

A SERMON

PREACHED IN

SAINT WERBURGH'S CHURCH,

ON SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1838,

IN BEHALF OF

THE SCHOOLS OF THAT PARISH.

BY

THE REV. HENRY IRWIN,

Chaplain of Sandford Church, Dublin.

DUBLIN

MILLIKEN AND SON, GRAFTON-STREET,

BOOKSELLERS TO THE UNIVERSITY.

J. G. AND F. RIVINGTON, LONDON.

MDCCGXXXVIII.

Dublin: Printed by JOHN S. FOLDS, 5, Bachelor's-Walk.

P R E F A C E.

VARIOUS circumstances have occurred which render it necessary to offer a few prefatory remarks, in order to account for the publication of this discourse.

Having been most importunately solicited by the Curates of St. Werburgh's Parish to preach the annual sermon in aid of its funds, on the 11th of February last, I undertook the task, not without some personal inconvenience. As the young persons, for whose benefit the appeal was to be made, were children of members of the Established Church, and to be trained up in the knowledge of its doctrines, discipline, and ritual, I esteemed it to be no unfitting opportunity to set before them somewhat of the character of our Church, as embodying the pure principles of the Gospel of Christ, as the source of our social and domestic happiness, the safeguard of our liberties, and the main instrument of our national prosperity ; I endeavoured particularly to call their attention to the scriptural truth, piety, and pathos of our Liturgy.

Conceiving that there was nothing wrong in accommo-

dating instruction to the exigence of the times, and beholding an impetuous tide of democratic fury sweeping away by degrees every thing venerable amongst us, I considered it peculiarly seasonable to hold forth our Church as a providential embankment against its desolating progress, and to call upon my hearers to "know the God," and to cling to the Church "of their fathers." I reminded them how wisdom had laid its foundation, martyrdom had borne testimony to it, experience had approved it, and gratitude should endear it. Indeed, nothing is more evident than that at the Revolution of 1688, it was the wish of the nation, and the intention of the legislature, to render the Established Church an *immutable law*. It was incorporated in the very elements of the constitution, and the Crown itself is accepted by the Sovereign, under the sacramental promise to maintain its security. The State, by alliance with the Church, is bound to protect her from exterior injury, to strengthen her outworks, and to watch over her peace. It cannot, however, be denied, that the devoted attachment, and decided preference formerly manifested towards her, has lamentably cooled of late, even amongst many who still strangely call themselves not only her members, but her friends. Other religions have been let into political power, but she is the only one who hath parted with her supremacy, and contends against them with unequal strength. In thus advocating our Church, I conceived that I was advocating not only the cause of pure religion, but also of genuine liberty; for I feel a strong conviction that if her "candlestick were to be removed out of its place," the light of the gospel would (in this country at least) be greatly obscured. Under this persuasion, when adverting to

various instances of a change of feeling and of preference towards the Church, and a gradual departure from her principles, and a seeming indifference to her efficiency and advancement, I could not but earnestly entreat my hearers to remember and to "know the God of their fathers," and to train up their children in an intelligent acquaintance with, and an ardent attachment to, the doctrines of that Church, with which they professed to hold communion. With these exhortations I commended the cause which I advocated to the blessing of God, and to the liberality of the congregation.

When I had retired from the vestry-room, and the amount of the collection had been ascertained, the minister and one of the churchwardens, as I am informed, drew up an address to His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, *apologizing* for the sentiments contained in my sermon, to which His Excellency is reported to have returned a suitable answer. Of this correspondence I have never been able to obtain a perusal: the person who holds it in his hands declines either to shew it, or state its contents. In truth, I knew nothing of displeasure in any quarter, until I read the following paragraphs which appeared in the *Dublin Evening Post*, and in the *Morning Register* :—

"A POLITICAL SERMON.—On Sunday last, the Rev. ——— Irwin, of Sandford church, preached a sermon before the Lord Lieutenant, in the church of St. Werburgh's. Of the nature and temper of this sermon, the public, perhaps, will judge, when they learn that the churchwardens and the minister of the parish felt themselves bound to address a letter of apology to his Excellency, in consequence of the scandalous and indecent conduct of the clergyman who had desecrated the pulpit of this ancient church. We content ourselves at present with stating the fact."—*Dublin Evening Post*, Feb. 13th.

"Upon this subject we find, apropos, in the *Post* of last evening, an account of the truculent insolence of the Rev. H. Irwin, of Sandford, a parson of the rampant school. On Sunday last he was permitted to preach in St.

Werburgh's church, in the presence of the Lord Lieutenant: and in the natural spirit of a violent and vulgar fanatic, took the occasion of delivering a politico-polemical discourse, of such a character that the churchwardens and the minister of the parish felt it necessary to address to his Excellency a letter of apology. These men, who make the pulpit a show-box, produce upon their congregation the very reverse of the effect described by the poet of the 'Deserted Village,' for

"Those remain to scoff who came to pray."

—*Morning Register*, Feb. 14th.

Had the minister and churchwarden, instead of allowing me to learn their sentiments through such a medium, candidly told me that my discourse was *calculated* to injure the charity which I intended to benefit, and to insult the government which it is my duty to "honour," I trust that, with corresponding candour, I should have endeavoured to explain what was imperfectly heard, or entirely misapprehended: and to express sincere regret for any passage which, after such explanation, fairly appeared to be reprehensible. But how could I imagine that the officers of St. Werburgh's were dissatisfied with the sermon, when none of them ever told me so—nay, when one of them actually shook hands with me, and *thanked* me for it?! Besides, if the churchwarden or any others really thought that I had by my "scandalous and indecent conduct, and truculent insolence, desecrated the pulpit," I humbly conceive that the proper authority to whom complaint should have been made was the Archbishop of the diocese.

These paragraphs having been copied into some of the London, and most probably into several of our provincial papers, many of my kind friends expressed their most anxious wishes that the sermon were published in order to disabuse the public mind. Though much soothed by their affectionate sympathy in the trying circumstances in which

I was placed, I at first declined compliance with their request, partly from a love of ease and a sincere dislike to notoriety—and partly from a desire to maintain (as far as was in my power) the independence of the pulpit, and to leave unto God the vindication of his own cause, hoping with uprightness to outlive misrepresentation, and with the help of the Lord to meet all consequences.

Finding, however, that each succeeding day but added to the tissue of egregious falsehoods, as to the sentiments contained in the sermon; and being addressed on the subject of its publication by a very respectable body of the parishioners who had heard it,* I felt that no other course remained for me to adopt, but to acquiesce in their request; and in committing it to the press in the precise, literal, unaltered terms of its delivery, I solemnly declare, that there is not an expression in it, which I can conscientiously retract; I challenge my accusers to produce a single sentiment which in fairness suits the charge of its being a *political* sermon. It would be utterly impossible to speak of external privileges bestowed on the Church or withdrawn from it, without being liable to such a charge. But every legislative act, every ministerial measure to which I adverted, on that occasion, had reference, exclusive reference, to Protestantism and the *religious liberties* of its professors. The view I took of the measures which were calculated to cripple its energies and check its extension, spread itself over a period of above *forty years*, and under various administrations.—Maynooth College was founded in 1795, when Mr. Pitt was Premier—The National Board of Education in 1831 by Lords Grey and Stanley†—

* See Appendix, A.

