good* may accrue to the Roman Catholic faith. If the decrees of her General Councils are *irrevocable*, and which the practice of the Roman Church proves them to be, whenever she can enforce them,—it follows, that an *oath* taken against the real or presumed interests of that Church is not binding; and that mental reservation is not only permitted but enjoined by the authority of the Church herself, or those who execute and represent her higher powers, viz. her Councils, and the Pope, *ex cathedrâ*; and on the principle of the Jesuits, *ad majorem Dei gloriam!*—Let his Holiness first speak, *ex cathedrâ*.

"*Non dicenda sunt juramenta, sed potius perjuria quæ contra utilitatem ecclesiasticam, et sanctorum patrum veniunt instituta.*"—Conc. Lateran, sub Alexandro III. cap. xvi. 558. tom. 3. pars 2, *Binii*.

TRANSLATION.

"Those obligations are not to be called *oaths*, but rather *perjuries*, which are found to be contrary to the advantage of the Church, and the institutions of the holy fathers."—16*th Canon of the Council of Lateran*, as above. See also "*The Digest of Irish Evidence*," 1824 and 1825, part ii. pp. 182—193.

Now, if it be pretended that this principle is grown into dusuetude, or become, like my Lord Plunket's "old almanac," *obsolete*, such pretence is a flagrant deception and falsehood; for on the 13th *November*, 1825, (vide Note, p. 448, erroneously there dated 1835,) a *Papal Bull* issued under the authority of this very Canon, embodying nearly the whole of its express terms, substituting *promise* for "obligations," and *traditions* for "fathers!" In what case, then, stands the Protestant Church of England, by the security of *a parliamentary oath*,—or, *per contra*, what *guarantee* has the legislature against such mental reservation, or *Salvo ordine Episcopali vel Papali ex cathedrâ?*

Now we must judge men by their actions, not by their declarations; and in the midst of all declarations and oaths to the contrary, Popery, with unblushing front, is now openly prepared, supported by an association of confederated apostate Whigs and levelling Radicals, to annihilate our Protestant institutions, over which, in an unguarded, impolitic, and falsely confiding moment, we have given its disciples a legislative control, or rather the opportunity for abusing a sacred state trust. Already one part of our venerable Protestant Establishment totters to its foundation, in the security of its temporalties—its means of grace and usefulness; whilst its more faithful sons are justly alarmed for the consequences to pure spiritual instruction, which the proposed measures must materially circumscribe, and, to a great extent, entirely abrogate; but thanks to God, the voice of Protestant England has proclaimed her dissent to the unholy, the unjust, and the unconstitutional design of spoliation! Protestantism, the fair herald of Christ's kingdom upon earth, has arisen from her slumber; and arrayed in the mantle of HIM, whose Gospel is the power of God unto salvation, she marshals her followers, and disdains the imperious foe,—disclaims the association of apostate sons, who would resign to the enemies of her Lord and King the outworks, the buttresses, which constitute the citadel of the Christian's faith. Do we make strong assertions? Let us judge the Church of Rome by her own acts—by her avowed principles—by her Councils. Let her and her advocates learn the *truth*, and hear her condemnation from her own mouth—*la vérité sans peur*.

The entire constitution, spirit, policy, and discipline of the Papal Church in Ireland are at variance with, and opposed to, the law of the land. The concealment of crime, and even its encouragement towards Protestants, on the part of the Roman Catholic priesthood, and the political laity, its confederate, are part and parcel of the authorized and immoral system of Popery itself, for the subversion of all other creeds, in favour of its own,—the subjugation of all other power to its despotic sway, its iron-bound tyranny of soul, conscience, person, and property! Already has the *Gazette de France*, availing itself of the policy assumed by Lord John Russell, involving his declared principles, his preference for "*anarchy* to *despotism*," proclaimed "*La restauration de la science politique*," that is, of the Church of Rome, and *her*

resumption of the monarchy of England [1]. *Verbum sapienti.* Englishmen must have at least an outline of what this science really is, drawn from the archives of the Court of Rome—the *sanctum sanctorum* of the holy Pontiff himself. And first, for an advanced point, let us put the simple question—*Does not the feudal and episcopal oath of fealty to the Pope, continued to be taken by the Roman Catholic priesthood, embody the declaration or affirmation following*—WE DECLARE, SAY, DEFINE, AND PRONOUNCE, THAT IT IS ALTOGETHER NECESSARY TO SALVATION FOR EVERY CREATURE TO BE SUBJECT TO THE ROMAN PONTIFF!!

Is not this episcopal oath of feudal allegiance and supremacy binding on the Roman Catholic laity, through the priesthood; and does not this oath and that of Pius IV. (without mental reservation) cancel or render null and void all other oaths, hostile or opposed thereto, in *spirit*, as well as in *letter?*

What does the decree of the fourth Council of Lateran, held under mandate of the holy Pontiff himself, say in sustenance of the principles, and in furtherance of the power and objects of this feudal oath? Lest it may be denied, let the act speak for itself in its original tongue!—

"Et si necesse fuerit, per censuram ecclesiasticam COMPELLANTUR seculares potestates quibuscunque jungantur officiis, quod de terris suæ jurisdictioni subjectis universos hæreticos ab ecclesiâ denotatos bonâ fide pro viribus exterminare studebunt, et si satisfacere contempserit intra annum significetur SUMMO PONTIFICI, ut ex tunc IPSE VASSALOS AB EJUS FIDELITATE DENUNCIET ABSOLUTOS et terram exponat CATHOLICIS OCCUPANDUM qui eam, exterminatis hæreticis, SINE ULLA CONTRADICTIONE POSSIDEANT, et in fidei puritate conservent."—Conc. Lateran. iv. anno Domini 1215. Can. 3.

TRANSLATION.

"And if it shall be necessary, let the secular powers be compelled, whatever situation they may fill, to give due diligence, according to their power, *to exterminate all those who are marked*

[1] See an admirable exposition of the policy declared by this Roman Catholic organ with regard to England, in the *Times* journal of Saturday, May the 9th, with extracts, declaratory of the consequences to the Protestant Church, throne, and nobility, which must result from the Russell innovation scheme.

out by the Church as heretics, from the lands subject to their jurisdiction; and in case they shall contemptuously refuse to make satisfaction within one year, it shall be signified to the *Sovereign Pontiff,* that, as occasion may be, he may declare his subjects *absolved from their allegiance,* and lay open his country to be possessed by Catholics, who, *exterminating the heretics,* shall thence hold it without contradiction, and preserve it in the purity of the faith!!!"

Here we have a fair sample of papal intolerance—of despotic usurpation—of *seizing* on temporal power, authorized by an *unrepealed* decree of the famous Council of Lateran, and standing in the *Canon Law* of the Roman Catholic Church, whose license to define *heresy* remains to her *ad libitum;* and thus does the possessor of the papal tiara arrogate to himself the right *(pro re nata ex cathdrâ)* to dispossess every lord or prince of his *land,* and the allegiance of his subjects, whenever his spiritual or secular *vassals* may think fit or *expedient* to proclaim the latter *heretic;* and as the Church of Rome is *universal,* this authority, of course, extends to all states and jurisdictions; but more especially to *Ireland,* as having been claimed by Pope *Adrian* as his own property, and delivered over by him to his dear son, Henry the Second, of Catholic memory! One more specimen of this famous exterminating decree, from another papal authority, or Roman Catholic source, turning *(a la Don Carlos)* their own guns upon the enemies of the Protestant Church. The powers are here somewhat enlarged. From the "*Labbei et Cossartii Consilia,*" vol. xi. part i. page 148, Canon the Third—*De Hæreticis.* "Let *secular* powers, whatever office they execute, be admonished, persuaded, and, if necessary, *(si opus necessit) compelled* by ecclesiastical censure, that as they desire to be reputed and accounted faithful, so they would *publicly take an oath for the defence of the faith,* (that is, the Roman Catholic,) that they would endeavour in all good faith, according to their power, *to destroy all heretics, marked by the Church, out of the lands of their jurisdiction.* But if the *temporal Prince,* being admonished and required, shall neglect to purge his land from this heretical filthiness, he shall be *excommunicated by the bishops of the province;* and if he shall refuse to give satisfaction within a year, let it be signified to the Sovereign Pope at Rome, that he may forthwith pronounce his vassals absolved from their

allegiance, and expose his land to be possessed by *Catholics*, who, *having destroyed the heretics*, may possess it without contradiction, and preserve it in the purity of the faith; saving the right of the principal Lord, whilst that he doth make *no hindrance thereto*. Nevertheless the same law is to be observed towards them who have no principal Lord!"

There is the decree of Boniface VIII., copied into, adopted, and standing in the Canon Law, the statute book of the papal realm. Will Doctor M'Hale or Mr. O'Connell deny this fact, or satisfy the Protestant members of the House of Commons in what light the Roman Catholics of Ireland, *Priesthood* and *Laity*, entertain it. This is a vital point. If the reader wishes sound information, let him consult *Barrow's Treatise on the Pope's Supremacy*.

Under the *Oath of Pius the Fourth*, and the Lateran Decree, the following Bulls and sentences of excommunication were issued in latter times against our own Protestant Princes, viz.

Henry VIII. in	1535, by Pope Paul III.
Elizabeth	1569, Pius V.
Ditto	1580, Gregory XIII.
Ditto	1587, Sixtus V.
Ditto	1600, Clement VIII.
Charles I. in Ireland . .	1643, Urban VIII.
George II.	1729, Benedict XIII.

The last Papal Bull against the English Crown was obtained by "the Titular Bishops of Ireland," with authority to dethrone their Protestant King!

To the above may be added, the peremptory Bull of the famous *Hildebrand* (Gregory the VIIth), with his *mandate* to William the Conqueror (1088) to "perform *fealty* to him for his *crown*," which William spurned with becoming dignity; that of Boniface VIII. to *Edward the First*, 1306 (see page 288, chap. vi.), claiming to be "liege Lord of Scotland;" and another by *Innocent* III. (1210) denouncing King John, and demanding a return to *his fealty, &c.*

In his Bull for the jubilee of 1825, the late Pope Leo XII. asserted his pretended right to extirpate *heresies*—one of the conditions of gaining "*the most plenary and complete absolution and pardon of* ALL *their sins*," was that of pouring forth "*pious*

prayers to God for the speedy exaltation of the Holy Church, and the extirpation of all heresies!"

• As to the power of the Pope and his Bishops, to absolve both the Roman Catholic priesthood and laity, from all oaths taken in what they may please to define *prejudice* to the Papal Church, and her creed or policy, we have the authority of Bellarmin, the most learned of her champions who ever wrote, that, "*if the Pope should* ERR *in declaring vices to be* GOOD, *and virtues* EVIL, *the Church* (i. e. *the Roman Church*), *must believe him?*" Preposterous as is this doctrine—immoral as is its tendency, it is no less than a declared principle, by which the head of the Church of Rome *may* advance her objects; and consequently a principle on which her priesthood and laity *may* act under the principle of mental reservation; and although conscientious Catholics would possibly shudder at the immorality of the act, there are always, as experience shows, numbers of political Catholics to be found, with slight scruples of conscience, ready to avail themselves of the subterfuges and means of evasion, which the doctrines and dogmas of their Church hold out, under the sanction of her general councils, and the acts of her supreme head, founded upon them. But what says Bellarmin in conclusion of this infallible principle resting in the Pope—why, that "THE CHURCH IS BOUND TO MAINTAIN IT, UNLESS SHE WISHED TO SIN AGAINST CONSCIENCE!!!" Now, in the language of the never-dying Burke, have we the "demon of sophistry unmasked,"—here is license for conscience: is it doubted?—let the author speak for himself:

"FIDES CATHOLICA DOCET, OMNEM VIRTUTEM ESSE BONAM, OMNE VITIUM ESSE MALUM: SI AUTEM PAPA ERRARET PRÆCIPIENDO VITIA, VEL PROHIBENDO VIRTUTES, VENERETUR ECCLESIA CREDERE VITIA ESSE BONA ET VIRTUTES MALAS, NISI VELLET CONTRA CONSCIENTIAM PECCARE."—*Bellarmin*, de Romano Pontifice, lib. iv. cap. v.

A little more for the means of satisfying conscience, where the interests, temporal or spiritual, of the Romish, as opposed to the Protestant Church, are concerned; and we may be permitted to put some few questions to the advocates of measures, which must necessarily place the Protestant Church of Ireland at the mercy of her uncompromising enemy, without any *tangible security*, for the little which may be left to her; for *an oath* has proved itself a

treacherous security indeed; and although *treason* may apparently be combined with perjury, where the Protestant Church of England is concerned, the Roman Catholic prelates have sworn an oath they deem far more *sacred* and binding on themselves, and their entire charge—they have sworn to their supreme head to *defend* and to *extend* their Church—is it not more likely they should keep such oath? In what position are they placed between the *two*, that oath taken by themselves and that taken by their lay representatives? Nor are they responsible, though the King should be *advised* to draw a distinction between his *executive* and his *legislative* conscience; but his responsible advisers are answerable, if such advice is tendered him, because they lead the way to such interpretation, and the former may urge "*nec interpretando sibi jusjurandum et leges aptas facere!*" Thus, they will successfully *rebut* the charge of treasonable design, whilst the facilities for levelling a faith to which they are, by every tie they hold sacred (justifiable or not it matters little) opposed, are thrown in their way, by those who should be the last to concede them. We, as Protestants, form our own interpretation of the obligation—the Roman Catholics form another for themselves; and although we may dispute the *morality*, they will plead a justification upon grounds of *expedient conscience*; for it is not in political as it is in legal dispute, "*certum est quod certum reddendi posset.*" This is the position in which the Protestant Church of Ireland is placed by Lord John Russell's motion, and its attendant consequences!

The confederated liberals of the opposing creeds, will declare this asserted principle of mental reservation a calumny against their associated brethren; be it so, the calumny proceeds from the Papal, not the Protestant boundaries. What says the doctrine of the Jesuits, whose influence in old Ireland is pretty well known, and their principles followed?

Suarez de virtute et statu religionis, Tom. ii. pp. 473,475. Lugd. 1641.—"I maintain, first, that intrinsically there is *no evil in equivocation, even in swearing to it, whence it follows that there is no perjury in it.* Equivocation in discourse does not always include a lie, therefore it is not perjury, nor intrinsically evil, to affirm such a thing *with an oath.* The reason is, that a lie is a thing spoken contrary to the thoughts of the speaker, because he is required to

conform his words to his own intention; but not always obliged to do so to the attention of him who listens. Now the former (the speaker) cannot be said to speak contrary to his thoughts when he uses equivocal terms in a sense agreeing with his own intention only: therefore he does not lie, nor do any thing intrinsically evil in thus speaking.' I say, in the second place, as often as for an honest cause, words are used which convey a meaning differing from the thoughts of him who uses them, neither perjury nor sin is incurred, even if an oath be added; which I will prove by examples given by good authors and received by custom. If a man, who has contracted exteriorly, *without an intention of per forming*, is questioned by a judge, and required to declare, under sanction of an *oath*, whether he has so promised or contracted he may simply say *no*, because it may have a legitimate sense, namely, *I have not promised with a promise that I mean to keep, or that obliges me;* and he has a legitimate reason for thus answering, since otherwise not being able to prove the *defect of intention*, he would be compelled to pay that which in fact (conscientiously) he did not owe. It is thus *Navame* teaches, when he says, that *an oath may be taken*, not only that he *has not thus promised;* but even if he is asked, that he has not *uttered* such words, *understanding that he has not pronounced them in promising truly*, or that he has not uttered them in a way that he is obliged to confess. Thus we have resolved the question, and proved that mental equivocation is permissible within certain limitations!!!"

Reginaldus, Praxis fori Pœnitentialis, Tom. ii. Lib. 18, c. 7.—"If a man has a legitimate reason to use ambiguity or artifice in swearing, although he to whom the oath is made understands him in a different sense, and is consequently *deceived*, he does not sin *mortally*, sometimes not even *venially*. It is asked whether it is permitted to evade the truth by ambiguous discourse?—it is answered, it is permitted. But the case in which this may be done without an untruth is, when what a man says is *true*, according to his *own intention*, although it be *relatively false to that of the person who listens, and in the ordinary acceptation.* It is however to be observed, that the ambiguity here spoken of, is not only that which results from the different signification of words, but also that which arises when the words used are in fact false,

taken separately and in themselves; but become true by the aid of some additions which are understood by him who speaks ! !!"

Vincentius Fillilucius, Jacobus Gordonus, Gregorious Gobatus, and Joannes de Cardenas, all assert the same principles on the right of mental reservation; the latter in his *Crisis Theologica,* pp. 384—395.—" It is permitted, whether in trifling or important matters, *to take an oath without an intention of keeping it,* if a man has sufficient reason for doing so; and this is so certain that *Sanchez* assures us, that all the doctors agree in this opinion. The internal intention is, say they, *the soul of the words;* these are therefore as dead bodies without life, *and the oath loses all its force if he who made it did not intend to swear.* In the second place, they maintain that human actions, which contract an obligation, demand *an assent of the will;* but this consent cannot be given without intending to do that action from which the obligation springs: hence, therefore, since an *oath* is an action which produces an *obligation,* whether it be to speak the truth or perform a promise, it requires the *entire consent of the will,* and consequently the intention to take the oath ! ! !"

Paulus Laymann, Theologia Moralis, Lib. iv. Tract 3. p. 86.—" In order to swear a real oath, it is not sufficient to pronounce the words which constitute its material expression, if we have not at the same time an intention to swear and internally to call on God to witness the truth, otherwise it is not true, but a simulated and artificial oath—such an oath is indeed *obligatory, sometimes on account of the scandal which it may cause, or the injury its omission may do us, but does not impose as a duty religious binding* ! ! !"

Busembaum et La Croix, Theologia Moralis, Tom. i. Lib. 3. p. 226.—" Quest. Is it permitted to swear *equivocally?*—Ans. To swear equivocally, when we have a just cause, and when equivocation is in itself permissible, is not an *evil;* because in so far as we have a right to hide our sentiments without lying, *there is no irreverence to the sanctity of an oath in swearing it.* It is also allowable to swear equivocally, if the oath is unjustly required, that is, if he who administers it has no right to exact it ! ! !"

These few selected specimens, present us with a very fair exposition and sample of Popery, on the subject of mental reservation; nor can it be pretended, in the teeth of the decree of the Lateran Council before cited, and of the Papal Bull of Leo xii. 1825, that

these principles are the principles of any one sect or order of the Romish Church. The justification for all the fraud, falsehood, impiety, casuistry, and treachery involved in them, is to be found in the acts of the entire Papal Church, her *unrepealed canon law*, and the edicts of her supreme head; and though honest Protestants would shudder at the black atrocity of such doctrines, infatuated, spell-bound and bigotted, priestly or political Catholics act upon them in too many instances, with few compunctions of conscience. Here they are recorded in an English dress, that no plea of ignorance may avail.

