

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL. IV.

MAY 1838.

No. 5.

THE DANGERS OF EDUCATION IN ROMAN CATHOLIC SEMINARIES.

A Sermon, delivered by request, before the Synod of Philadelphia, in the city of Baltimore, October 31st, 1837; and afterwards in the city of New York, November 26, 1837. BY SAMUEL MILLER, D. D. Professor of Ecclesiastical History, and Church Government, in the Theological Seminary, at Princeton.

(Published by Request of the Synod.)

And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart, and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children.—DEUT. vi; 6. 7.

THE trust committed to Christian parents, in regard to their children, is, evidently, next to the salvation of their own souls, the most momentous and solemn that can be committed to mortals. They are bound by every tie to train them up for usefulness and happiness in this world, and for eternal blessedness in the world to come. And, for this purpose, to instruct them in truth; to exhort them to duty; to warn them against every species of error and danger; and to go before them in every thing adapted to prepare them to glorify God, and to enjoy him forever.

There have been some indeed so unreasonable as to contend, that the minds of our children ought not to be pre-occupied by any particular form of religious belief, or sentiment, lest we fill them with *prejudice*, and thus interfere with an impartial selection of a religion for themselves when they reach mature age. It is hoped that none in this assembly need to be put upon their guard against an opinion so perfectly absurd. As well might it be said that we ought not to pre-occupy the minds of our children with the belief that lying, theft, and drunkenness will injure them; but that it is better to leave them to make the discovery in after life, by their own painful experience; and this lest we fill their minds with prejudices! Surely none but those who are destitute of natural affection, and of all regard to the order and happiness of society, as well as of

reason, can contemplate such a sentiment without the deepest abhorrence.

But against *what errors and dangers* are we to warn our children? I answer, against *all*, and, of course, *especially* against those which are most fashionable and most destructive; those which present the strongest allurements to the youthful mind; and are most adapted to destroy their hopes for both worlds.

To a particular danger of this class it is my desire to call the attention of my hearers at this time. I mean THE GREAT DANGER OF ENTRUSTING THE EDUCATION OF OUR CHILDREN TO ROMAN CATHOLIC SEMINARIES.

I am well aware that, in the discussion of this subject, I have to meet in the onset a powerful prejudice. There are very many who believe that, in regard to this matter, there is no need of either warning or caution. Many serious, well meaning Protestants imagine that the Popish controversy, though deeply interesting in other lands, and in former times, has become, at the present day, and especially on this side of the Atlantic, in a great measure obsolete; and, of course, that it demands no special attention. They have felt as if the numbers of Romanists in our country was so small; their influence so inconsiderable; the popular sentiment so adverse to their superstitions and claims; and a competent amount of light concerning these superstitions and claims so generally diffused; that the whole subject might be very safely dismissed from public attention. The consequence is, that a degree of apathy in reference to this matter prevails, which certainly bodes no good to the great interests of truth and righteousness. Meanwhile, the advocates of Romanism are growing in numbers, in almost every part of the United States; are gradually extending both their plans and means of operation; and are manifesting a very marked increase of zeal and confidence. Meanwhile, when their preachers have an opportunity of speaking in the presence of Protestants, they seldom fail to express the utmost surprise at the opposition of Protestants to their system. They gloss over their most enormous errors, with a degree of art and plausibility, which would seem to render all opposition unnecessary, and even uncandid. They make no scruple of positively denying the most serious charges brought against them;—charges founded on the unquestionable, published acts of the Council of Trent, and the works of their own Bellarmine; and endeavouring to persuade their credulous hearers that these charges never had any other origin than Protestant ignorance or malice: many believe these representations, and wonder why it is that Protestants are so much prejudiced against the Romanists, and so much disposed to denounce the principles and practices of that large portion of nominal Christendom. And hence we so often see intelligent Protestants not hesitating to commit the education of their beloved offspring to Roman Catholic seminaries; and that from the slightest consideration of local convenience, of comparative cheapness, or of any trivial advantage.

Now, is there no need of correcting this mistake?—this deplorable and mischievous mistake? Shall thousands be permitted unwittingly to cherish these opinions, and to take this course, un-

warned, unadmonished? Every principle of compassion to the souls of men, and of fidelity to our Master in heaven forbids it. The watchmen on the walls of Zion are bound to lift up their voice in solemn warning; and every one who loves the Redeemer's kingdom, or feels the least interest in the welfare of the rising generation, ought to respond to the warning of the watchmen, and to take an active part in guarding their own children, and all with whom they have any influence, against the threatened evil.

Allow me, then, to employ the remainder of the time allotted to this discourse:—*First*, in showing, that there is real danger of our young people being beguiled, and drawn into Roman Catholic seminaries; and *Secondly*, in pointing out some of the evils which are to be apprehended from the influence of those seminaries on those who enter them.

I. There is real danger of our youth being allured and drawn into Roman Catholic seminaries. This will appear evident to every impartial mind from the following undoubted and prominent facts.

1. The first fact which I shall mention is, that the founders and conductors of these seminaries do not hesitate to avow, that *one of their favourite objects is to obtain, as far as possible, the education of our youth*. For this purpose they multiply seminaries as far as they have the power. They publicly invite into them children of all religious denominations. They frequently accompany this invitation with the most solemn pledges not to interfere with the religious belief of any of their pupils. They endeavour to make their terms of admission and instruction as cheap as possible, and, in some cases, entirely gratuitous, so as to attract the most indigent classes of parents. And they scruple not to say, in so many words, that one great object which they have in view, is, to bring large numbers of children within the reach of their instruction and influence. The late Archbishop of Baltimore, in a published report to a foreign society;—a society, be it remembered, formed for the express purpose of spreading Romanism in America;—speaking on this subject, expresses himself thus:—"I cannot help mentioning, that in this school, as in all the Catholic institutions for education, a large proportion of the children are *Protestants*; a circumstance which contributes not a little to the spread of our holy doctrine, and the removal of prejudices."—It is, surely, no want of charity to impute to them that which they openly declare to be one of their favourite and most interesting objects. It is no calumny to charge them with aiming at that which they themselves declare to be a primary purpose.

2. Another fact, which very strongly illustrates, and confirms the preceding, is that, with a far-seeing policy, the Papists in the midst of us are most careful to *plant and to multiply seminaries in those parts of the United States in which they will be likely to exert most influence on the Protestant population*. Let their policy be brought to the test of indubitable facts. In what parts of our country are seminaries under the direction of Papists most numerous, and established on the most popular and captivating plans? Is it in the Eastern States, and in our largest cities, where the amount and the

exigencies of the Roman Catholic population most urgently demand them? By no means; but in the Southern and Western States, in which the general means of education are most inadequate; which are destined, ultimately, to control this great country; and where, of course, seminaries formed and conducted with skill, will be likely to attract the greatest number of pupils, and to produce the most important ultimate results. It is believed that three-fourths of their larger institutions for the training of youth are in the South and West. But it is self-evident that this is not the relative proportion which the wants of their own children demand. Their plan is palpably founded on a proselyting principle; and is, beyond all doubt, most skilfully adapted, and indefatigably pursued. Their own children are in a multitude of cases, notoriously and most grievously neglected, in their zeal to provide for educating the children of their Protestant neighbours.

3. Another feature in the Papal system as administered in the United States, which goes to confirm all I have said, is, that its conductors manifest so much desire to *take the lead in female education*.

I need not say to those who are accustomed to reflect on the nature and history of human society, that female character, and of course, female education, lie at the foundation of all that is precious and vital in the social system. Those who have the training of the female part of any community, may be said to hold in their hands the moral and religious interests of that community. The influence of woman on the character of the rising generation; on the tone of public sentiment; and, of course, on the purity and edification of the church, is so extensive and commanding, that if it were possible for any one man, or body of men, directly or indirectly to control it, the same individual or body might govern the nation. Our Roman Catholic neighbours, aware of this—have sagaciously directed a large share of their attention to this great object. Their establishments for female education are greatly disproportioned to the wants of their own people; and are avowedly adapted to attract the daughters of Protestants. This is, perhaps, the most artful and efficient system of proselytism that can well be imagined. All ecclesiastical history bears testimony to its power. So that if Protestants give their encouragement to this insidious scheme, no one can estimate the extent of the mischief which it may ultimately produce. If the fountains be poisoned, the streams must inevitably pour forth disease and death.

4. One more under this head; *the system pursued in Roman Catholic seminaries is peculiarly adapted to attract, and, having attracted, to dazzle and deceive*. I alluded, not long since, to a *pledge* frequently given, either virtually or formally, by the conductors of these seminaries, not to interfere with the religious opinions or preferences of their pupils. Now, even supposing this pledge to be, in all cases, sacredly regarded, even to the letter, which is, perhaps, supposing more than can be rationally expected—considering the character of the Papal system; considering their tenets, that “no faith is to be kept with heretics,” and that “the end sanctifies the means;”—yet even if they *do* adhere to their pledge, the danger is in a very small degree, if at all diminished. The whole design and

tendency of their ritual, in all its parts and exhibitions, is to dazzle and allure. It is calculated to address the imagination—to captivate the senses—and through the medium of both, to win the heart. It cannot be expected, or even requested of the conductors of such seminaries, that they should hide from the eyes of their pupils the rites and ceremonies of their own worship. Yet it is almost impossible that these rites and ceremonies should even be witnessed, from day to day, for a number of months together, without mischief. The instructors, indeed, may so far keep their promise, as never to say a word to their pupils which, if heard even by their parents themselves, could be construed into a direct violation of their engagement. But they can, systematically, pursue a course of treatment peculiarly affectionate and attractive towards those whom they wish to win. They can flatter, cajole, and draw them in a thousand nameless and covert ways. They can manage so as to present some of their most unscriptural rites and practices under very alluring aspects. They can invest those rites and opinions with all the attraction and splendour which the most refined efforts of sculpture, painting and engraving, can confer. They can contrive to give hints, innuendoes, and various practical suggestions in favour of what they wish to impress, not only without words, but, perhaps, more powerfully without than with them. Of these artifices, many pious, simple-hearted Protestants are not sufficiently aware; but Jesuits, and those who have imbibed Jesuitical principles and maxims, (which may, without injustice, be said essentially to belong to the whole system of Romanism) understand them perfectly. Meanwhile there is nothing more adapted to captivate the youthful mind than the Popish ritual. Its dazzling splendour; its addresses to the imagination and the senses, can scarcely fail of fascinating every young person, who has not a remarkably enlightened and well balanced mind. For this express purpose this ritual was devised; and thousands have been entangled and enchained by its power before they were aware.

So much for the real danger that our children will be captivated and deceived by the seminaries of the Romanists. But perhaps it will be asked by some—"Suppose our children *do* become captivated by these alluring arts: suppose they *are* attracted to these seminaries, and become subject to their plenary influence:—suppose, in a word, they *do* become Romanists? Where is the great harm of it? Many think that the anxiety of pious Protestants on this subject is altogether excessive; that the religion of the Papists is a far less dangerous system than is commonly supposed; and that the apprehension of mischief is founded far more on sectarian prejudice, than an enlightened and benevolent zeal. In reply to this erroneous estimate, let me,

II, *Secondly*, Call your attention to some of the great evils which will be likely to result from your children being brought under the power of the Roman Catholic system. And, I—THE SALVATION OF THEIR SOULS WILL BE AWFULLY ENDANGERED. I am far, indeed, from supposing that a Romanist, as such, cannot be saved. On the contrary, I cherish the pleasing hope, that, of the many millions who belong to that corrupt body, there are some who, amidst

all the deplorable superstition and darkness with which they are surrounded, have been taught by the Holy Spirit to know more than their earthly teachers. If, in times long since past, a *Thomas a Kempis*, a *Savonarola*, a *Pascal*, an *Arnaud*, and a *Fenelon* manifested by their spirit and conduct that they had been taught of God, why may there not be *now* some chosen ones in that mass of enormous corruption? I dare not deny or doubt that such may be found to be the case when the secrets of all hearts shall be laid open. But the question is, what are the *essential character*, and the *native tendency* of the Papal system? Can any intelligent Christian doubt that it is a system of abomination, which disguises and perverts the Gospel, and which of course, must jeopard the perdition of every soul exposed to its influence. Glance, for a moment, at the dark, revolting features of this system, and then, with the Bible in your hand, say whether it is not replete with peril to every soul that receives it? It is the great refuge of the guilty and the blinded conscience from the humbling requisitions of the Gospel. It is a systematic and most ingenious plan for gaining power, affluence, and a license to sin, under the mask of religion. In a word, it is a miserable system of Jewish ceremonial and Pagan superstition, disguised by a Christian nomenclature; and adapted to turn men away from the only scriptural foundation of a sinner's hope. Yes, my friends, so long as the Roman Catholic Church claims for the bishop of Rome, universal supremacy and infallibility; so long as she openly teaches the Anti-Christian doctrine of human merits, and sells for money indulgences for committing every species of sin; so long as she puts a set of deified saints, and deified ceremonies, in the place of Christ, as the ground of hope toward God; so long as she maintains the miserable idolatry of transubstantiation, which sets at defiance all sense, reason, and scripture; so long as she maintains the system of auricular confession, that nefarious juggle between a corrupted priesthood, and a corrupted people; as long as she enforces the celibacy of the clergy; the worship of images; prayers to the saints, and for the dead; especially, so long as she in a great measure, locks up the scriptures from the common people, and compels them to take both the contents and the meaning of the word of God, from her own tyrannical dictation;—so long as she continues to maintain these things, she cannot cease to be “Anti-Christ,” “Babylon the great, the mother of harlots and abominations.”