† See Appendix, D.

the dismissal of two British Protestant officers for requesting to be exonerated from participating in the ceremonies of the Romish Church, was in 1824, when the Duke of York was Commander-in-Chief, and the Duke of Wellington Master-General of the Ordnance; if allusions to these circumstances are the offspring of party, I would ask to what party do I belong? The compulsory attendance of British officers and soldiers at the Hindoo abominations are, I know not of how long standing; but I appeal to every reflecting well-constituted mind that they are abuses which call loudly for redress.* There is, surely, a wide distinction between toleration and indifference—between the protection which ought to be extended to every individual in the observance of his religious rites, and the latitudinarian principle which would cause a man to be indifferent whether he addressed “Jehovah, Jove, or Lord.” Let Romanists at all times find, in celebrating their public worship, that protection to which they have a just claim. But surely there is a limit beyond which we cannot pass with safety. Are we to surrender *our own* principles, and thus help to rivet more firmly the chains of Popery by bringing Protestantism and pure religion into contempt, in the *vain* effort to fortify our interests by flattering the Roman Catholics? It was not for party motives I brought these matters forward; I consider them to be a *national* disgrace—a *national* sin. There is and has been a most discreditable apathy upon this subject, even amongst religious persons. I was anxious to call public attention, and excite public sympathy to the hardships to which conscientious officers and soldiers are frequently ex-

* See Appendix, B. and C.

posed. If we would wipe off this stain which blots our character as the greatest Protestant nation in the world, it is necessary that every individual amongst us should remember that he can do something towards the accomplishment of so desirable an object; that he has a voice in the representation of the country; that at all events, he has the right of petition; and remembering these things, let him also recollect that ‘power and privilege are duty and responsibility.’ In bringing this subject before the *citizens* of Castle-street and Cork-hill &c., I could scarcely be considered as wishing to incite the *troops* to insubordination; a charge which, nevertheless, I understand has been brought against me. If there be any persons who really think that such was the design or tendency of my discourse, they little know the (almost chivalrous) attachment which I feel for soldiers. I was for sixteen years a chaplain to the Royal Artillery, and reckon among its officers some of the dearest friends I have. I still feel a lively interest in the character, a sensitive jealousy for the honor of the British army, which none can understand but those who have been associated with them; but it is my heart’s desire and prayer, that they may seek “the honor that cometh from God only.” I am no political partizan. At my advanced age, I have nothing to hope for and nothing to fear from any party. I have never fawned on or flattered, neither have I ever knowingly failed in due respect to my superiors in church or state. It is true, I have not dared to disguise or palliate my principles. Though I may have incurred displeasure, it was not my object or desire to provoke it. And if I have, contrary to my intention, uttered a single sentence which might give *just* (I say advisedly *just*) offence, even to the very lowest in-

dividual in the congregation, I should be glad, if I knew it, to ask his pardon.

Though I am not indifferent to the good opinion of my fellow men ; yet, where *truth* is concerned, it is a very “small matter with me to be judged of man’s judgment.” I would, indeed, desire to please all men “to edification”—but if through love of praise, or profit, or popularity, I should either conceal or dilute the doctrines of the Gospel, “I should not be the servant of Christ.”

I have availed myself of various quotations, which, were I to have published my sermon under any other circumstances, I would have either wholly omitted, or enlarged, or more specifically acknowledged ; but, in the present instance, I feel myself conscientiously bound not to alter a single passage, but to send it forth precisely as it was delivered.

SERMON.

1 CHRONICLES, xxviii. 9.

“Know thou the God of thy father.”

It is the observation of a distinguished political writer, that “states, in order to prosper, should often go back to their first principles:” that they should trace out the line on which they began to move, and measure the extent of their deviation from it. And the wisdom of this counsel is determined by the fact, that laws and habits rarely continue to flow in their original channel—time and accident changing the course, or even choking the stream.

THIS aphorism appears to be true also of churches as well as states, that in order to prosper, they should often go back to their first principles: and the dying counsel of the King of Israel to his son, as recorded in the text seems to harmonize with this sentiment—

“and thou Solomon, my son, know thou the God of thy father.” The first principles of Christian Churches are usually pure: having the model of the scriptures, they commonly begin well: and in the formularies, in which their first principles are embodied, they possess a standard, from whose authority none legitimately appeal. How necessary then for Churches to consult the early records of their opinions! When the sacred volume containing the first principles of the Jews’ religion was unexpectedly discovered, the monarch, struck with the awful contrast between the obligations and the character of his people, “rent his clothes, and turned to the Lord with all his heart.” And the impulse communicating itself from the throne to the people, the moment of the discovery of the law became the æra of national reformation. Nor would the return to these early documents ever fail, under the divine blessing, to produce a similar result. Men forget, while the eminence is obscured, from what height they are sunk. In going back to their original records, they at once learn “from whence they have fallen”—they place themselves at the point at which their fathers started

in the career of holiness, and, like the giant in heathen fable, strengthened by touching in the contest his mother earth, they recruit their exhausted spirits at the original fountain of their spiritual life. Hence then the wisdom of the counsel, "know thou the God of thy father." In states, good laws are often long preserved, because it is the obvious worldly interest of the community to preserve them. Each order also, as in our own mixed constitution, resists any invasion of the laws by the other orders. But in religion the case is different: its benefits are chiefly of a remote and spiritual nature, and therefore not valued by the irreligious. A vital and important doctrine may fall into desuetude, or be altogether removed, and a careless man feel no diminution of his pleasures. Hence decay makes rapid progress in religion. Hence the successors of St. Peter display scarcely a vestige of the religion taught in his epistles. Those Churches of Asia, once the "joy and crown" of the Apostles, are gone, —and the melancholy wanderer amidst their fragments, seems to see inscribed on every wall, and to hear in every echo, "know thou the God of thy father."

That this position is especially true of our own Church, I would ground upon the purity of its principles. Its formularies have *two* qualities which place them in the very highest rank of uninspired compositions. In the *first* place they are *scriptural*. The fathers of our Church searching the quarry of scripture, there discovered and appropriated those pillars of truth—the doctrines of man's depravity—the atonement of the Lord Jesus Christ—salvation through faith in that atonement—conversion by the Holy Spirit—and upon these they erected the national temple. In no human writings is the Gospel of Christ in all its parts so fully, so wisely, so pathetically, so scripturally set forth as in the sanctioned books of our Church—its doctrines are the Bible condensed into a smaller space. And this I contemplate as her lofty distinction. Religion in her hands has not evaporated into a frigid scepticism, or wasted to a spiritless formality; but it is the unadulterated faith of the scripture—the faith of “apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone.” But there is a second feature of our Church formularies scarcely less important—their *com-*

prehensiveness. Those who deeply reverence the Scripture do not always study it with an impartial eye. Attaching disproportionate importance to some passage, they insensibly tinge the whole volume with its particular complexion. Thus they narrow and systematize the broad and comprehensive truths of religion, and stamp their own image and superscription upon the pure gold of the sanctuary, and unfit it for general circulation. But how strikingly exempt are the formularies of our Church from this defect ! Universality is their grand feature—and there is scarcely any thing in it to check its extension, till it embrace every spot where man can worship, or where God will hear. Nor let this feature of universality be undervalued : it is the characteristic feature of Christianity itself—no longer the lamp of a solitary temple, it is a pillar of light to all the people of God. Such is the religion, such the Church which among us disseminates its truth. Such the formularies which thus assimilate the child to the parent, and stamp it with a sacred image. Can there be a stronger reason why the Church of England's members should be taught that lesson with double

emphasis—"know thou the God of thy father?"