No man, who has not travelled in Catholic countries, or dived into the *arcana selecta* of the Papacy, can form a proper estimate of the ramifications of its policy, superstition, and tyranny; and any opinion formed of Popery, from its latter aspect in England alone, is fallacious in the highest degree. For the literary policy of the Church of Rome, exhibited in her damnatory Catalogues, or *Indexes*, prohibitory and expurgatory, consult Mendham's work, published by Duncan, London, 1830. Civil liberty and papal power, are wide from each other, as the poles are asunder,—the attempt to assimilate them betrays a weak head, if not a corrupt heart, discreditable to the times in which we live,—a burlesque upon the assumed wisdom of the age.

Let inconsiderate Liberals answer the following questions satisfactorily, if they can.

Has not the Church of Rome, in every part of the world, broken through all law, human and divine, for the purpose of exterminating *heresy*, as she is pleased to term it,—that is, the Gospel, or Protestant reformed religion?

Has she not invariably suspended her arbitrary policy, whenever she durst not exercise it, and resumed it as occasion favoured, excommunicating princes *ad infinitum*, who disputed "her holy severity," and her supreme authority?

Is she not at this very hour struggling to extend her power even in this country, by an increase of chapels, beyond all precedent,—the foundation of an extensive *monastic establishment* at Princethorpe, near Coventry—the proposal for a *Cathedral* at Birmingham—and the formation of another large Collegiate Institution near Bath, with perpetual missions in other places?

Has she changed her fundamental principles in one *single point*,—abrogated one of the *penal bulls* of her Popes, or repealed any portion of her canon law, and its long string of *anathemas* against all those she is pleased to declare out of the pale of salvation?

Does she not at this moment, that is, by her Irish priesthood, and the

O'Connell party, proclaim the right of virtually taking *the lead*, as the *Church of Ireland*, on the abstract principle of numbers?

Do not the members of the Roman Irish hierarchy, swear to maintain inviolate the Tenth Article of *Pope Pius's Creed* and *Oath*, and to observe the General Councils of the Roman Catholic Church in the following terms?

"*I likewise undoubtedly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared, by the sacred Canons and General Councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent. And I condemn, reject, and* ANATHEMATIZE, *all things contrary thereto, and all heresies which the Church has condemned, rejected, and anathematized.*"

Is this juramentary oath considered a solemn obligation, and to be implicitly observed or not, by the Irish priesthood?

The first question may be answered by a short extract or history of *figures*, furnished by a learned Spaniard, whose book the author opportunely met with, when on his travels. It more than confirms Llorente's History, (vide quotation, p. 454.) It is entitled *Politica Ecclesiastica*, printed at Valencia, 1821; and, under the head of "*El Fanatismo y a Religion*," the *third volume* contains the following statement of human victims to papal tyranny.

In the Pontificate of Gregory VII. (Hildebrand,) including those who fell in his *Crusades* against the emperor	300,000
The victims of summary execution during the great Eastern schism	50,000 !
The war of the Hussites, occasioned by the murder of John Huss and Jerome of Prague	150,000
The massacres of *Merindol* and *Cabrieres*, &c.	18,000
The executions by *burning*, &c. in the various countries of Europe, from Pope Leo X. to Clement IX.	2,000,000 ! !
By the decrees of the Inquisition	200,000
In America (South) from the authority of *M. de Las Casas*	5,000,000 ! !
In sundry other places enumerated	1,980,000 ! !
Making a *total*, without including the massacre of Paris, &c. of	9,698,800 ! !

And yet, in the face of such a statement of human sacrifice, there are to be found professing Protestants, Liberals, and self-styled Gospel Dissenters from the Church of England, advocating principles, supportive of the designs of a power, against whom this blackened catalogue stands arrayed, and the last items of which come down to the very threshold of modern times, under

the delusive flimsy pretext, that popery has become *liberal*,—that it has conformed itself to the spirit of the times! *Fallacia alia aliâm tendit!* Now is the time to make a final stand for the Church of England, who, in the midst of all the scandal and opprobrium attempted to be unjustly thrown upon her, by an unholy and anomalous confederacy, is pure in her annals, as a human institution, from such categories of blood-stained crime—the bare reflection on the enormity of which, chills the warm flowing blood in the veins—makes the heart thrill with painful emotions, and raises in the cheek of ordinary humanity, a blush of shame, for the recorded moral degradation of our guilty species, even, when the soul inspiring influences of Christian charity, or religion, suspend their monitory functions! Can such be the religion of JESUS CHRIST, who commanded his followers to "*love their enemies?*" The bare assumption is an insult on his very name,—an usurpation of authority, denounced in his own parable, wherein he disclaimed the association and the works!

Already has the day of retribution for apostacy arrived, and South Devon shown herself worthy to have been the landing place of *William Henry the Third*,—that immortal Prince of Orange, whose ensign, floating in the breeze, ere yet he reached the haven of his anxious solicitude, proclaimed his Protestant spirit and the fond hope of England's reformed Church, "JE MAINTIENDRAI[1]!" The men of Devon have nobly done their duty to their God, their King, their Country, and themselves; adding fresh lustre to an event, the most interesting in English annals,—an honour reserved to their progenitors! Let the Gazette de France, and those who have furnished the grounds for its chuckling hopes and anticipations, of the approaching destruction of England's Church and monarchy, ponder the results,—Englishmen have thrown back the insulting *stigma* with becoming indignity, and with that honourable Christian independence, worthy of their Name, their Country, and

[1] "*Je maintiendrai.*"—This motto, in Orange characters, appeared on the blue ensign, appended to the mast-head of the vessel which conveyed the Prince and suite, and it drew forth the applause of the thousands assembled to witness his landing. He hoisted the same ensign on his voyage to Ireland, which was descried on his entering the bay of Derry, when he raised the memorable siege of that devoted city. See Landing of King William the Third at Torbay, and History of the Siege of Derry.

their Blood! *Nous maintiendrons, Monsieur le Conducteur de la Gazette de France,—nous avons tous assez de force, pour supporter les Maux d'autrui,* arising from the unhallowed and crooked policy which has produced them! Even at the risk of having "*The Lords and the People,*" added to the "*Index expurgatorius,*" are these sentiments expressed.

Politics have now become, of necessity, the *caput cœnæ* of our social existence, the moral spring, as it were, of our actions, as a people,—our religion, prosperity, and repose, are mixed up with them; and we can only successfully contend against the enemies of our faith, by entering the arena, and combating them on their own ground,—this is a palpable fact, for *civil and religious liberty,* at least its cry, seems to be the very incense of the liberal atmosphere, the lungs through which the abstract reformers respire and exist; but, that alone is *civil liberty,* which secures to every man his rights, his religion, his possessions, and his personal safety. An association with the despot of Rome, has nothing in common with the *cause of man;* and although faith in God should ever stand before human reason, yet there is a reason to be given for our faith and its preservation. That man is little better than an idiot, who believes a thing he does not comprehend, nor why he does believe it, nor why his neighbour rejects that, which, upon calm reflection and conclusive evidence, he finds to be utterly incompatible with the sacred word of God, and the necessary concomitant of Gospel religion, which is civil freedom. Our Protestant monarchy, was constituted by men of very exalted mental endowments, moral and Christian,—amidst all the fluctuations of centuries, its characteristics are evident, its fruits palpably visible, and its essential attributes, still retaining much of the vigour of their pristine ascendency, are so intimately commingled with all our social organizations, that we need not the spirit of prophecy to assure us, that the system, duly sustained, is the least perishable of human institutions, because it has *truth* for its guide. If we want a practical theorem, compare the state of Canada, prior to the expulsion of the papal government, with that which it has since exhibited. The history of America incontestably demonstrates, that the papal system is an incurable enemy of all the nobler efforts of genius, science, and art, and contractive of all the divinely bestowed immunities upon mankind, illus-

trated by the comparative liberty and prosperity of those colonies, which were founded by Protestants. To the papacy, and the papacy alone, may be attributed all the wretchedness and mental debasement of the Spanish and Portuguese colonies, contrasted with those of North America, as further evidenced by the existing condition of people and parties in Spain and Portugal at this very hour. The Gazette de France, the herald of absolutism and of popery, admits, against itself, the astounding fact, that *Protestantism* is the sole foundation of our national greatness, and that *Romanism* has been the cause of all the misery and wrongs of *Ireland;* for, in its barefaced attempts to bolster up the infallible Church, in this country, it negatives its own positions, in its premises. The political and moral degradation of Great Britain, must be measured in a corresponding ratio with the increase of *Catholicism* in the State,—by that state of vassalage to Rome, to which foreign powers have long been subject; and which constitutes the greatest obstacle to granting them the blessings of free institutions. So much then, for *la restauration de la science politique,* and the principles advocated by confederated Liberals, and uncompromising Papists, for the subversion of a free tolerant constitution!

As to the position propounded by Lord Brougham, and acted upon by Lord John Russell, that the State has a right to determine and to appropriate what it shall deem to be the *surplus revenues* of the Church, (vide note, p. 291, Chap. VI.) it may be asserted, that such a principle is utterly false, and morally untenable, even in the abstract. The State possesses no other authority, in reference to the *internal* concerns and property of the Church, than that which is derived, from the *jus cavendi et tuendi,* or the *jus advocationis et jus inspectionis,* constituting its protective character; and from these alone, can arise the rights and the duties claimed by the State, relatively to the Church. Thus, their lordships, in spite of legal learning and acquired constitutional lore, are decidedly in a false position, with regard to the relative connection of the Church with the State. They have to learn, that the Church is in the State, not the State in the Church; and if they retain any respect for the *jus divinum* of religion, existing in the latter, independently, they must be constrained to admit, that the *jus cavendi et tuendi,* establishes no other right than the *basis* for the considerate

exercise of those protective privileges claimed. This constitutes the grand distinction between a Protestant, and Popish form of government, the one being *absolute*, the other *free;* and whereas popery is dominant, it acts with *its own State*, in steady pursuance of its principles, and in obedience to the decrees of the councils of its Church, *as one body*, which arrogates to itself to be the mother and supreme mistress of all Churches—*Omnium ecclesiarum mater et magistra*—and here the position is reversed, for the *State* is involved in the *Church*, aud bound to pay implicit obedience to it in all things, so abundantly established by the Creed of Pius IV. It follows, therefore, that the right of direct interference and application is a popish principle, and nothing less than a popish principle, attempted to be applied, in a dominant form, to a Protestant, and hitherto independent, institution, with reference to the spiritual uses of its temporalties, always held *exempt* from any other than voluntary taxation,—nor does the very specious amendment of Mr. Fowell Buxton, proposing to give to Parliament the right of *reapplying* the funds to Protestant uses, in any way lessen the popish quality of the principle.

The State, being Protestant, is bound and empowered, under its connection with the Church, which furnishes the authority for the exercise of Christian law, as regards all *external* concerns of its subjects, to decide whether they, under the performance of overt-acts in the moral world, act in conformity with its precepts; and it is also authorized, in order to uphold its own dignity, as well as its external legislative existence, to *reject* such as do not harmonize with those precepts. This right appertains to the State executively, in the person of the chief magistrate, or *sworn trustee*, relatively to every society existing within it, but more especially so to the *ecclesiastical body;* and hence the entire fallacy of the arguments advanced by Mr. Serjeant Talfourd, and others, in support of the principle of Lord John Russell's motion. The State, as constituted, is imperatively bound to take cognizance of all concerns in which its subjects are engaged as members of the Church; and of all those precepts, usages, and ordinances, which the Church, as a Protestant institution, has ordained, propounded, or introduced for her members, *for the advancement of her faith,* and which continue to issue from her authority, either publicly or privately; her existence and spiritual power being acknow-

ledged as a fundamental principle of the *monarchy*, and the King being her *grand conservator and legislative guardian in the State.* This important position seems to be entirely misunderstood, or overlooked, by Lord John Russell and his colleagues, in their proposed measures, which tend to compromise the Sovereign the execution of the most sacred trusts; but thus far only, is the State privileged to judge of all matters in respect to *itself*, and to tolerate or reject them, according as they harmonize or not with the precepts of the *Church;* because the introduction of schism, or false doctrine therein, is calculated to destroy the security of both. These rights of the State, legislatively, emanate from its very nature, aim, and end, which consist in promoting and preserving *good order, peace, security, and public prosperity*, as well as social content. They are secured to it by Christianity under the original compact; and have been exercised by it during all ages, even in popish times, independently of *papal bulls*, as the testimony of history sufficiently establishes. Accordingly, not only are the Liturgy and outward discipline of the Church, but also the articles of faith propounded, subject to the *supervision of the State*, under its guardianship, and without which the State would not strictly remain Christian, nor the King perform his trust, agreeably with his *oath and promise.* As regards the *doctrines* of the Church, it is not the province of the State to decide upon them, but it is nevertheless bound to inspect them, for the purpose of adopting precautionary measures against perversion, should any principles be at any time put forward by unauthorized persons, or schismatics, which may militate against the grand design of the government and established institutions, or be incompatible with the security of both Church and State, the happiness and prosperity of the People, and the safety of the Monarchy; and which, from their very nature and objects, can never be rendered safe appendages to Christian rule, but remain *alien* to its entire principles. Upon this ground also, it is the duty of the State to take into its serious consideration, how Religion is taught, and in what manner the ministers of its Religion are educated, with direct reference to its permanence, and the proper instruction of the people, under a Gospel dispensation. This is the *positive duty* of the State, being Christian, rather than the diverting of funds, originally set apart for *purely Christian purposes,*

to vague indefinite *moral objects*, and, probably, the advancement of principles utterly at variance with the foundation and the ends of a Christian institution, and a Christian government identified therewith. These are views which the earliest and best legal authorities of this country have recognised in their writings,—without positive violence and perversion of *right*, the State can go no further. *See the Duties of the Chief Magistrate*, (i. e. *the State,) for the Reform and Government of the Church, from the "Determinationes" of Bishop Davenant, pp.* 294—298, *Chap. VI. of the accompanying work.*

In the next place, the State is imperatively bound to consider, that the public worship of God, duly sustained, is the most rational, and at the same time the most influential means for preserving and extending the practice of *morality*—the pure love of God—duty to our neighbour—respect to the laws, and a becoming allegiance to our King and Country. Nothing is so calculated to arrest attention, and to promote reflection, as the sound—the monitory voice of the Church-going bell. Man is, in a great measure, the creature of external impressions, of sympathy and example. A truly chaste and dignified worship of God in the State, is the basis of all individual decorum, prosperity, and national happiness. It is, therefore, especially the duty of the supreme power, to watch over the public worship of God. It ought never to be a matter of indifference to the Legislature of a Christian State, whether neglects, abuses, or deficiency of the means of public worship exist; and so far the State is bound to interpose, and see that the duties of the Church are effectually and sufficiently performed; *but without attacking the essence of Religion itself, or diverting its fundamental objects from their original design and sacred purpose, merely to aid the presumed mental illumination, which has been diffused through the community, by the means of politics.* Such right has been exercised by Christian rulers in all ages; and there is nothing in it contrary to the design and advantage of Religion itself. In fine, Religion is to be held the foundation of all safe or useful instruction for the State, the primary means for the attainment of the end in good government: under our Christian constitution, it especially forms the essence of the education of the people, and the sum of their civic improvement, in proportion as it is sustained with devotion, or conducted

with hypocrisy. What opinion then, can rationally be formed of the social policy, or the statesman-like judgment of men, moral or practical, who would destroy the most effective means for the attainment of the end?

It necessarily follows, that Religion being the chief buttress of the State, in Britain, moral sentiments and moral conduct amongst the people, can only be properly inculcated by the force of example —by enlightened Christian instruction, vigorously enforced. And unless the advocates for a system of purely moral cultivation, are fully prepared to prove, that, for the general purposes of society, the population of either portion of the kingdom, can be trained in a manner superior to that, which results from the influences of religious tuition, they fail in showing, even in theory, the *expediency* of rendering education independent of Religion, much less, the solution of a practical problem for a declared moral object. Such a scheme, therefore, can be reasonably viewed in no other light, but an evidence of folly; or, taken as a *covert step* preliminary, for the more ignoble purpose of separating the Church from the State, without any plea of justification to warrant it. How is it possible to render one independent of the other, even upon the abstract principle? If the solemn services of our Protestant Church, are not only designed, but eminently calculated to make its congregations fairly acquainted with the most valuable and important moral truths,—if the entire construction and sublime Liturgy of the Church of England, its simple yet dignified forms of devotion and pathetic doctrines are, confessedly, such as are eminently calculated to render *truth* and *virtue* both sensibly impressive, and restraining on the human heart, by external dispensation and Gospel teaching—*to make morality itself susceptible to conviction, and acceptably efficacious to the State*—to the advancement of social comfort and the increased security of moral obligation, why is the Church to be deprived of its *legitimate prerogative*—disturbed in the fulfilment of its high and holy office, or the State driven from its stern propriety, into measures which are *extra-judicial*, and which, in their whole compass, negative the principle, destroy the frame-work on which the Church itself is founded? Is it because a few busy *doctrinaires*, acting as leading individuals, have arrogated to themselves the right of forming a judgment, on a subject of such magnitude, not only to the tem-

poral comfort, but the eternal welfare of thousands—of *millions* of human beings, that the voice of Protestant England is to be drowned in the senseless clamour which upholds them?