Now, shall we deliberately expose our children to the contagion of this soul-destroying system? Shall parents who call themselves Christians, act with so much blindness and cruelty to their offspring? Shall we commit them to instructors who, we know, will send them for a hope of heaven to rites and penances, and relics, instead of the Saviour? Shall we commit them to the instruction of those who will teach them to fly from the terrors of a guilty conscience to “the confessional, and the wafer,” without the sacrifice of a single lust? Alas! my friends, this is so much like the conduct of some who boasted of being the covenant people of God of old, who “caused their children to pass through the fire to Moloch,” that it is difficult to speak of it in terms of adequate reprobation.

2. Another source of danger connected with the Papal system is, that, corrupt and destructive to the soul as this system is, it is, at the same time, PECULIARLY ATTRACTIVE AND FASCINATING TO DEPRAVED HUMAN NATURE. One of the most polished and popular living writers in England, Dr. *Southey*, remarks, in a late work, "that a system in all things so unlike the religion of the Gospel, and so opposite to its spirit as the Papal, should have been palmed upon the world, and established as Christianity, would be incredible, if the proofs were not undeniable and abundant." *The Book of the Church*, vol. I. p. 292. This is the remark of a man much better qualified to decide a question of polite literature, than one of theology or ecclesiastical history. His representation is just the reverse of truth. It is so far from being incredible that the fact of which he speaks, should be a fact, that it would be strange if it were otherwise. The system of Romanism is the religion of depraved human nature. It is the natural confederacy of blinded, self-righteous man to get rid of Christ; and to substitute a gilded and dazzling machinery of superstitious rites in place of his holy, humbling, and self-denying religion. No wonder, then, that this system has been so extensively popular. It finds a ready response in every selfish, worldly, sensual heart. Our children will be a thousand times more apt to be fascinated and led captive by it, than if it were a purer and more rational system. Before their inexperience, and unsuspecting credulity are apprehensive of danger, they will be borne away, "as the ox is led to the slaughter, not knowing that it is for their life."

3. A third consideration which shews the danger of committing our sons and daughters to Roman Catholic instruction, is, THE NOTORIOUS AND DREADFUL MORAL CORRUPTION WHICH IS KNOWN TO CHARACTERIZE MANY OF THEIR INSTITUTIONS. The moral profligacy of monasteries and nunneries has been, for many centuries, the astonishment, the loathing and the horror of the Christian world. The evidence of this is as unquestionable as it is abundant. I trust that no reflecting hearer will imagine that the charge here made rests, in any degree, on the authenticity of any recent "awful disclosures" made by a popular manual; or that it can be affected by the character of the person alleged to have made those "disclosures." With any recent publications on this subject, I have no intention, at this time, to meddle. Concerning such publications, it is not my intention either to affirm or deny any thing. They make no part of the authority on which I rest. But I do affirm, that, even if they be all given to the winds, and their authors consigned to perpetual discredit and infamy,—the evidence of the wide spread and awful pollution of monasteries and nunneries remains unimpaired. Unless we are prepared to discard the accumulating testimony of a thousand years; unless we are willing to set at naught the suffrages of the greatest and best men that ever adorned the church of God; nay, unless we are prepared to reject the confessions of some of the most respectable Romanists themselves;—we cannot evade the evidence that many—very many of those boasted seats of celibacy and peculiar devotedness, have been, in reality, sinks of deep and awful licentiousness. Indeed, if it were not so,—considering

what human nature is ; and considering the nature and management of those institutions, it would encroach on the province of miracle. And that the institutions referred to, in our own country, are not free from the corruption to which I allude, he must have great hardihood of unbelief who can entertain the smallest doubt.

Surely, then, it requires no laboured argument to convince a conscientious Christian, that he ought not to commit his children to such polluted and polluting hands. Surely he who can deliberately expose a beloved son or daughter to the possibility of such danger, must be either strangely blinded, or as destitute of natural affection, as of Christian principle. I am not ignorant of the force both of prejudice and of habit ; and can make much allowance for Protestant parents who have long been accustomed to regard Popish instructors as safe in every respect, and as peculiarly accomplished as literary guides. But it is difficult to frame an apology for those who, with such a flood of light on this subject as now shines around them, can still pursue their old course. Fathers ! Mothers ! can it be necessary to beg that you will pause and consider well before you place your children in circumstances which will put in fearful jeopardy all their most precious interests for this world, as well as for that which is to come.

4. If our children should ever be brought under the power of the Roman Catholic system, we may rest assured it will be to **TRAIN THEM UP AS SLAVES, INSTEAD OF HIGH-MINDED FREEMEN.** The system of Romanism is, throughout, a system of tyranny on the part of the priesthood, and of abject submission and servitude on the part of the people. It is a fixed enemy to civil and religious liberty in every form. It denies and takes away the rights of conscience. It prohibits the people from reading the scriptures in their vernacular tongue, and judging for themselves what the inspired oracles teach. It subjects the whole Christian world, as far as it can, to the despotic dominion of a kind of deified individual. It is a decided foe to liberal inquiry, whether in literature, in science, or in duty. It rules, as far as it has the power, by terror and persecution ;—persuading the people that their destinies, for time and eternity, are in the hands of their priests. It claims the power of remitting and retaining sins ; and, of course, of inflicting upon those who are not submissive to their will, not merely the penalty of exclusion from the covenant and the privileges of mercy in this life ; but by withholding that which is essential to salvation, the terrors also of eternal perdition. In short, every thing pertaining to the Papal system, tends to repress free inquiry ; to destroy the freedom of the press ; to keep the people in ignorance ; to take out of their hands the choice of their spiritual rulers and teachers ; and, eventually, of their civil rulers ; to enslave their minds ; and to prepare them for the most abject submission to a priesthood, whose lust of power, of pleasure, and of gold may be considered as forming the prominent character of nine out of ten, and, more probably, of nineteen out of twenty, of the whole body, from the sovereign pontiff, down to the lowest member of their ecclesiastical orders.

My friends ! have you the souls of freemen ? Are you desirous of maintaining and transmitting unimpaired to posterity the dearly

purchased rights, and the spirit of your patriot fathers? I know you are. Guard, then, O guard with sacred care against exposing your children to the influence of a system, which, however plausible in its professions, or high in its claims, can only prepare them to become recreant to all their privileges, and, ultimately, ignoble slaves.

5. Once more; to all the preceding evidence of the danger to which your children are exposed from Papal delusions, we may add **THE TESTIMONY OF PAINFUL EXPERIENCE.** Were I able, my friends, to set before you examples of the kind which I have described, with all the vividness of colouring possessed by the reality, you would be filled with mingled feelings of grief and horror. Your own city, as well as many other parts of our nation, furnishes many signal and mournful examples of the perversion of the minds of ingenuous youth, when committed to the instruction of Romanists. Never shall I forget one remarkable instance, which occurred, many years ago, not only within the bounds of my own knowledge, but in one of the families of my own pastoral charge. An amiable, elegant, and highly promising youth was sent to a Roman Catholic Seminary, for the single object of learning, to rather more advantage than was otherwise practicable, a polite living language. He attained his purpose; but at a dreadful expense. He very speedily became a zealous Papist; began in a few weeks to address and reproach his parents, by letter, as blinded heretics, out of the way of salvation; was deaf to every remonstrance, both from them and their pastor; and remains, to the present day, a devoted, incorrigible Romanist. And similar to this is the mournful story of hundreds of the sons and daughters of Protestant parents in our land, who have inconsiderately and cruelly committed their children to Papal training; and found, when too late, that they had contracted a moral contagion never to be eradicated.

The foregoing statements, my friends, have been made, if my heart does not deceive me, in the fear of God, and with a deep conviction that I have uttered nothing but the truth. Indeed, I am quite certain that, in every case, a picture still more dark and revolting might have been presented without the least exaggeration. If there be a serious Romanist in my audience, I take for granted that he hears me with the most revolting impression that I am slandering the body to which he belongs. And I doubt not that there are really many individuals connected with that large body, who, conscious of sincerity and honesty themselves, have never yet penetrated beyond the exterior of the "whited sepulchre" to which they bear a relation; and really know but little of the death and rottenness which reign within. For Romanists, as well as the old Pagans, have their "mysteries," and their "chambers of imagery," which are fully disclosed only to those who can be trusted with the knowledge of them. It is with Romanism in general, as with the artful and profligate society, of Jesuits. Even when that society was at the height of its prosperity and power, many nominal Jesuits were notoriously, in a great measure ignorant both of the principles and policy of their order. For all who, thus, for want of information, in the honesty of their hearts adhere to the Papacy, I have unfeigned respect, and know how to make the proper allow-

ance. But such honest Romanists, must allow those who have paid a little more attention than themselves to the history of the church of God; and who cannot close their eyes against the testimony, not merely of one, but of multitudes of the most pious, learned, and venerable Protestant divines that ever lived, and the direct confessions of Romanists themselves:—I say, they must allow such to believe, what can really no more be questioned, than the existence of such a city as Rome, or of the pontiff who sits enthroned there. The great searcher of hearts knows that I have no desire to slander any individual or body of men. But being, however unworthy, among those who are set as “watchmen on the walls of Zion,” wo to me, and wo to others, similarly situated, if we give not a distinct and faithful warning.

Can it be, my friends, that such men as Luther, and Calvin, and Cranmer, and Knox, and Melancthon, and others, their compeers and contemporaries, who were all bred in the bosom of the church of Rome, were ignorant what Romanism was, and opposed it without reason? Can it be that the enormous corruption, both in doctrine and morals, which they describe and denounce, were mere idle fancies, which had no existence but in their own imaginations? Can it be that the most learned, wise, and pious Protestant divines of England, Scotland, France, Holland, and Germany of later times, were all ignorant, or deceived, or slanderers concerning a body in the midst of which they lived, and wrote, and died? We must either suppose all this, or admit the representations which I have given to be substantially correct.

Say not, my friends, that these remarks are made in a spirit which amounts to the *persecution* of the Romanists. Far, very far from us be such a spirit! Did our blessed Saviour persecute, when he pronounced woes against the scribes and pharisees, and warned men to flee from their fatal errors? Did the inspired Apostles persecute, when they proclaimed to Jews and Pagans that there was “no other name given under heaven among men whereby they could be saved, but the name of Jesus Christ;” and that all who rejected him must “die in their sins”? Did the noble-minded reformers persecute when they came out from the church of Rome, as they found her three centuries ago, and solemnly exhorted all whom they addressed to come out of her also, that they might not be “partakers of her plagues”? I ask again, were these exhortations and warnings persecution? Surely no Christian man will dare to ascribe to them this character. And is it come to this, that taking precisely the same ground, and speaking precisely the same language with those great leaders, shall be stigmatized as persecution? Is it come to this, that warning our children and neighbours against errors and superstitions which we verily believe are adapted to destroy their souls, is denounced as persecution? No, my friends, we desire not to “destroy men’s lives, but to save them.” Our great object is to warn men of the dangers to which they are exposed, that “their blood may not be required at our hands.”—

These things being so, what, then, some will ask, is to be done? Our duty, my friends, is plain. It is, first of all, to arouse from our torpor and indifference on this important subject;—to believe that

the venerable reformers did not wage war with imaginary, but with real and appalling evils; and that when we make a truce with Romanism, we abandon their spirit, and dishonour their memories. It is to recognise that the Papal system is the same now that it was, when, more than three centuries ago, the illustrious Saxon hero, taking his life in his hand, stood forth an undaunted witness against the "man of sin." In this free country, indeed, Romanism, restrained by public sentiment, as well as by wise and equitable laws, would seem to be a mild and inoffensive system:—but go to Spain, to Portugal, to Italy, where it reigns without control, and, of course, has the power to act out its native, essential spirit, and behold the fearful aspect which it wears there! Has it materially changed since the days of Luther and Calvin? It rejects this defence, and denies that it has materially changed even for the better. In fact a church which professes to be "infallible," can never acknowledge that she has *changed*, without abandoning one of her most prominent and essential claims.

Settle it in your minds, then, that Romanism,—while many of its "adherents" mean not so, neither do they in their hearts think so,—Romanism, as a system—is anti-Christian,—tyrannical,—immoral,—and hostile to all the most precious interests of man, temporal and eternal. Let every friend of the Redeemer's kingdom regard it as the great "mystery of iniquity," and keep at the utmost distance from all fellowship with it. I do not exhort you to hate the men who hold it; on the contrary, love them, and be ever ready to do them good. But hate, and turn away with loathing from their system. Be aware of its radical corruptions. Guard your children, and all with whom you have influence, against its fascinating allurements. Keep back those whose education is entrusted to your care from Papal seminaries of every kind. Imagine not that *any branch of knowledge* can be better acquired in those seminaries, than in the Protestant institutions around you. Never was there a more miserable delusion. And even if it were otherwise, you have seen the fearful expense at which even a real advantage may be obtained.

But something more is necessary than merely abstaining from contact with the danger in question. We are bound, as members both of the church and of the civil community, to do all in our power, by Christian means, for removing the contagion by healing the infectious disease. Let us endeavor, then, to pour the light of divine truth all around us, by holy living, by faithful instruction, and by unceasing prayer. Nothing more certainly expels the darkness and corruption of which I have spoken, than the light of spiritual knowledge, accompanied by the power of the Holy Spirit. **THE BIBLE AND ROMANISM CANNOT LIVE TOGETHER.** As well may light and darkness, Christ and Belial attempt to maintain fellowship. To this great principle, then, let every patriot, every parent, and especially every Christian direct his attention and his efforts. Let a Bible be placed in every family. Let an efficient Sabbath school be established in every neighbourhood, from one end of our land to the other. In every one of these schools, let Biblical instruction, in all its simplicity and richness, be faithfully imparted. Teach all

the rising generation, from their mother's lap, that the BIBLE, the BIBLE is the only infallible rule of faith and practice; the common legacy of all Christians; the common charter of our hopes; and the best pledge and safeguard of our rights, civil and religious. Let our whole population be brought, as far as possible, under such teaching, and the power of the Holy Spirit implored to give it success, and all will yet be well. Let the only weapons employed in opposing Romanism be *example, instruction, and prayer*. Ever abhor, I beseech you, those weapons of blood which Romanists have so long and so cruelly wielded against Protestants. Let not the pictures of the sword and the fires of martyrdom, with which their history teems, move you to return evil for evil. The man who recommends religion to all who converse with him by the lustre of a holy life; who contributes, by all the means in his power to the circulation of the word of God; to the enlightened and faithful instruction of the rising generation; and to the diffusion, in every form, of simple, pure, scriptural truth; and who accompanies every effort with humble, importunate prayer for help from on high;—that man is the best benefactor of his country, and of the Church of God. These are the means by which every species of error is to be opposed. These are the means by which Anti-Christ is finally to be put down. These are the means by which every thing adapted to "hurt or destroy" is to be banished from the abodes of men; and by which the earth is to be "filled with the knowledge of the Lord as the waters fill the sea." Amen! "come quickly, even so come, Lord Jesus"!