It is also peculiarly the duty of our Church to go back to her first principles, because peculiar events in our national history have tended to draw many of us away from them. The events to which I allude are, the invasion of the Church and State at the time of the Commonwealth. It is not one of the least disastrous circumstances of that melancholy period, that it tended to bring suspicion and contempt on many of the fundamental principles of the gospel. The invaders of the Church and State were, *many* of them, (God forbid that I should say *all*) men whose creed it is wholly impossible to reconcile with their practice.—Avowing all those grand doctrines of religion that are best calculated to form good citizens and good men, they erected upon this sacred basis a superstructure of follies and crimes. They, as it were, borrowed the vessels of the temple to prostitute them to the indulgence of their own passions. And mark the consequence. Religion suffered the penalty of the unnatural alliance into which she had been forced. At the Restoration the tide of popular feeling

in working back to its old channels, swept every thing before it. Puritanism was not the solitary victim of its impetuosity; but all that an enraged populace and a licentious court could in any way associate with puritanism—the vital principles of religion—the doctrines of original sin—of justification by faith in Christ—of conversion by the Holy Ghost—were all identified with it, and involved in one common ruin. For a season, the lessons of our blessed Lord and his Apostles were deemed the language of rebellion. Time, and the blessing of God, and the efforts of devout men have, in a measure, corrected the national superstition: but, to this moment, the fundamental doctrines of the gospel and the faithful preachers of them are visited for the offences of the Usurpation. Is this impious attempt to fix upon divine truth the follies and crimes of its false or overheated apostles never to cease? God forbid. Surely “the time past suffices” to have offered such indignities to the religion of Jesus Christ. Let us “know the God of our our fathers”—may the formularies of our Church, handed down to us from her illustrious first fathers live in our memories and

hearts. Such is my own impression of the superiority of the productions of that age to those of a subsequent period, that I should be tempted to say—when the angel of the Reformation descended to trouble the stagnant pools of Popery, “those who *first* stepped in,” chiefly felt the healing efficacy. Most writings or formularies subsequent to these, either take from scripture, or add to it—either shrink from its mysteries, or encumber its simplicity. These formularies come down to us signed and sealed with England’s best blood. They come surrounded with the glory of the Reformation. They are identified with our liberties and conquests—with our independence at home and our renown abroad, and with our possession of the blessed volume of divine truth. The army of martyrs seem to throng around us to bear testimony to these writings—seem to arise from the flames or to bend from the block to inculcate the lesson of the text—“Know thou the God of thy father.”

I would confidently appeal to any pious man, whether when most humbled in spirit he has entered the sanctuary of the Lord,

he has not found the services of the church then most consonant with his feelings? When sensible of the purity of God's law, and of his own guilt and danger, has he not found the simple and humble confessions of our liturgy *just then* most exactly suitable to his convictions? No flattering allusion is ever made therein to any power, merit, or dignity, in man: but Christ is the only refuge under which the penitent is directed to repose. The voice of the Church has for centuries, through the power of the Holy Spirit, conveyed peace to the contrite sinner in no accents but those of the Bible.—“O Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world, grant us thy peace.” Grace, free, full, and everlasting, is the sole ground on which the certainty and perpetuity of our blessings are secured: and in all our applications for those mercies, we are taught to breathe forth the spirit of self-renunciation—“We do not presume, O merciful Lord, to come trusting in our own righteousness, but in thy manifold and great mercies.” In a word, not only the awakened, burdened conscience finds relief in venting its confessions to God in the language of our liturgy. Here

the rejoicing Christian pours forth, in the most appropriate language, his adoring praise. Here, he whose heart the love of Christ has softened, and opened to the love of the whole human family, offers up his earnest supplications, intercessions, and thanksgivings for all men. Here the Church has provided for all the special occasions of a Christian family, from the cradle to the grave, a series of services which for solemn and impressive matter, for rich evangelical sentiment, for piety, and pathos, stand unrivalled. O, that our hearts might always ascend with our words in the confessions, prayers, praises, and thanksgivings, which we profess to offer; then should we indeed feel the privilege of worshipping God in the language which humbled and gladdened the hearts of our fathers. Those who framed this holy, this simple, this affecting, service, seem to have caught the very spirit and manner of the Bible. Their minds must, surely, have been cast in no ordinary mould. How important, then, is it to bring up the children of her communion in warm attachment to, and in intelligent acquaintance with, the doctrines and services of that Church

whose basis we believe to be the rock of ages, and its superstructure the temple of truth. Fixed into the soil, wrought into the frame and substance of our laws, majestic in its form, mild in its ordinances, tolerant in spirit, pastoral in its care, she joins humility with enquiry, and tempers freedom with obedience. If we of her household desire to protect her from harm, and to vindicate her glory, we should remember that the character and conduct of her members is the best mirror of her perfections. Let us tread her courts in peaceful unanimity : and instead of unfurling a flag of defiance, let us erect her standard in the face of the world, emblazoned with her victories of patience, her triumphs of zeal, and her trophies of faith. We must shew her in her true majestic comeliness—her primitive attire ; such as she was seen by those who proclaimed her in the midst of the flames, loved her through imprisonment and torture, and placed the Bible in her hands as the charter of her constitution, and the trophy of their triumphant sufferings. From happy and providential circumstances, the precious truths of our Church were once entwined into the whole

framework of the British constitution ; they were the golden ligature which bound it around the heart. Protestantism was declared to be the foundation stone, and with a continual reference to it the social edifice was systematically maintained ; and to it Britain owes more of her moral superiority and national greatness than her statesmen are willing to allow. The equity and mildness of its principles have found their way into the spirit of her laws ; and to the sure, though unobserved, influence and unostentatious agency of scriptural morality, we are indebted for the high-toned integrity which so eminently distinguishes those tribunals from which the laws are administered. Yes ! the Bible contains all the springs of our moral energies,—it proclaims the noblest principle that ever inspired a patriot's heart or graced a patriot's creed—" We ought to lay down our lives for the brethren." This is true patriotism—the patriotism of the heart. The nation, during the last fifty years, having begun to leave *this centre*, the rapidity with which it is diverging from it is truly astonishing and alarming. The state has ceased to see any difference

between truth and error—has avowed that “every one is to do that which is right in his own eyes”—that she will not aid the one more than the other—that she “careth for none of these things”—she has refused to aid the Church in the Canadas—in Australia she preferred Romish error to truth,—while twenty millions were voted to abolish slavery in the West Indies (which no Christian man grudges) it is proposed to abolish church rates at home, as if man’s bodily freedom were a higher and worthier object than the emancipation and enlightenment of the human mind. Thus, in *this* country, in her *system of national education*, she affords every facility for the inculcation of the dogmas of popery—as dangerous to the independence of the state, as they are false, erroneous, and unscriptural—a system, which in my conscience I am persuaded has inflicted on the land a greater injury to the cause of pure religion than any measure of the last 150 years—a system calculated to stereotype Popery in the country, whereby is surrendered what *was* the glory of our Church and people, the free unrestricted use of the Holy Scriptures, and thus at-

tempts to disinherit our poor countrymen of their eternal birthright, steals from them the charter of salvation, and disfranchises them of that liberty wherewith Christ makes his people free ; she endows a college for the education of its priesthood ; she withdraws all assistance from schools where scriptural instruction had been imparted for years to the young ; and while liberty of conscience is justly granted to the Roman Catholic soldier, who is exempted from attending Protestant worship, Protestant military officers have been cashiered for hesitating to take part in the idolatries of Rome ; nay, and while crippling the energies of our Protestant establishment at home, she actually countenances, and even concurs in and supports Hindoo abominations. Will it be credited, that the impure and degrading services of the pagodas are carried on under the supervision of British Christian officers in India—the priests attached to them receive from the British collector of the district a monthly stipend for their attendance, with such other allowances as may be requisite to *keep up the establishment* of the temple-worship ; not even the priestesses, who are prostitutes, can be employed

or discharged without the official concurrence and orders of the principal European, and therefore, Christian officer of the government. The processions are in some instances so shockingly detestable, that every pure-minded person closes his windows as they pass, to save his family from the view of such unutterable impurities. And yet, Protestant officers and soldiers, are obliged to give compulsory attendance at these festivals. The idol is brought out mostly on *the Christian sabbath*;—our troops in review-order have to escort, and render honor to the idol;—and by this honor, thereby attach greater importance to these wretched superstitions in the eyes of the assembled thousands of natives. Oh! how can a Government, calling itself Christian, thus needlessly reduce its officers and privates to the alternative either of disobedience to orders, and consequent dismissal from the service, or of violating the command of God! Is this toleration? is this religious liberty?

Is it then the modern maxim, that the *many* are to be conciliated at all risk, and that truth and righteousness are of no moment? Can all this be tolerated by Protestant Britain, whose

church is the favorite child of the Reformation? Is this the result of the boasted illumination of the age in which we live? Who will not adopt the Prophet's language and say, "Oh! that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of my people!"—*Jer.* ix. 1. Who is on the Lord's side? Is then Christianity changed within the last 50 years? No. Is Popery changed? No. Then, what is changed? *We.* We have lost the simplicity of the gospel of Christ—ensnared by the encroachments of a refined and fashionable philosophy, an intellectual paganism is usurping the place of Christian principles—man's rights and liberties are the object of almost idolatrous worship, and the authority and commands of Almighty God almost overlooked. Thus, in our enlightened day, man and his privileges are every thing—God and his claims nothing. These are the views which command "the applause of listening senates"—this the latitudinarianism, which looks with an equal eye of approbation on the worshipper of Bramah, the denier of the divinity of our adorable Jesus, and the worshipper of the Virgin Mary. But

some of our great men say, 'that the points of difference between the Churches of Rome and England are so few and slight, that it is not for them to decide on matters of theological nicety'!! Now, this is just as absurd as to say that they see no difference between the two theories of astronomy, of which the one places the earth in the centre, the other, the sun. Oh! for a voice to reach their ears, and for the Holy Spirit to carry to each of their hearts, "Know thou the God of thy father!"—O that Protestants would now, and I trust that many do in some measure, see that the negligence or indifference of the state bestows a privilege upon *them*—the high honor of providing for the spiritual wants of the poor, and teaching them to "know the only true God and Jesus Christ, whom He has sent."

I solicit your liberal support and patronage this day to the schools of this parish. I present before you *seventy* children—I bring them to you to shelter them from the contagion of the streets, and to instruct them in what they ought to believe, and what they ought to do. Knowing that the germs of our most lasting attachments and the grounds of our most adhesive habits are formed in the ductile and im-

pressible season of youth, these children are trained up in a system adapted to the principles of the church to which they belong, in a firm and enlightened attachment to the great doctrines of redemption as contained in her formularies. These schools consist of sixteen girls (chiefly orphans), who are dieted, lodged, and educated,—and sixty boys, who are educated,—sixteen of whom are clothed, and daily receive a comfortable breakfast. All of these children, when duly qualified, are apprenticed to Protestant tradesmen, or obtain situations as servants in Protestant families. Of positive good effected we could produce abundant evidence, affording one of the best inducements for perseverance and enlarged exertion. Some of the children may be traced into life with orderly well-regulated habits, as trustworthy servants—skilful mechanics, and respectable tradesmen—several of whom attend on these occasions to contribute according to their ability to the fund from which themselves formerly derived education and support.

It would be injustice to this excellent institution, as well as to very meritorious individuals, if I withheld a tribute of acknowledgment to

the appropriate qualifications and conscientious assiduity of the master and mistress of these schools. Surely you will not forsake a work which has been so long fostered by you. Is it much to ask such a parish as this worthily to support such an institution? I would be ashamed to use importunity to such a congregation on such a subject. It disdains the use of eloquence—it relies, under God, on the truth and justice of its claims. Its grand but simple object is to teach these children the precious truths of God's word, which alone have power to lighten the pressure of poverty—to raise the tone of morals—to purify the springs of domestic happiness—and to bind in harmony the various members of the embodied state. Be assured, that no scheme of education for the poor can succeed unless the Bible in the length and breadth of it is the source of its health and its strength. For the poor there is but one sort of literature, the literature of duty and peace—but one sort of wisdom, the wisdom that shines forth in the beauty of regulated affections. Thousands may be learning to read, but it is a Christian's duty to give the reading a correct turn—to inculcate with it and by it Christian truths, prin-

ciples, and motives. Some indeed tell us, that to teach the morals of the New Testament will be sufficient!—From the morals of the New Testament merely as such, no greater influence is to be expected than from those of Seneca or Epictetus, if motives more powerful, and larger aids cannot also be offered. Man's hopes and fears are the sinews of his virtues—man wants *power* as much as direction: and even when his mind is instructed, he is motionless to what is right, while without the animating principle of love. The heart of the whole system of Christian morals is the love of Christ—this is the spring of obedience—this is the fountain head of morality. To take the *morals* of the New Testament and discard its *faith* is to sever the tree from the root, while it is yet in bloom. The hues may be admired, and the fragrance be for a time “as a field which the Lord hath blessed”—but “their blossom shall go up as the dust, because they have cast away the law of the Lord of Hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel.” We have already in this country abundance of the education of *letters*, and yet what is its state at this day after nearly 700 years' connection with the greatest

empire and most enlightened nation in the world—enjoying a free constitution, yet with the aspect and turbulence of slaves—though under the proximate superintendence of a Protestant government, yet in respect of real scriptural religion she remains a dark spot in the midst of an illuminated sky, under the almost undisturbed dominion of ignorance, priestcraft and superstition, presenting a spectacle calculated to wring with anguish the heart of a patriot, philanthropist and Christian. Do we not see, throughout much of the land, the highest of all religious obligations (that of an oath) recklessly violated and abused—the deepest of all crimes (murder) meditated with cool satisfaction, perpetrated often in open day without remorse, and sanctioned with popular approbation : and do not British subjects stand trembling in the jury box under the terror of a power more awful than the law, and giving to the threats of unseen conspirators more weight than to the plighted faith of British justice ? The wretched peasantry (wretched because vicious, vicious because irreligious, irreligious because untaught the truths of pure Christianity) while peremptorily forbidden to read the word of God, have

free unrestricted access to the garbage provided by a flagitious press, and thus become the dupes of inflammatory falsehoods, and filled with discontent and bitter animosity. Amongst those who are raised to a grade above them, I would ask what have Mechanic Institutes, Penny Magazines, Useful Knowledge Societies, and the whole apparatus of godless science effected? The tree of knowledge has not been shaken in vain. The fruit has fallen plentifully—it has been devoured greedily. It is painful to an educated man to utter a sentiment against plans of general education and intelligence: but really when I see schemes in progress on principles virtually depreciating whatever is specifically *Christian*, and thereby dishonoring God's word, I do feel alarmed in no ordinary degree by all the concern I ever felt for the eternal well-being of my fellow-countrymen. I would tell you with all the solemn earnestness of which I am capable, that the work of educating man involves a tremendous responsibility—and may be perverted to his utter undoing unless it be guided by enlightened discretion. Such is the inveterate disease of man's nature, that it often perverts while it attracts, and poisons while it

appropriates the best intellectual aliment : and converts it into the means of malignant resistance to the glorious Gospel. Man being morally depraved, if a species of knowledge be thrown into his mind which incorporates with, instead of neutralizing that depravity, his power of sinning is thereby increased. To talk of education, as a safeguard to society apart from the power of scriptural truth and Christian godliness, is at once impious and absurd. If education be not decidedly Christian, it will not be *regenerative* ; the exterior of life may be improved, but its fountain not purified—it is the *dispositions*, not the manners, which must be renewed in order to consolidate a people's loyalty and happiness. It is on this ground, that I would present before you the schools of St. Werburgh's parish.—Here are seventy children hanging upon your bounty—who if deprived of the blessing of Christian instruction, may grow up in vicious ignorance, live without God, and die without hope. Remember, each of these children has immortality written upon it, the inscription is indelible, traced by the finger of God. Each of them, then, shall be either a happy spirit before the throne of God, or a

hopeless outcast from his heaven. The Lord works by means—if you then can be instrumental in any degree in stamping happiness on that immortality, Oh ! can I call forth your aid by any more powerful motive ? To be the honoured instrument of ministering to the eternal felicity of a spirit which shall never lose its being or its consciousness—if this fail to interest, I have no excellency of speech to win you.

If these little ones want an advocate, unto Thee, my God, I commit them—for thine is the power to move the heart—and so be thine the glory for ever and ever.—AMEN.

APPENDIX.

A.

TO THE REV. HENRY IRWIN, MINISTER OF SANDFORD CHURCH.

St. Werburgh's Parish, Monday, Feb. 12, 1838.

REVEREND AND DEAR SIR.—We, the undersigned parishioners and hearers of your sermon, preached on Sunday, the 11th inst., in advocacy of the charity schools of the above parish, most earnestly request that you will favour us and the Protestant Inhabitants of this city with the publication of that very important, apostolic, and evangelical discourse, in which the weighty and solemn truths of the Gospel, the awful state of the nations of the earth, and the Reformed Protestant Christian Religion, were so clearly developed as to render it desirable that a copy thereof should be in the hands of every faithful Protestant of the city of Dublin.”

[Here follows a list of seventy-five signatures, including nearly all the Protestant Inhabitants of the parish, together with those of many other persons who heard the sermon.]

ANSWER.

Sandford Parsonage, Feb. 23, 1838.

GENTLEMEN—I beg of you to accept my cordial thanks for your very kind address, particularly acceptable to me as coming from so many parishioners of St. Werburgh's, in whose Church I had been most earnestly requested to preach, on the 11th inst.,

D

in behalf of its schools ; and for the honest discharge of my duty to the best of my ability, (and to which, I understand, the congregation very liberally responded,) I have been subjected to treatment from persons officially connected with that Church, such as far exceeds anything that, in the course of a long experience in the Ministry, I ever heard of—treatment as unexpected, as I am certain it was undeserved.

On other occasions I desire to demean myself as “the least of all, and the servant of all ;” but when the ministers of Christ stand in the pulpit, they speak in *His* name, and under *His* authority ; and being “allowed of God to be put in trust with the Gospel, even so we speak, not as pleasing men, but God which trieth our hearts.” Applications from very many attached friends, now seconded by the united request of persons so intimately connected with St. Werburgh’s as you are, have overcome the strong repugnance which I felt to publish my much-abused and overpraised sermon ; and I will send it to press in the confident assurance that no fair and candid mind will discover in it either personality or politics. I have not the slightest doubt that I spoke truth ; and I challenge the most fastidious reader to point out any language in it unworthy of a Christian and a Gentleman. The time has now come when it requires more courage to defend our church than to attack it ; and, in my humble vindication of it, I feel not less ashamed of receiving praises which I do not deserve, than indignant at reproaches which are not merited.

I remain, Gentlemen, with due respect and esteem,

Your obedient servant,

HENRY IRWIN.

B.

The officers here alluded to were Captain Atcheson and Lieutenant Dawson, of the Royal Artillery, who, when stationed in Malta, were dismissed from the army (and turned adrift upon

the world to seek the means even of *subsistence*) for the alleged crime of requesting to be exonerated from participating in one of the idolatrous ceremonies of the Church of Rome. As the facts of the case have been widely and essentially mistaken, the reader is requested to peruse the following letter from the Governor, which will shew what are the services which Protestant officers are called upon to perform.

Chief Secretary's Office, Valetta, Aug. 4th, 1823.

SIR—I have the honor to acquaint you that application has been made to Government for salutes from Castle St. Angelo and St. Michael's Tower, on the 9th and 10th inst., being *the eve and anniversary of St. Lorenzo, and the Tutelar Saint of Vittoriosa*.

His Honour the Lieut. Governor has been pleased to grant salutes* on the 9th inst., at noon, and on the day following, at half-past ten, A.M., and in the evening, *during the procession*, from Castle St. Angelo, *accompanied by the tolling of the castle bell*, which his Honour requests that you will order to be carried into effect, &c.

I have the honor to be, &c., &c.,

H. C. GREIG, A. C. S.

To the Officer Commanding
the Royal Artillery.

Adjutant-General's Office, Ionian Islands, Head
Quarters, Corfu, November 13, 1824.

Brigadier-General Sir P. Ross, K. C. St. Michael and St. George, with *all* the Officers of the Garrison, and departments

* The ordinary morning pettararo salute was for the *Host*, at its elevation during mass—the signal to fire was made from the church by the *priests*. *Thirty* pettararoes, accompanied by the tolling of the bell, when the salutes are at Fort Angelo, are fired for the *Host*, at its elevation, when *Te Deum* is chanted; and *sixty* more for the *Host* or the *Image*, when brought out of church to be *worshipped* in the afternoon processions.

off duty, will be pleased to meet his Excellency the Lord High Commissioner at the Palace, to-morrow morning, at ten minutes before eleven, *to attend the ceremony and procession* of St. Spiridione.*

(Signed)

G. RUITT, D. A. G.

A Roman Catholic soldier dare not be *forced* to attend Protestant worship ; the law of the land protects him, and justly so. Is, then a member of the Established Church considered to have no conscience ; or, having one, is there no respect to be paid to it ?

C.

For a christian nation to give encouragement to polytheism and idolatry, and thereby to prolong the existence of the most impure and impious observances, is a line of conduct equally repugnant to the dictates of religion, and the maxims of sound policy. I do not think that there is another example in the history of the world, of a people, for years, **ACTUALLY PROHIBITING THE PROPAGATION OF THEIR OWN FAITH!!** And though restraints to the free preaching of the gospel have been, within these few

* At this procession, the bones or mummy of the supposed saint are carried about the streets for some hours, in a covered glass chair, in order to obtain a good harvest ; avert the plague ; or assist the Greeks against the Turks. As the procession leaves the church, the principal *British officers*, with some Greeks, *bear a canopy over the bones*, and the rest of the officers, civil and military, follow, *bareheaded*, some carrying lighted candles along with the priests. The inhabitants flock from all parts to this relique, and bring their sick and lame, that its shadow may heal them. After the procession, the saint is placed on the high altar ; the feet are uncovered, and the people are admitted within the rails to pay their devotions, kiss the feet, and leave their offering. A subaltern's guard is to mount sentries at the rails of the altar, until this scene is over.

years, removed, and, in one or two minor particulars, the practice of countenancing idolatry has been corrected, and the British Government has ceased to “*force* the poorer classes of the Hindoos to draw the idol car,” yet, still, it gives greater countenance to the false religions of India, than it does to the Established Church in Ireland.* It gives money to maintain the worship; it takes money from the worshippers, as a profitable tax upon their devotions; it assumes a share in the management not only of the revenues of their temples, but of their internal worship, and of all the abominations connected with them; it interferes in the appointment of those who shall minister in their temples; in the removal of them, *if they neglect their idolatrous duties*; the very dancing girls (who are, in fact, unchaste females)—the distinct appointment of every one of these emanates from the British functionary!! Are not these most humiliating facts? What can possibly justify them?

A memorial on the subject was not long since presented to the government at Madras, signed by the bishop of Madras, (the late venerable Corrie,) 13 chaplains, 37 missionaries, and 152 European residents, civil and military. The memorial was forwarded by the bishop with an accompanying letter.

*Memorial, &c.—To the Right Hon. Sir Frederick Adam, K.C.B.
Governor in Council, Fort St. George.*

“RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR,—We the undersigned ministers and members of the different denominations of Protestant Christians in the Presidency of Fort St. George, beg leave most respectfully to approach your Excellency in Council, to lay before you various instances in which, we humbly conceive, the principles of religious toleration to be widely departed from under this Government; subjecting those of us who are members of the civil or military branches of the service to great and peculiar personal grievance.

“We venture, at the same time, with much deference, also to express to your Excellency in Council the pain with which we behold the Christian

* The wall of the Seringham Pagoda was rebuilt, at an expense of 40,000 rupees, by British authority, only a few years ago.

Government of this Presidency and its officers affording encouragement to, and still identified with, the idolatry and superstitions of our native fellow-subjects, in opposition, as it appears to us, to the orders on this subject of the Hon. the Court of Directors, addressed to the Supreme Government, under date the 28th February, 1833,—to the word of God, and to the best interests of those who have, by his over-ruling Providence, been subjected to British dominion in Southern India.

“ We beg leave, in proof of our statement, to bring to your Excellency’s knowledge, as matters of grievance,—

“ First. That it is now required of Christian servants of the Government, both civil and military, to attend heathen and Mohammedan religious festivals, with the view of shewing them respect.

“ Second. That in some instances they are called upon to present offerings, and to do homage to idols.

“ Third. That the impure and degrading services of the pagodas are now carried on under the supervision and control of the principal European, and therefore Christian, officers of the Government, and the management and regulation of the revenues and endowments, both of the pagodas and mosques, are so vested in them, under the provisions of Regulation VII. of 1817, that no important idolatrous ceremony can be performed, no attendant of the various idols, not even the prostitutes of the temple, be entertained or discharged, nor the least expense incurred, without the official concurrence and orders of the Christian functionary.

“ Fourth. That British officers, with the troops of the Government, are also now employed in firing salutes, and in otherwise rendering honour to Mohammedan and idolatrous ceremonies, even on the Sabbath-day, and Christians are thus not unfrequently compelled, by the authority of Government, to desecrate their own most sacred institutions, and to take part in unholy and degrading superstitions.

“ Protestant soldiers, members of the Church of England, we may add, have also been required, contrary to the principle declared in his Majesty’s regulations, that every soldier shall be at ‘ liberty to worship God according to the forms prescribed by his religion,’ to be present at, and participate in, the worship of the Church of Rome.

“ By the requisition of the foregoing and similar duties, we cannot but sensibly feel, that not only are the Christian servants of the state constrained to perform services incompatible with their most sacred obligations, and their just rights and privileges as Christians infringed; but that our holy religion is also dishonoured in the eyes of the people; and public and official sanction and support given to idolatry and superstitions destructive to the soul, and apostasy from the only true and living God.

“ We believe, also, that your Excellency in Council will, on inquiry, find, that the prescribed interference of the Christian officer with their religious services, mosques, and endowments, is not in unison with the feelings and

faith of our Mohammedan fellow-subjects ; and that there is, therefore, no valid ground whatever for its existence in this Presidency. And although our heathen fellow-subjects, we can scarcely doubt, are generally gratified by the honour rendered by the Government to their idols, still we have the strongest reason to question whether the official support at present given to their superstitions is, in all its extent, desired by the great mass of the people. We may cite, as one instance, peculiarly deserving of your Excellency's attention, the drawing of the idol car—this onerous task is now only effected throughout this Presidency by the agency of the police ; thousands of the poorer classes being *forced*, under the orders of the collector and magistrate, from their homes, for the performance of this special duty, without, in the great majority of cases, the slightest compensation. And whatever may be the wishes and sentiments of the individuals immediately connected with the pagodas, we are fully assured, that this interference is viewed by the great body of the people, both land-owners and their labourers, as a vexatious and oppressive exercise of power, to which they submit *only* on compulsion. It is, we conceive, therefore certain, that this baneful part of the debasing idolatry of the land is now upheld and carried on in this Presidency, *solely* by the interposition and authority of the British government.

“ Entertaining these sentiments, and deeply convinced that we are by these acts resisting the will of God, by whose blessing alone this or any nation can prosper, whilst we are not less firmly persuaded that positive injustice is done under the existing system to the Protestant subjects and servants of the state ; we most respectfully, yet most earnestly, entreat your Excellency in Council to be pleased to take this subject into early and deliberate consideration, and to afford to the utmost of your power, to Christianity, and to ourselves, as members of the Protestant community, the same toleration and exemption from requirements contrary to our consciences, as are enjoyed by members of all other persuasions.

“ We explicitly disclaim, as utterly inconsistent with our principles as Christians, all desire that the liberty of conscience so fully and justly accorded to the Mohammedan and heathen, should be in any degree violated. Our sole object and wish is to see the true principles of religious toleration, declared in the instructions of the Honourable the Court of Directors, already referred to, practically and universally enforced, believing the policy there marked out of a ‘ real neutrality ’ to be as safe and salutary as it is wise.

“ We would most humbly pray, therefore, that in accordance with those instructions, all superior officers of this government may be henceforth strictly prohibited from issuing orders, or affording encouragement to Mohammedan or heathen rites and festivals. That it be not hereafter required of any Christian servant of the state, civil or military, of any grade, to make an offering, or to be present at, or to take part in, any

idolatrous or Mohammedan act of worship or religious festival. That the firing of salutes, the employment of military bands, and of the government troops in honour of idolatrous or Mohammedan processions or ceremonies, and all similar observances, which infringe upon liberty of conscience, and directly 'promote the growth and popularity of the degrading superstitions of the country,' be discontinued. That such parts of Regulation VII. of 1817, as identify the government with Mohammedanism and heathenism, be rescinded; and every class of persons left, as the Honourable Court of Directors has enjoined, *entirely to themselves*, to follow their religious duties according to the dictates of their consciences.

"Aware, however, that the execution of the orders of the Honourable Court is entrusted to the Supreme Government, and that it will not be in the power of your Excellency to comply with all these requests, we earnestly and respectfully solicit that measure of present relief which your Excellency in Council may see fit to grant, and that a copy of this address, supported by your Excellency's powerful recommendation, may be forwarded to the Right Honourable the Governor-General of India in Council, with a view to the attainment of the full measure of relief hereby sought.

"In conclusion, we entreat the attention of your Excellency to the facts detailed in the following Appendix, every one of which, we take the liberty to state, has been, and will, if necessary, be again authenticated by individuals subscribing this address. And with our fervent prayer that your Excellency in Council may be guided on this important subject by Him to whom belong all the nations of the earth, and that your consultations may be directed to the advancement of his glory, the good of his Church, and the safety, honour, and welfare of our sovereign and his dominions, we have the honour to subscribe ourselves, with unfeigned respect, your Excellency's most obedient servants."

[*Here follow the signatures.*]

To the Right Honourable Sir Frederick Adam, Governor in Council.

"RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR,—I have the honour to transmit to your Excellency in Council, at the request of those who have signed it, a memorial, together with the original signatures to it, enumerating instances wherein those whose duty it is to engage in them, feel themselves aggrieved by practices and orders which seem to them contrary to the command of God, thereby subjecting them to the painful alternative of violating the dictates of their consciences, or incurring the displeasure of the Government, and praying that the same tolerations and exemptions which have been long granted to their heathen and Mohammedan fellow-subjects may be extended to the Christian members of this Presidency.

"It is my duty to state, that I fully concur in every part of the Memorial and its prayer, and I earnestly hope that it may be thought fitting to concede the full measure of relief prayed; and in respect to such part as rests

alone with the Government of India to grant, that your Excellency in Council will be pleased to transmit the Memorial to the Right Honourable the Governor General in Council, with your powerful recommendation in its favour. I have the honour to be, right honourable sir, your obedient servant,

"Madras, 6th August, 1836. (Signed) DANIEL MADRAS."

This temperate memorial, transmitted in the Bishop's calm and dignified letter, received the following answer, which I forbear to characterise:—

"MY LORD,—I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your lordship's letter of the 6th August, 1836, enclosing a memorial, signed by some of the ministers and members of the different denominations of Protestant Christians in the presidency of Fort St. George, on the subject of religious toleration, and praying that a copy of their address, supported by the powerful recommendation of this government in its favour, may be forwarded to the Right Honourable the Governor-General of India in Council, with a view to the attainment of the full measure of relief thereby sought.

"The Right Honourable the Governor in Council, conceiving that the principle upon which it may be deemed fit to regulate such matters as are noticed by the memorialists should be alike throughout all parts of the territories subject to British dominion in India, has forwarded the memorial for the consideration and orders of the supreme government, with a full statement of his sentiments on the subject, and will communicate the result to your lordship at a future period. Those sentiments, I am directed to apprise your lordship, are not in support of the measures advocated by the memorialists; and it is matter of the deepest pain and concern to the Right Honourable the Governor in Council, that your lordship, instead of exercising the proper influence of your office, strengthened as it must be by the personal respect which is everywhere entertained for you, in moderating the zeal of over-heated minds, should have made yourself the channel of a communication fraught with danger to the peace of the country, and destructive of the harmony and goodwill which should prevail among all classes of the community.

"I have, &c.

"(Signed) HENRY CHAMIER, Chief Sec.

"Fort St. George, 11th Oct. 1836."

Some idea of the kind of hardship inflicted on individuals under authority, by the practices complained of, may be gathered

from the following narrative, contained in an Appendix to the Madras memorial :—

“ In the year 1828, the head-quarters of the 15th regiment were stationed at Trivanderam, the present capital of Travancore, and the ordinary residence of the Rajah. Within the fortress, stands one of the principal temples of the province, dedicated to Padmanaba Deo (or Vishnoo.) Once a year the idol is brought out, and carried in procession to the beach, about three miles distant, where it is bathed in the sea. It rests, of course, with the Brahmins to select the most auspicious day for the ceremony, and it has been observed, that, whenever it has been practicable, a very intelligible preference has been evinced by them for the Christian Sabbath. It was on a *Sunday* that we were required to attend. At two o'clock in the afternoon, the regiment, arrayed in review order, was formed in line with two battalions of Nair troops, on one side of the road leading from the fort to the sea. There we remained, during three weary hours of idle expectation,—the gazing stock of the assembled thousands, thus learning from our presence to attach still deeper feelings of importance to their wretched superstitions. At intervals, groups of Brahmins passed down our front, and from these we received no doubtful intimations of the light in which they regarded us. One party approached from the pagoda, bearing several pots of water intended for the use of the idol, and of the Ranee. The pots were of brass, and their mouths closely covered with plantain leaf, well secured, it might seem, against aught of external pollution. Stopping short, at some distance from us, the Brahmins waved to us imperiously to give them room. Between our front rank and the wall by which the opposite side of the road was bounded, there was a clear breadth of more than twenty paces—but this was insufficient. We were required to close back upon the wall in our rear, and then with a quick and stealthy step, drawing the cloths closely around them, and keeping as far from our line as the road would possibly admit, every look and gesture expressive of anxiety to escape the pollution of our vicinity, they proceeded with their precious burden. At five o'clock the idol was brought out, attended by the Ranee and crowds of Brahmins; as it approached, the order was given to present arms. The procession advanced, and the *troops*, filing to either side, formed a street and *accompanied* it, amidst the din of horns and tomtoms, and all the uproar and confusion of a heathen ceremony. About midway between the fort and the beach, is a small open choultry or pandall; a number of stone pillars supporting a flat stone roof, open on all sides, and at other times accessible to all, to man or beast, of every caste or character. The idol was carried under this, the Nair battalions followed; but, as if it were designed to heap the fullest measure of contumely upon us, we were made to pass outside. There were Europeans, Mohammedans, and various officers of impure tribes

in our ranks; we were unclean—our footsteps carried contamination. Arrived at the beach, we were told to go back—we were no longer wanted, the ablutions of the idol might not be performed in our view. Tired and ashamed, we returned to our barracks. There was then no one amongst our number who had any actual consciousness of the unholy and sinful character of the proceeding in which we had been engaged; but we felt that we had been degraded, that we had been treated throughout with undisguised contempt, and, that not only the natives of the province, but our own men likewise, had reason to despise us for submitting to such open humiliation.

“There are, no doubt, some who will maintain that in all this we were acting simply in the performance of a military duty, and in no way connected with any religious observance; that we were in attendance, not upon the idol, but upon the Ranee, and that it was to the Ranee we presented arms; very probably it may have been on some such pretexts that the Ranee herself requested the attendance of the British troops; but the people did not view the matter thus; our own men did not; and may we not add, God did not view it thus! It is unhesitatingly affirmed that the impression made by our presence upon the minds of the thousands assembled from all parts of the province was, not that we were there merely in compliment to the Ranee, but that we attended as part of the public escort of the idol, and for its especial service and honour. The same impression was left upon the minds of our own men, and so justly did the Mohammedans in the regiment appreciate the actual character of the proceeding, that but for the countenance of their European officers they would probably not have consented to take part in it. It has been said, that on the occasion now referred to, there was no man amongst our number with true Christian feelings. Now, however, were we ordered upon the same duty, there are several of us who must refuse to attend. It is admitted that we should do this at the peril of our commissions. Nay more, it is admitted, not only that our refusal would subject us to dismissal from the service, but that it might require our dismissal—for, as military men, we are sensible that the very existence of an army must be endangered, if once it be conceded to any of its members to deliberate upon the propriety of the orders they may receive. But is it not then unjust that such orders should be issued? Is it not cruel to place us in such circumstances? And why should a Christian government thus needlessly reduce its officers to the alternative, either of disobedience to their orders, or of violating the command of God.”

The following is another instance of the same description:—

“In September, 1835, the drummers of a native regiment, (19th) being required to attend at the procession of the Dushura, refused, stating, that as Christians they could not take part in a heathen ceremony. They were in consequence placed in confinement, while the circumstance was reported to higher authority. The subject was referred to government, probably

under some impression, that, according to recent proceedings, it might be the intention of our rulers, that liberty of conscience should now be extended to Christians, as it had been to Mohammedans and Heathens. The result was, that the drummers were declared to have been guilty of a breach of discipline, for which they were ordered to be discharged from the service, and the attendance of Christian drummers of regiments at native heathen festivals was pronounced to be unobjectionable, the indulgence having the sanction of long custom. The men were subsequently pardoned, but only on their expressing deep contrition, and promising never to repeat the like offence. *It appearing that the drummers were instigated to this proceeding by a Roman Catholic priest, with whose congregation they were connected, it was intimated to him from the right honourable the governor in council, that on the occurrence of any similar interference with the discipline of the troops, he would be interdicted from residing within any military station under the Madras government.* It may be true that these drummers were influenced, not so much by the conviction of their own consciences, as by the prohibition of their priest. This, however, does not in the slightest degree affect the question at issue, which depends simply upon this, whether the toleration granted to both Mohammedan and Heathen, is to be denied to the Christian under the British government of India."

It is a painful dilemma in which the Christian servants of the Indian government are placed by such proceedings, and great is the responsibility of those who place them in it: grieving the consciences of those who have scruples, by compelling them to attend such a worship—searing and hardening the consciences of those who have no scruples, by exposing them to such a deadening influence. What effect must it have on the minds of our young fellow countrymen who go out to India at a period when their religious principles are too often unsettled; they go into provinces, where they are not only surrounded with idolatry, but are called to witness and take part in superintending the service.

Again would I solemnly urge the consideration of this great moral enormity on Christian attention, in the hope that an earnest, an universal call may be made for its suppression; and thus not only a blot on the national character be removed, but the name of Christ cease to be dishonoured among the heathen by our fellow-countrymen, and one of the greatest

stumbling-blocks which remain to the progress of Divine truth in India, be for ever taken away.

D.

EVER since the fatal establishment of the National System of Education, I have never omitted any fair opportunity (when preaching in behalf of a charity school) to lift up my feeble voice against it as a dereliction of Protestant principle, and an exclusion of the children of the nation from the pure light of the Divine word. God has mercifully vouchsafed to give his word free, full, and uncontaminated.—Be it ours to protect its purity, and preserve its fulness. Let us assert the right of every human being to have free access to it, against all who would limit or control its approach.

That these views of the existing system are not merely the sentiments of an obscure, factious individual, may be seen by the following passages from an Address of the SEVENTEEN undersigned Archbishops and Bishops to the Clergy of their respective Dioceses.

Address of the undersigned Archbishops and Bishops to the Clergy of their respective Dioceses.

* * *

“It is therefore with unfeigned regret that they are constrained to express their deliberate and conscientious persuasion, that the proposed plan of National Education, instead of producing these salutary and much to be desired effects, would tend rather to embitter existing animosities, by marking more distinctly the difference of creed in the public school, and by pointedly excluding, as a common source of instruction, that volume which authoritatively inculcates, under the most awful sanctions, universal charity, mutual forbearance, and the cultivation of order and peace.”

* * *

“They further state, that they do not affect to conceal their grief at beholding the clergy of the Established Church deprived of the trust committed to their hands by the legislature, of superintending National Education—a trust which they have not failed to execute with a fidelity and zeal, pro-

nounced to be most exemplary on every inquiry made into the discharge of their duty, and, at the same time, with a prudence and moderation most particularly required in the divided state of religious opinion in Ireland. Nor are they at all consoled in seeing this superintendence in matters of National Education taken from themselves, for the purpose of being vested in a Board composed of persons of such conflicting religious opinions, that it is impossible to conceive an unity of operation, without some surrender or suppression of important points of revealed truth."

"With these views, the undersigned archbishops and bishops, whilst they give just credit to the intentions of his Majesty's government, in bringing forward a plan of National Education, cannot but regard that which has been proposed as most inapplicable to the present state of Ireland—as subversive of those institutions for the education of the poor, which, without giving just cause of offence to Roman Catholic prejudices, have produced great good, and which, if duly supported, would have unostentatiously gone on producing much more—as separating religious from literary instruction, which ought to proceed hand in hand together—as depriving Roman Catholics of the Scriptures, which, it appears, from undoubted documents, they are every day becoming more anxious of obtaining—and as transferring from the National clergy all superintendence over the National Education, of which they are the appointed guardians."

Feb. 23, 1832.

JOHN G. ARMAGH,
POWER TUAM, &c.
NATHANIEL MEATH,
CHARLES KILDARE,
GEORGE KILMORE,
ROBERT P. CLOHER,
CHRISTOPHER CLONFERT AND KIL-
MACDUAGH,
JAMES KILLALLA AND ACHONRY,

JOHN ELPHIN,
ROBERT OSSORY,
RICHARD WATERFORD,
JAMES DROMORE,
RICHARD DOWN AND CONNOR,
THOMAS LEIGHLIN AND FERNS,
WILLIAM RAPHOE,
JOHN CLOYNE,
SAMUEL CORK AND ROSS.

This voice of firm, meek, and dignified wisdom was wholly disregarded; and the bad working of this bad system is palpable to the most cursory reader of the evidence given before the Committees of both houses of Parliament in the last session.

THE END.