As it is the unquestionable duty of the State to train up, mould, and preserve the people, becomingly forming the *materiel* of all civil society, it is equally bound not to lose sight of the most efficient means of preserving and extending moral obligation and good discipline amongst them. To instruct—to effect—to edify—Religion, and its external exercises, must first be preserved, and, it is the positive duty of the State to assign the lead in that secondary work, to its Protestant Church, or to relinquish at once its connexion therewith, ingenuously,—to maintain its faith becomingly, if worthy, and, if unworthy, to relinquish it altogether! There is no intermediate shuffling course of temporising expediency to be pursued in this question—no intricate *Machiavellian* policy will sustain the honour of the Church of England; she must have the *lead*, or retire from the charge, under untarnished glory,—debasement forms no part of her system, to gratify either empty vanity or insatiable ambition, at the expence of her honour and her faith—"*in eâdem re, utilitas et turpitudo esse non potest*," therefore, the Church of England cannot be compromised: moral benefits to be procured at the sacrifice of public honour, and the abandonment of private virtue—the loss of honest political principle, are empty shadows—the illusions of impaired imagination, never to be realised! What did purely moral instruction, of the best kind, effect for ancient Rome? Let the State, with becoming dignity, assist the Church in remedying defects and abuses, which have crept therein, in custom,—let it modify and extend the usefulness of the *Church funds*, in their proper application and objects—forming *the outworks of Religion*, according the extent of other existing knowledge and population, not neglecting the spiritual responsibilities, nor yielding to the clamour of a few *fanatics*, the sworn enemies of a *creed*, which restrains their intolerance, and bridles their despotism! The State cannot submit to be governed, nor the Church borne down, by the unreflecting multitude, against propriety and common sense—against that sterling maxim of Cornelius Nepos,—*Non posse benè geri rempublicam multorum imperiis!*

If the faith, the security, and the utility of the Church o

England are *jeopardised*, it does not arise from her asserted pretensions to *infallibility and supremacy*, over the Romish or any other Church; but from her *excessive liberality and tolerant spirit*, the opposite to that "*holy severity*," and absolutism, which distinguishes her uncompromising antagonist,—neither, does the Church of England claim the exercise of a temporal monarchy, *in her own right*, although she became *the ally of the State*, in virtue of her apostolic office, and, agreeably with the express command of God, removed the *idolatrous altars*,—nor, does she incur danger from the adoption of a *traditionary rule of faith*, invented at the Council of Trent. She exercises no "mysterious ceremonies," propitiatory sacrifices, saint worship, or invocation of their *relics*, or purgatory, to shroud her communion, or darken her faith! The reformed Church of England has *disowned* the innovations, in faith and in practice, brought here by Austin, the missionary of the first Gregory, and established, first by sophistry and deception, and subsequently by the aid of the rack and the *sword*[1], at a time when the native inhabitants of Britain bent under an oppression they could not withstand. The Church of England is endangered from *within*, by the sinful supineness and apathy of many of her individual members,—by their attention to popular and worldly objects, to the neglect of their faith,—the stewardship of their Master's household,—by the conduct of professing but insincere friends,—from without by an unholy and an unnatural confederacy for an impure object. Liberals and Infidels—Socinians and Pa-

[1] Since the whole of the chapters in the accompanying work were printed, the author has read, with great satisfaction, in the daily journals, the memorial of a body of Welch Protestant Clergymen, resident in Yorkshire, addressed to Sir Robert Peel, showing the great antiquity of the Welch Episcopal Church, and confirming the historical statements adduced in the *Fifth Chapter*, with the difference, that instead of "*twelve* hundred labouring men," having been sacrificed, at the treacherous instigation of *Austin* the monk, and his followers, given on the testimony of the Roman Catholic authority Bede, (vide pp. 221—227,) these Protestant ministers assert, from their own history, that *twelve hundred of their poorer clergy were destroyed!* As Bede admits, that "they came to *pray*, and not to *fight*," the latter statement is far more probable to be correct. The conclusive arguments furnished by the memorialists, on the appointment of bishops for the Welch, versed in the ancient *vernacular*, powerfully sustain the views advanced by the author, on the contingent advantages of scriptural instruction for the Irish, in their native Celtic tongue.

pists—political apostatizing Churchmen, and political (not truely Christian) Dissenters, marshalled for the destruction of those great principles, which *Somers, Algernon Sydney,* and *Russell,* of a former day, struggled to establish; each of these incongruous elements, at the sacrifice of what they degrade by the name of *principle,* abetting the other, and forming, under the assumed visor of *freedom,* an association the most monstrously anomalous ever presented in British annals! But, amidst this display of the envenomed passions, the Church needs but a proper assertion of her faith; and a becoming display of mental energy on the part of her sons, to defeat this dark conspiracy against her honour and her usefulness, already writhing in despair and chagrin, at the universal burst of sentiment in her favour, from nine-tenths of all that is valuable in the three kingdoms,—nor, is this an ephemeral duty a passing effort; it is her province at all times to remember the watch-words of her Lord and Saviour,—"*Beware of false prophets,*"—"*He that is not with me is against me, and he that gathereth not with me scattereth.*" Her duty is obvious—her support manifest. It is no part of the duty of the Church of England to court *popularity,* in support of her faith, which stands upon its own merits, under the revealed will of God; but, with the view of obviating the insidious poison of her traducers—the impugners of her articles of faith—of meeting the principal objections of conscientious Dissenters—of showing the injustice—the falsehood of the imputation of unjustifiable illiberality, or exclusiveness, it is but right to place the Church of England in her true position, and proving thereby, that she is bound, by an act of duty, to maintain her altars *undefiled*—her communion *unpolluted*—as well before passive as active enemies. This will best be effected by setting forth, in a brief form, the grounds of her positive rejection and denunciation of all the leading *dogmas* and *superstitions* of *the Papal Church,* utterly incompatible with the word of God, and the liberal constitution of the Church of Christ! Let the following *thirteen* rejected rules, or articles of faith and obedience, retained in the Creed of the Church of *Rome,* stand as an example.—

1. Church of Rome. *The asserted universal feudal dominion, supremacy, and infallibility of the Pope,* under the decree and *oath* of Pope *Boniface* the Eighth—(unrepealed)—the *oath* and *creed* of *Pius* the Fourth—the confirmed

decrees of the fourth Council of Lateran, and the declared irrevocable articles of the Councils of Trent. The XXXVIIth Article of the Church of England affirms, that "*the King's Majesty alone hath the chief power in this realm of England, and other his dominions*,"—that such power does not extend to "*giving to our princes, the ministering either of God's Word or of the Sacraments*;" that to the King "*the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all causes doth appertain*;" that his Majesty "*is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction*;" and that "*the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England*." With regard to rights and ceremonies, that, "*every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies, or rights of the Church, ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying*," and "*that nothing be ordained contrary to God's Word*." (Vide Article XXXIV. Church of England.)

2. Church of Rome. *The declared equality and force of unwritten and unauthorized traditions, with the divinely inspired authority of Holy Writ, comprised in the Canon of the Council of Trent, IV. Session decree.* SCRIPTURE. "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to Salvation, so that whatever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to Salvation. (Art. VI. Church of England.)

3. Church of Rome. *The prohibition of the reading of the Scriptures by the laity or common people.* Compare *Homily the First*, Church of England, which contains an unanswerable exposition of the duty of all persons to read and learn the Scriptures, without reserve, but with becoming devotion and piety,—confirmed by daily practice and public reading from Scripture in all her services and Churches.

4. The recognised sale of *indulgences*, granting of *absolutions*, &c.

5. The worship of *images*.

6. The invocation of saints, relics, angels, and the adoration of the *Virgin Mary*, as co-equal with God and Christ.

7. The belief in *purgatory*, and the power of the Church, under its prayers, to release them therefrom. Compare the XXIInd Article of the Church of England, and the Homily against *Idolatry;* the latter of which, from its scriptural arguments, and historical analysis, contains a complete refutation and exposition of the irreligion of the last *four articles* of Romish faith and practice.

8. *The increase of the sacraments to seven.* Compare Article XXV. and Catechism of the Church of England, admitting only *two* Gospel sacraments to be essential to Salvation,—*Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.* The remaining five, *Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony*, and *Extreme Unction*, received as states of life; but not as Gospel sacraments ordained by God!

9. The unproved and superstitious doctrine of *transubstantiation.* (Compare Article XXVIII. of the Church of England.) "Transubstantiation, (or the change of the substance of bread and wine, in the Supper of the Lord,)

cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions."

10. Withholding the cup from the laity. (Compare Article XXX. Church of England.) "The cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay people: for both the parts of the Lord's sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment," (Matt. xxvi. 27; Mark xiv. 23; 1 Cor. xi. 26—28.) "ought to be administered to *all Christian men* alike."

11. The performance of public worship, in a language generally unknown to the laity, in most countries, and in England especially so. (Compare Article XXIV. Church of England.) "It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the primitive Church, to have public prayer in the Church, or to minister the Sacraments, in a tongue not understood by the people."

12. *Doctrine of human merit, and good works.* The Church of Rome teaches, that the good works of persons justified by faith in her doctrines, are truly meritorious, and render the performers worthy of *eternal life*, by denouncing, under her curse *(anathema)* all persons and creeds who entertain a contrary doctrine. 32 Canon. chap. xvi. session vi. Council of Trent. (Compare Article XI. Church of England, which teaches under the authority of Scripture, (Psalm cxliii. 2; Rom. iii. 24—26; Ephes. ii. 8, 9.) that "we are accounted righteous before God, only for the *merits* of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings."

13. The enforced celibacy of the Roman Catholic clergy,—directly contrary to the Word of God, it was decreed by the Council of Trent, that *the Clergy may not marry.* Session vi. Canon IX. (Article XXXII. Church of England. "Bishops, priests, and deacons, are not commanded by God's law, either to vow the state of single life, or to abstain from marriage; therefore it is lawful for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry, at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness.")

Thus, for the refutation of those, who do understand the marked distinction, between the doctrines repudiated by the Church of England, and retained by that of Rome, but, who interestedly mystify that knowledge, as well as for the benefit of others who are ignorant of the distinction, the Church of England is here placed in her true character, on all the essential points of her faith and practice; and the challenge of comparison for purity of doctrine, generosity, and *morality of principle,* given to her enemies out of her own Articles, and her own Homilies. True it is, she retains some few things, which happen to be retained by the Church of Rome; but it is equally true, that they were entertained by the *primitive fathers* of the Christian Church, by apos-

tles and Martyrs; and they are not enforced on her followers by any despotic authority, or *anathema,* although she uses them with her fasts and festivals, as preservatives of the *unity* of her faith, and memorials of her persecution!

The Church of England, standing on her own proper foundation, may indeed challenge comparison. Her system is the system of general freedom and Christian benevolence—of universal love to mankind; because it proceeds from Him, who is the Author of all good works! She liberally teaches, that man is not in any case responsible to his fellow-man, for his religious opinions, scruples, or conscientious practices; but that all are held responsible to God, —that *vengeance is his alone,* for any breach of faith, and seeks only protection against scandal and immorality, in the exercise of a positive duty. In direct contrast, stands the Church of Rome, equally opposed to civil liberty, as she is to spiritual freedom, in all her essential doctrines [1]. The Roman Catholic is bound to believe, (or he acts hypocritically,) that all and every one who refuses to receive the doctrines, ordained by the despotic human Council of *Trent* held in the sixteenth century, (1546,) and contained in a summary form in the Creed of Pope Pius IV, are *out of the pale of all salvation,* and must be *irretrievably damned to all eternity!* But, the Church of Rome goes even further. Under the unsupported usurped authority of another council, she decrees the judgment of excommunication and *death* to all who shall dispute such doctrine! Will any one of her champions pretend that she entertains this merely in theory, in the teeth of her recorded practices? Will any one assert for her, that she has given up her right—dispensed entirely, except from necessity, with her persecuting maxim, that "those whom she shall pronounce *heretics,* may and ought to be compelled by the secular power to renounce their opinions, or be punished for their obstinacy even unto *death?*" What says her own historian, *Du Pin,* on the decree of her fourth

[1] *Sharon Turner* merits the gratitude of his country, of the present generation of Englishmen, as he will of posterity, for his admirable historical exposure of the papal conspiracy against our own Queen Elizabeth. What George the Third said of Burke's book, with the alteration of a word, is applicable to this,—"It is a book which every English gentleman *(Protestant)* should read."

Council of Lateran[1]?. Although civil and religious liberty has progressed, and men become enlightened with freedom, generally, does not the Church of Rome, in opposition to public freedom and individual opinion, receive, retain, and affirm in faith, all the things received by her general councils? Away with sophistry and mystification of the truth, when acts and decrees, *unrepealed* by any subsequent council, or ordinance, remain—whilst up to the last, and present possessor of the papal chair, the *Acts* of the Council of *Lateran* are referred to as authorities—as precedents!

If any man doubts the existence of this temporal, as well as spiritual bondage of the Church of Rome, over the minds of men, wherever it can be exercised, let him consult the episcopal oath of *feudal allegiance* to the Pope—the Oath and Creed of Pius the IVth, the Liturgies and Devotions—the Missals—the Breviaries—the Pontificals—the Manuals or Rituals—the Councils, especially that of Trent—the *tridentine Catechism*—the pontifical Bulls and Breves—lists of *prohibited* books, and those for *expurgation*—the *Decretals*, containing the whole body of the pontifical or canon law, and, lastly, the *Hungarian Confessional*, consisting of *twenty-two articles*, the most *bitterly despotic*, that can be conceived, extracts from which are given in the accompanying Seventh Chapter, pp. 419. 421, &c. Let the reader analyze and compare any of them, with the Articles—the Homilies—the Liturgy of the calumniated Church of England, and then pronounce his verdict. As to the works put forth by Challoner[2], and other jesuitical apologists for Ro-

[1] The *third canon* of this council, anathematized and excommunicated all *heretics;* ordered them to be delivered over to the *secular power*,—directed sovereigns and states to exterminate them, and threatened excommunication if they refused; and granted the same indulgence to Catholics, who undertook to extirpate heretics, *vi et armis*, as to those who joined the crusades to the Holy Land. *Du Pin*, xi. p. 96.

[2] In 1683, one *Mr. John Gother*, who had been seduced to *apostatize* from the faith of the reformed Church, published a notable tract, entitled "*A Papist Misrepresented and Represented.*" The then recent transactions of the Church of Rome in France, and other countries, together with the cruelties consequent upon the revocation of the *Edict of Nantes*, in 1685, and the conduct of King *James the Second* in England, rendered popery so odious, by displaying it in its true light, that Mr. Gother's effusion became a *dead letter;* for the tales of the poor *Huguenots*, who took refuge in England, and elsewhere,

manism, purely to mislead the judgment, and please the imagination of the unwary, at the expense of truth, and even the *denial of faith*, it is only necessary, in refutation, to refer to Cramp's Text Book of Popery, (Dublin, 1827,) and for *practical* illustration to *Dr. Kenny's Facts and Documents*,—Note to Preface, (London, 1827. 8vo.) In the latter will be found, a revolting narration of the barbarous proceedings which drove 800,000 Protestants out of France. Will any apologist for the Church of Rome, deny the full sanction and the approval of her holy father, Pope *Innocent* the XIth, to that cruel persecution? Did he not send a *Brief* to Louis the XIVth, in which he assured him, that what he (Louis) had done against the heretics (Protestants,) would be "immortalised by the eulogies of the Catholic Church?" Did not the same Pope Innocent, on the 18th of March, 1689, deliver a discourse, in a *consistory of cardinals*, in which he declared that "the most Christian king's zeal and piety, did wonderfully appear in extirpating *heresy*, and in clearing his whole kingdom of it in a few short months?" Was not *Te Deum* celebrated on the 28th of April following, with great pomp, on account of it? Who further instigated the murder of the French Protestants at Thorn, in 1724, under the mockery of a trial,—the cruelties inflicted upon those of Saltzburg—upon the thousands of Albigenses and Vaudois? Did they, or did they not, fall victims to the "holy severity and the holy inflexibility" of the "misrepresented"—tolerant—liberal Church of Rome? As to Challoner's denial of idolatrous image-worship, and the adoration of the blessed Virgin, &c. it is in perfect keeping with the rest; and, if Englishmen are not to be deceived in *politics*, which are *non-essentials*, let them not, whilst studying in

belied Mr. Gother's assertions, and exposed both his folly and his wickedness. In the *nineteenth century*, it suited the popish objects of the late Dr. Challoner, to bring this unfortunate book to light, and to republish it with an introduction of his own, having, as he asserts, "owed to it the choice of catholic unity."—It is intended as an *introductory guide* to his "Garden of the Soul," or "Garden of the Lord," &c.—some *thirty* editions have already been published, chiefly for the purpose of free distribution, especially amongst young females.—The introduction very significantly commences with "the father of lies is the author of misrepresentation!" It is replete with sophistry and perverted texts, selected for the object, from *Scripture*, and affects to rank with the memorable *Apology* of Tertullian, (for pure Christianity,) addressed to the magistrates of the Roman empire!!!

the school of *knowledge*, be mystified with regard to religion, which is *essential*. In what position stands Dr. Challoner, and his "*Papist Misrepresented and Represented*," with that celebrated Romanist *Gerson*, who, not only admits, but justifies the practice of idolatrous saint-worship in his book *De direct. cor.* part iii.? "The Church," says *Gerson*, "hath changed many rites of the Gentiles, (primitive Christians,) not by the abolition of them," &c.—"but, *the worship of saints* seems to abound with superstition: as the offering of such a gift to such a saint,—*as the offering of a cock for boys, a hen for girls*,—the invoking one saint in preference to another, *for the cure of some particular disease*, &c. —the thinking that in one Church (*i. e.* place of worship,) more than another, the virtue of some one saint will be found more powerful and more prompt, &c.—They are (the superstitions) endured, because they cannot be eradicated; *and because the faith of the common people is regulated and preserved by the faith of their superiors.*"—Here is Gerson's testimony, and Dr. Challoner's representation directly at issue! O fie, Dr. Challoner, to misrepresent, and attempt to falsify this learned authority of your own Church! But let us see, standing between the two *(con amore)* how far *Gerson* merits the unholy stigma—the lie direct, thus gratuitously put upon him, by bringing forth Mr. Gother from his musty retreat, and giving him a new *surtout*, that he may appear plausibly captivating to the *liberales* of the nineteenth century. Well, outrageously insulting as it may appear to the "liberality and the knowledge of this age of scrutiny," as my Lord Brougham expresses it, it is a positive fact, that Mr. Gerson is a most vilely traduced and calumniated person, even whilst engaged in fighting the battles of the universal Church, and, notwithstanding the direct authority of his holy mother, his lordship's aid, *amicus curiæ*, and that of Mr. O'Connell, *ex officio*, may yet become necessary to his defence. But, to be serious; without entering into a lengthened inquiry into the worship of angels, the saints, relics, and the Virgin Mary, so barefacedly denied by the pious Challoner, the sanction and authority of the holy Father, Pius IV, comes forward, and dares any apostate son within the pale to question, or any *heretic* without, to dispute either the principle or the practice! Now, singular as it may appear to those who have read Challoner's book, every one, to whom the cure of souls is intrusted

in the Roman Catholic Church, is compelled to subscribe to the following articles of this Pope's creed.

" *Constanter teneo—similiter, et sanctos unà cum Christo regnantes, venerandos atque invocandos esse, eosque orationes Deo pro nobis offerre.*"

" I constantly hold, in like manner, that the *saints* reigning with Christ, are to be *worshipped and invoked,* and that they offer prayers for us to God."

Does the Church of Rome in Ireland, deny the intervention of the holy Father from the chair, or dispute and set at nought the *mandate,* the canons of the Council of Trent? If she does, where is the reversing decree, when, where, and by whose authority was it published? The long canon of the tolerant Council of Trent, at the close of whose sittings the good fathers, instead of a benediction of mercy, grace, or peace, shouted *Anathema! Anathema! Anathema!* against all who should disobey its decisions, contains the following.

" MANDAT *sancta Synodus omnibus Episcopis, et ceteris docendi munus curamque sustinentibus, ut juxta Catholicæ et Apostolicæ Ecclesiæ usum, sanctorumque patrum consensionem, et* SACRORUM CONSILIORUM DECRETA, *in primis de sanctorum intercessione, invocatione,* RELIQUIARUM *honore, et legitimo imaginum usu, fideles diligenter instruant, docentes eos, Sanctos, unà cum Christo regnantes, orationes suas pro hominibus Deo offerre; bonum atque utile esse suppliciter eos invocare,*" *&c.*—(Conc. Trid. Sess. xxv.)