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

THE INSTITUTION OF CELIBACY IN THE PAPAL CHURCH.

No. I.

XVI. WE come now to the writings of St. Paul. The writings of this apostle seem more favourable to celibacy, but his language certainly does not admit of all the consequences which have been deduced from it. Read 1 Cor. ch. vii. (1.) It gives no countenance to constraint. (2.) It is advice, not precept. (3.) The advice has relation to circumstances *then* existing. (4.) In express terms, he says the motive of his opinion in favour of celibacy was the existing distress. (v. 26.) The motive has ceased by a change of times. The advice is therefore no longer applicable. Opposition was incident to the establishment of a religion so pure and holy and exclusive as the religion of Christ. The Acts of the Apostles prove that the violence of the people preceded the edicts of princes. It was natural that Paul should, under such circumstances, advise his converts to avoid attachments which would bind to earth, as by such abstinence they would diminish the sacrifices they might at any moment be required to make. (1 Cor. xv. 30—31.) It does not follow

from this, that Paul would have advised works of supererogation after the times of persecution had gone by, especially after having had experience of its demoralizing effects in times of quiet. (1 Tim. v. 14.)

XVII. After these preliminary observations we are prepared to take a rapid survey of the principal texts of this apostle. The first few verses of the vii. ch. 1 Cor. have often been cited to prove the apostle's preference of celibacy; but many interpreters, and particularly the most ancient, regard this passage as applicable only to second marriages. It is thus Clement of Alexandria understands the famous passage (in v. 9.) *melius est nubere quam uri*. (Strom. 461.) "God permitted," says this father "polygamy under the ancient law, &c. But under the new law he allows the espousal of only one woman, &c. But if after the death of this woman the man cannot contain himself, the apostle allows the espousal of a second, and in doing so he does not sin, &c. But he does not attain the perfection recommended in the gospel."

XVIII. Verse 7 is also cited, in which the apostle expresses the wish that all men were like himself. These words must refer to second marriages, or we must suppose the apostle would annihilate the race. Tradition supports this view. Most of the ancient fathers believed that Paul had been married. Ignatius asserts it in his Epistle to the Philippians. Clement of Alexandria (Strom. p. 448) says that Paul, to honor marriage, feared not to make mention of his wife in one of his epistles, but he did not lead her about with him that she might not be a charge to the churches. Origen (in Epist. ad Rom.) though an *ultra* partisan of continence is of the same opinion, and he thinks the words in the Epistle to the Philippians, ch. iv. 3; "*I entreat thee also true yoke fellow*," are addressed by Paul to his wife. (91.) In the vulgate it is, *Rego et te germane compar*. The Greek *συνος*, suits either sex, and although it may signify a colleague, it is commonly employed to signify the union of husband and wife, (see 2 Cor. vi. 14.) But what testimony is preferable to that of Origen, the most learned of the fathers, and who studied the scriptures very thoroughly? (But see McKnight, Scott, and Hardoin on this verse.) Those Roman Catholics who give the force of authority to the vulgate, of course, cannot admit of the correctness of this interpretation, without admitting the infidelity of their text—Basil (*de abdic serm*) and Eusebius (Hist. b. 3. c. 30.) and many other fathers were of the opinion, that Paul had been once married. If this be so, this apostle's example, would be an argument only against second marriages, which would render the wish expressed in verse 7 more reasonable. The same remarks may be made in substance upon the first verse of this chapter, Taken in the broad sense, the doctrine is impracticable. It would make the race itself an evil and a sin. The sense of every passage ought to be kept subordinate to the principal subject. The apostle, in this place is answering a particular question: "*Now concerning the things whereof ye wrote unto me*." The answer is referable only to the persons or the circumstances upon which the apostle had been consulted.—What then was the object of this advice? The sequel shews that, the question was this, whether sexual inter-

course was allowable except with reference to the principal end of marriage, viz: the procreation of children. Paul answers that it is commendable to impose a restraint beyond this limit; still he dares not to enjoin it, knowing, as he did, the frailty of men. If this were not the real subject or question, which drew forth his remarks, why did he enter into all the detail of the relative rights of husband and wife? This is the explanation of Clement of Alexandria in his *Stromata*, and very nearly that of St. Alexander, in his commentary on Paul. It falls in well with the principal subject; for it will be observed, that the first part of this chapter, contains advice, only for married persons, and general advice to abstain from all women would have been quite out of place in an address to married persons professing Christianity.

XIX. We now come to the sentiments of Paul on the subject of the marriage of ecclesiastics. In 1 Tim. ch. iii. 2: he says, a bishop must be blameless the husband of one wife (or woman)—below he adds, (v. 12,) let the deacons be husbands of one wife (or woman.) In Titus i. 5 and 6, the same order is repeated as to presbyters and bishops. These passages have been differently interpreted. The first is that of Theodoret (in Epis. I ad Tim.) He says—In regard to the words "husband of one wife," I approve the opinion of those who believe, that, as the Jews and Greeks had many wives at the same time, and as the laws of the emperor at present forbid it, they keep concubines with their wives, the apostle requires that those only should be ordained for priests or bishops, who have but one wife, and who live with her in honourable and chaste marriage: for say these interpreters, "the apostle has not rejected second marriages, but has many times recommended them. But he is guilty, who after having repudiated his wife has married another," &c. *Si enim ipse, priore expulsâ uxore, fuisset alii conjunctus dignus esset qui reprehenderetur et jure esset accusationi obnoxius; sin autem vis mortis priorem disjunxerit, urgens autem natura ut secundâ uxori conjungeretur coegerit non ex voluntate sed ex casu processit secundum matrimonium. Haec considerans admitto eorum interpretationem qui sic intellexerunt.*" These words are remarkable, as the author is here speaking of the marriage of ecclesiastics, they admit the right in them to marry a second time, even after they are in orders, because the author does not except this case, and the reason which he gives, is equally applicable to ecclesiastics as to laymen. Chrysostom, before Jerome, had given the same explanation in his X. Homily, on this Epistle. Jerome in his letter to Oceanus says, the opinion was supported by many, though he does not himself seem to give much weight to it. But Estius says, that if this passage be understood to prohibit ecclesiastics only from having two wives, it would seem to allow other Christians that liberty.

Others think, that divorces, being then very frequent among the Jews and Romans, there must in all probability have been found among the converts, men who, ~~often~~ having been separated from their first wives had married a second time, and that they were allowed to retain the second wives because the evil having been done, could not be repaired; yet, in as much as the gospel was opposed to such disorder, it was thought that such persons should not be

*This interpretation shows the Jerome's ingenuity of
not his good sense*

received into the sacred ministry.—A third opinion mentioned by Jerome (Epist. ad Ocean) is, that the injunction was purely allegorical, and ment merely, that a minister should not leave the church which had chosen him; and this they said was the reason, why translations from one church to another, were forbidden by the Council of Nice.

But most of the fathers, so called, supposed that the apostle meant that none should be received into the sacred ministry who had been married more than once, whether the wife were living or dead. The question then occurs whether this law (supposing it to be a law) prevented them from marrying again (if the wife were dead) after they had come into the ministry—Or (if she were living) did it require them to observe continence in respect to their wives after having taken holy orders.

XX. At an early period in the history of the church, second marriages were regarded as an evidence of weakness, and evangelical perfection, was thought to require abstinence, from them. "Second marriages," says Athenagorus, (Leg. ad Gent.) are in our eyes only an honourable kind of adultery. For he who has dismissed his wife and married another, says the Lord, is an adulterer. Thus he allows us neither to divorce the wife to which we are united, nor to marry a second wife. If the first be dead, the adultery is not less real, nor the transgression less formal according to the law of God: For he created at first but one man and *one* woman.

Without a minute examination of this opinion, it is obvious, that the example of Adam cannot form a rule for us. Adam received his wife directly from God—her life continued in all probability about the same time as his, and with the exception of her, the rest of the race were his descendants. If this example proves any thing, it is, that every man is under obligation to unite himself in marriage to one woman; but the Roman Catholics are not anxious to deduce this inference from it—This opinion, however, certainly was not that of Paul. Rom. vii. 1—3.

The expressions of some of the other fathers against second marriages are not so strong, but most cast a slur over them, varying in its hue with their austerity.

XXI. Such being the prevailing opinion, as it respected all Christians, it was to be expected that ecclesiastics, whose profession supposed a higher degree of evangelical perfection, were required to be more rigorously abstinent than others; and as they were then elected by the people, none could obtain their votes whose life shocked their opinions.

XXII. But the other question is, whether ecclesiastics who had been once married, could marry again? It may be remarked that the apostle lays down a general rule.—He makes no exception. There is no text which formally forbids them. The utmost that can be said is, that the state of public opinion in regard to bigamy, which was then understood in the sense of a second marriage, after the first had been dissolved by death, would probably render such marriages rare in the case of ecclesiastics. Thus a general usage may have obtained, which served as the foundation of a law prohibiting them; which, however, was not rigorously enforced till the ninth century, and then through the instrumentality of the cele-

brated Hildebrand, who was pope under the name of Gregory VII. (See *Newton on the Prophecies*, *Dessert*. 23, No. vi.)

XXIII. Still the ancient severity was by degrees relaxed, before the introduction of the greater rigour which prevailed from the ninth century. Jerome in his letter to Oceanus says, that without counting priests and deacons who had been twice married, there had always been twice married bishops enough to form a council as numerous as that of Rimini, where there were nearly four hundred.

XXIV. But the requirement of continence between married persons is much more singular than the prohibition of a second marriage. It seems an inconsistency to allow a marriage to *subsist* and yet prohibit, that which is its chief end, (Gen. ix. 1,) and one would think, this would be a profanation,—(an impiety,)—in the eyes of those who consider marriage a sacrament. Besides, it cannot be taken for granted, that the dispositions of both parties, will always be the same, and the continence of one, may be the occasion of sin to the other (1 Cor. vii. 5.) And where is the authority for any such rule? The passage just cited seems irreconcilable with such a rule, and it applies with equal force in the case of ecclesiastics as of other persons. How is it possible, in any case, that men can abolish a right or law given to man by nature, and impose upon him obligations which neither Christ nor his apostles have thought necessary? It is quite certain that no such law was *inferred* any where before the 4th century. The third canon of the collection called apostolical, which was made about the end of the 3d century, forbids under pain of excommunication every bishop, priest, and deacon to separate from his wife under pretext of religion. Clement of Alexandria says (*Stromat.* l. III. p. 462,) “that marriage must not be forbidden, nor any precept made, requiring abstinence from wine or meats, but only to require moderation in the use of them. All the epistles of the apostles recommend temperance and moderation—they offer us many precepts upon marriage, generation, and the cares of a family: None forbid, honourable and lawful marriage. All believe that the promises of the Saviour may be shared by those, who enjoy the state of marriage with thankfulness to God, as well as by those who live in perfect chastity; each being bound to regulate his life according to his necessities and the measure of grace which he has received.” Below he adds, “the apostle admits that whoever has but one wife only, whether priest, deacon, or layman, provided he uses marriage in a manner not blameworthy shall be saved by the procreation of children,” *σθηνεται δια της τεκνογονιας*. Clement (*in Strom.* p. 472,) combats the Carpocratians, Marcionites and other heretics, who forbade marriage, thus: “What can they answer to the laws imposed by this apostle, who would have them choose as the head of the church one who has already learned to govern a family, and who allows to a bishop the marriage of one wife.”

XXV. These proofs are opposed by no tradition which reaches to a time anterior to the fourth century. But it is said, that in the first ages of the church, marriage was allowable to bishops, because the new converts were mostly married persons. This is not probable, at least so late as the time of Clement of Alexandria. There

were schools in Alexandria in his time. Twenty ecclesiastics would doubtless have sufficed then for that place; for fifty years after that, in the time of Cornelius, forty-four were sufficient for Rome, where it is said the Christians at that time were innumerable. (*Henr. Vales. in Euseb.*)

It is also said that married bishops were bound to continence upon taking holy orders, but Clement and several others deny that. Finally, all the resources of ~~education~~ are exhausted to prove that where the apostle says "a bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife," he means to use the past tense, *that is*; that "a bishop *must have been* the husband of one wife," *unius tantum fuisse uxoris maritum*, and the proof offered is 1 Tim. v. 9, where the apostle in speaking of widows, uses the past tense "*having been the wife of one man*." But who does not see the inaptness of this passage for that purpose. The word *widow* conveys by its definition an allusion to a relation which no longer exists. She is a wife while her husband lives,—a widow when he is dead. How then could the apostle have said a widow "*being the wife of one man*"?—Yet these, and such as these are the arguments of Estius, Hardoin and other interpreters of that class.

XXVI. Before explaining the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church upon continence and austerities, it is proper to advert to the source of the opinion by which they are accredited. It is commonly supposed they are of Christian origin, but this is not the fact. These practices have subsisted from time immemorial in India, Syria, and Egypt. See the accounts which Chardin, Tavernier and other travellers have given of the Bonzes and Faquirs. It corresponds minutely with the accounts we have of the first monks of Thebais. Herodotus (in Euterpe) also gives a similar account of the Egyptians.

These notions are the offspring of a false philosophy which was early engrafted upon Christianity. Manicheism is one of its forms. Two principles or deities were introduced to *explain the origin of evil*. These austerities and self-denials were the combat, waged against the bad principle or demon of evil, and therefore supposed to be agreeable to the sovereign author of good, and therefore regarded as an essential part of virtue and piety. Athenagoras (*Leg. ad Gent.*) in order to shew that most of the practices of paganism were inspired by demons, says, who but demons could have persuaded the priests of Rhea to make themselves Eunuchs—those of Diana to wound themselves in a thousand ways—others to lacerate their bodies with scourges? These frightful penances can proceed only from demons. The true God never moves us to such a contradiction of nature. As he is goodness himself, he is always beneficent. Clement of Alexandria (*Adm. ad Gent. p. 58.*) writes to the same effect. And those who wish to pursue this parallel may read the works of St. John of Elimachus, or his description of the ancient monks in what is called the fervour of their institution. The philosophy of Plato had great influence in introducing austerities into religion. His system was extensively adopted by the first fathers. None of the heathen philosophers had such noble ideas of God—or of his attributes, or of the human soul. He taught that

the life of man on earth was a state of expiation or suffering for transgressions committed in a previous state, though in tracing the plan of his republic he makes no use of this idea. But when his philosophy got a footing in Egypt, it found a people predisposed by the climate, to the excesses of superstition. They joined to it Pythagorean abstinences and some dogmas derived from other sects. Hence the Eclectics which flourished at Alexandria, to which St. Augustine and Clement and other fathers belonged. Then arose the new Platonism of Ammonias Sacas which was of a more austere character. It was little more than a science of privations—a school of enthusiasm and fanaticism. As a means of purgation of the soul, it prescribed abstinence from marriage and from all the pleasures of love. The body was the prison of the soul, and to be the means of increasing the number of sufferers, was a sin. Another prescription of this philosophy, was silence and retreat from intercourse with men to deserts or caverns—Again, continual fastings to arrive at a state of perfection called *Theurgia*, in which the subject of it might converse with *genii* and by their aid do miracles. These practices were adopted nearly at the same time into Christianity and by the philosophers, and probably from the same source. We do not read of monks before that time. Origen, a great advocate of continence, was a disciple of Ammonias.—

Plotinus and Porphyry and Jamblicus taught similar lessons to the philosophers.—Their life was as austere as that of the monks. Porphyry has left an account of the Samaneans and Brahmins, a species of solitary Indians which would be applicable to the ancient monks. (*See his Treatise De. Abst. Carn. l. IV.*)—Philo has given an account of the Therapeutes, a set of Jewish monks. Eusebius copies him, and pretends that it is a portrait of the life of the first Christians. It is not probable that Philo, a Jew, would be disposed to eulogize the Christians; or that he, who was an eye-witness, and says that *they were Jews*, was more liable to mistake than Eusebius, who lived three hundred years after him. The portrait given by Pliny (*Epist. B. X.*) of the first Christians is quite different. Fleury (*Moeurs des Chrétiens. p. 206*) admits that most of the early Christians were married.

XXVII. Still, in the apostolic and succeeding age celibacy was commended, as appears by Justin and Ignatius. But the reason has been given—persecutions—fear of martyrdom—the belief that the end of the world was near (*See Cyprian in Demet upon this last point*)—But it was about the middle of the second century that rigorous and severe penances (unknown in the apostolic age,) were introduced. *See Euseb. b. III. c. 23.*

Human motives had their influence in producing those practices. Tertullian (*De feland virg.*) informs us that virgins were permitted to appear in the churches with uncovered heads, but married women were veiled according to the apostle's precept. Virgins were otherwise honoured. The eloquence of Tertullian was not sufficient to change this custom, through fear of diminishing the number of those who would be willing to consecrate themselves to celibacy. The custom of kissing is adverted to by the same author. The virgins practiced this ceremony with uncovered face.—The married

Concupiscunt
 females gave and received the kiss through their veils. His words are, *Dum inter amplexus et oscula concalescit*. He reproaches the virgins with abusing the privilege by adorning themselves. He adds, that this continence is founded on vanity—does not always resist temptations—that scandals were frequent, and would have been more so, if culpable precautions had not been taken to conceal them. *Quanta etiam circa uterum suum audebit ne etiam mater detegatur. Scit Deus quod jam infantes et perfici et perducere ad partum integros duxerit debellatos aliquandiu a matribus. Facillime concupiscunt et felicissime pariunt ejusmodi virgines. Haec admittit coacta et invita virginitas.* (Tert. de ~~de~~ *veland virg. ad finem.*) Public opinion having taken this course, it was not difficult to find texts which might be so perverted as to seem to authorize the practice. Some of the perversions of scripture were very strange. For example, Jerome (in his letter XXI. ad Eustochium) says, that the ass which our Saviour sent his apostles to bring, just before the last supper *was the figure of virginity*.

Many proofs equally impressive with this might be found in the writings of the fathers.—The parable of the seed sown was explained so as to commend the popular practices. That which produced a hundred fold, was explained of martyrdom—that which produced sixty fold, was explained of those who took the vow of virginity. But when Christianity became triumphant in the reign of Constantine and there were no more martyrs, it was necessary or convenient at least to change this tariff. The number one hundred was adjudged to virginity, and sixty to marriage.

XXVIII. Still, however much celibacy may have been in repute, none were compelled to observe it against their will before the 4th century. The apologists for coerced celibacy cite no examples from authors more remote than Epiphanius and Jerome, and these authors gave only the usages of their own time. They ought at least to produce a law requiring it, or a general usage, before the Council of Nice. As for a law there is none, and the usage of the primitive church we will now proceed to inquire into, beginning first with the apostles.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

LIFE'S VOYAGE.

By Mrs. J. L. Gray, of Easton, Pa.

I.

Set the sail and trim the boat,
Softly blow the breezes;
Let the light bark onward float,
Where the zephyr pleases.

II.

Though the mountain's ponderous
brow,
Casts its shadow o'er us;
Yet the valley's sunny glow,
Is beaming bright before us.

III.

See, our sail is filling fast!
Unlash the cords that bind her;
Our graceful skiff with her slender
mast,
Soon leaves the shore behind her!

IV.

Hill and dale and shady bower,
To our view advancing;
Lowly hovel and lordly tower,
In the sun-beam glancing.

V.

Now we hear the jocund song,
Of the lusty reaper;
Now from yonder mournful throng,
Wailings of the weeper.

VI.

See yon gay and beauteous bower,
In the sunlight glowing;
And the fragrant shrub and flower,
In its shadow growing.

VII.

O! ye breezes cease to blow;
Stay O rippling river;
Though fain to linger we onward go,
'Tis gone 'tis gone forever!

VIII.

Thus adown the stream of life,
Time our bark is guiding;
Through scenes of pleasure or of
strife,
Onward ceaseless gliding!

IX.

On alike through weal and wo—
On through joy and sorrow—
How quickly come! how quickly go,
Noon and night and morrow!

X.

Come we to some fragrant vale,
Fondly would we linger;
But the fresh winds press the sail;
'Time's relentless finger,

XI.

Onward points—and as we go,
Memory's pencil only,
Can faintly paint the gorgeous glow,
Of scenes so loved and lovely.

XII.

Hill and dale how soon they're gone,
In this ceaseless motion!
Winds and waves still urge us on,
Onward to the ocean!

XIII.

Thus along life's gliding wave,
Morn and noon and eve'n,
To the dark insatiate grave,
Forward all are driven.

XIV.

Nor stop we there; still on we go,
Never, never ceasing—
On in joy or on in wo;
In infinite progression.

XV.

Soon our bonny bark will pass,
To the gulf of wailing;
Or soon be on the sea of glass,
In heaven, our sunshine, sailing.

XVI.

Gracious Spirit, in this vale
Give us favouring breezes!
Mighty Maker trim our sail;
Hold the helm, O Jesus!

MEMOIRS, TO SERVE AS A HISTORY OF THE SEMI-PELAGIAN
CONTROVERSY IN THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

No. I.

*The General Assembly of 1835; with a narrative of its principal
doings.—Sketch of the Foreign Missionary question.*

THIS important meeting was distinguished by three remarkable facts.

I. This was the first occasion on which the General Assembly ever met in "the *Valley of the Mississippi*." The selection of the city of Pittsburg, seems to have been made by a common consent between the great contending parties in the Assembly of 1834. Whether this was meant as a tribute to the influence of the *great west*, or an act of justice to its claims, it was certainly eminently favourable to a full representation of the churches—"scattered abroad," as they are through our immense national domain. And as the result was so favourable to the cause of truth and order, so it afforded a satisfactory demonstration of the soundness of our church at large; and especially of that part which lies west of the Alleghany.

II. The second remarkable fact, was, the powerful reaction produced by the measures of the previous Assembly. This was evident, the moment the body was brought into a shape to do business. The unconstitutional and revolutionary acts of the Assembly of 1834, were so numerous, that the church was aroused through all its parts. The first decisive movement against these decisions, was made with great promptitude and effect by the minority of that body before they separated—in adopting the memorable "Act and Testimony," and calling "a Convention" to meet at Pittsburg, a few days before the meeting of the Assembly of 1835. As the result has indisputably proved, these were most timely and effective movements. The former testified to the truth, and against error; the latter organized the reform which had been produced—and directed the awakening energies of the friends of truth. Perhaps a more deeply solemn, and prayerful body never was convened, than the Convention referred to. The Head of the church, seems to have presided in its councils—and the firm but sober wisdom of its decisions defeated the machinations and disappointed the hopes of the opposing party, while it prepared important materials for the approaching Assembly.

III. The third remarkable fact was, the union (for the first time in many years) of all the orthodox in one great party. The General Assemblies of several previous years had exhibited the extraordinary spectacle of a minority governing a majority by dividing it—and attaching one of its parts to itself. Real Presbyterians then composed if not two thirds, at any rate three fifths of the church. They

agreed in their *doctrine*; but differed as to the best method of conducting the controversy with those who were corrupting the church. The *New School party* was a *motley group* made up of all sorts—from the milder forms of error which is sometimes called *orthodoxy* in New England, to the *extremes of Pelagianism*. They were composed of several factions—which often agitated each other, *except* in the General Assembly. There they *always* acted in concert. Indeed the chief bond of union seemed to be opposition to Presbyterian faith and order. These men had contrived to play off the different portions of the Old School, or Presbyterian body, against each other in such a way as to introduce into the church their own doctrines, their congregational peculiarities, and the whole system of *voluntary institutions*.* And they had so laid their train, that the continuation of the same state of things for three or four years more must inevitably put the standards, institutions, funds and influence of the Presbyterian church under their supreme control. This began to be fully seen at the Assembly of 1834; and although many of the orthodox were dissatisfied with the policy of issuing the "Act and Testimony" and of calling "the Convention," yet they made *common cause* on the floor of the Assembly of 1835—and by that act, under God, sealed the salvation of our bleeding and endangered church. Forced together by common ruin threatened, they nobly buried every jealousy—and every minor difference in a general devotion to the great interests of the people of Christ, and came up as one man "to the help of the Lord against the mighty."

There occurred at the opening of the Assembly, an incident which served to rebuke the presuming confidence of the late dominant party—and to inspire the friends of truth with confidence. The moderator of the Assembly of 1834, the Rev'd Dr. Lindsley, foreseeing his absence, had written to the Rev'd Dr. William A. McDowell, moderator of the year 1833, requesting him, according to the rule on that subject, to open the Assembly with a sermon. Dr. McDowell requested the Rev'd Dr. Miller to do it; and after the service closed, he was about to organize the meeting, when Dr. Ely interposed—called the house to order, and informed them that as Dr. Lindsley was absent, the Rev'd N. S. S. Beman being the next moderator *who had a commission*, was the proper person to occupy the chair. He therefore moved that Dr. Beman take the chair. Such was the suddenness and audacity of the movement, that it was carried, by preconcert on the one part, and by perfect surprize on the other. During the recess, however, which immediately followed, a moment's reflexion convinced many members of the injustice which had been done; and as soon as the house assembled, Dr. Beman was much to his own mortification, requested by a large majority to retire; and Dr. McDowell, was placed in the chair.

This simple incident was useful.

Soon after, the orthodox party elected their moderator, &c. by

* By concealing their real opinions, by skill in tactics, with the help of the voluntary associations for missions and education; by the plan of Union and the emigrating habits of New England and New York—they had grown into a powerful party.

triumphant majorities, indicating the unexpected and very auspicious strength of their cause on the floor.*

It is not possible to go into much detail in this rapid sketch;—nor is it necessary to observe the chronological order of business. We propose to present only the leading acts of the Assembly—and in the order of their importance. As soon as the Assembly was organized, all eyes were turned to the Convention. That body, it was known, had recently adjourned—having drawn up a decisive, and full memorial addressed to the Assembly—stating the errors, and disorders which had been introduced, or connived at by late Assemblies, especially the last; and praying for prompt and adequate remedies. This document was, at an early day, laid before the Assembly by the committee on bills and overtures—and referred, after a vain attempt to prevent its reception, to a weighty committee—composed of the following members, viz:—Dr. Miller, Dr. Hoge, Dr. Edgar, Rev'd Mr. D. Elliot, Rev'd Mr. McElhenny—and Messrs. Stonestreet and Banks.

It will be remembered that the Assembly of 1834, adopted a most offensive and dangerous paper of which the *dignified, intelligent, and very modest* Mr. LEACH, of Va., was the reputed, but it is said Dr. Beman was the real father. This paper was revolutionary and in its tendency ruinous; and had largely contributed to alarm the church, and to create the Convention.

With the view of having it fully before our readers, that they may be the better prepared to understand the report which follows it, we publish it *entire*.

The Assembly resumed the unfinished business of last evening, viz. the report of the committee on the Memorial on the present state of the Presbyterian Church. The question was taken on the whole report, as amended and adopted by paragraphs, and the whole was adopted, and is as follows, viz:

The Committee to which was referred the Memorial complaining of sundry grievances abroad in the church, beg leave to report that they find said Memorial adopted, either in whole or in part by about nine Presbyteries, and eight Sessions; it is also signed by about eighteen ministers, and ninety-nine elders, asking of this Assembly to apply such remedies as may be necessary to correct the evils of which they complain.

Your Committee, after the most careful investigation, and mature deliberation, that they could bestow on the subject, have concurred in the following resolutions, which they recommend for the adoption of this Assembly, viz., Resolved.

1. That this Assembly cannot sanction the censure contained in the Memorial, against the proceedings and measures of former General Assemblies.

2. That it is deemed inexpedient and undesirable to abrogate, or interfere with the plan of Union between Presbyterians and Congregationalists in the new settlements, adopted in 1801.

3. That the previous action of the present Assembly on the subject of ordaining men is deemed sufficient.

4. That the duty of licensing and ordaining men to the office of the Gospel Ministry, and of guarding that office against the intrusion of men

* This was a large Assembly.—Early in the session on the vote to turn out Dr. Ely from the *clerk-ship*, 222 votes were given—and on one of the most important questions, the fourteenth day of the session—the entire vote polled was 208.

who are unqualified to discharge its solemn and responsible duties, or who are unsound in the faith, is committed to the Presbyteries. And should any, already in that office, be known to be fundamentally erroneous in doctrine, it is not only the privilege, but the duty of Presbyteries constitutionally to arraign, condemn, and depose them.

5. That this Assembly bears solemn testimony against publishing to the world, ministers in good and regular standing as heretical or dangerous, without having been constitutionally tried and condemned, thereby greatly hindering their usefulness as ministers of Jesus Christ. Our excellent constitution makes ample provision for redressing all such grievances; and this Assembly enjoins, in all cases, a faithful compliance, in meekness and brotherly love, with its requisitions; having, at all times, a sound regard to the purity, peace, and prosperity of the church.

6. That this Assembly have no authority to establish any exclusive mode of conducting missions; but, while this matter is left to the discretion of individuals and inferior judicatories, we would recommend and solicit their willing and efficient co-operation with the Assembly's Board.

7. That a due regard to the order of the church, and the bonds of brotherhood, require, in the opinion of this Assembly, that ministers dismissed in good standing by sister Presbyteries, should be received by the Presbyteries which they are dismissed to join, upon the credit of their constitutional testimonials, unless they shall have forfeited their good standing subsequently to their dismissal.

8. That in the opinion of this Assembly, to take up, and try, and condemn any printed publications as heretical and dangerous, is equivalent to condemn the author as heretical; that to condemn heresy in the abstract, cannot be understood as the purpose of such trial; that, the results of such trial are to bear upon, and seriously to affect the standing of the author; and that, the fair and unquestionable mode of procedure is, if the author be alive, and known to be of our communion, to institute process against him; and give him a fair and constitutional trial.

9. That in receiving and adopting the formularies of our church, every person ought to be supposed, without evidence to the contrary, to receive and adopt them according to the obvious, known, and established meaning of the terms, as the confession of his faith; and that, if objections be made, the Presbytery, unless he withdraw such objections, should not license, or ordain, or admit him.

10. That in the judgment of this Assembly, it is expedient that Presbyteries and Synods, in the spirit of charity and forbearance, adjust and settle, as far as practicable, all their matters of grievance and disquietude, without bringing them before the General Assembly, and the world, as in many cases, this tends to aggravate and continue them, and to spread them over the whole church, to the great grief of its members, and injury of the cause of religion.

This paper, when viewed in connection with the "elective affinity" principle of forming Presbyteries—and the decision of this same body on the questions pending between the Synod of Philadelphia, and the "affinity Presbytery," may be considered as the *crisis* of our ecclesiastical troubles. It is amusing to see stuck on to this paper, resolutions *expressing attachment to our standards!*

The above resolutions embodied a report on a memorial of grievances.—In contrast with this report of a new school committee in 1834, we next give the noble report of an old school committee of 1835—which may be considered jointly as a *response* to the memorial of the convention, and a *reply* to the paper printed above. A diligent comparison of their principles will at once explain what we

mean. For example: compare the first resolution of the following paper, with the seventh of the above paper: the second of this, with the eighth of that, &c. Here follows the document.

The committee to whom was referred the memorial and petition of a number of Ministers and Ruling Elders of the Presbyterian Church, and certain other papers relating to the same or allied subjects, beg leave to report,

That they have endeavoured to deliberate on the said memorial and petition, and other papers committed to them, with all that respect which the character of those from whom they come, could not fail to inspire; and with all the calmness, impartiality and solemnity which the deep importance of the subjects on which they have addressed the Assembly, so manifestly demands.

In approaching the consideration of these weighty subjects, the committee deemed it to be an obvious duty to exclude from their view, all those principles which result from the wishes or plans of different parties in the church, and to take for their guide simply the word of God, which we consider the only infallible rule of faith and practice; and those public Formularies by which we have solemnly agreed and stipulated with each other, to be governed in all our proceedings. The moment we depart from these, we are not only exposed to all the evils of discord; but also run the risk of destroying those bands of union by which we have been so long bound together as an ecclesiastical body. There is certainly no portion of the visible church in which a harmonious accordance with the same adopted formularies, and a uniform submission to the same rules of truth and order, are so essential to the maintenance of ecclesiastical peace, and to cordial co-operation in promoting these great purposes for which the church was founded by her King and Head, as among the churches of our denomination. The committee, indeed, by no means expect, and do not suppose, that the Assembly would think of enforcing that perfect agreement of views in every minute particular which, in a body so extended as the Presbyterian church, has perhaps never been realized. But that an entire and cordial agreement in all the radical principles of that system of truth and order which is taught in the Holy Scriptures, which is embodied in our Confession of Faith and form of government, and which every minister and elder of the Presbyterian church has solemnly subscribed and promised to maintain, may not only be reasonably expected, but must be, as far as possible, secured, if we would maintain the "unity of the Spirit" in the bonds of peace and love,—it is presumed this General Assembly will be unanimous in pronouncing. If this be not so, it is in vain that we assemble from year to year; in vain that we hope for intercourse either pleasant or edifying. Our judicatories must be scenes of discord and conflict, and the ties which bind the several parts of our extended body to each other, can scarcely fail of being ties to strife and contention.

Under convictions which these general principles are adapted to impress, the committee most deeply feel the importance of some of the conclusions to which they are constrained to come; and although some of these conclusions are at variance with several acts of the last General Assembly, yet they cannot doubt that they make an essential part of the Presbyterian system; and of course cannot be abandoned without seriously endangering both the comfort and the safety of our beloved church.

The committee therefore as the result of their deliberations on the documents committed to them, would most respectfully recommend to the Assembly, the adoption of the following resolutions, viz.

I. Resolved, that in the judgment of this General Assembly, it is the right of every Presbytery to be entirely satisfied of the soundness in the faith, and the good character in every respect, of those ministers who ap-

ply to be admitted into the Presbytery as members, and who bring testimonials of good standing from sister Presbyteries or from foreign bodies with whom the Presbyterian church is in correspondence. And if there be any reasonable doubt respecting the proper qualifications of such candidates, notwithstanding their testimonials, it is the right, and may be the duty of such a Presbytery to examine them, or to take such other methods of being satisfied in regard to their suitable character as may be judged proper; and if such satisfaction be not obtained, to decline receiving them. In such case it shall be the duty of the Presbytery rejecting the applicant to make known what it has done to the Presbytery from which he came, with its reasons. It being always understood that each Presbytery is, in this concern, as in all others, responsible for its acts to the higher judicatories.

II. Resolved, that in the judgment of this General Assembly, it is the right, and may be the duty, of any judicatory of our church, to take up, and if it see cause, to bear testimony against any printed publication which may be circulating within its bounds, and which, in the judgment of that judicatory, may be adapted to inculcate injurious opinions: and this whether the author be living or dead,—whether he be in the communion of our church or not,—whether he be a member of the judicatory expressing the opinion or of some other. A judicatory may be solemnly called upon to warn the churches under its care, and especially the rising generation, against an erroneous book, while the author may not be within their bounds, or immediately responsible at their bar; and while, even if he *were* thus responsible, and within their reach, they might not think it necessary to arraign him as a heretic. To deny our judicatories as guardians of the churches, this right, would be to deny them one of the most precious and powerful means of bearing testimony against dangerous sentiments, and guarding the children of the church against “that instruction which causeth to err.” The writer of such a book may reside at a distance from the neighbourhood in which his work is circulating and supposed to be doing mischief, or he may be so situated that, even if it be proper to commence process against him, it may not be possible to commence, or, at any rate, to issue that process within a number of months. In the meanwhile, if the right in question be denied, this book may be scattering poison without the possibility of sending forth an effectual antidote. Indeed, it may be indispensably necessary, in cases which may easily be imagined, to send out such a warning, even though the author of the book were fully acquitted from the charge of heresy.

III. Resolved, that the erection of church courts, and especially of Presbyteries and Synods on the principle of “elective affinity,” that is, judicatories not bounded by geographical limits, but having a chief regard in their erection to diversities of doctrinal belief, and of ecclesiastical policy;—is contrary both to the letter and the spirit of our constitution; and opens a wide door for mischiefs and abuses of the most serious kind. One such Presbytery, if so disposed, might, in process of time, fill the whole church with unsound and schismatic ministers, especially if the principle were adopted, that regular testimonials must of course secure the admission of those who bore them into any other Presbytery. Such a Presbytery, moreover, being without geographical bounds, might enter the limits, and disturb the repose of any church into which it might think proper to intrude;—and thus divide churches; stir up strife; and promote party spirit and schism with all their deplorable consequences. Surely a plan of procedure in the church of God which naturally and almost unavoidably tends to produce effects such as these, ought to be frowned upon, and as soon as possible, terminated by the supreme judicatory of the church. Therefore,

IV. Resolved, that at (and after) the meeting of the Synod of Philadel-

phia in October next, the Synod of Delaware shall be dissolved, and the Presbyteries constituting the same shall be then and thereafter annexed to the Synod of Philadelphia: and that the Synod of Philadelphia thus constituted by the union aforesaid, shall take such order concerning the organization of its several Presbyteries as may be deemed expedient and constitutional:—And that said Synod, if it shall deem it desirable, make application to the next General Assembly for such a division of the Synod as may best suit the convenience of all its Presbyteries, and promote the glory of God.

V. Resolved, that while this General Assembly fully appreciate, and deeply deplore the many painful evils which result from the present division in our church, in respect to the method of conducting domestic missions, and the education of beneficiary candidates for the ministry; they are persuaded that it is not expedient to attempt to prohibit, within our bounds, the operation of the "Home Missionary Society," or of the "Presbyterian Education Society," or any other voluntary association not subject to our control. Such an attempt would tend, it is believed, to increase, rather than to diminish the existing evils. The Assembly, however, is persuaded, that it is the first and binding duty of the Presbyterian church to sustain her own Boards; and that voluntary associations, operating within the bosom of the Presbyterian church, and addressing themselves to her members and congregations, are bound upon every principle, both of moral and ecclesiastical obligation, neither to educate; nor to send forth as Presbyterians, any individuals known to hold sentiments contrary to the word of God, and to the standards of the Presbyterian church.

VI. Resolved, that this Assembly deem it no longer desirable that churches should be formed in our Presbyterian connection agreeably to the plan adopted by the Assembly and the General Association of Connecticut in 1801. Therefore, Resolved, that our brethren of the General Association of Connecticut be, and they hereby are, respectfully requested to consent that said plan shall be from and after the next meeting of that Association, declared to be annulled. And, Resolved, that the annulling of said plan shall not in any-wise interfere with the existence and lawful operations of churches which have been already formed on this plan.

VII. Resolved, that this General Assembly see no cause either to terminate or modify the plan of correspondence with the Associations of our Congregational brethren in New England. That correspondence has been long established. It is believed to have been productive of mutual benefit. It is now divested of the voting power, which alone could be considered as infringing the constitution of our church by introducing persons clothed with the character of plenary members of the Assembly. It stands, at present, substantially on the same footing with the visits of our brethren from the Congregational Union of England and Wales; and in the present age of enlarged counsel, and of combined effort, for the conversion of the world, ought by no means to be abolished. Besides, the Assembly are persuaded, that amidst the unceasing and growing intercourse, between the Presbyterian and Congregational churches, it is desirable to have that intercourse regulated by compact, and of course, that it would be desirable to introduce terms of correspondence, even if they did not already exist.

VIII. Resolved, that while this General Assembly has no means of ascertaining to what extent the doctrinal errors alledged in the Memorial to exist in our church, do really prevail, it cannot hesitate to express the painful conviction that the allegation is by no means unfounded; and at the same time to condemn all such opinions, as not distinguishable from Pelagian or Arminian errors; and to declare their judgment that the holding of the opinions referred to is wholly incompatible with an honest adoption of our Confession of Faith. That this is the case, will be doubted by none who impartially consider the statements of that formulary

contained in Chap. VII. Sect. 3d and 4th,—Chap. VII. Sect. 2d,—Chap. VIII. Chap. IX. Chap. X. Sect. 1st and 2d.—Chap. XI. Sect. 1st—which statements must of course, be interpreted in their plain, obvious, and hitherto acknowledged sense. Against the doctrinal opinions, therefore, above alluded to, the Assembly would solemnly lift a warning voice; and would enjoin upon all our Presbyteries and Synods to exercise the utmost vigilance in guarding against the introduction and publication of such pestiferous errors.

This admirable paper was passed after a protracted and brilliant discussion, by a majority of 130 to 78. In it will be found the germ of a radical reform; even the first step toward the dissolution of the plan of union. After this decision, the new school party abandoned their vain opposition; and with the most indecent precipitation—returned to their homes in great numbers.

The next most important act of the Assembly was, that which related to the work of foreign missions. The history of this great question in our church, for nearly one third of a century, has been that of a struggle on the part of those who loved *power*, as well as the *souls* of the poor heathen, to constrain the spirit of missions to flow in extraneous and unnatural channels. The spirit of missions has never existed in our church with that depth and diffusion, which was at all commensurate with the claims of so great and good a cause; and it is conceded freely that *the fact of giving the gospel to every creature* is far more important than the *mode of doing it*. But then the mode of doing it, is very *vital* to the doing it at all. And if the mode *be* unimportant, the existence of a preference for one method, in any communion, is reason sufficient for indulging them in that. At any rate, the convictions, and preferences of a Christian people like a river, may be stayed for a season, and in a degree—but what is against the current of the popular feeling and conscience cannot finally prevail. It will on the contrary accumulate additional force from resistance—which at length will sweep away every existing barrier.

So it has been with this question. The progress of the foreign mission spirit in our church, has been retarded by the attempts to force our people to stand in a false position, and act through an unnatural channel. And it became still more exciting, when the doctrinal controversy of the church was mixed up by the friends of voluntary associations—with *foreign*, as well as with *domestic* missions. Their selfish policy of identifying the missionary spirit with the new school theology, was long suspected; but it was never fully revealed till the victories of 1836 so elated the party, that it cast off all disguise. The policy which dictated such a course was as falacious, as it was un-christian, and was destined to fail because it proceeded on the divorce of *benevolence* from *truth*. "*Charity*," (love) *rejoiceth in the truth*." The spirit of missions, which is the expression of true piety—*towards men*, must spring from the knowledge, belief, and love of the truth. Hence the *truly orthodox* must have the only *pure* and *permanent missionary spirit*. And while it is to be deplored that those who profess this distinction, have often lacked the spirit of missions—it is also true, that *heresy* will consume that spirit even where it once existed.

And how great a mercy is this, to the poor heathen,—that when a people become so corrupt in doctrine, that their teachings would injure the heathen, they ordinarily lose the zeal to spread it. Thus error often destroys itself—like the carcase which by the putrescence of death, generates the vermin that devours it.

After several ineffectual struggles to begin the work of foreign missions in the church *as such* (in previous years)—the Synod of Pittsburg nobly commenced in her distinctive character, as a foreign missionary society—in the year 1832.—The origin, and history of the *Western Foreign Missionary Society*, is so intimately blended with the recent controversies in the church, that we need not here dwell on them. But there lies even aback of that institution an event, which though apparently small in itself, was connected with important results. The Presbytery of Baltimore, as early as the year 1830, had moved in the work of ecclesiastical action for foreign missions. The writer of this article, with the view of ascertaining himself of the facts, requested the history and records of this movement, from his highly esteemed friend, the Rev'd G. W. Musgrave, of Baltimore. The following is his reply.

Extracts from the minutes of the Presbytery of Baltimore.

"Baltimore, Oct. 6th, 1830.

"The following preamble and resolution, were offered by Mr. John Breckinridge and unanimously adopted. Whereas, in the view of this Presbytery, the Presbyterian church with which we are connected, in general, and we as a Presbytery, in particular, have, to a most inexcusable degree, neglected the claims of foreign missions; and whereas, the present state of the heathen world, as well as the last command of our Divine Redeemer, most urgently calls us to exert ourselves in this noble cause; therefore

"Resolved, that we, as a body, will make the attempt from this time to support at least one missionary, from year to year, in the foreign field."

"Baltimore, April 27th, 1831.

"The Presbytery, having determined by a resolution passed Oct. 6th, 1830, to support at least one Missionary in the foreign field; and having learned from Mr. Armstrong, that it is his intention to devote himself to foreign missions; and being, from long acquaintance with him, satisfied of his qualifications for this work; it was

"Resolved, that Mr. Armstrong be our missionary to the heathen, and that we will be responsible for his support.

"It was Resolved, moreover, that Messrs. Breckinridge, Nevins and Musgrave be an Executive Committee on Missions, to carry forward the objects of our resolutions."

Attest,

G. W. MUSGRAVE,

Stated Clerk of the Presbytery of Baltimore.

Given at Balt. this 24th day of Feb'y, A. D. 1838.

My Dear Friend, In furnishing you the extracts from the minutes of our Presbytery, I will add a few remarks, which you are at liberty to use at your pleasure.

The subject of the foregoing resolutions had been privately discussed by the pastors of the city of Baltimore, for more than a year before their pre-

sentation and adoption by the Presbytery, and a strong desire had been repeatedly expressed in their weekly meetings of Conference, that the Presbyterian church, as such, should exert itself more directly and efficiently in the cause of foreign missions. It was felt to be her imperative duty, which she could not neglect without great guilt, and absolutely essential to her piety and permanent prosperity. It was believed that the only organization which then existed, (the A. B. C. F. M.) could never call into action the latent energies of the whole church, and that something was required from among ourselves, to accomplish this transcendently important object. Accordingly, the Rev'd Dr. John Breckinridge introduced the preamble and resolution of the 6th of Oct., 1830, which were unanimously adopted by the Presbytery;—and subsequently,—on the 27th of April 1831, the Rev'd Messrs. Breckinridge, Nevins and Musgrave, were appointed an Executive Committee to carry forward the objects contemplated.

In pursuance of their appointment, the committee digested a plan for Presbyterial action on the subject of foreign missions and issued a circular to all the Presbyteries connected with the General Assembly, inviting their immediate and earnest co-operation.

In the meantime, however, the Presbytery of Baltimore, was sorely disappointed and greatly obstructed in their proceedings, by the unexpected refusal of the brother whom they had designated as their missionary, to accept of his appointment and support from the Presbytery. It is but justice to him, to say, that the objections which he urged, viz: the novelty of the experiment, and the comparative insecurity of his support, were weighty; yet we could not but judge, that the importance of the trial was worthy of much greater risk than would have been incurred, and that the prospect of entire success was highly flattering. In consequence of this disappointment the plan of the Presbytery could not be immediately executed, and subsequent events prevented its further execution.

In this early movement of the Presbytery of Baltimore, I can aver absolutely for myself,—and from a most intimate acquaintance with those with whom I was associated, I feel fully authorized in saying for my brethren,—*there were no party feelings, or designs.* The sole object was,—to engage the church more extensively and efficiently in the conversion of the world. And notwithstanding all the changes which have since occurred and the existing relations of the several missionary institutions, I have reason to believe that, in preferring to sustain the board established by the General Assembly of our own venerable and beloved church, Presbyterians are still actuated, not by mere party policy, but by a supreme regard to the glory of our adorable Head, and the interests and claims of a dying world.

Yours, affectionately,

G. W. MUSGRAVE.

The Rev'd — — — —.

This admirable paper needs no comment.

The Committee did accordingly issue a circular to every Presbytery in the land. Of the one hundred or more then organized, about twenty, as far as we can judge, passed resolutions to co-operate with the Presbytery of Baltimore; and some—as for example, the Presbytery of Philadelphia, entered with spirit directly on the work. The Presbytery of Baltimore immediately secured the necessary sum for supporting their missionary—but *Jonah had fled!!*

The following is the circular mentioned above.

(CIRCULAR.)

BALTIMORE, March 18, 1831.

DEAR BRETHREN:

At the last stated meeting of the Presbytery of Baltimore, the following preamble and resolution were unanimously adopted, viz:

WHEREAS, in the view of this Presbytery, the Presbyterian church with which we are connected, in general, and we, as a Presbytery, in particular, have, to a most inexcusable degree, neglected the claims of Foreign Missions; and whereas, the present state of the heathen world, as well as the last command of our Divine Redeemer, most urgently calls us to exert ourselves in this noble cause—Therefore,

RESOLVED, That we, as a body, will make the attempt from this time, to support at least one Missionary, from year to year, in the foreign field.

[It is to be understood, that the Presbytery reserves to itself the right to select the Missionary, when it is thought proper; but the details of the plan were designedly left for future and more general consultation—The object at first was only to present the general principle.]

Since that time we have attempted to carry into effect the plan therein expressed; and if we are not deceived, it is well adapted to interest the people of God in the great cause of missions; and has been attended by tokens of the Divine favor.*

We feel at the same time, unfeigned diffidence in our own judgment—and desire the prayers and counsel of our brethren on this momentous subject. We therefore venture to lay before you the plan which we have been led to adopt, affectionately asking your co-operation if you approve it; or your suggestions as to some other plan, better fitted to promote the interests of foreign missions.

You are fully aware that we are doing *almost nothing* for the cause of foreign missions, in the Presbyterian Church in the United States. And compared with what we ought to do, with what we might do, and with what we have done in other forms of Christian charity, our neglect of *this* is surprising, criminal, and very perilous.

Much of this has been owing, we think, to the want of a specific plan, fitted to reach and excite our people, and to carry forward this great work. No such plan has ever been projected, or carried actively into general use among us.

Yet our church affords peculiar facilities for combined, uniform and powerful operations in this way.—It is organized already, and only needs to be set in motion, in order to make it a most efficient missionary institution.—The plan proposed above of operating, through the Presbyteries, seems to be at once the most simple and effective.

One reason why the cause of foreign missions has not more interested our people has been, their ignorance of the men to be supported by them, and of the destination of their money when given. From this, has resulted a vague, abstract sentiment on the whole subject; and their sympathies have not been enlisted, even when their consciences have been in part informed.—This scheme has the advantage of directly identifying the body of the people with the foreign missionaries whom they support; and with the field in which they labour. Thus the regards of our people will be in some measure located abroad; and out of their personal and almost pastoral relation to the missionaries whom they support, will arise attachments well calculated to secure their continued prayers and charities.—In confirmation of this, we need only refer to the striking fact, that those churches

*Between four and five hundred dollars have already been secured towards this object, since October last.

and "neighbourhoods, from which missionaries have gone out, have uniformly felt and done most for foreign missions; and for *that portion of the heathen world* also in which such missionaries labor.

It is a very interesting circumstance in connection with the view, that many young men well qualified for the work, are now preparing in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, and elsewhere, who are saying with deep desire, "send me," "send me"—and who may at once be selected and sustained by their respective Presbyteries.

In proposing this plan, it is by no means intended to interfere with other societies already engaged in missions. On the contrary, the object is to co-operate with them, as far as it is possible to do so.—But the Assembly's Board of Missions is fully occupied on our own continent, and has no purpose of effort beyond the two Americas.* The American Home Missionary Society is exclusively domestic, as its name imports; and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, needs some such combined effort as this, to bring up "to the help of the Lord against the mighty," the whole Presbyterian Church.

The details of the plan may be left for future consultation—but the great principle of operation might be at once adopted; the whole church might be simultaneously excited through the Presbyteries; and the way be thus prepared to send forth from 100 Presbyteries, 100 missionaries to the foreign field.

Dear Brethren, we are wedded to no peculiar plan; but we feel that something must be done; that it must be done at once; that it must be done by all the church; and with all "our heart, and soul, and mind and strength."

Our prayer is, that we may be divinely directed and sustained in all our efforts for this great and neglected cause. May millions now *ready to perish* rejoice forever in the great salvation sent to them through our hands—and may we escape the awful curse of having their blood found in our skirts.

WILLIAM NEVINS, GEORGE MORRISON, GEORGE W. MUSGRAVE, JOHN BRECKINRIDGE,	} <i>On behalf of the Pres- bytery of Baltimore.</i>
--	--

Out of these operations grew two important events. The first, was the drawing up by the Rev'd Dr. John H. Rice of his celebrated overture to the General Assembly. It was at the request of the committee which issued the above circular, that Dr. Rice prepared that paper. *The end in view, was, to take the next step*, being, as the circular avows, at a loss what next to do, venerating the *American Board*, and yet alive to the duty of the church, the committee in Dr. Nevins's parlour, during Dr. Rice's last visit to Baltimore, preferred the request. He said "*he would think of it.*" On his death bed by an amanuensis, he prepared the document which was afterwards presented as overture No. VI—to the Assembly of 1831. It is a noble paper—and is as follows :

The Presbyterian church in the United States of North America, in organizing their form of Government, and in repeated declarations made through their representatives in after times, have solemnly recognized the importance of the missionary cause, and their obligation as Christians to promote it by all the means in their power.

But these various acknowledgments have not gone to the full extent of

*At least so far as we are now informed.

the obligation imposed by the Head of the church, nor have they produced exertions at all corresponding thereto. Indeed in the judgment of this General Assembly, one primary and principal object of the institution of the church by Jesus Christ was not so much the salvation of individual Christians,—“for he that believeth in the Lord Jesus Christ shall be saved,”—but the communicating of the blessing of the gospel to the destitute with the efficiency of united effort. The entire history of the Christian societies organized by the apostles affords abundant evidence that they so understood the design of their master. They received from him a command to “preach the gospel to every creature,”—and from the churches planted by them the word of the Lord was “sounded out” through all the parts of the civilized world. Nor did the missionary spirit of the primitive churches expire, until they had become secularized and corrupted by another spirit; and it is the decided belief of this General Assembly that a true revival of religion in any denomination of Christians, will generally, if not universally, be marked by an increased sense of obligation to execute the commission which Christ gave to the apostles.

The General Assembly would therefore, in the most public and solemn manner, express their shame and sorrow that the church represented by them, has done, comparatively, so little to make known the saving health of the gospel to all nations. At the same time, they would express their grateful sense of the goodness of the Lord, in employing the instrumentality of others to send salvation to the heathen. Particularly would they rejoice at the divine favour manifested to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, whose perseverance, whose prudence, whose skill in conducting this most important interest, merit the praise, and excite the joy of all the churches.

With an earnest desire therefore, to co-operate with this noble institution; to fulfil, in some part at least, their own obligations; and to answer the just expectations of the friends of Christ in other denominations, and in other countries; in obedience, also, to what is believed to be the command of Christ; be it therefore *Resolved*,

1. That the Presbyterian church in the United States is a Missionary Society; the object of which, is to aid in the conversion of the world; and that every member of the church is a member for life of said society, and bound in maintenance of his Christian character, to do all in his power for the accomplishment of this object.

2. That the ministers of the gospel in connection with the Presbyterian church, are hereby most solemnly required to present this subject to the members of their respective congregations, using every effort to make them feel their obligations, and to induce them to contribute according to their ability.

3. That a Committee of ———, be appointed from year to year by the General Assembly, to be designated, “The Committee of the Presbyterian Church of the United States, for Foreign Missions,” to whose management this whole concern shall be confided, with directions to report all their transactions to the churches.

4. The Committee shall have power to appoint a Chairman, Corresponding Secretary, Treasurer, and other necessary officers.

5. The Committee shall, as far as the nature of the case will admit, be co-ordinate with the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and shall correspond and co-operate with that association, in every possible way, for the accomplishment of the great objects which it has in view.

6. That inasmuch as members belonging to the Presbyterian church have already, to some extent, acknowledged their obligations, and have been accustomed, from year to year, to contribute to the funds of the American board, and others may hereafter prefer to give that destination to their contributions; and inasmuch as the General Assembly, so far from wish-

ing to limit or impede the operations of that Board, is earnestly desirous that they may be enlarged to the greatest possible extent; it is therefore to be distinctly understood, that all individuals, congregations, or missionary associations, are at liberty to send their contributions either to the American board, or to the Committee for Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian church, as to the contributors may appear most likely to advance the great object of the conversion of the world.

7. That every church session be authorized to receive contributions; and be directed to state in their annual reports to the Presbytery, distinctly, the amount contributed by their respective churches for foreign missions, and that it be earnestly recommended to all church sessions, in hereafter admitting new members to the churches, distinctly to state to candidates for admission, that if they join the church, they join a community the object of which is the conversion of the heathen world, and to impress on their minds a deep sense of their obligation as redeemed sinners, to co-operate in the accomplishment of the great object of Christ's mission to the world.

The Assembly acted on this overture by electing a committee, of which the Rev'd Dr. McCaully was chairman—to confer with the American Board, and report to the next General Assembly.—The American Board *discouraged* any such an action as the overture called for; the chairman of the Committee reported a paper which is a lasting monument of the ignoble spirit of its author; and the General Assembly of 1832, connived at the disgraceful conclusion to which the report conducted this injured cause, by *resolving to do nothing*.

But while the work was so shamefully resisted at the north—and east—a noble plant was shooting forth in the west. For at this critical conjuncture the Western Foreign Missionary Society was organized. This we regard as the second great event resulting from the Presbyterial movement on the subject of Foreign Missions.

We now come, after this tedious detail, to the link which connects the missionary question with the Assembly of 1835. On page thirty-one of the minutes—we find the following report, viz:

The Committee on the papers submitted to them in relation to the Western Foreign Missionary Society recommended the adoption of the following resolutions, viz.

I. That it is the solemn conviction of this General Assembly that the Presbyterian church owes it as a sacred duty to her glorified Head, to yield a far more exemplary obedience, and that in her distinctive character as a church, to the command which he gave at his ascension into heaven, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." It is believed to be among the causes of the frowns of the great Head of the church, which are now resting on our beloved Zion, in the declension of vital piety, and the disorders and divisions that distract us, that we have done so little—comparatively nothing—in *our distinctive character* as a Church of Christ, to send the gospel to the heathen, the Jews, and the Mahomedans. It is regarded as of vital importance to the welfare of our church, that foreign as well as domestic missions should be more zealously prosecuted, and more liberally patronized; and that as a nucleus of foreign missionary effort, and operation, the Western Foreign Missionary Society should receive the countenance, as it appears to us to merit the

confidence, of those who cherish an attachment to the doctrines and order of the church to which we belong.

II. Resolved, that a committee be appointed to confer with the Synod of Pittsburg on the subject of a transfer of a supervision of the Western Foreign Missionary Society now under the direction of that Synod, to ascertain the terms on which such transfer can be made, to devise and digest a plan of conducting foreign missions under the direction of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, and report the whole to the next General Assembly.

Dr. Cuyler, Dr. Cummins, Dr. Hoge, Mr. Witherspoon, and Dr. Edgar, were appointed this committee.

On page 33, the Assembly still further act—adopting the following resolution—viz.

Resolved, That the committee appointed to confer with the Synod of Pittsburg, on the subject of a transfer of the supervision of the Western Foreign Missionary Society to the General Assembly, be authorized, if they shall approve of the said transfer, to ratify and confirm the same with the said Synod, and report the same to the next General Assembly.

The committee did accordingly ratify and confirm the *transfer* of the society—to the General Assembly. The General Assembly of 1836—led by new school men, refused to accept the transfer.—The Assembly of 1837, fully carried out the arrangement—and the church now rejoices in the result. And so we believe millions of souls ready to perish will also rejoice. The great problem has now been solved; the momentous question finally settled, that the Presbyterian church should, can, and will conduct the work of foreign missions according to that organization which she believes to be consonant with the will of God, and the order of his *house*. The farther pursuit of the question, however, belongs to the review of another year—and to the regular historian of the church of Christ.

There is another subject which may be considered cognate to this—as it certainly is correlative. It is the arrangement for missionary instruction in the Theological Seminary of the church. As early as the Assembly of 1829, we find the following resolution—viz. “Resolved, that the Rev’d Dr’s Alexander, Miller, Carnahan, Skinner, and Messrs. Hodge, Sanford, and J. Breckinridge be a committee to consider the expediency of establishing a *Missionary Institution for the instruction and training of missionaries*, which shall be under the care of the General Assembly, and in connexion with the Theological Seminary at Princeton—and that this committee be instructed to mature, and report a plan of the same to the next General Assembly—provided they, or a majority of them, shall approve of such an establishment.”

This committee reported a plan in 1830—which was referred to a select committee and by it recommended and adopted as follows:

The Assembly resumed the consideration of the report in relation to a missionary institution, in connexion with the Theological Seminary at Princeton: and after considerable discussion, the report of the committee was adopted, and is as follows, viz.

The committee to whom was referred the Report of a Committee of the last General Assembly, on the subject of a missionary institution, in con-

nexion with the Theological Seminary at Princeton, beg leave to recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of the report of the said committee, with the exception of the third resolution; and also the adoption of the following resolutions, viz.

1. That the General Assembly will proceed to appoint a professor in conformity with the recommendation contained in the said report, as soon as a sufficient annual income can be secured to support the said professor: and,

2. That the whole subject be referred back to the original committee.

The report of the committee appointed on this subject by the last Assembly, and adopted by adopting the above report of the committee to whom it was referred, is as follows, viz.

The Committee appointed by the last General Assembly to consider the expediency of establishing "a Missionary Institution, for the instruction and training of Missionaries, under the care of the General Assembly, and in connexion with the Theological Seminary at Princeton," beg leave to report.

That after repeated meetings, and mature deliberation on the subject committed to them, they are of the opinion, that such an institution as this appointment seems to contemplate, is much needed, and, if wisely established and maintained, may be expected, under the Divine blessing, to contribute much to the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom.

The missionary cause is assuming an importance, and its operations an extent, which must more and more interest the religious public. Every thing, therefore, that is adapted to impart a new impulse to the missionary spirit; to give it a wise and happy direction; or to bring a larger number of individuals, and especially of candidates for the holy ministry under its immediate influence, cannot fail of proving both reasonable and useful. The Committee are, therefore, persuaded that the General Assembly could scarcely adopt a measure better adapted to aid the missionary cause; to draw down the richest and most appropriate blessings on the students of the Theological Seminary; to meet and gratify public opinion; and to furnish a centre of information, of instruction, and of impulse, in reference to this great subject, from which invaluable results might be expected.

The spirit of the religion of Jesus Christ is essentially a spirit of missions; and, undoubtedly, one of the first and highest duties of the Christian church, is to nurture and extend this spirit, and to make all her establishments tributary to its advancement. The importance, therefore, of connecting an institution of the kind proposed, with a seminary in which a large number of candidates for the holy ministry are assembled, is obvious. Its native tendency, if properly conducted, will be to kindle among the rising ministry, a new and more fervent zeal on behalf of missions; to call forth, animate and prepare larger numbers of missionaries, both for the foreign and domestic field; and, eventually, to diffuse, throughout all our churches more of that deep and practical sense of obligation in reference to this subject, of the want of which we have so much reason to complain, and the increase of which is so earnestly to be desired.

In another view, also, the Committee believe that such an institution as that which is now contemplated, would be productive of incalculable benefit. The great importance of maintaining a spirit of deep and elevated piety in our theological seminaries, has been always acknowledged by the friends of vital religion, and is beginning, it is hoped, to attract more of the attention of those who are entrusted with their management. Unless such a spirit can be, in some good degree, maintained among assembled candidates for the holy ministry, theological seminaries will, assuredly, not prove a real blessing to the church, but rather the reverse. Now the Committee are fully convinced that it would not be easy to sug-

gest a plan better adapted to subserve this great object, than to connect with a theological institution, a department of instruction, the primary purpose of which should be, to cherish fervent love for immortal souls;—large views and plans of evangelical usefulness; and every species of knowledge, and of practical accomplishment adapted to prepare the sons of the church for spreading the gospel throughout the world. Even those who never actually engage in missionary work, will be likely to be essentially benefitted by such an appendage to the usual course of instruction;—to have their personal zeal for the salvation of men increased; their preparation for pastoral fidelity promoted; their knowledge of the wants and miseries of perishing souls extended; and their ultimate capacity for actively favouring the missionary cause, wherever their lot may be cast, greatly enlarged. In this, and in various other ways, it is manifest, that in theological seminaries, as well as in the church at large, every effectual step that is taken to extend the missionary cause, tends no less surely, to promote piety and pastoral fidelity at home; and to render every new minister that is added to the church, a new centre of influence and of action for the spread of the gospel.

It would, moreover, be desirable to have some place provided where men destined to foreign missions, might profitably spend a year or a few months, in such studies and exercises, as would tend to prepare and qualify them for their arduous and interesting work. At present much time frequently elapses before the missionary can be conveniently sent to his field of labour; which time would be much more advantageously spent in retirement, study and devotion, than in travelling as an agent.

It has also occurred to your committee, that, if the proposed institution should be established, and adequately fostered by the favor of the church, it might hereafter be expedient to have provision made for the comfortable support of aged and invalid missionaries on their return to their native country. It is due to men who have exhausted their health, their strength, and their years in the service of the church, to be furnished with a peaceful asylum for their latter days.

The committee are further persuaded, that public sentiment in the Presbyterian church is ripe for such an institution as that which is now under consideration, and prepared promptly and fully to sustain it. And as other theological seminaries are increasing the number of their officers and departments of instruction, it is respectfully submitted whether immediate measures ought not to be taken for a corresponding enlargement of the institution at Princeton, if its friends are desirous of seeing it keep pace with sister institutions in growth and usefulness.

Indeed, so deeply convinced are the committee of the salutary tendency of such an appendage to an institution destined for training up ministers, that they indulge the hope of seeing, before the lapse of many years, such an addition to every theological seminary in the land, which has a sufficient number of pupils to demand and warrant the enterprize. They firmly believe that the pecuniary resources of such institutions cannot be bestowed upon an object more likely to be productive of the richest blessings to themselves, and to the whole church.

The committee are of the opinion, however, that a large and expensive establishment ought not, in the outset, to be attempted. A small and humble beginning will, perhaps, be most likely to lead to the best results, by gradual enlargement, as experience may dictate. Some of the most extensive and important institutions now in existence, took their rise from small beginnings. Nothing more, therefore, ought, in the opinion of the committee, to be contemplated, at present, than the commencement of a plan, which may be enlarged and strengthened, as the Assembly may hereafter think proper, and be able to command resources. And as the constitution of the seminary at Princeton admits, without alteration, of an indefinite addition to the number of its professors, the committee, there-

fore, unanimously recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of the following resolutions, viz.

1. Resolved, That there be appointed an additional professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, to bear the name and title of the "Professor of Pastoral Theology and Missionary Instruction."

2. Resolved, That the said professor have committed to him the instruction in every thing which relates to the pastoral office, and that he be especially charged with collecting and imparting instruction on the subject of missions; and with using all proper means, by public lectures, and private interviews, to promote among all the students an enlarged spirit of pastoral fidelity, of missionary zeal, and of liberal preparation and active effort for the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom.

This was a plan of too much comprehension to be attempted at once, or perhaps ever, by one communion, while we have so little of the spirit of missions in the church. But even the first step was important.—It is said that the Rev'd Dr. J. H. Rice was the man generally looked to, as the occupant of the new chair. But this was on conference with him, abandoned—he being pledged to the south; and the chair was therefore, left vacant for many years. In May, 1835, the board of directors, of the Theological Seminary, recommended that this professorship be filled—by adopting the following resolution, viz:

"Whereas the General Assembly, in the year 1830, resolved, that a professor of pastoral theology, should be appointed as soon as a sufficient annual income can be secured to support said professor—Resolved, That in the opinion of this Board, the time has come, when such an appointment ought to be made."

Considering the character of the Assembly of 1834, and the general state of parties, this was a hazardous resolution. But it was suddenly adopted, without apparently any forethought or conference. On page 23 of the minutes of the subsequent Assembly, is found the following document, viz.

The report of the committee on the annual report of the directors of the Theological Seminary at Princeton, was taken up. After some discussion the report was adopted, and is as follows:

The committee to whom was referred the report of the directors of the Theological Seminary at Princeton, have much satisfaction in contemplating the prosperous condition of that most important institution; and they fully approve the suggestions of the Board of Directors, respecting the appointment of additional professors; they therefore recommend to the Assembly, the adoption of the following resolutions:—

1. Resolved, That it is expedient to appoint at this time, a professor of pastoral theology, agreeably to a resolution of the General Assembly of 1830; with a salary of eighteen hundred dollars per annum; and that the election be the order of the day for Saturday morning next, at ten o'clock.

2. Resolved, That there be appointed an associate professor of oriental and biblical literature, with a salary of one thousand dollars per annum; and that such professor shall be elected at the same time as the professor of pastoral theology, as above directed.

These offices were, at an after day of the session, filled by the election of the present incumbents.

There were many other very important decisions. But this sketch has been already so greatly extended, that we forbear to dwell on them.

That in regard to the circulation of the Word of God, may deserve a place, especially as it expresses an *old school* Assembly's "*indifference to and disjunction from the active benevolence of the age.*" It is as follows.

The committee to whom was referred overture No. 4, relative to supplying the world with Bibles, reported; and their report was accepted and adopted, and is as follows:

The committee recommend the following resolutions for the adoption of the Assembly, viz:

1. It is the duty of the people of God to give the Bible to every family and dweller upon earth, in the earliest period of time in which it is possible to do it.

2. Resolved, That in the judgment of the General Assembly, the church of Christ is, under God, *able* to give the word of God in a comparatively short time, and much shorter than is ordinarily supposed,—to the whole world; and that from the peculiar position and resources of the American, and especially of the Presbyterian church in the United States, our responsibility in this momentous service, is beyond all other people, great and pressing,

3. Resolved, That, inasmuch as the fixing of a definite period, has some important benefits connected with it, and, as in the judgment of the General Assembly, the period agreed upon is sufficiently long, it be recommended to all the churches under the care of this Assembly, and respectfully proposed to all the sister churches in correspondence with our own, to follow the noble example, and unite in the important resolution of the Society of Virginia, viz: to endeavour to give the Bible to the whole world, in a period of not more than twenty years.

4. Resolved, That it be recommended to the ministers and churches under the supervision of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, and the churches in correspondence with the same, to observe the First Monday in January, 1836, as a day of humiliation, fasting and prayer, for the divine blessing on the ministry of the gospel throughout the world, for the revival of religion in the whole of Christendom, and for the entire success of those benevolent enterprises, which have for their object the world's conversation to God.

5. Resolved, That other denominations of Christians in the United States, and the Christian churches in all other countries, be and they hereby are affectionately, and with Christian salutations, invited to concur in the observance of the day above specified.

6. Resolved, That these resolutions be published with the signatures of the moderator and clerk of the General Assembly, for the information of such Synods, Assemblies, Associations, Conferences, Conventions, and other ecclesiastical bodies as may choose to recommend the above observance, to the churches under their care. And may grace, mercy, and peace, be multiplied to all throughout the world, who love our Lord Jesus Christ.

As soon as the fate of the *first* resolution or the *convention's memorial* was known, the new school men rose, retreated precipitately from the house and floor—so that near fifty of them got leave of absence—in about twenty-four hours.

That resolution on the memorial which consolidated the Synod of Philadelphia, and the elective affinity Synod—was originally

shaped somewhat differently. It was then agreed to indulge Dr. Ely and others by a com-promise, i. e. to refer the settlement of the questions about the *third* Presbytery of Philadelphia, to the united Synods. If the *Assembly* had dissolved and disposed of that "*crooked stick*" all difficulty might have ceased. But Dr. Ely *begged off*; and agreed to submit all to the Synod. When the Synod *met at York*, he had changed his mind, and resisted its jurisdiction. When reminded that the whole was his own creature proposed as a *friendly* and *final* adjustment—he gravely said that "*it was a slip in Providence*;"—which he explained by saying that *two words* "*at and after*" had been afterwards inserted in the original motion. Since that time some instructive experience has been had on *slips in Providence or improvidence*—according to men's views of *doctrine and duty*.

The Assembly of 1835 was the proper *effect* of the Assemblies of former years; as that of 1837 was the fair re-action of the violence and mis-rule of 1836.

We trust that we shall no more be left to swing from side to side, like a pendulum; but that henceforth we shall be established in righteousness—under truth and peace.

A MEMBER OF THE ASSEMBLY OF 1835.

PERFECTIONISM IN WESTERN NEW YORK.

REV'D R. J. BRECKINRIDGE.

Dear Sir: IT is with no ordinary degree of grief, that we, the ruling Elders of the Presbyterian Church of Adams Watertown Presbytery have observed a publication over the signature of E. H. S. in the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine. We are astonished that any Christian minister should have made charges like those contained in the first article against us.

In that article many of the churches in the Synod of Utica are charged with having persons in them called perfectionists, compared with whom the Methodist Perfectionists are very orthodox, and in the same article says "In the church of Adams Watertown Presbytery they proceeded to acts of the grossest sensuality, on the principle that they can do no wrong; indeed some of their notions are blasphemous." It is indeed matter of astonishment and grief to us that such a communication should ever have been made, or if made, should have been published in any religious periodical, as there are no facts existing or that ever have existed, that will warrant them.

If we can be charged with the things mentioned in that article, every church in the land by the same rule, may be charged with all the abominations committed within their bounds.

We are free to admit that in the summer of 1836, a few individuals came to this village and propagated the peculiar views of the per-

fectionists, and gained some proselytes, and that two of the members of this church embraced some of their views—and it is true that by a kind but faithful labor with them, they returned to the bosom of the church by a public confession of their sin, several months before the communication of E. H. S. was written, and are now apparently steadfast in the faith, and fellowship of the Gospel. And we further state without fear of contradiction that neither of those members who thus for a time were led away, were guilty of any immoral conduct, much less of any act of gross licentiousness.

You, dear sir, cannot but be convinced that our feelings are much injured, when you remember we are set to watch over the church, and guard in a subordinate capacity, its communion; and we do earnestly appeal to your sense of justice that we may be permitted to make this letter as public as the charges were that it intends to repel.—We know, that the cause of our blessed Redeemer will suffer, as many who have seen those charges may never see this denial. And that our enemies may continue to throw such things in the way of the success of the Gospel, who know them to be without foundation.

* Adams 10th Feby. 1838.

BENJAMIN WRIGHT.

WM. GRINELL.

JOSHUA HINMAN.

SAMUEL BOND.

PEARLEY D. STONE.

*Dear Brother :—*WHEN your letter of the 5th inst. came to hand, I was absent from home. I take the earliest opportunity to reply to it. I acknowledge myself the author of the communication to which the session of Adams refer, and to which my name in full was subscribed. It was written with the view of shewing the state of things in western New York, and contained facts which the minority of the last Assembly seemed disposed to cover over or deny. I considered them as notorious, and as much the property of the public as the *air*, and that every one (whatever animadversions he might bring upon himself by so doing,) was bound to contribute all the knowledge which he supposed to be incontrovertible, in his possession.

I have not my letter to you, before me, nor can I lay my hand upon it, but so far as I recollect, my testimony was such in its result as to afford one or two reasons at least for the decisive action of our highest judicatory. I came to this conclusion in my letter by dwelling on a number of particulars. I stated among other things, that Perfectionism was more or less prevalent in the Synod of Utica, in comparison with which the doctrines of the Methodist perfectionists were very orthodox. And who will say that I was not warranted in saying this? Do they not call themselves God? Do they not aver that it is as impossible for them to sin as it is for God to do so, on account of their identity with Deity? Have they

* This letter was received on the 3d of March—though dated so long before. On the 5th a copy of it was sent to Mr. Snowden whose letter follows. And the whole was unexpectedly and unintentionally excluded from our April number. [ED'S.]

not proceeded to acts of gross sensuality and justified themselves on the principle that they can do no wrong? It would be as easy to convince me that Amasa Converse can revolutionize the South, as that the perfectionists are a pure people. A lady of great respectability informed me that she had an intimate knowledge of one, having travelled in her company, and that she openly violated the Sabbath, and considered churches as nuisances, and public worship entirely useless. She had got beyond it. A young man by the name of Nymy who was once a member of the church in the Presbytery of Watertown of which I was pastor, has been heard to say that he was God, or words to that effect. The Rev'd Mr. Lusk told me that the Church of Camden, in the Synod of Utica, over which he presided as pastor, or stated supply, was deeply infected with perfectionism, and that he should leave it, and he has done so. The statements of Messrs. Foot and Wood go to confirm my assertions. Ah! but I have been too precise. I have come nigh the Adams church, and that is the unpardonable sin. Well that church has always been such a mass of combustibility. It has been so often Burchardized and Finneyized, it has got rid of, by good or ill treatment, so many estimable ministers that if it has fallen under unjust suspicions, it must blame itself in part. But have I proceeded on unfounded suspicions? According to their own shewing, their members or some of them have been in bad company. I never asserted that all the Adams church were perfectionists, nor could any one understand me so. I never asserted that the session had neglected to notice their apostacy. How could they avoid censuring members who held such sentiments? I said in my letter what was no invention of my own—It was what I had heard on as good authority as themselves, even an Elder of the Presbyterian Church. The case had not then been submitted to a judicial investigation. They admit that some of their members were perfectionists, and do not deny but that some of the *Perfectionists* of *Adams* were guilty of licentiousness. This point they evade, but deny that those who were drawn off from them were *thus* criminal. They allow that some of their members were numbered, with, or did for a time herd with *them* who for aught that appears in their statement, were *guilty* as charged by me, and whose guilt from what I heard, I considered as beyond a doubt. If gross immorality has infected the perfectionists of Adams and their own members (as they acknowledge) have become perfectionists, then gross immorality has entered their spiritual body or church, or else their own members were *out* of the church. If I prove persons to belong to a body, they must bear the imputations to which that body is liable. If I unite with the Methodist Episcopal Church, I must submit to be called an Arminian although I may still be a Calvinist at heart, because the creed I have adopted is decidedly Arminian, and the church as a body glories in its adherence to the Arminian system. Until they deny as a session that *any* of the perfectionists who lived in Adams were guilty of grossly immoral conduct, I shall not be satisfied, and possibly not then, for I know how things are managed in those churches. Almost any result may be brought about that a few leading persons please. And if they have, since I left that country or about that time, by a sessional process, brought back those wandering stars to their allegiance, I do not regret it. I hope that

a wholesome investigation will commence, as to many other churches, and that they will dig down to the very foundation of things, and bring out all their secret iniquity to the light of the sun, that the rubbish deposited by the flood of fanaticism which has overspread that section of country, may be removed. There is a case originated in the church of Adams, and which occupied not only the session, but the Presbytery, and which is no doubt spread out on their records which will shew that all their members are not angels.

Having noticed as far as I think it incumbent on me, this communication, I will now with the permission of the Adams Session, continue my testimony as to the state of the church in western New York. This must be gathered from various facts and circumstances, the bearing of which may not be immediately perceived. If we look very attentively at them however, we may occasionally get a glimpse of the system which was to have been set up. And 1st, Who will deny that the Revd. Mr. Crandal (as thorough going an agitator as his small abilities will permit him to be,) was licensed by the Black River Association, after having been refused licensure by the Presbytery of Watertown and was immediately after received by said Presbytery on the principle of clean papers? And that the said Crandal as moderator of the Presbytery preached the opening sermon at Brownville in 1836, in which he asserted that the *concurrence of the creature was necessary to regeneration*. The idea conveyed was, that though God had done, or might do a great deal towards changing the heart, yet unless man came into the *measure* it could not be done. This concurrence he did not make the *effect of the spirit's operation*. The presbytery did not call him to an account. It depends on *man* according to this, whether the Redeemer shall see of the travail of his soul. Somewhat analagous to this is another error, which I found to be prevalent among some of the church members. That the sinner could repent of himself, and that if he did so, God would certainly change his heart, or was bound to do so.

2nd. Will any deny that Rev'd Israel Brainard (a man whom I venerate) did assert in the Synod of Utica, at Oswego in 1834, that a new school man told him that there were such improvements in instructing youth, that the time was at hand when young persons would become Christians without passing through the process of regeneration. The idea I took to be this, that maternal associations would lead them a certain distance, then Sabbath schools would take them by the hand, and after this, protracted meetings perhaps would come in, until they would finally emerge without special grace into the marvellous light. I do not introduce these institutions in this connexion with the view of condemning them in themselves, for I approve of them when rightly used, and think that several days' meetings may do good when there are some good indications in the church previously, and the pastor governs them, and they are not pressed too far.

3rd. Will any deny that I was once urged by a leading New School man, to fall in with the plan of licensing men to preach who had not much education, as some other sects do? I replied that a

few well trained, would accomplish *more* in the end than an undisciplined host, and that we should *then* have no security that these narrow minded persons might not vote down every thing that was peculiar to our system. He replied that the educated or knowing ones could manage them and guide their movements.

4th. Who will deny that Dr. Davis while President of Hamilton College, had great opposition from the leaders of Oneida Presbytery, and that the prospects of that rising institution were darkened, and the Oneida Institute set up against it principally because Dr. Davis would not favor Mr. Finney's measures. Of the high standing of Dr. