

The Press and General Review.

FRANCE.

From the Paris Correspondence of the Watchman, 18th Dec.

The affairs of Rome still hold the first place in the religious and political thoughts of the French; and, as new events transpire, the invasion of the Pontifical States by our troops is more severely condemned. That which has raised the national indignation to its height, are the last acts of Pius IX., his *ad populum* and his amnesty. I need not analyse these pieces, they are probably known to all your readers, but I ought to notice the impression they have produced in France. Discontent and reprobation have been almost unanimous. Not only the Democratic journals, but even the organs of the most moderate opinions, have expressed strongly their censure. Thus, for example, the *Journal des Debats*, which preserves constantly extreme moderation in its opinions, has not been able to conceal how frivolous have been the political concessions of the Pope, and how worthy of derision his amnesty. The Ultramontanes alone have tried timidly to stammer out an apology for these unqualified proclamations.

Truly, we expected little from the Cardinals and Jesuits who surround Pius IX. History has taught us that the priests of Rome practice not pardon of injuries, that they are without pity towards the conquered, and shrink not from any atrocity, in order to strengthen their power. We Protestants, in particular, know, by long and mournful experience, that the Papacy is lavish of human blood, and crushes its adversaries, when it can, with an iron hand.

Present events, however, seem to demand more mildness, or at least more prudence, on the part of the Roman clergy. It seems that the Pope and the Cardinals, having been restored to power by the bayonets of France, ought to have some regard for the wishes of our Cabinet, and the sentiments of the French army, and to yield to policy that which they would not have done from motives of generosity. But no; a spirit of error and blindness rules the dignitaries of the Roman Church. They strike, they condemn, they imprison, they banish, with inexorable fury, and proclaim a pretended amnesty, when the executions are more numerous than those who are pardoned.

completely discredited. All has vanished. He is still a private individual, but hated and detested. Men think that this Pontiff lacks inness, that he is better fitted than for the chair of Rome, and the first word of modern Pius IX. He had hoped to obtain the affection and love of the civilized world, the elements of his reign were theosis, and now he drinks of bitterness. Memorable is incompatible with the at time! It is an old institution, only the shadow of life; it vain phantom, as soon as a fresh attempt at emancipa-

Many pamphlets published here is one, among others, "L'Europe" The author has not a to this pamphlet; some was written by the illustrious, but I think this condensed. The enormous commencement, "I can a without reserve; I do not its doctrine, I repudiate no with incomparable boldness, of Pius IX. he cries out, addressing the Pope, in the blood of thy subjects, which Chateaubriand gave as a sword! Thy sceptre ought to be a sword, letters, and the ark; the people, of thy throne, ought to grow in peace, and in liberty; the triple crown of the VII. was the lightning of Europe and the lightning of Europe. What hast thou made of the world? What hast thou made of the world where Brutus wrote Liberty? What hast thou made of the world where Peter and Paul wrote Love? What hast thou made of the world? The last rest of feudalism. How hast thou succeeded the efforts of people who have claimed their rights? No, they have yielded in the struggle, thou hast triumphed. Thy sceptre is stained with blood, which holy oil cannot wash. What hast thou made of the world? The blood of the Lombards, the blood of the Sardinians, the blood of the Romans—unwashed, Gregory VII!"

After this here philippic the author undertakes to lay the following propositions:— 1st. That the temporal royalty of the Pope is not a continuation of divine right. 2ndly. That this royalty is irreconcilable with the well understood interests of Catholicism and the Papacy. 3rdly. That the Roman States are not the property of the Pope. 4thly. That the independence and sovereignty of the Pontiff can be exercised only in his temporal character. 5thly. That the Pope can never have the bishoprics of the world severely dogged.

All these pamphlets circulate in profusion among all ranks of the people, and excite strong hatred of the Papacy. It is a propaganda made by Roman Catholics themselves, and which prepares the way for the fall of their church. The Protestants are as *athletes* in this anti-papal crusade; their voice would be scarcely heard, their intervention would be suspicious. It is better that those who still bear the name of Romanists should do this work. Then, when the favorable moment shall have arrived, the disciples of the Reformation will bring to this people the doctrine of the Gospel.

A curious circumstance has recently revealed the sentiments of the Parisian population on the Papacy and its agents. Some dramatic writers had composed a piece entitled *Rome*. It was the history of Pius IX., from his youth until the present time. They represented first *Mastor* (the first name of Pius IX.) in the character of a soldier. Then they related his old adventures. After that, they indicated how he had been led to embrace the sacerdotal career, and showed him raised to the dignity of sovereign Pontiff. Then they displayed, in successive paintings, the different episodes of the Roman expedition. The intentions of the dramatists were not anti-Romanist; on the contrary, they gave great praises to the Pope, and tried to revive his popularity. But the mass of the spectators deceived the expectations of the composers. The panyric of Pius IX. was received with ice-cold silence. No applause—no manifestation of sympathy, but rather marks of scorn. And, on the other hand, when the scene represented the Romans defending their city against the French, they were received with frantic acclamations.

Thus, even in Paris, the people have applauded those who fought against our soldiers. This has produced, as you may expect, immense scandal. The Ultramontanes and the friends of Government have cried out that it is a shame to see French men take the part of the Romans against the French army and the national flag. In brief, the play, "Rome," has been forbidden by order of the police; but, the impression is not the less incontestable. It is certain that the population of Paris is deeply irritated by the unhappy enterprise which took our troops into Italy, and that, if there were immediately fresh political elections, a great majority would protest against this fault of M. Louis Bonaparte.

As it regards the Cabinet, its only aim is to get out of this wretched business as soon as possible. MM. Odilon Barrot, de T. Gerille, Du-faure, Passy, &c., rightly think that they have been grossly deceived; they are ashamed of having rendered the assistance of our soldiers to these incorrigible Cardinals, who revive the horrors of the Inquisition. But what can they do? What resolution can they take? Is it possible to abandon the unfortunate Romans to the vengeance of their barbarous masters? The Legislative Assembly will be soon called upon to resolve these grave questions. It is probable that the leaders of the moderate party, MM. Ehius, Mole, de Broglie, will demand the immediate evacuation of the pontifical territories, and leave the subjects of the Pope to the mercy of the Austrians and the Neapolitans. Thus, our troops will return to the French soil, but blushing for the triumph they have obtained, and our name—the name of France—will be so great and so glorious, will receive a stain which will not easily be effaced.

What these debates occupy public opinion, the bishops and their acolytes hold solemn assemblies. I have already spoken, in my last letter, of the Provincial Council convoked at Paris. I can now give some details of the proceedings and operations of this priestly assembly.

It is necessary to repeat that the organic laws, published by Napoleon after his compact with the Pope, prohibited a Council, either national or provincial, without the previous sanction of the Government. The Roman bishops have taken no notice of this legal restriction. They have judged, apparently, that priests are far above laws; that they may do what they please, and need not ask sanction from anybody. Our Government have played a poor game, and taken a position almost ridiculous in all this affair. On the one hand, it has not dared to resist the pretensions of the bishops, and order these recalcitrant prelates to return to their dioceses; it is afraid of not being obeyed, if it takes this vigorous course. But, on the other hand, the Ministers of State cannot tolerate, without saying a single word, this flagrant violation of the organic laws. What have they resolved? They have adopted a middle course altogether singular. The Minister of Public Instruction and Worship, M. Langumais, who, for the present, occupies the place of M. de Falloux; who is extremely ill, has published an ordinance, signed by the President of the Republic, authorising the Provincial Councils. But this sanction had not been asked. No matter, our Government has granted spontaneous permission, when it saw that the bishops had decided on acting without it; it has granted them that which they asked not. It was, in its opinion, to save appearances. But appearances are little in such an affair, and the Government has succeeded only in proving that it has not courage to proceed to the execution of laws before the demands of the Romanist episcopate.

Be this as it may, the bishops held a council in Paris twelve days with their theologians and their canonists. There were in this assembly

two parts, very distinct—the one *public* and the other *secret*. The public part was entirely composed of processions, litanies, chants, festive ceremonies; the secret part was engaged on serious questions, deliberations on points of doctrine, discipline and worship. Such is the spirit of Popery. It gives to the laity—What? Only that which speaks to the eyes, the ears, the senses, and the imagination, and then the priests preserve for themselves, for themselves alone, that which concerns intelligence, conscience, spiritual being. The laity are treated as children, or profane. Do you wish spectacles? Do you have music? Are you charmed at seeing pompous priestly vestments? Do you desire to be amused by processions, directed with litanies? Come, Rome will give you all these one things. It will help you to pass many agreeable hours by its theatrical practices. But ask nothing more. You may perhaps have a strong desire to know what has been said and discussed among the members of the Council; you may take a lively interest in learning the different opinions of the bishops, and you may think that the prelates should open their sittings to the public. But take care! This is not the custom of Rome. The priests have undertaken to think for the laity, to mediate for them, to arrange the affairs of their souls without consulting them; and, after making a show of their pompous decorations, they carefully close the doors when the hour of discussion arrives.

GORHAM, BISHOP OF EXETER.

From the British Banner.

In our last Number we intimated, that the Appeal case of Mr. Gorham was then being heard before the Privy Council. The pleadings are now closed, but the Lords and Gentlemen have taken time to consider their judgment. Notwithstanding the extreme length to which the arguments have gone, we have given the Trial entire, that our readers may have the whole case before them at one view. The *British Banner* is the only Journal in which the Report has appeared complete in one number. With a view to this, we abstained last week from giving a portion of the pleadings, that, by exhibiting the whole, at once, our readers might be enabled to compare the arguments on both sides with more facility. It is, however, just possible, that a portion of our friends will scarcely thank us, and deem that our space might have been better occupied; and we confess, that in one view we concur in the opinion. But still there is another side, and there are strong reasons for the deed, since very important purposes may be subserved by it. It is not enough, that men of sense have made up their minds upon the subject: the bulk of the people as yet, know very little about it, while the times we live in are such as to render it no small importance that the public at large should be thoroughly acquainted with the principal merits of the case, and of the circumstances attending it, as most powerfully illustrating the corruption, the carnality, and the entire worldly character of the institution of the established Church. It will be seen, that even Mr. Gorham has still somewhat to learn on the point in litigation; his views are by no means Scripturally clear; but this is of small moment. Enlightened Christians have not now to learn the meaning of words which have been so long before them; and Nonconformists, above all, have not now to ascertain the meaning of the Rubric, Catechism, and Act of Uniformity, for which their fathers so nobly suffered and sacrificed their earthly all. There is no mystery requiring the wisdom of great Law Lords and Prelates, learned or unlearned. It is purely a question of the Grammar, and of the Dictionary—a question of the meaning of language, which may be settled by the simplest peasant in the land, who has had the benefit of a good Sunday School education. A decision on the point may be necessary for the guidance of the Church so called, in matters of preferment, but it is utterly valueless for any Theological purpose. As it respects this, there will be no difference, either in the Church or out of it. The minds of the Clergy, whatever their class,—Evangelical, High Church, Puseyite, or Popish,—to a man, are made up. Whatever may be the Judgment, they will continue severally to believe, as they have hitherto believed, and they will teach as they have hitherto taught—while Dissenters, of every grade will remain, unchanged, their opinions. Such will continue to be the state of things whether the judgment of the Court below be confirmed reversed, or modified by the Privy Council. But there is the best reason to think that the judgment will leave matters, as much as possible, just as they were before the judgment of Sir Herbert Jenner Fust. The policy of the Privy Council will be to give to neither party a triumph. The probability is therefore, that they will reverse the judgment of Sir Herbert Jenner Fust only to the extent of restoring matters to their former condition. The Ecclesiastical Judge boldly, positively, and without the slightest reserve, declared for Baptismal Regeneration,—and, in doing so, he undoubtedly gave the true interpretation of the *Litany* and the *Catechism*, and threw the weight of an official sanction upon the scale of the High Church and its supporters. This was sufficient for the *Evangelical* and the object of the Privy Council will be, to give

as far as practicable, to halve the difference, and thus take off the edge of the Judge's sentence. But this will go for nothing in the mind of the people, the judgment was not the mere *dictum* of the Judge, apart from evidence, or against it; for he gave explicit reasons for all that he said, and reasons which cannot be gainsayed at the bar of sound, unprejudiced reason. He has incontrovertibly given the real sense of the Prayer Book and the Catechism. As Sir Herbert Jenner Fust said, the question is not one of truth, or of error, and still less one of the Sacred Scriptures, it is simply one of the Church of England. His sole and unavowed object was to declare what the Church taught, and, according to her Catechism and Litany, the Judge declares, that the lesson she teaches is—*Baptismal Regeneration*.

Mr. Gorham's ground is, that the Articles above are to be taken as the exponents of her doctrine. This is the point his Council have labored to prove, but in our view, they have altogether failed. The *British Banner* has conclusively shown, that there is no distinction made on behalf of the Articles in the Ordination service, or in the Catechism. The Ordination service speaks thus:—

"Will you then give your faithful diligence always so to minister the Doctrine and Sacraments, and the Discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and R. did hath received the same, according to the commandments of God; so that you may teach the people committed to your Cure and Charge with all diligence to keep and observe the same?"

"I will do so, by the help of the Lord." It is in vain to look here for such pre-eminence in behalf of the Articles. The matter is spoken of as a whole, without the slightest discrimination or particularly with respect to them. But the Canons are not less explicit. Canon XXXVI, for example, places the Articles and the Prayer Book on the perfect level:—

"No person shall be received into the Ministry . . . except he shall first subscribe . . . that the Book of Common Prayer, . . . and of ordering Bishops, Priests and Deacons, containeth in it nothing contrary to the Word of God . . . that he himself will us the said Form in the said Book . . . that he alloweth the Book of Articles of Religion . . . to be agreeable to the Word of God."

Here, again, there is no exclusive authority given to the Articles by the Rubrics and the Catechism, and such is the same in Canon LI, which regards the preaching of strangers in Cathedral Churches. The Common Prayer Book and the Articles are here represented as co-ordinate authorities. The thing runs thus:— "If any in his Sermon shall publish any doctrine, either strange, or disagreeing from the Word of God, or from any of the Articles of Religion . . . or from the Book of Common Prayer; the Dean or the Residents shall . . . give notice of the same to the Bishop of the Diocese."

Again, Canon LXI brings out the Catechism as actually the *faith* of the entire community, and of all who offer themselves for confirmation:—

"Every minister . . . shall take such especial care as that none may be presented to the Bishop for him to lay his hands upon, but such as can render an account of their Faith according to the Catechism in the said book set forth."

This language is utterly fatal to the views of Mr. Gorham, as giving the pre-eminence of a controlling power to the Articles: for her Catechism, not the Articles, is made the *testing point*, and that which, in this matter, is to determine the course of the entire clergy of the realm.— This, in our view, therefore, is altogether conclusive. But, if anything more were wanting, it might be found in the atrocious Act of Uniformity, which ordains that every parson shall say—

"I, A. B., do hereby declare my unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained and prescribed in and by the Book of Common Prayer."

No wonder that Thomas Scott, in his later years, repeatedly refused to subscribe even as the condition of preferment; and that, on his death bed, he advised one of his most intimate friends to escape from the Church of England, as by law established.

This is an awful declaration for any man to make who has a conscience, and desires to keep it without offence. But we cannot close without reminding our readers, that if the Privy Council should declare out and out for Mr. Gorham, and against the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, this will still leave the Law-Church in its essential character, untouched.— It will then merely be—so far as the view of the Privy Council can make it—the same as the Church of Scotland doctrinally. It will leave the whole mass of the evils of the Establishment entire. Rightly understood, this very trial will throw a flood of light on the Church and State which has only to be looked at through the window of an official sanction, and from the New Testament, to be seen in its true character; a State Church on the scale of the High Church and its supporters. This was sufficient for the *Evangelical* and the object of the Privy Council will be, to give