" Command all bishops, and others, who have the charge or care of teaching, that, in conformity to the usage of the *Catholic and Apostolic Church,*" *&c.* * * * * " and by the concurrence of venerable fathers, as well as the *Decrees of Holy Councils,* they labour with due diligence and assiduity to instruct the faithful, *concerning the invocation and intercession of the saints, the honour due to relics, and the legitimate use of images,*—teaching them, that the saints, who reign as one with Christ, offer up their prayers to God for men,—*that it is good and useful to invoke them by supplication,* and to flee to them for help, prayer, and assistance," concluding in justifying the supplication, verbally and mentally, of the saints who reign in heaven! Let any impartial reader compare this single canon with Dr. Challoner's " Papist Misrepresented," and then judge for himself. But what becomes of *miraculous images,*

the common objects of adoration in foreign Catholic countries? Where is the crying saint of Ancona—the saint *Veronica* of Milan —our Lady of the *Pillar*, and our Lady of *Valvenera*, in Spain, &c.?

Of the first, that honest investigator of the romance of real life, Sir Walter Scott, has given us an interesting account, in his "Life of Napoleon," vol. iii. chap. viii. p. 276, detailing the consequences of the interview of Napoleon with the holy lady. Before this unexpected *rencontre* she perpetually shed tears; but Napoleon, by some miraculous *feint*, or intervention, without even supernatural agency, removed the cause, healed her woes, and replaced her saintship, *griefless*, in the Church of *Ancona! O impietas imperialis!*

Of the second, the saint Veronica, Dr. Middleton, in his "Letter from Rome," has given us a satisfactory account; but the original "Life of the Saint Veronica of Milan," certified by the heads of the university of *Coimbra*, in Portugal, *to have been* "*revised by angels and approved by God*," (subsequently translated by Dr. Geddes, and finished by Ozell, London, 8vo. 1716,) printed at Lisbon, 1671, and dedicated to the Princes of Portugal, is preserved in the *Archiepiscopal Library* at Lambeth. A translation of this work, or a republication of that by Ozell and Geddes, would be an excellent companion to Challoner's "Papist Misrepresented." The accounts given of her combats with the *devil*, as "the father of all lies, and the author of misrepresentation," —her journey to heaven, to be cured of the wounds inflicted by *Malatasca*, (the accursed evil spirit,)—her embassy from thence to the Pope (Alexander VI.) in 1494, with her holy attendant Thaddea, a nun, her *tear catcher*, (vide, page 10,) would make the adventures of the saint Veronica, a most interesting *appendage;* especially if detailing the result of her embassy to Rome, and private conferences with the holy pontiff!

With regard to the Lady of the Pillar, or of *Loretto*, her history, and that of the pilgrimages to her "holy shrine," are, or ought to be, known to every romantic novel reader, in the land; but with reference to the Lady of *Valvenera*, a little information may not be unacceptable to the general reader, as lightening the heaviness of the subject. In a sequestered valley, in one of those romantic mountainous tracts, or *sieras*, which abound in the peninsula, rises the monastery and church of Valvenera, the same, who,

according to the testimony of *Yepes*, "has preserved for ages a perpetual fire, in one of the conventual kitchens, burning with a bright and luxuriant flame, without the aid of *fuel*, of which fact the Queen Isabella, who made a pilgrimage to see and make splendid offerings to the saint, was also convinced;" and the same who, it is asserted, appeared to the sinner Munio, (a noted brigand robber,) and converted him by a miracle! At all events, whether the holy fire, like that of ancient Roman fame, still burns or not, the following inscription shines conspicuously over the altar of the Church, built on the spot where, it is said, the saint first appeared to the *bandit*, from an oak tree, to which he had been directed by a hermit, "in a heavenly form."—"*On the high altar of this Church is the image of Valvenera, powerful in miracles, and Lady of many virtues, the same which appeared to the sinner Munio, as a sign that she is the advocate of sinners; and all who devoutly visit this holy place, or commend themselves to her protection, shall be consoled by her grace, and obtain pardon of their sins!!!*" But, "Oh!" exclaims some jesuitical champion, armed, of course, with that deadly weapon, *an anathema*, "this is a vile invention of the author of 'The Lords and the People,' aided by 'the father of lies—the author of all misrepresentation;' and, if even true, it has reference to *Spain*, and not to *England* or *Ireland*, where true catholicism abhors such sad superstition!" How is the author to assist himself in such a dilemma! To parry the first mortal thrust, he must needs bring to his aid a *cavalier*, equally obnoxious to his faith, as his presumed new antagonist,—to the second, (astounding impudence) he calls on the holy Father himself, in the exercise of his authority, if needful, to defend him, and, asserting his apostolic right, to make his faithful Irish children remember, that they are not to deny unity in him, as Peter disgracefully denied his Lord,—that the Church is universal and immutable, and the unity of all her parts, Italian, Irish, or Spanish, indissoluble, for so speaks the canon law! "*Un ami en nécessité, un ami en vérité!*" And so far *Yepes* is a gallant knight of the pen, at all events. "The *image* of our Lady of Valvenera is well worthy of the worship paid to it, both on account of its astounding miracles, as well as the divine beauty it exhibits, raising the mind of the beholder to an extatic height of devotion,—should any female remain within the sacred bounds of Valvenera, for a

longer period than *nine days*, (the *novena* of the station) she would be instantly punished *with death by the offended idol*; and many examples of this remain on record to warn all future pilgrims!!!" Why this antipathy to females after the *ninth day* does not appear, excepting safety towards the holy friars is considered! Really the Society for Diffusion of "*Useful Knowledge*" should obtain, translate, and publish a few *legends* of this sort, to aid the progress of religious liberalism. In charity it must be inferred, that Dr. Challoner had neither read nor heard of the Councils of Lateran and Trent, the Oath and Creed of Pius IV. nor visited the Lady of Valvenera [1], (as the good Queen Isabella, and all her court had done,) when he republished Gother's jesuitry, and essayed to claim for himself, *sub deliramenta doctrinæ*, an alliance, offensive and defensive, with the renowned Presbyter of Carthage! An apology equally specious as his own, will be found for him, if not justified by the writings of the primitive father, amongst those of that order whose saving motto is "*ad majorem Dei gloriam*,"—or of the Knights Templars "*Tout pour L'Eglisse*." But the attempt to palliate popery—to make it appear liberal, by denying its essential attributes, and abjuring its authorities and *bulls* of reverence, has really been too bare-faced, too *immoral*, under the very nose of the *schoolmaster*, who has unlocked his knowledge box—displayed the lofty ravings of genius, and travelled abroad and at home, with his *talismanic wand*, forbidding *dust* of any kind to be thrown in the eyes of his followers!

As to a voluntary principle for the Church of Rome, it is a perfect farce—denial of matter of fact, authority, and perversion of the truth, for the mere purpose of promoting objects, which are contrary to the principles of this protestant State, must not now be tolerated, when the means of exposure are so powerful and so abundant. Whilst the deliberate sanction of that Church, under her *Eighteen General Councils*, and her uniform practice for ages, nay centuries, are before us. As regards the Creed and oath of

[1] After all, the Lady of Valvenera is nothing more nor less than a very handsome carved image in ivory of the Virgin Mary, said, by *tradition*, to have been found by Munio, a brigand chief, in an old oak tree, in the valley of Valvenera; but to which he had been directed by a hermit, or holy monk!

Pius IV. The admission of the late Dr. Doyle, *on oath*, before the Lords Commissioners, (1825,) shows that the full and perfect profession of Pius's Creed, and observance of the decrees of the Council of Trent, (a summary of the whole,) are *strictly obligatory upon the whole body of the Roman Catholic Church.* (Vide Bull, dated Nov. 13, 1564). The monument of spiritual despotism should therefore be thoroughly known by every British legislator. That Bull contains *eleven sections*—the first nine are introductory—the tenth is the Creed—the eleventh, the usual termination of such documents—even *military* and *medical* orders and degrees are included. By the third Constitution of Pius V. *supra gregem*, Mar. 8, 1566, Doctors in medicine are obliged, and held responsible, when they attend the sick, before all things to send for a Confessor, and to admonish the patients, on pain of the penalties involved; to confess, &c. The introductory clause especially provides, that "*All doctors, teachers, and heads of universities, shall strictly profess the Creed;*" and that failing in such profession every promotion or election *shall be null.* See the twelve *confessional articles*, and the Bull, *Magn. Cherubini Ludg.* 1665. The next article in importance is the *Episcopal Oath of obedience to the Pope*, temporal and spiritual—also the Decree of Boniface VIII. in the Statute Book or Canon Law. Perhaps the oath of Pius may be denied to be obligatory by the political Romanists, upon the principle that "Oaths contrary to the *interests* of the (Roman Catholic) Church are *null* in the making;" that is, when their *enforcement* might create prejudice[1]. But this oath, if observed,

[1] A most interesting account is given in *Harris's Hibernica*, vol. i. p. 78, of the mode by which the Roman Catholic Bishops, Priests, and Laity, endeavoured to evade the oath of allegiance consequent upon the suppression of the rebellion in Ireland, at the accession of Henry VII. The doctrine of the Papal Church, sanctioned by the Council of Trent, under the authority of a curse against all who deny it, is that of the *intention* of the officiating Priest being necessary for insuring *the validity of a religious rite.* It was deemed necessary in the case referred to, as a security, to have the parties sworn on the holy sacrament *or consecrated wafer;* this they endeavoured to evade, by trickery with their Priests; but Edgecombe being aware of the intended deception, insisted on the ceremony being performed by his own chaplain. Father Walsh has since made the honourable admission, that "the abjuration of transubstantiation was imposed by the legislature, simply on account of its being the *only security* against mental equivocation and reservation." Recent occurrences

sets at nought all other oaths, as that of the Eleventh Article goes to retain and maintain inviolate all the articles of the Eighteen General Councils. And thus, as Bellarmin has expressed it, (*in decretis morum,*) even "*if the Pope should decide virtue to be vice, and vice virtue, the Church must believe him,*"—what a tenure of security for Protestants, under an equal participation in legislation!

The Bulls of the Popes, under this asserted infallibility, must necessarily form part of the received faith and obedience of the universal Church. The Bull *Unigenitus* is fully acknowledged in Ireland as binding, and it is diametrically opposed, in the most important points, to the views of the Protestant Church on the subject of Scripture. This deserves the most serious consideration, on the part of the House of Peers, as the legislative guardians of the latter. It is also important to know, how far the declaration of the Pope's authority for altering and reversing *Scripture*, contained in the German or Hungarian Confessional (xi. and xxi. Articles) is admitted or received in Ireland; for this forms a vital point, with reference even to the *moral instruction of the people*, and the efforts of the Romish Priests to extend Proselytism to their Creed. This precaution becomes eminently necessary, in the face of the proposed measures of education, and application of the Church property; for, whilst they in no way tend to increase the influence and authority of the Crown, they directly tend to set up a power in the State, which, depriving the King of his Christian guardianship, may be used in opposition to the Crown itself, and in subversion of the liberties of the people. Thus, instead of rendering the Crown popular and influential, as it ought to be, and as the advocates of these innovating schemes pretend, the King will tacitly be led to take the Crown from his own head, and place it on that of the *Pope*, by giving to his delegates the privilege of exercising their uncontrolled influence over the minds of *seven millions of his (the King's) subjects!* This power, rising in the State, is far more to be dreaded than the imaginary *despotism*, the *clap-trap* put forth by the noble leader of the liberals; and may indeed produce the very anarchy preferred, and even

show the justice of his admission, but speak little for the discernment of Protestants!—*Sed Experientia docet!*

render an *appeal to arms* necessary, to prevent the monarchy becoming swamped in actual spiritual despotism—the alternative to be avoided. If Scriptural instruction is not protected by the Crown and the Parliament, the principles of Popery and Proselytism thereto, will increase fourfold; it will be impossible to prevent it.

The eleventh and twenty-first articles of the Confessional Creed, in use on the Continent for proselytes, speaks in terms at once plainly intelligible; and, if not in exact words, the same principle is followed in Ireland.

"We confess that the Pope at Rome has the power to alter the Holy Scriptures, and to add and diminish as he pleases."

"We confess that the Holy Scriptures are imperfect, and a dead letter, without the explanation of the Pope at Rome, and his permission to read them."

It is, therefore, self-evident, that the measures propounded, by curtailing the means of Scripture instruction, *if carried into a law*, will directly aid this very fundamental principle of Popery, as opposed to Protestantism, in the State. How can the principle of any Bill founded upon them be reconciled to the principles of the British Constitution, even admitting the expediency of parliamentary intervention? Whilst the Church of Rome renders subscription and obedience to the Creed of Pius IV. and the Constitution of Pius V. imperative on all her public teachers and heads of colleges—whilst she requires conformity thereto *in the form of an oath*—why is the Protestant University of Oxford vituperated for maintaining an adhesion to the *Thirty-nine Articles* of the Church of England? Is there to be no check, no counterpoise, to the increasing growth of *Catholicism* and free principles in the State, retained for the Protestant Church, whilst the other interests have become perfectly unshackled, with reference to ordinary state privileges? The recent decision of the University on this important point shows the well-grounded alarm which a great body of honourable and learned men, lay and ecclesiastical, justly entertain for the institutions of the land; and which must be viewed by rational persons in its proper precautionary light, and not as an act of hostility to the opinions or feelings of the present generation, of which those who formed so overwhelming a majo-

rity [1] are a component part, and whose deliberate judgment has been the result of conviction, in *foro conscientiæ*.

The tacit assenting faith of the Romish Church in Ireland to the bulls and decrees of the Pope, renders them valid and obligatory, as admitted by Dr. Higgins himself (p. 274), and that, "in consequence of the infallibility of the dispersed Church." They are also obligatory on all parts of the Church, unless regularly annulled or *suspended*, as was the case with the bull of *anathema* issued by Pius V. against Queen Elizabeth, and afterwards renewed by Gregory XIII. for Ireland, absolving the subjects from their allegiance. Hence the recent bull of Leo XII. calling on the faithful everywhere to exterminate "heresies and heretical doctrines," is binding against the Protestants of Ireland; and as to *unity, teaching, doctrine*, and the duty of encouraging *proselytism* to the "*Universal Mother Church*," it is only needful to peruse the *Encyclical Letter* of the present Pope (Gregory XVI.), dated Aug. 15, 1832, in the Laity's Directory for the year 1833, addressed to "all patriarchs, primates, bishops, &c." Under the declared principle of unity and obedience to the decrees of the Pontiff, *ex cathedrâ*, is the following:—

"To humble, therefore, the audacity of those who would infringe upon the rights of Our Holy See, or who would destroy its junction with the Churches, to which those Churches owe their support and their vigour, inculcate in them to regard the most zealous fidelity, and the most sincere veneration, proclaiming, with St. Cyprian, 'that he falsely imagines himself to be in the Church, who deserts the chair of Peter, upon which the Church is founded.' * * * Let all remember, that the principles of sound doctrine, with which the people are to be imbued, must emanate from, and that *the rule and administration of the universal Church belongs to the Roman Pontiff*, to whom was '*delivered the full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the universal Church by Christ our Lord*,' as the Fathers of the Council of Florence have unequivocally declared."

[1] On a proposition made for dispensing with subscription to the *Thirty-nine Articles*, by scholars, on entry, the University of Oxford, in full convocation, on the 20th May instant, decided against the proposed change of rule, the numbers being *placets* 57, *non placets* 469, majority 412, or 8 to 1!

* * * "It would moreover be a crime, and entirely at variance with that deep veneration with which the *laws of the Church should be received*, to censure, in the wild spirit of criticism, discipline sanctioned by her, whether as regards *the administration of things sacred, the rules of morality*, the rights of the Church, or of her ministers, or to cavil at it, *as clashing with the principles of natural law, or to pronounce it lame and imperfect, and subject to the civil tribunal.*" * * * "That the dispensing with the Canons hath been committed to the Roman Pontiff only; and not in any private body or individual, but in him only, resides the power of making decrees touching the ordinances of the Fathers; and also, as St. Gelasius writes, 'to balance the decrees of the Canons, and to determine the precepts of their predecessors, so as to direct, after careful consideration, *what relaxations the circumstances of the times require for the good of particular Churches.*" * * * "Having confidence in your piety, to you we commit the defence of a law of so much moment, against which the darts of the lascivious are directed from every quarter. Preserve the building entire; *and, in its protection and defence, neglect none of those resources which the sacred Canons have in reserve for you.*"

A mere schoolboy must perceive, on perusing these extracted sentences, that although the tone may be somewhat moderated, neither has the Church of Rome, nor her fully acknowledged *supreme head*, surrendered one *iota* of their dominant authority, whether for spiritual or temporal obedience. What, then, must not be the consequences which will result to the Monarchy and the Constitution of this country, if any Bill is permitted to pass into a law, which will necessarily limit the authority of the Crown of England, in the direction of the Irish Protestant Church?—Here is the supreme authority of the Pope, *ex cathedrâ*, recently promulgated (without any reservation with regard to Ireland), and the constitutional authority of the King of England, already at issue, *even on the question of moral discipline for his subjects*; and yet it is proposed, in the teeth of this pontifical manifesto, to lessen the integrity of the Protestant Church, and to place her, for the purposes of alleged *moral instruction*, below par in the scale, with a Church which pays obedience to a foreign power—a Church, which upholds a faith, and maintains, to the last, a love of despotic canon law, directly hostile, nay, opposed to every principle on

which the Constitution of England is founded! By the fundamental rules of the English Constitution, the administrative power is placed in the hands of the Crown. By this very Encyclical Letter, the executive and legislative power, for the whole Roman Catholic Church, and population of Ireland, are declared to be centered in the *Pope*, and to be enforced, through the Catholic bishops and clergy; and yet the Protestant bishops and clergy, the immediate members of the King's Charge in a Protestant state, are called upon to succumb, to fall prostrate before a power so tyrannous;—are to have the means of extending their faith curtailed, whilst that of their avowed enemy is to be fostered and preserved. This is to be the result of that vast, that boundless patronage, from the self-styled liberal Administration, which it is the object of their supporters to obtain, in the proposed measures, for the Irish Protestant Church; but, to preserve the integrity of the British Crown—to keep the people free, tyranny must be resisted in every form; and more especially in this nefarious effort of the united Roman Catholic interest in Ireland, and the liberal Whig interest in England, to destroy the balance of the Constitution. There is no danger in the mere cry, "the Church is in danger,"—the hazard exists in her being *actually placed in danger*; and with the desecration of her rights and privileges, the Monarchy and the Constitution of England become alike endangered; and although much is due to that Constitution for the liberty we possess, a vast deal is also due to the Protestant Church Militant for its promotion of social harmony, individual piety, private benevolence, and public charity,—for its moral obedience, and submission to legal rule in the State, and support of order—principles which may indeed be looked for in vain, in its opposite, generally speaking, in the Sister Kingdom!

It is entirely preposterous to imagine that any system of even moral education can be made to harmonize with the principles of the Church of Rome, which does not directly fall in with those principles. If any proof were wanting of the justness of this assertion, let it be drawn from the fact, that the following books have recently been added to the *Index Prohibitorum*, by the present Pope (Gregory XVI.), *and the reading of which is consequently prohibited to the whole Catholic world.* Laland's Astronomy; Botta's History of Italy, in continuation of *Guicciardini*; Europe

in the Middle Ages, translated from the English by Hallam; the Constitutional History of England, from Henry VII, to the death of George IV; and Dr. Burgess's Lectures; with others! How is it possible for the *Schoolmaster*, or his champions, to get over this? Do they mean to set at nought the mandate of the Holy Father in Ireland? Hence the plan of education proposed by Mr. Wyse, the member for Waterford, though it may appear patriotically benevolent in *theory*, and designed to please all parties, cannot possibly please any; for each religious sect feels an imperative duty incumbent upon it, to obtain proselytes to its own creed,—it is vain, therefore, to talk of establishing a system of general national education, *without proselytism*, which shall be approved by the Protestant—the Catholic and the Presbyterian interests in Ireland. The Church of Rome has ever been, and ever will be, the most proselytising Church upon earth,—for this cause she has undertaken all those dreadful enormities, which have rendered her name terrible, and her history execrable; and for this cause, is she at this moment arrayed in open political hostility to the Protestant Church in Ireland; whilst in England, by passive, but not less effectual means, she is daily extending her missions. The Church of England is therefore bound, acting on the defensive, indefatigably to progress on the same principle, even if it were not her sacred duty, by command of her Divine Founder, to "preach and to teach the Gospel," and to obtain converts thereto!

As it is impossible to change the propensities of mankind, by an act of parliament, or to control effectually the prejudices of religion, arising from different views of faith and obligation, and which are the strongest of all human prejudices, as the duties they give rise to, are contradictory and contentious amongst parties in a free state, Mr. Wyse is by no means felicitous in his judgment of human nature; and, with evidently philanthropic intentions, his aim at maintaining an impartial bearing between the discordant elements, has misled him,—thus, the honourable member propounds a scheme, which is morally impracticable for Ireland. The Church of Rome has her *positive veto* [1], against any

[1] It is only necessary to refer to the *Bullarium Magnum*, and the *Index Expurgatorius*, to satisfy any impartial mind, that popery cannot possibly be assimilated with any general system of *liberal* education; and although many

such system, independently of which it could only be effectually conducted under an absolute government; or by restrictions

of the most despotic Bulls on this subject are withheld, even from Roman Catholic Compilations, they are, nevertheless, deposited in the archives of the Holy Pontiff. The encyclical letter of the present Pope, Gregory XVI, already quoted, and which is immediately accessible, (Vide "*Laity's Directory*, 1833.") is a perfect declaration of war—a denunciatory manifesto against the entire popular system of instruction propounded and defended by Mr. O'Connell and his political colleague (*ex cathedrâ,*) at the city of London Tavern, and elsewhere; and although the doctrine there put forth on general education, treats the papal decree as mere *bruta fulmina*, the authority of *the representation of St. Peter* will be looked up to, when the political *ipse dixit* of Mr. O'Connell, and the political philosophy of a noble and learned authority, or that of his schoolmaster, will be treated with contempt, by "*the faithful*," although they may serve the movement, the passing purposes of *expediency*, condemned by the Sovereign of the two swords. Passing over the *fifth* paragraph of this encyclical letter, (which deserves the attention of Lord John Russell, and his colleagues,) let the following be put in juxta-position with the general principle of popular teaching, recommended to the notice of the modern Whigs, and of which they are pleased to approve. "*For hence arise these revolutions in the minds of men; hence this aggravated corruption of youth; hence this contempt among the people of sacred things, and of the most holy institutions and laws; hence, in one word,* THAT PEST OF ALL OTHERS MOST TO BE DREADED IN A STATE, UNBRIDLED LIBERTY OF OPINION, LICENTIOUSNESS OF SPEECH, AND A LUST OF NOVELTY, *which, according to the experience of all ages, portend the downfall of the most powerful and flourishing empires.* HITHER TENDS THAT WORST AND NEVER SUFFICIENTLY TO BE EXECRATED AND DETESTED LIBERTY OF THE PRESS, FOR THE DIFFUSION OF ALL MANNER OF WRITINGS, WHICH SOME SO LOUDLY CONTEND FOR, AND SO ACTIVELY PROMOTE. *We shudder, venerable brethren, at the sight of the monstrous doctrines, or rather* PORTENTOUS ERRORS, *which crowd upon Us, in the shape of numberless* VOLUMES *and* PAMPHLETS, *some in smaller size; but* BIG WITH EVILS, *which stalk forth in every direction, breathing a malediction which* We *deplore over the face of the earth. Yet there are not wanting, alas! those who carry their effrontery so far, as to persist in maintaining, that this* AMALGAMATION OF ERRORS *is sufficiently resisted, if,* IN THIS INUNDATION OF BAD BOOKS, *a volume now and then issues from the press in favour of religion and of truth. But is it not a crime, then, never sufficiently to be reprobated, to commit deliberate and greater evil, merely with the hope of seeing some good arise out of it?* OR, IS THAT MAN IN HIS SENSES, WHO ENTRUSTS POISON TO EVERY HAND, EXPOSES IT AT EVERY MART, SUFFERS IT TO BE CARRIED ABOUT ON ALL OCCASIONS, AYE, AND TO BECOME A NECESSARY INGREDIENT OF EVERY CUP, BECAUSE AN ANTIDOTE MAY BE AFTERWARDS PROCURED WHICH CHANCE MAY RENDER EFFECTIVE?" What system of popular moral instruc-

which would be incompatible with free government. If all contending sects were to be admitted, on the broad principles of *national right*, to interfere in this intervenient system of public instruction, without religion, there would soon be an end to all rules and all orders—for no rules could possibly be drawn or defined, by the legislature, which would not be broken through. The most safe and equitable system of public or national instruction, is that practically observed in Holland, where the government provides for the education of its Protestant subjects, *primarily*; but liberally aids all others in promoting moral teaching. And in Holland we hear of no contentions on this head, because the government pays strict respect to the established principles of the State! But, forsooth, the system recently set up in France, where, to use a homely phrase, religion is made "to play second fiddle," is to be foisted into the plan, thrust on the neck of Protestant England, merely because some two or three aerial philosophers, labouring under that paroxysm, which results from deep learning—a species of *delirium tremens*—have decreed, in their febrile imagination, that it must be in England, as it is in France, a glorious sea of uncertainty, alike destitute of religious protection, as it is of moral security! Mr. Wyse stands exonerated from any intention to do violence to any party, he has merely caught a portion of the *Gallo-mania*, brought here by others! Without desiring to offend the French nation, it may not be amiss to turn the keen satire of their countryman, M. de Voltaire, applied to themselves, against the follies of our own.—"*Une nation frivole, qui rit follement; mais, qui croît rire gaiement, de tout ce qui n'est pas dans ses mœurs, ou plutôt dans ses modes!*" M. de Voltaire à Monsieur du Marsais, Oct. 12, 1775.

To those who have the power of serving Ireland effectually, by

tion, acceptable to the *Romish hierarchy*, will my Lords, the Russell Whigs and their commissioners propound, which shall meet the objections of his Holiness, (addressed to the universal Church throughout Christendom,) for Ireland? Here is the whole authority of Rome, ancient and modern, permanent, repeated, and present, arrayed against them! *Mus in pice*, my lords and gentlemen,—verily you have got into the spiritual pitch-tub; get out unscathed if you can! Whilst you proclaim general popular instruction, and *reading knowledge*, the head of the Catholic Church decrees the consignment of every thing, which his spiritual members may deem obnoxious thereto, to the flames!—*Read—read—read!*

their abilities or their influence in the Senate, or their local authority and property, and will suffer "the clouds of prejudice to be removed from their eyes," arising from a difference in religious opinion, the written judgment of the late Dr. Adam Clarke, as an erudite Christian and a philanthropist, recorded by a member of his family[1], is worthy of the deepest consideration; and, coming as it does from a native, who felt a lively interest for his unfortunate countrymen—a Christian sympathy for their mental degradation, and moral wrongs, is divested of the rancour of party spirit, and the ambition of selfishness. Dr. Clarke's views, statistical, moral, and religious, contain a splendid *expose* of the superstition, the jealousy, and wickedness of that entire system, which is the grand cause of Irish misery and disloyalty to the Protestant State. His estimate of the Irish population, and its wants, after one of his tours of inspection to his schools, ought to be read by every man, who is engaged or interested in the question of Irish education, before he forms his judgment (Vide (1,) No. 35, Vol. III.) on its condition. With regard to amelioration. Secondly, "The Irish," says he, "on the other hand, are capable of much improvement,—they have a quick apprehension —it is an easy task to instruct them in any thing. In short, you have but to *emancipate them from their superstitions*, and to cultivate the *minds* of the Irish, and they are as noble, as intellectual, and as fine a race of beings, as are in the world; while, at the same time, they are as capable of practising the moral and social duties, as any people are under the sun."—Vol. III. pp. 64—66. Let the English legislator, unacquainted with Ireland, turn to the following, in Vol. II. p. 161.—In 1808, he "was employed to make general searches through all the records of the nation relative to the *Licentia Regis*, necessary for the currency of *Papal Bulls*, especially such as affected the *King's prerogative*, or the privileges or safety of the nation. This was a laborious search; but the fruits of it produce mass of evidence relative to the continual exertions of the *Papal See*, to *seize on all the power, secular as well as ecclesiastical, of the British empire, and to make the Parliament its tool, and the King its deputy ! ! !*" But, to be appretiated correctly, the work itself must be referred to, especially

[1] See an Account of the Religious and Literary Life of Adam Clarke, LL.D. By a Member of his Family. 3 vols. 8vo. London. 1833.

the third volume, which details the origin, foundation, and effects of the Irish schools and missions. Were any refutation necessary, of the unjust and groundless nature of the charge of an alliance with popish superstition brought against the Wesleyan Protestants, as a body, by a noble author, these reminiscences of Dr. Clarke abundantly contain it; whilst they add further honours to the memory of that primitive Christian, in character and disposition, from whom he first imbibed the principles of his faith. It is due to the memory of Wesley, to perpetuate his own sentiments, on the superstitions—the *idolatry of popery*—especially so, after the opinions expressed of his doctrine, in so noted a work as "The Memoirs of the History of Europe," Vol. III. p. 58, by Lord John Russell. In the memorable passage referred to, the noble historian is pleased to present the following attempt at witty sarcasm.

"The Wesleyans *multiply miracles* beyond the regular and limited practice of the Romish Church. If a Methodist preacher wants a dinner, a suit of clothes, or a few pence to pay a turnpike, he puts up a prayer [1], and his wants are miraculously supplied,—thus, between *perjury* and *fanaticism*, sober and genuine Christianity is utterly lost." At page 579, of the same volume, his lordship further says—"Another defect of Methodism is, that, by the confession of Wesley himself, it borders closely on doctrines destructive of all morality."

The most striking ignorance of the true principles of *Methodism* is here manifested; for the Methodists are more attached to the

[1] The noble author, assuredly, must have entirely lost sight of the Lord's Prayer, and of the practice of Christ himself, and his express commands to his disciples, when he volunteered this indirect burlesque on practical religion in general; and, although possibly overstrained in some individual instances, by parties not blessed with his lordship's talent for moderation, or discretion, the practice of praying, so severely censured, cannot possibly partake of *perjury*; and, as to *fanaticism*, it is, at all events, the fanaticism of a faith taught by Jesus Christ, which injures no man, and *breaks through no law;* and has nothing in common with that fanaticism of the *brand and the stake*, which taught men they were doing God a service, by condemning their fellow mortals by wholesale to *cruel deaths*, for opinions of conscience.—Talk not of *liberality* after this,—the comparison is odious, as it is unjust: no apology can extenuate a deliberately inflicted injury to that correct profession of faith which the New Testament every where enjoins, whether for Churchmen or Dissenter—a reliance on the bounty of God!

views of *Arminius*, who held the necessity of observing moral obedience to obtain salvation, than to those of *Calvin*, who maintained the doctrine of original saving grace, and *election;* and are thus far greater sticklers for *practical morality*, and the exercise of good works, (but not their sole justification, like the Romanists,) as essential to that state of saving grace, or approbation,—adopting Christ's definition of godliness, "*By their fruits shall ye know them,*" than are many of the sects of *Calvinists*, who, believing in such doctrine of election, and saving grace alone, imagine and maintain that man cannot be lost by a fall from the duties of moral obligation, although he may incur God's chastening displeasure thereby! It was this view of Scripture, carried to an extreme point, by some eminent divines of the Church of England, under the assumed authority of one of her Articles, (XI, vide p. 512,) and a desire to extend his practical usefulness beyond that contracted sphere in which he might be compelled to move, by remaining therein, that alone occasioned Mr. Wesley's secession from the Church of England[1]:—he left her in no spirit of rancorous hostility, as his public addresses from the pulpit, and declaration to more than one member of her communion, sufficiently attest. And it was his friendly cherished feeling for her general doctrine, and state utility, more than his principles, which drew down upon him the ire of Whitfield, Toplady, and others! But let Wesley himself answer the allegation of *immoral doctrine*, for his followers, and they will not need the noble lord's promised *Apology*, made to the electors of South

[1] The Rev. J. Wesley was originally designed for the medical profession: he partly studied, and took a preliminary degree therein, and wrote more than once on medical subjects. The author's father, a rigid Protestant, had the Rev. gentleman's own declaration on this point of doctrine, and reasons for nonconformity, and which, in early life, during his (the Author's) studies, frequently occasioned a warm discussion with his sire, who was disposed to approve the correctness of Mr. Wesley's views, generally, after his personal explanation of the necessity for enforcing moral obligation, in conformity with Christ's teaching, even in matters connected with *worldly rule;* whilst the Author, at this period, was inclined to entertain the opinions of *Calvin*, to an extent, not even recognized by the Church of England; and the *error* of which, subsequent reading, deep reflection, and consideration of Scripture, as a whole, have rendered manifest. The views of *Calvin* and *Arminius* should be *balanced*—the extremes of *either*, not well understood, are dangerous!

Devon, for the second edition of his work of historical misrepresentation. The following letter appears in John Wesley's Journal, dated "27th August, 1739," the authenticity of which can very easily be established.

"Sir,

"I return you thanks, both for the favour of your letter, and for your recommending my father's proposals to the Sorbonne.

"I have neither time nor inclination for controversy with any; but least of all with the *Romanists*. And that both because *I cannot trust any of their quotations, without consulting every sentence they quote in the originals;* and because the originals themselves can very hardly be trusted, in any of the points controverted between them and us. I am no stranger to their *skill in mending those authors, who did not at first speak home to their purpose;* as also in *purging* them of those passages which contradicted their *emendations*. And, as they have not wanted opportunity to do this, so doubtless they have carefully used it, with regard to a point that so nearly concerned them as the *supremacy of the Bishop of Rome*. I am not, therefore, surprised, if the works of St Cyprian (as they are called) do strenuously maintain it: but I am that they *have not been better connected;* for they still contain passages which absolutely *overthrow* it. What gross negligence was it not to leave his 74th Epistle (to Pompeianus) out of the *Index Expurgatorius*, wherein Pope Cyprian so flatly charges Pope Stephen *with pride and obstinacy, and with being a defender of the cause of the heretics, and that against Christians, and the very Church of God!* He that can reconcile that, with his believing Stephen *the infallible head of the Church, may reconcile the Gospel with the Koran!*

"Yet I can by no means approve the scurrility and contempt with which the Romanists have often been treated. I dare not rail at nor despise any man; much less those who profess to believe in the same Master. But I pity them much; having the same assurance that Jesus is the Christ; and that no Romanist can *expect to be saved, according to the terms of his covenant*. For thus saith our Lord,—'WHOSOEVER SHALL BREAK ONE OF THE LEAST OF THESE COMMANDMENTS, AND SHALL TEACH MEN SO, HE SHALL BE CALLED THE LEAST IN THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN,'

—AND, '*if* ANY MAN SHALL ADD UNTO THESE THINGS, GOD SHALL ADD UNTO HIM THE PLAGUES THAT ARE WRITTEN IN THIS BOOK.' But all Romanists, as such, do both. Ergo—

"The minor I prove, not from Protestant authors, nor even from particular writers of their own communion; but from *the public authentic Records of the Church of Rome.* Such are the *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent;* and the edition I use was printed at Colen, and approved by authority."

"And, first, all Romanists, *as such,* do break, and teach men to break, one (and not the least) of those commandments; the words of which, concerning images, are these,—'THOU SHALT NOT BOW DOWN THYSELF TO THEM, NOR SERVE THEM[1].'—Now שָׁחָה (as every smatterer in Hebrew knows,) is *incurvare se*[2], *procumbere, honoris exhibendi causa,* and is accordingly rendered by the Seventy, in this very place (by a Greek word of the very same import, προσκυνεῖν). But the Council of Trent, (and consequently all Romanists, as such, all who allow the authority of that council,) teaches, session 25, paragraph 2, that it is [3] *legimus* imaginum,—*eis honorem exhibere,* procumbendo coram eis!

"Secondly, all Romanists, as such, do *add to those things, which are written in the book of life.* For in the Bull of *Pius* IV, subjoined to those *canons and decrees,* I find all the additions following:—

"1. Seven sacraments.
"2. Transubstantiation.
"3. Communion in one kind only.
"4. Purgatory, and praying for the dead therein.
"5. Praying to saints.

[1] *The whole sentence,* involving this portion of the *second* commandment, is given by Mr. Wesley in the original Hebrew text characters, but introduced here in *Roman capitals* for the sake of *perspicuity,* in a point of so much general importance.

[2] *Literally, to bow down oneself before any thing in token of submission, or homage.*—Vide etymology of *incurvo, incurvare,* "to bow, bend, or crook," &c.

[3] "The proper use of *images* is to *honour them,* by bowing down (or falling prostrate) before them." The word *procumbendo* is sufficiently expressive (vide Latin etymology); and yet, in the teeth of this express article of the Council of Trent, Challoner, in his "*Papist* Misrepresented," impiously *denies* this recognised worship of images in the devotional service of the Church of Rome.

" 6. Veneration of *reliques*.
" 7. Worship of images.
" 8. Indulgences.
" 9. The priority and universality of the Roman Church.
" 10. The supremacy of the *Bishop of Rome*[1].
" All these things, therefore, do the Romanists add to those, which are written in the book of life!

" I am, ——— ."

A more complete answer to the gratuitous calumny offered to the principles of the Wesleyans, in " The Memoirs of the History of Europe," cannot possibly be given, than is here presented; whilst the doctrines of that *infallible* Church, the uncompromising foe of the Church of England, are exposed in a style of original simplicity, yet masterly force of reasoning,—are pourtrayed in their true colours, for the contemplation of the Protestant members of the "*reformed*" House of Commons, once called " The first Assembly of Gentlemen in the world!" In fine, in the beautifully emphatic words of Nangle—" Christianity, or Protestantism, is not inseparably connected with any external forms or visible systems,—Popery is." With that external system, which is designated by the " Church of Rome," popery stands or falls. " *De qua agitur*," says Bellarmine, writing of papal supremacy,—" *cum de Primatu Pontificis agitur? Brevissime dicam de summa rei Christianæ, id enim quæritur, debeatne Ecclesia diutius consistere, an vero dissolvi et considere*[2]." Protestantism claims exemption from such *vital connexion* with any peculiar form of Church government. The bird that wings its way across the ocean, may rest the sole of its foot on the ships which float upon the surface, but its existence is not inseparably connected

[1] It will be observed, that in neither instance, in this letter, does Mr. Wesley mention the head of the papal Church, in any other terms, than as the " Bishop of Rome.". In his Journal he also uses abbreviations for the words *the*, *them*, *that*, *Christians*, &c. (" y^e y^m y^t X^tians X^t," &c.) here given *in words at length*, for facility of reading. The authenticity of the *original* in the Journal of Mr. Wesley, was certified by a Clergyman of the Church of England, the Rev. C. D. I. of *Winton* (Winchester), to the writer of the Protestant Journal, (a personal friend of the author of this work,) May 20, 1833.

[2] Vide Bellarmin, præfæt. in libros de Rom. Pontiff, sufficiently declarative. —*Author*.

with their safety,—if any of them sink, it flies to another—or, borne up by the strength of its *pinions*, pursues its flight without such assistance. 'Tis thus *Protestantism*, on wings of faith, pursues her course across life's troubled sea, to the land of everlasting rest. She may find refreshment in communion with a *visible Church*, but her security does not depend entirely on its existence,—she lives in the power of life, derived from Christ, and therefore, no casualty which may befal earthly systems can destroy her. But it is not so with Popery; she, like the vermin that infest a ship, must sink or swim with the crazy hulk of that visible system in which she has incased herself. Still, it is somewhat anomalous, that Popery, which is declining in its spiritual power and moral influence, in all foreign states, even at the very *footstep* of St. Peter's chair, is rapidly rising in importance in Protestant Britain, under the protection of free institutions. This is the result of an organized system concocted in the councils of the *Vatican*[1], partly in consequence of the progress of opinions in the very heart of Italy, repugnant to the despotic authority of the Romish creed and laws; and so particularly denounced, in a tone of alarm for the safety of the universal Church itself, in the encyclical letter of Pope Gregory, of August, 1832.

A reference to this document, or papal decree, will be sufficient to satisfy any impartial mind, that the entire *Corpus Juris Cano-*

[1] The joy and exultation of the late Pope, Leo XII. and the Cardinals, on the prospect of the passing of the Roman Catholic Emancipation Bill, consequent upon the expected accession of the late Mr. Canning to office, who had pledged himself to that measure, was unbounded—the usual precaution of *close secrecy* was thrown overboard, and the present Pontiff (then Cardinal Gregory) related, under that exultation, the expressed command of the Pope, delivered in a conclave held on the occasion—"*Write, write, immediately to all my faithful children, urging them to exert themselves—to spare no means nor pains to get this object accomplished*, WHICH WILL PLACE THE KEY OF ENGLAND IN OUR HANDS." This fact, re-stated to a living witness, by a Romish priest, to whom Cardinal Gregory had stated it, with equal fervour of expectation, was communicated to the late Duke of York, shortly afterwards. The *funds* for founding Roman Catholic colleges, &c. in England, are not all obtained in this country. A *new Jesuits' College* is to be built in Leicestershire, the land, as stated by the *Leicester Journal*, 226 acres, at Charnwood Forest, already purchased by the Rev. Mr. Hulme, a popish priest of Loughboro',—whilst another large establishment rises at St. Leonard's, Hastings! This should open the eyes of Protestants. *Verb. sap.*

nicæ of the Romish Church, is held to be in full force and effect, and that, to surrender the right of instruction on the principle of numbers (*i. e.* the assumed majority) into the hands of the Romish priesthood in Ireland, which is the design indirectly contemplated, will be virtually, in effect, to surrender, in the words of Leo XII. "the key of England" into the hands of the Roman Pontiff, Nor can the Romish hierarchy permit the unfettered progress of any system of moral instruction, which shall be likely prospectively to interfere with the restrictions and rules of faith held by their Church, and which, in their exclusiveness, are binding on all doctors, teachers, heads of universities, and of monastic institutions, of *military* and *medical* orders, and by an Anglican provision, on all reconciled converts! The Roman Catholic bishops, under the confirmed authority of the canons, by the present Pope, will be bound to extend that power, and not to curtail it. The existing suspension of its exercise, is the suspension arising from *necessity:* remove the restrictions of Protestant instruction, and the Romish priest, in all those districts where the Catholics constitute the *majority,* will have a clear field for the propagation of his creed. In fact, under the propounded scheme, more than half the present legally constituted Protestant parishes in Ireland would be rendered, *de facto, Roman Catholic,* the retention of a Protestant character, *de nomine,* a mere illusion! The State, ostensibly, can only uphold one form of religious worship—the Protestant, or the Roman Catholic; if the former, it is bound to take care, that no system of projected purely philosophical instruction, (for such it must be, divested of religion,) shall be made the engine for establishing the ascendancy of the *See of Rome,* to the prejudice of the king's authority, in the Irish portion of the king's dominions,—nor be rendered the auxiliary step for obtaining a *momentum* of papal influence, in the councils of future British sovereigns, similar to that practised with Louis the Fourteenth of France. It is the duty of Protestant counsellors to legislate for posterity—for statesmen to abjure that contracted selfish doctrine, which proclaims the unchristian principle,—"let posterity legislate for itself." In what condition would be the English Protestants of the nineteenth century, but for the uncompromising conservative virtue of our progenitors of the seven-

teenth? The State may legislate for, nay, is bound to protect his Majesty's Roman Catholic and Presbyterian subjects of Ireland, in the free exercise of their religious rites and civil privileges; but it is also bound, in the strict exercise of *moral duty*, to maintain the integrity and the independence of its *Parliament*, and obedience to the restrictions imposed thereby,—that *an oath taken for a state purpose of security, shall be construed and observed in the full sense and intention of the power imposing it*, and not by any partial or ambiguous construction which may be put upon it, *by individuals taking it!* Such legislation and protection cannot, constitutionally, be conducted upon the principle of vitiating the *recognised* instructive powers, assigned to the Protestant Church, as part and parcel of her office, even in an indirect form; and which must be the inevitable result of permitting the *traditionary doctrines, and despotic principles, of the Council of Trent*, to be read and promulgated instructively, without restriction, by the Romish priesthood, and (without any correcting influence) under the authority of that council, strengthened by the express direction of the *living spiritual head* of the Roman Catholic Church, "*pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia*," with the pure Gospel of Christ!

Corporation reform, in England and Wales, and the Irish Tithe Reduction Bill, with the moral instruction car appended, to balance the philosophic balloon of Hibernian hope, are, it seems, to constitute the only two *grand acts* of the *Whig drama*, for the fourth sessional division of the reformed Parliament. It requires little penetration to discover, that the first is designed as a grand thrust (*à la pas de charge,*) against the towering popularity of the ex-minister, at the procrastination, or probable sacrifice, of more vital questions of State, and even popular emergency; and for the *avowed* purpose of retaining exclusive possession of the *official* field of battle! Whether this comes of the advice of our *privy counsellor*, le Gérant de la Gazette de France, or not, is uncertain; for it is possible, that, by leaving the Protestant Church *unreformed*, and consequently *unpopular*, it may be hoped, by the popish party, to lead the way to a *republican sweep*, as the grand stepping-stone to *pure Catholicism!* Le grand dénoûement de cette pièce d'intrigue de cabinet libéral approche! Ah! Messieurs!

C'est une affaire de considération, et de moment, de trouver la solution de cette difficulté, que vous avez pris sur votre juridiction—les décisions qui règlent la discipline et le gouvernement ecclésiastique. Mais, les décisions des Conseils de Cabinet, ne sont pas toutes également obligatoires, sans la délibération du bien publique, dans une affaire jugée importante à la religion de notre père, pour les biens de l'Eglise, *et la conservation des droits de l'état!* Nous maintiendrons notre foi!

If the Protestant succession to the throne is to be maintained in this kingdom, it is the duty of its legitimate guardians of the popular estate, *being Protestant*, to provide firmly against the increasing influence of papal doctrines, which are unchanged, and unchangeable: neither bigotry nor intolerance are essential to the due fulfilment of *a positive state duty*, which the Church of Rome would assert, without any feeling of reserve or delicacy, under similar circumstances. An upright zeal for the cause of truth, and becoming fidelity to established principles, are equally remote from persecution and injustice. The rising youth of Britain, many of whom, by force of education, property, and station, will be progressively called to take a prominent part in the public business of the State, should never lose sight of the dark policy of the Church and Court of Rome, connected with the persecution of the reformed Christian religion in France, which led the way to that great moral scourge of Europe, the Revolution of 1789. Therein was the full vengeance of an offended God, declared in the conclusion of the *second commandment*, abundantly made manifest to an unrighteous and factious generation,—the sin of *infidelity* succeeding the sin of *superstition*, and creating the materials for its own just punishment, at the edge of the sword!

The influence of Le Père la Chaise, the confessor of Louis XIV. instigated by the court of Rome, and the arts of Madame de Maintenon, occasioned that barbarous crusade against liberty and religion, unequalled in any civilized age. Under the pretext of destroying treasonable plots in 1679, the decree against those who had *relapsed* into the reformed religion—"*toutes les sectes réformées*," was enforced with unpitying severity,—the *Rélaps*, as those sects, or individuals, were denominated, who had embraced *Protestantism*, were condemned "*à la peine du bannissement, celle de l'amende honorable*[1], *et de la confiscation des biens*,"—and this

in an age of letters! In 1681, children of *seven years of age* were permitted to choose their religion—their business—or their further studies, the authority, natural, legal, and moral, of their parents ceasing! *Lettres de cachets* were issued, for the purpose of separating children from their parents, that they might be instructed by strangers in the religion of the Church of Rome! In 1685, the revocation of the *edict of Nantes* crowned the work of despotic fury—cruelty succeeded cruelty, and even the sanctity of the dying bed was invaded, for the purpose of extorting recantation and obedience; whilst many who had, in effect, under terror and for the sake of their families, renounced *Protestantism*, still persevered, in the last extremity, in their refusal to take the sacrament, in the sense ordained by the Romish Church! Did such constancy *to the death*, invoke pity—disarm bigotry—obtain mercy—or open the eyes of their talented persecutors? What did it produce[2]? "*Ceux qui dans une maladie refusèrent les sacremens, seront après leur mort trainés sur la claie, et leurs biens confisqués; et s'ils guérissent, ils seront condamnés à faire amende honorable, les hommes aux galéres perpétuelles, les femmes à être renfermées, et leurs biens également confisqués.*" This savage decree was executed to the letter, at the instigation of the king's confessor[3],—"*Plus*

[1] "*L'Amende honorable*," under this proceeding, was a public apology and confession of *error*, accompanied with a *pecuniary fine*, at the discretion of the judges,—in fact, a virtual recantation. The offending parties were held guilty of a *criminal offence*, and, as such, were visited with a *special penalty*, not the satisfaction of an ordinary apology. *Une sorte de peine infamante ordonnée par les juges, et qui consiste à reconnoître publiquement le crime, et à en demander pardon, avec une peine pécuniaire, imposée par la justice, pour satisfaction et réparation de faute!* The distinction is material to be attended to.—*Author.*

[2] "Those who, under sickness, refuse to receive the *sacrament*, shall, after their death, *be drawn on a hurdle*, (that is, have their bodies publicly exposed, as a mark of ignominy,) and have their goods confiscated,—and if they recover they shall be condemned to make *penal satisfaction*, (*amende honorable,*) the men to *the galleys for life*,—the women *to close imprisonment* ("*Ren fermées*," securely locked up)—and have their goods confiscated and distributed.—This is given as literal as possible.—"*Egalement*," under the old French law,—"*Distribution préalable qui se fait avant partage entre des enfans héritiers, de leur père ou mère.*"

[3] "Frequently were the priests seen, accompanied by the judges and officers, carrying the *sacrament*, or *host*, in their hands, to be administered to the

d' une fois on vit des prêtres le viatique en main, accompagnés des juges et de ses huissiers se rendre chez les mourans." Thus, indeed, was "*La sainte sévérité, et la sainte inflexibilité,*" declared by *Bossuet*, to be "indispensable to the faith of the Catholic Church," literally made manifest: neither were the remonstrances of *Fenelon*, the talented and more tolerant Archbishop of Cambray, of any avail,—he became the object of alarm, jealousy, and banishment! By this iniquity, to satisfy the rapacity of the Jesuits, the views of *Le Père la Chaise*, *Le Père Letellier*, and *Le Cardinal de Noailles*, as well as the unsaintly intrigues of *Madame de Maintenon*, were *two millions* of useful Protestant French subjects, driven from their native soil, to seek asylums in a foreign land[1]; nor did this vile persecution cease till the latter part of the reign of Louis XV, which has been so well described by M. Saint Foix, in his "*Essais Historiques*[2]."—"*Je suis entré dans beaucoup de détails sur la proscription des Protestans; elle a plus influé qu'on ne pense sur la revolution de* 1789, *et la plûpart des loix rendues à ce sujet depuis le* 15 *Septembre*, 1685, *ont un rapport direct avec le code anarchique de* 1793!" The age of persecution in France, was succeeded by that of irreligion and false philosophy; nor has the Roman Catholic religion there, become *reformed* in its principles, under the various changes which have taken place, since 1789,—dormant in its spirit, and lax in its moral conduct, it, nevertheless, slumbers in the mantle of superstition, as of yore, appended to a system its very opposite; but to which it yields under the force of necessity—the pressure of adverse circumstances; and still infusing into the minds of those

dying."—Literally going in procession to the abodes of the sick, and those *in articulo mortis!*

[1] A truly romantic, yet faithful narrative of these proceedings, and of the destruction of the monastery of Port Royal, on a liberal foundation, is given in the 4th edition of Jamieson's History of France, vide note 13. pp. 486—491.

[2] *Saint Foix.* "I have entered very minutely into the details on the *proscription* of the Protestants—it had more influence than one would imagine in producing the Revolution of 1789,—and the greater part of the laws passed on this subject, since the 15th September, 1685, have a direct connexion with the code of anarchy of 1793." This learned man's work is invaluable. The author of "The Lords and the People" purposes giving an English translation of those parts which refer to these important events, when leisure will admit.—Vide *Letters of Napoleon*, chap. iv. p. 144.

who hold the *reins of power*, the choicest sentiments of despotism. These things considered, under a feeling of rational philosophy, such as that which *Bacon* or *Descartes* would have asserted, had they been living in the present day, should make us pause ere we entirely dissever the influence of Christianity existing in the State, from any new system of education, which may be propounded.

It must be admitted, that where Roman Catholic subjects make part of a population, subject to the rule of a Protestant government, the vigilance and arts employed by the dependents on the Church of Rome, to keep the eyes of their followers closed against the light of Gospel Scripture, have less chance of being permanent, than where, as in some foreign countries, the whole power of the State is used to prevent an inquiry into the grounds of its religious faith, connected with despotic purposes; but, if the means of contact with Protestants, even in small numbers, are to be cut off in Ireland, and the missionary field left open to the Romish priesthood, for want of an adequate provision for a Protestant instruction, there will be an end of the balance of power, between the two religions; and the Bible will become as effectually proscribed, in that portion of the kingdom, which, under its connexion and act of union with England, *is virtually Protestant*, as it is in the absolute Catholic dominion of the Emperor of Austria! And, singular as it may appear, although the schoolmaster has been *abroad* for some time, there exists, at this moment, in the whole of the internal provinces of Austria, an extent of bigotry, superstition, and ignorance, amongst priesthood and people, almost incredulous to any but an eye-witness, in the present age of intelligence; and scarcely paralleled in any other part of Europe, save the almost exclusively Roman Catholic districts of Ireland. The cool temperament of the Germans, absence of conflicting opinions, and the absolute vigilance of a purely military government, preserve order, submission, and obedience; but *liberty*, mental and moral, under this refined catholic system, is a ghostly spectre indeed! The philosophizing genius of "useful knowledge,"—that intractable giant-spirit of the nineteenth century, instead of disturbing the concord of the social elements at home, might here find ample occupation for the exercise of a versatile taste, were it not that the dread of a more

potent ferula might cool its ardour, and arrest its progress. In Austria, at all events, popery "apes not the gown hypocrite," as Shakespeare expresses it; whilst in Belgium, in France, and in Ireland, it assumes, for purposes politic, a *mantle* [1] which does not belong to it.

In every State, where the religious liberties of Protestants are not unjustly encroached upon, or improperly restrained by authority, religious, and ultimately civil, liberty will be proportionately increased. In illustration of the truth of this position, it is only necessary to refer to the present condition of the conquered and ceded territories, belonging to the King of Prussia, which, so nearly approximating to the catholic kingdoms of Germany, present a gratifying contrast, for the contemplation of the scholar and the philanthropist. Whence arises this great distinction?—The answer is simple, yet conclusive—the King of Prussia is a Protestant; and whilst he freely tolerates the Catholic religion, he maintains the ascendency and the integrity of the Protestant faith, and its schools of instruction, throughout his dominions; nor has the Prussian government once permitted the immense addition of whole Roman Catholic provinces, which were made to it by the general treaty of peace of 1815, to interfere in its internal policy on this head. Here are no contests about the religious distinctions of Protestants and Catholics, because the government maintains a becoming balance between them. Is a practical theorem sought for?—it is easily furnished. When (in 1742) Silesia was conquered by Prussia, *nine-tenths* of the population of the former were Roman Catholics; and, astounding as it may appear, the immense *majority* of the Silesians are now, within *two generations*, or ninety-three years, Protestants! Has this been effected by violence, or by moral philosophical teaching? nay,

[1] The original famous Bull of persecution of Pope *Innocent* the VIIIth, against the Waldenses, 1487, was deposited in the public library at Cambridge, and *surreptitiously carried away from thence*, a little more than half a century back,—it is not given in any papal collection, (not even in the Bullar. Mag. of Luxembourg;) but may be seen, printed at length, in Morland's and Leger's Histories, and is well worthy of perusal. The Bull and *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* of Pius V, is also excluded from general observation; but its authority is duly acknowledged.—Vide Encyclical Letter of Gregory XVI, 1832.

rather by rational unrestrained and well maintained freedom of intercourse, combined with the full exercise of a Protestant ministration,—the result has been gradually produced by the force of conviction, gently and imperceptibly through natural causes, without the aid of violent apostolic zeal, nor sustained by any other prop than the firm protective interference of the government, which has not permitted the spiritual domination of the Romish priests, whilst, under the original treaties, with regard to Silesia, many of the Churches were used by both sects on the same day, alternately! In some parishes the Churches have been finally settled upon the Catholics, whilst in others, once entirely peopled by them, the inhabitants are exclusively Protestant. But what has been the *main spring* to this increase of Protestantism in Prussian Silesia,—*the free protected circulation of the Holy Scriptures, combined with instruction to read and to understand them.* Is Prussia less moral—less happy—less prosperous, or are the *Silesians* impoverished and dissatisfied, under the change? If any sceptical advocate for purely moral instruction, wishes to satisfy himself on these points, let him visit the beautiful country at the foot of the Giant Mountains—the linen manufactories of Hirchbirg and Schmiedeberg, and their schools, and he will find the practical solution of a problem, infinitely superior to all the fancied advantages arising from that aerial philosophy, based on theory and politics, which pervade the halls of learning in Paris, —systems which suit the views of the aspirant to political agitation or demorgorgon importance; but which have nothing in common with the happiness or the moral worth of an industrious community of husbandmen or mechanics; and, last of all, of an Irish population. Purely useful knowledge is that which teaches man his duty to God and to his neighbour,—*to know himself,* as Solon taught the Greeks,—to learn the means of obtaining a useful and honourable existence in the society of his fellow man. It is contrary to the nature of things, for all men to be rendered poets, statesmen, philosophers, or politicians,—the history of the world—of human nature, in its totality, condemns the hypothesis as an impracticable fallacy.

The system of Universal Instruction taught by M. Jacotot[1], in his Louvain School, may possibly, for purposes of mental embel-

[1] Vide Fraser's Magazine, June, 1835. pp. 680, 682, &c.

lishment, be adapted to the quick capacity of the French character, and its well-known quality of retentive memory; but Monsieur Jacotot, like all great theorists, with vivid imagination, is an enthusiast, and perfectly unacquainted with the varied mental phenomena and physical construction of man, as the position he sets forth in his "*Langue Maternelle*," fully shows,—namely, (Preface, p. 8,) that "*all men have equal intelligence;*" that "*intelligence is equal among all men,—it is the common property of the human race.*" P. 35. This view of the general mental capacity of man, or rather his universal faculty of perception, and intuitive power, is combatted in Chap. III, (illustrative of the "theory of equality and representative rights,") and in pages 84 to 91, Chap. IV. of the annexed work, with what success the reader must determine.

The King of Prussia stands prominently forward, as an exception to the despotic feeling generally evinced by the continental sovereigns. To his Prussian Majesty and family [1], the whole Protestant Church owes a weighty debt of gratitude; and not merely for the paternal solicitude exercised towards it, by the king in his own dominions; but by the force of his example throughout Germany, where the benign light of the Reformation first dawned on the dark surface of besotted superstition, and burst asunder the bonds of mental tyranny. In his own country his activity and zeal for its liberal conservation are beyond all praise; nor is he the less respected by those large masses of Roman Catholic subjects, which, without any stipulation or treaty for preserving religious distinction, have passed from the temporal dominion of the papal power, on account of his active attachment to, and support of the reformed religion. And here the Church of Rome has indeed lost truly magnificent territories. The whole surface of the European continent hardly presents a region more abundant in all the needful productions of nature, than do the ex-

[1] The Princess Royal of Prussia, by birth a Roman Catholic Princess of Bavaria, as well as the consort of his Prussian Majesty, having both embraced the Protestant faith, it produced a powerful impression on the minds of the Catholics, generally, enhanced by their kind attention to the Protestant schools of instruction. The Prince Royal himself possesses all the mental endowments, blended with unaffected piety, and the elegancies and charities of private life, which ensure the continuance of kindred attachment to the sacred cause of Protestantism in the succession to the throne.

tensive districts which bound the course of the Rhine and the Moselle, the scene of some of the finest encampments of Napoleon, and the nursery of his first armies. Here are rich and splendid cities, whilst a numerous and contented population occupies the whole district, comprising the lengthened valley of the Salzach, in the Bishopric of Salzburg; and yet the archiepiscopal electorates of Cologn, Mentz, and Treves, together with other episcopal principalities, convents, &c. have been suppressed, and the revenues of the chapters alienated; whilst English and Scotch Missionaries preach the Gospel, unmolested, in the thickly populated cities and romantic valleys of this part of Germany. The early victories of Buonaparte, the Confederation of the Rhine, and the annexation of the kingdom of Westphalia, to that league, comprising an immense tract of territory, with a divided Protestant and Catholic population, gave the first fatal blow to the papal power, in this portion of the *ci-devant* dominions of the Emperor of Austria, who, upon the first peace, resigned the title of Emperor of Germany therewith; but the existing contrast in the moral condition of the population, under the subsequent distribution, and the government of Prussia, offers us a severe moral reproach, for our ages of misgovernment towards Ireland, when the bounty of God, and the hand of nature, have done so much for the benefit of its inhabitants. We have seen what the conservative policy of the king and government of Prussia have effected for his newly acquired Catholic possessions, within half the period of a generation,—it remains to be shown, whether the declared *compromising* policy of the liberal Whig Cabinet of England, will sustain the honour of the king's crown, by producing obedience to the laws; and, at the same time, fulfil the important duty of reforming and extending the utility of the Protestant Church, as a legitimate counterpoise to the Emancipation Bill of 1829, and the Reform Franchise of 1832,—or whether, in effect, it will give *the balance to the papal power*, and thus virtually *repeal the act of legislative union*, by destroying the proper *Protestant connexion of Ireland with the English monarchy!*

It is now sufficiently manifest, that the entire abrogation, rather than the restoration, or extension, of the *ancient* privileges of cities and boroughs, is to be the leading feature of the new meditated corporation enfranchisement. The truth of this can be

sufficiently proved by reference to *Coke* and *Selden*. Under the ancient constitution of English boroughs, they had both a *judicial* and *legislative* principle, existing within themselves. In the boroughs, the community of burgesses, or *petit barons*, in proportion to their tenures, exercised the self same prerogatives and powers, within the boroughs, that the earl or baron did in the *earldom* or *barony;* and with the concurrence of the *suitors* exercised, not only a judicial, but also a legislative power; but in this miscalled *reform*, there are no *corporate judicial offices* provided within the borough system, which gentlemen of fortune, or even men of fair independence, can fill with real personal honour, or real public benefit;—*i. e.* the local advantage of their fellow-citizens, for the *coup de grace* is to be given to that conjoint judicial and legislative authority, which heretofore existed in a mayor, aldermen, and court of common council in cities; whilst both in them and the new boroughs, instead of a common council and ward electors, composed of *real property holders*, and responsible trustees, the man of no property will be placed on a par in privilege with the *bona fide* holder,—in fact, with an *annual* rotation of change, no suitable qualification is by Lord John Russell's bill necessary to render the enfranchised parties eligible to important offices of trust,—verily this is carrying democracy beyond its utmost limits[1]! Even an important portion of *Magna Charta*

[1] The first catastrophe of the mighty *municipal reform scheme*, is developed, and, eclipsing its *precursor*, it displays, on a more enlarged scale, the *wise* design of sustaining, *in futuro*, a limited monarchy, on the equivocal basis of a local republican institution, possessing all the external forms of an extensive democratic arrangement; but alike divested of sound legal securities, and those nobler attributes of social independent rule, which marked the ancient municipal system of the expanding British constitution, in all the fundamentals of its construction and moral worth. It aims directly at the constitution of a power hostile to the independence of the *Crown* on the one hand, and to the just privileges of all Corporate Bodies on the other,—*the concentration of an unnatural and irresponsible power of creative appointment of all the higher offices of legal trust and patronage in the hands of the Minister of the Crown, or the government for the time being;* whilst the proposed *materiel* of the new borough, or municipal constituency, neither harmonizes with the former, nor existing principle of government in our State Institutions. This measure, instead of maintaining the rights of property, or extending the corporate privileges of individuals, on a scale commensurate with the just increase of possessions, and the constitutional power they should always embrace, proposes at

itself, must necessarily be *repealed* by this bill, because it contains an absolute departure from the stipulated conditions and provisions of that charter, in the *novel principle* proposed to be set up.* But the whole of the mischief does not rest here; *the recognised securities of the crown itself, must be placed in positive jeopardy, if extensive modifications are not made, even with regard to the principle of the measure,* which carries on its front the marks of most ill-judged haste in its concoction.

The etymology of the word burgher and burgess, gives a plain indication, that the word *baron,* in its original signification, was applied to *burgesses,* or *property men;* for *War* and *Bar,* whence the word baron is derived, were the same word sounded and spelt

once to create an elective constituency, or *franchise*, opposed in extent, principle, and operation, to the declared final franchise constituency of the Reform Bill of 1832. And thus, if carried into a law, as it stands, to produce uniformity of action and power, must speedily drag the latter to its own extent, or become the certain spring of conflicting interests, and the destruction of that balancing power in the state, which is essential to the safety of the kingly authority. It presents the anomalous qualities of being a compound of despotism on the one hand, and republicanism on the other. Shorn of their virtual independence, the corporate boroughs, under the proposed bill, will rule in *form*, whilst the government, (but not the balanced power of King, Lords, and Commons,) will rule in reality; for neither, does the bill propose to give to the reformed Corporations, legally or constructively, the needful representative principle of sovereign power, in connexion with the head of the state; and which, under the *original* municipal government, rendered it every where a *type*, moral and real, of that independent rule of law, or *supremo jure imperare summæ potestati præesse*, which distinguished the governing principle of the English nation, above all the governments in the world.—In fine, this bill, which is designed as *a charter of uniformity*, has nothing whatever uniform in its composition,—its principle is bad, (without being expansive,) and the principle being bad, the *details* must be equally defective. The judicial powers of all existing corporate bodies, lay and ecclesiastical, and *manorial interests*, are still represented in the *Peers*, the ancient inheritors; and let their lordships well and truly consider the certain, and not remote, operation of a bill, which has not any of the qualities of a measure of *reconstruction*, even on *a liberal scale;* but embraces an entire series of new principles and combinations, based on a theory of speculative philosophy, seeking power and *popularity;* but progressively subversive of the grand design of constitutional rule, as exemplified in Chap. V. and VI. of the accompanying work, relating to the monarchy of England! Vide pp. 276 to 281.—284. 287. 319. 446. 475 to 480. Chap. VI. and pp. 251 to 274, et seq. Chap. V.

differently, and in the Saxon tongue *burgh-war* signified the martial men of the boroughs, whence by corruption of the terms were rendered *burghers* and *burgesses;* and from the first men of trust and substance; and thus, in the plural, rendered by the Saxons, in the Latin, *barones*, or men of might. In proof of this, after the Conqueror's time, the burgesses in several cities and towns were expressly styled *barons*. One writ of William's is directed to the "*Portgreve* or *Burgesses of London*," afterwards another to the "*Mayor and Barons of the city of London.*" (Vide *Argument Antinor*, p. 74.) Thus, in one instance denoted by their *Saxon*, and in the other by their *Norman*, appellation. In another of William's writs *(Argument Antinor*, pp. 82, 83.) the Burgesses of Carlisle are so styled (barones),—in *Domesday* the Burghers of London and Warwick are called barons, and *amerced* as such in their *lands*. (Pleadings in the *quo Warranto*, 2, 3. 8, 9.) There were also the Barons of *Corfe Castle* (burgesses); but by *tenure of their lands*, in a letter to their representative Hobart, (afterwards chief justice,) so styled themselves. (Willis's Act. Parl. vol. ii. p. 499.) There were also the *Barons of the Cinque Ports*, (commoners,) who held by *grand sergeanty*, and whose representatives retain that appellation to this day; thus the Lord Mayor of London is, as such, the king's *cup bearer* at the coronation, and the Barons of the Cinque Ports always support the *canopy* at that solemnity. Therefore, were burgesses, or barons, in the ancient acceptation, men of trust and some substance; for if the importance of a *coronation* is properly understood, their services will be found equal in dignity to the most honourable, as it proves their ancient connexion with the personal representation and support of sovereign power. This is a death-blow to the principles of the Whig Bill of *equalization*, if the government mean to set it up as an enlargement, or a restoration, of the early system of municipal privilege adapted to modern usages, so abundantly illustrated in the elaborate writings of Dr. Brady, on the early Constitution of English Boroughs. The boroughs, it has been proved, held these judicial rights and legislative powers within themselves, that is, *election of their own legal functionaries;* they were vested with this right in the time of the Saxons, and it has been abundantly shown in the accompanying work, they had the same powers under William the First, and his successors.—The plan proposed

is, therefore, a positive departure from the ancient principle and practice. In many boroughs, by their gradual decline from *wealth*, these powers have become lost, and even their remembrance is obliterated; but in others the principle and even practice is fully retained, as in the city of London itself, more strikingly remarkable in having preserved its immunities during many ages, rather than in having any peculiar to itself. The privileges of the city of London were always sustained as a *royalty* within itself; for so late as the time of *Henry the Fourth*, such was the legal power of the mayor, that he peremptorily refused the passage of the king's troops through the city, (vol. i. Collect. Hist. of England, p. 421.) and to this day the *sword* and *mace*, the two greatest emblems of *legal authority*, are carried before the lord mayor.

The municipal laws are called *bye laws*, from two old Saxon words, *by* and *lagen*, which signifies borough laws; neither does it appear, in the times treated of, that the assent of any but the burgesses, or *barons*, was requisite to give them obligatory effect. From this ancient legislative power in boroughs, possessed by the holders of property, or manorial estates, &c. we find the explanation of diversity of privilege so fully detailed by Lord Coke, and showing wherein a borough might prescribe for customs which a town could not; for those customs were originally only so many different rules of acting prescribed by the legislature of the different boroughs, which being disused are yet said to bind by *prescription*, (excepting so far as altered by the Reform Bill,) even as many things first established by the legislature of the realm, are now said to bind by common law, (vide *Spelman's Codex Leg.* and *Camden's Britan. Willis's Act. Parliam.)* which is agreed to differ from customs only, in the extent of ground wherein they retain the force of law; thus, if it bind them through the whole kingdom, it is called *common law;* if in a borough, or manor, it is called *custom:* now towns being parcel of a manor, which is one royalty, cannot prescribe for *customs*, because the orders made at the manor court, bind not only the town, but the whole manor; for, in all cases, by the rule of common law, the prescription must be as extensive as the custom: whereas, boroughs being a distinct or entire liberty, as the law now stands, may prescribe for customs within the extent of their own territories, excepting so far as they stand affected by the arrangements under the Reform Bill

of 1832. And with regard to judicial offices, or *corporate magistrates for life*, we may collect the fact, that the making of a judge for life, as in the two original courts of common law, is nothing more than restoring the principle of the ancient English borough constitution, and shows the grounds on which the judges yet sit, by virtue of their office, in parliament, and which once were of more consequence than they are now; and that, consistently with *Magna Charta, they amerced Peers.* This principle agrees with the universally received opinion of our most judicious, legal, and constitutional authors, who universally agree, that the citizens and burgesses, *as privileged barons*, sat in Parliament long before any knights of the shire were chosen, and that they represented the *royalties* within their jurisdiction; and under such constitution both houses originally sat together. (Vide *Atkins's Rights of the Commons*, pp. 24. 26. and 35.) Here at once is shown the reason why the Parliaments were the supreme courts of judicature, and why *writs of error* did, and still do lie to *Parliament*; and although the members of the House of Lords are now the sole judges; yet is the *error* of corporate or borough legislation supposed still to be redressed in Parliament, as of old; for the ancient Parliament consisted of earls who presided in the county court, barons who did the same in the court barons, and the representative barons or burgesses were the parties judged. (Vide *Crompton's Jurisdict.* 17 Hen. II. 12 Rich. II. and 28. Ed. III. 2. Inst. 26.) What system can be more equitable or natural, for a free people, than that the errors of one or more *responsible judges*, shall be redressed or corrected by an assembly of the chief judges in every district of vested interests? Hence the origin of the Privy Council, the Courts of King's Bench and Exchequer, &c. and their present constitution[1]. O ye modern state philosophers, in entering upon *politics*, an abstruse science, you have forgotten its true end, that of *securing* the happiness and *property* of the whole community, upon a *valid* foundation!

[1] Vide Madox's History of the Exchequer, Brady's History, Tyrrell's History, Hales's Hist. of the Law, Selden's Titles of Honour, Petyt's Rights of the Commons, Coke's Cases, Prynn's Plea for the House of Peers, and Nicholson's History. For information on the Scotch boroughs—Dalrymple's Collection of Scotch History, Craig's Works, Mackenzie's Institutes of the Laws of Scotland. See also Sergeant Merewether's History of the Boroughs, recently published.

N.B.—For corroboration of the principles asserted, and the opinions expressed in this work, as well as for the further illustration of the doctrines and policy of the Church of Rome, any of the following works may be consulted with advantage by the reader; and most of which are immediately accessible.

Hallam's Constitutional History of England, especially for the Middle Ages.

Mendham's Literary Policy of the Church of Rome. London. Duncan. 1830. 1 vol. 8vo.

" Corpus librorum symbolicorum, qui in Ecclesia Reformatorum auctoritatem publicam obtinuerunt; novam collectionem instituit, dissertationem historicam et literaram subjunxit, et indices adjecit, Jo. Chron. Guil. Augusti. 8vo. Eberfeldi. 1827." This work is invaluable for its expositions; the collection contains sixteen different Catechisms, or Confessions of Faith; the Helvetic, French, English, Scotch, Belgic, Hungarian, Polish, Bohemian, &c.

Browning's History of the Huguenots. London. 1829.

Clarke's Succession of Sacred Literature. London. 1830. Contains a Chronological Arrangement of Authors and their Works, to 1445.

Cramp's Text Book of Popery. Dublin. 1831.

Dr. Phelan's History of the Policy of the Church of Rome in Ireland, from the Introduction of the English Dynasty to the Great Rebellion. London. Cadell. 1827. Contains a full illustration of the causes which led to the increase of the papal domination in Ireland, and its moral results to the general population of that portion of the British empire.

O'Donnoughue's History of the Church and Court of Rome. 2 vols. 8vo. Dublin. 1831. Contains copious Chronological Tables, and detailed notices of the *eighteen General Councils;* also a succinct History of the three grand *Epochs* of the Romish Church—its rise, transcendance, and declension; notices of the Crusades, Institution of the Jesuits, the Court of the Inquisition, &c. &c.

The Difficulties of Romanism, by G. S. Faber, B.D. London. 8vo. 1830. Rivingtons. A work of superior intellectual research, and sound information with regard to evidence.

Soames's History of the Reformation of the Church of England. 4 vols. 8vo. London. 1826. Rivingtons. This work is chiefly founded on the documentary evidence furnished by *Burnet* and *Strype*.

M'Gavin's History of the Reformation in Scotland. Glasgow. 1831. A truly important work, showing the perfect independence of the Episcopal Church of Scotland of the See of Rome to the latter end of the fifth century.

Gilly's Waldensian Researches. 8vo. London. 1831. Rivingtons. One of the most interesting records of faithful Protestantism, and an able *exposé* of the artifices of the Jesuits, *Gretser* and others; especially valuable at this time, on the eve of the foundation of an extensive Jesuits' College in the centre of the kingdom.

Bishop Gibson's Preservative. Curry and Co. Dublin. A new edition of this standard work, with considerable additions, has been published by Mr. Curry, Upper Sackville Street.

Latimer's Sermons, by Dr. Watkins. London. 1824. Duncan.

Archdeacon Cotton's Publications, expository of the *Doctrines* of the Romish Church.

The Writings of *John Jewel,* Bishop of Salisbury, obit. 1571. London. (Religious Tract Society. 1831.)

Archbishop Cranmer's Works. Clarendon Press, Oxford.

The Marchmont Papers, edited by the Right Hon. Sir Geo. H. Rose, Bart. An original and elegant history of public affairs in Britain; from the death of Charles the Second to the accession of George the Third. 3 vols. Murray.

Edgar's Variations of Popery. London. 1831. Key and Cochrane; and Curry and Co. Dublin. An elaborate and strict analysis of the *variations* of Romanism, especially useful for those who cannot obtain *Basnage's History of the Reformed Churches,* which is a triumphant refutation of the celebrated learned Romanist *Bossuet,* Bishop of Meaux, in his work "*Les Variations des Protestans.*"

Histoire des Variations de l'Eglise Gallicane. Par J. B. Renoult. Amst. 1703. (Letters to the Bishop of Meaux.—"*I will freely confess to you, that nothing has so effectually convinced me of the falsehood of your religion, as the bad faith of all your controversialists, and their impudence in denying or disguising the most notorious facts!!*")—Renoult, p. 149.

The Modern Jesuits, from the French of *L'Abbé Martial M. de la Roche Arnauld.* Longman and Co.

Richardson's Popery Unmasked. London. 1825.

Thorpe's (the Independent minister) *Destinies of the British Empire.* London. 1831.—Mr. Thorpe's work should be read by all seceders from the Church of England, in this age of apostacy and liberalism.

Whately's (the Rev. Dr.) *Errors of Romanism.* London. 1830.

Bishop Burnet's History of the Reformation. Oxford University Press edition. 1831.

The Works of Bishops Hall, Usher, Stillingfleet, and Archbishop Tillotson.—Any and all of which are invaluable for controversy and sound doctrine.

MONUMENS INÉDITS DE L'HISTOIRE DE FRANCE. A Paris, Crapelet. London: Treuttell and Co. 1830.—Contains, Part I. the Secret Correspondence of Charles the Ninth, with *Le Sieur Mandelot*, the Governor of Lyons, during the year 1572, (the epoch of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew.)—Part II. *Lettres des seize au Roi d'Espagne Phillipe II. Armée*, 1591.—This work, and the works of the President *De Thou* and his son, should be read for the illustration of Dr. Lingard's Apologetic Sophistry on behalf of the Church of Rome.

Finch's Sketch of the Romish Controversy. London. 1831.—Very useful, on account of its accurate references to original writers.

LETTRES DE SAINT PIE V. *Sur les Affaires Religieuses de son temps en France, &c.* Par de Potter a Bruxelles. 1827.—This is a second, or abridged edition, of the scarce and valuable work published at Antwerp, 1640, by Fran. Goubau.

Henry's History of England. Vol. X. Parts I. and II.

Middleton's (Dr.) *Errors of Romanism.*

Bingham's Antiquities of the Christian Church.

Keith's Signs of the Times. 2 vols. Edinburgh. 1832.

Kenny's Doctrines of the Church of Rome. London. 1818. Rivingtons.

Matthias's Compendious History of the Council of Trent.—An excellent abridgment of the acts of this council.

The Life and Pontificate of Gregory VII. (Hildebrand,) by Sir Roger Greisly, Bart. London. 1832. Longman and Co.

The Life and Pontificate of Pius V. by the Rev. J. Mendham, M.A. London. 1832.—These two works are of the first standard importance, exemplifying the lives and proceedings of two of the most celebrated Roman Pontiffs; and contain an abundance of

original and authentic information, on many of the most weighty circumstances detailed in *Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History*, &c. With regard to an extensive knowledge of ancient authors, and the *Arcana Selecta* of the Papacy, Mr. Mendham ranks one of the ablest champions of *Protestantism* of the present age.

Short's Sketch of the History of the Church of England. London. 1832. Rivingtons.—"*transeat in exemplum,*" has been applied to it, by an able reviewer; the information contained to 1688 is original and valuable.

Digest of Evidence on the State of Ireland, by *Phelan* and *O'Sullivan.* Dublin. 1827.—Important and valuable.

Religious and Literary Life of Adam Clarke, L.LD. London. 1833. Very interesting.

Cunninghame's Apostacy of the Church of Rome. 2d edit. Edinburgh. 1833.—The Author's name is a sufficient passport—an earnest of the talent and veracity of his work.

M'Gavin's Protestant. (American edit.) reprinted from the ninth Glasgow edit. *Hartford,* U. S. 1833.—Contains a splendid *exposé* of Jesuitism, Monachism, and Romanism, in America.—Compare "*Baxter's Key.*" London. 8vo. 1674, which ought to be reprinted and republished, with suitable additions, at this time.

Jenkyn's Remains of Cranmer. Oxford University Press. 1833.—A sound Protestant work, highly honourable to the university, and creditable to the author.

Ecclesia Anglicana. 8vo. London. 1833. Rivingtons.—An elegant literary and theological poem, in vindication of the Church of England.

Smedley's Reformed Religion in France. 1832. Rivingtons.

Allport's Davenant on the Colossians. London. 1831 and 1832. 2 vols. Hamilton; and Birmingham, Beilby and Co.—This work is an elaborate and original translation from the Latin of Bishop Davenant, and is, unquestionably, one of the best theological productions of the present century. It abounds with illustrations, doctrinal and practical, of the errors of the Romish Church, on the authority of the ancient fathers, &c. cited by that eminent divine and profound polemist; and the able translator, by his copious additions, has rendered it a truly valuable *apanage* to the literary possessions of the English Protestant Church Militant.

Bishop Butler's Analogy of Natural and Revealed Religion.

Chauffepiè, Dictionnaire Historique. Tom. 4. Thorndike.

Heylot's Histoire des Ordres Religieux. 8 tom. 4to. Paris. 1792.

Sir W. Twysden's Historical Vindication of the Church of England. (Scarce.)

Roscoe's Translation of the Life of Scipion de Rici, Bishop of Pistoia. (Par de Potter. Bruxelles. 1825.) London. 1829.—Illustrative of the immoralities of celibacy and auricular confession, as ordained by the Church of Rome.

Collier's Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain.

Fuller's Church History of Britain.

For the state and progress of *Catholicism* in Germany, the works of the candid Roman Catholic author, *Alexander Muller*, of Neustadt, and the able Protestant controversialist, *Dr. Fridolin Huber*, of Frankfort sur la Maine, may be consulted with advantage.

BONAVENTURA'S WORKS.

In exposition of the recognised *idolatrous* worship and doctrines of the Church of Rome, the most conclusive proof is contained in the writings of *Bonaventura*, authenticated by *Waddin*, in his *Scriptores ordo min. Romæ*, 1658, pp. 60 to 75. But the Romish *Ritual*, in its present form, was fixed by a decree of Paul V. anno dom. 1614. Bonaventura's Works were reprinted by authority of a Bull of Pius V. at the *Vatican Press*, 1588.—The whole collection contains *seven large folio volumes*,—they are difficult of access; but there is a fine copy of his *Psaltarium B. Virginis*, preserved in the Bodleian Library. Oxford—(6th edition, dedicated to Pope Clement VII). The Psaltarium is a complete parody, or *transformation*, of the sublime application of the entire *Psalms of David*, addressed to God and Christ, to the Virgin Mary, to the end. The first Psalm commences,—"*Blessed is the man who loves thy name, O Virgin Mary*," &c. The second, "Why have our enemies raged and meditated against us vain things.—Let thy right hand protect us, O mother of God!!" The 130th Psalm begins, "Out of the depths have I cried to thee, Lady, Lady, *(Domina,)* hear my voice!!!"

Nothing short of a probable *denial*, would justify the translation of such *blasphemy*, although in a somewhat minor degree it is to be found in the devotional books, HOURS OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN, GRADUALS, ANTIPHONERS, THE GARDEN OF THE SOUL, THE MONTH OF MARY, or of May, (French.) *Ceremonies*, &c. &c. For a full account of which see *Zaccharia's Bibliotheca Ritualis.*

For a full and conclusive exposition of the confirmed *secret* system of the Church of Rome, in Ireland, doctrinal and practical, as sanctioned by her Archbishops and Bishops, vide DEN'S THEOLOGY, *or Body of Divinity*, (for the exclusive use of the Priests,) 2d. edition. Dublin. 1833.—See also, THE BOOK OF RATES OF THE CHURCH AND COURT OF ROME, containing the Bulls, Dis-

pensations, Indulgencies, Pardons, &c. for all kinds of offences, with the *several sums* to be paid for them, by Anthony Egan, B..D London. 1825. Eèdes, Little Knight Ryder Street, Doctors' Commons.

The authorised version of the Roman Catholic Bible was thus advertised in Cork, in the year 1814:—

"A new, superb, and elegant edition of the Catholic Bible, now publishing in Numbers and Parts, by J. A. M'Namara, Cork, under the Patronage of his Grace the most Rev. Dr. O'Reilly, Roman Catholic Lord Primate of all Ireland; his Grace the most Rev. Dr. Troy, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin; his Grace the most Rev. Dr. Murray, Coadjutor Archbishop of Dublin, and President of the Royal College of Maynooth; the Roman Catholic Bishops of Cork, Waterford, Ferns, Leighlin, Kilmore, Ossory, &c. containing the whole of the Books in the Sacred Scripture, explained or illustrated with Notes or Annotations, according to the Interpretation of the Catholic Church, which is our *infallible* and *unerring* guide in reading the Holy Scriptures, and bringing men to salvation." It was also published in Dublin, *cum Ecclesiæ C. R. privilegio*, A.D. 1814, and also in 1818.

The following annotations are extracted from it, and by the authority attributed to Romish ecclesiastical tradition, they are stated and expounded by the pastors of that Church to be equally binding on the conscience of a Papist with the Holy Scriptures themselves.

"PROTESTANTS are heretics and schismatics—the bane and disease of this time."—*Note on John* xiv. 28.

"All the definitions and marks of a heretic fall upon them."—*On Titus* iii. 10.

"The Church of GOD, calling the Protestants' doctrine heresy, IN THE WORST SORT that ever was, doth right, and most justly."—*On Acts* xxviii. 22.

"The new pretended Church service of England is in schism and heresy, and, therefore, not only unprofitable, but DAMNABLE."—*On Acts* x. 9.

"He (Christ) could not abide to see the temple of God so profaned—How, then, can he abide the profaning of the Churches now, with heretical service, and preaching of heresy and blasphemy? If the temple was then a den of thieves, how much more *now*, when the house appointed for the holy sacrifice and sacrament of the body of CHRIST is made a den of thieves for the ministers of CALVIN'S breed."—*On Mark* xi. 17.

"The PRAYER OF A SCHISMATIC (*i. e.* PROTESTANT) CANNOT BE HEARD IN HEAVEN."—*On John* xv. 7.

"The speeches, preaching, and writings of heretics (Protestants), are pestiferous, contagious, and creeping like a canker: therefore Christian men must never hear their sermons, nor read their books."—*On* 2 *Tim.* ii. 17.

"The devil acknowledging the SON of GOD was bid to hold his peace; therefore neither heretics' (Protestants) sermons must be heard, no, not though

they preach the truth. So is it of their prayers and services, which, being never so good in itself, is not acceptable to GOD out of their mouths: yea, it is no better than the HOWLING OF WOLVES."—*On Mark* iii. 12.

" A Christian man is especially bound to burn and deface all heretical books; and, therefore, Protestant Bibles, Prayer Books," &c.—*On Acts* xix. 19.

" THE TRANSLATORS OF THE ENGLISH PROTESTANT BIBLE OUGHT TO BE ABHORRED TO THE DEPTH OF HELL."—*On Heb.* v. 7.

" Roman Catholics must avoid them (Protestants), because their familiarity is contagious and noisome to good men: but in matters of religion, in praying, reading their books, hearing their sermons, presence at their service, and all other communication with them in spiritual things, it is a GREAT DAMNABLE SIN to deal with them."—*On John* ii. 10.

" The GOOD (*i. e.* the Papists) must tolerate the EVIL (*i. e.* the Protestants), when it is so strong that it cannot be redressed without danger or disturbance of the whole Church; otherwise, where evil men, be they heretics, or OTHER MALEFACTORS, may be punished, and suppressed, without disturbance and hazard of the good, they may, and ought, by public authority, either SPIRITUAL or TEMPORAL, to be chastised or EXECUTED."—*On Matthew* xiii. 29.

" Not justice, not all rigorous punishment of sinners is forbidden; nor are the *Church* and princes blamed for putting *heretics to death;* but that none of these should be done of our particular revenge, or without *discretion*, and regard of their amendment, *and example for others.*"—*On Luke* ix. 55.

" All heretics, though in the beginning they may appear to have some show of truth, yet, in due time, their deceit and falsehoods shall be known by all wise men; though for troubling the state of such commonwealths, where unluckily, they have been received, they cannot BE SO SUDDENLY EXTIRPATED."—*On* 2 *Tim.* iii. 9.

The Protestant clergy, of all denominations, are further described, in this authorised popish Bible, as " THIEVES, MURDERERS, AND MINISTERS OF THE DEVIL."—*On John* x. 1. They and their flocks, as supporters of the Protestant heresy, are declared " to be in a rebellion and damnable revolt against the priests of GOD'S Church; that rebellion (which they declare) is the bane of our days."—*On Heb.* xiii. 17. The Papists are commanded by this Bible, their authorised divine oracle, to be zealous and stout against heretics, of what sort soever, remembering the example of holy Elias, who, in zeal, killed 450 false prophets.—*On Rev.* ii. 6. 20. " When Rome puts heretics to death, and allows their punishment in other countries, their blood (the blood of the Protestants) is not called the blood of saints, no more than the blood of *thieves, man-killers,* and other *malefactors* (is so called), for the shedding of which, by order of justice, no commonwealth shall answer."—*On Rev.* xvii. 6. In another annota-

tion, the exclamation of Queen MARY's Rhemish Priests is sanctioned; viz. "If St. PAUL appealed to CÆSAR, not yet christened, how much more may we call for the aid of Christian (meaning popish) princes, for the punishment of heretics?"—*On Acts* xx. 11. Again, "The Protestants resemble JUDAS in apostacy."—*On John* vi. 68. "To all such the apostle giveth the curse, and telleth them that the storm of darkness and *eternal damnation* is provided for them."—*On Jude* 11.

LET PROTESTANTS READ, AND JUDGE FOR THEMSELVES!

CORRIGENDA.

At page 161, Chapter IV. paragraph the second, line 14, relating to *Napoleon's* letters, read in addition and correction, as follows, after "French"—with *lithographic* fac-similes, taken from the *autographs*, having the signature of "*Buonaparte*" attached to them; and designed as an illustration of the *manuscript of St. Helena*, &c.

Page 143, line 7, for "nineteenth," read *eighteenth* century of the Christian era.

Page 384, (Chap. VI.) paragraph 2, instead of—"It is admitted by *Josephus*," &c. read the following omission: It is related by *Christopher Noldius*, thereby confirming the signal *declaration* of *Josephus*, Book XVIII. Chap. III. p. 435, Jewish Antiq. "*This was* CHRIST, *who being accused by the princes of our nation, before Pilate, and afterwards condemned by our people, and punished with crucifixion; yet they ceased not to love him, who had once set their love upon him,* FOR HE APPEARED ALIVE AGAIN THE THIRD DAY, *the* HOLY PROPHETS *having spoken these and a* THOUSAND *more things about him*,"—that the *Roman Custodia*, or threescore soldiers, with the centurion, &c. (as it stands to page 385, for the rest, on the testimony of *Noldius*, *Justin Martyr*, &c.)

Page 432. *(Note.)* Instead of "*The Garden of the Lord*," this Roman Catholic publication is more generally known in London as *The Garden of the Soul*, i. e. the one by Challoner.

Page 448. *(Note.)* Instead of Papal Bull, dated and issued March 13, "1835," read 1825.

THE END.

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, Printers, St. John's Square, London.

Of the same Publisher may be had, Price 5s. Boards,

I.

The FROGS and their KING; or, The PEOPLE and their RULERS. A Moral Analysis of Men and Manners, adapted to the Nineteenth Century. By IGNOTUS COAXUS.

"Croak! croak! croak!"—*Aristoph.*

"Upon the good old apologue of Esop, the author has founded many sensible and moderate observations, applicable to all times, but particularly to the crisis at which his native land has now arrived."—*Lit. Gazette.*

"An elaborate and skilful application of the old fable to the history of the past, and to the condition of the present times."—*Spectator.*

"Containing much important truth, both moral and civil. The author has brought the authority of history, the science of legislation, and the great laws of morality and religion, to bear upon the actions of statesmen, the deliberations of senators, the conduct of rulers, and the desires and complaints of the people."—*Gentleman's Magazine.*

II.

The only complete History of France to the present Time.

Price 6s. 6d. bound.

A HISTORY of FRANCE, from the earliest Periods to the Year 1834: with a Chronological Table of Contents, Lists of Contemporary Sovereigns at the end of each King's Reign, and Biographical Notes and Illustrations. By MRS. JAMIESON, Author of a "History of Spain," &c. &c. Fourth Edition, enlarged.

"A very useful work."—*Times.*

"It is drawn up with much tact and perspicuity. On the subject of the French Revolution, Mrs. Jamieson expatiates most fully."—*Sun.*

"We predict that it will become a Class-book in schools; and though now already in its fourth edition, that it has only commenced its successful career."—*Metropolitan Magazine.*

"An excellent school book, a suitable companion for 'Pinnock's History of England,' and certainly the best concise History of France in the English language."—*North Devon. Journal.*

III.

In the Press, and speedily will be Published,

(Intended as a Supplement to the above Work,)

A TOPOGRAPHICAL, STATISTICAL, and DOMESTIC HISTORY of FRANCE, which will be embellished with a great variety of Engravings, illustrative of the most novel and important subjects that the Traveller meets with throughout that interesting Country. By Mrs. JAMIESON. In one Volume, 12mo.

IV.

MEMOIRS of a TRAIT in the CHARACTER of GEORGE III. of these United Kingdoms; authenticated by Official Papers and Private Letters in Possession of the Author: with an Appendix of illustrative Tracts, &c. Abridged from the Original Work in Manuscript. By JOHAN HORRINS, Gent. Price 7s. 6d. Boards.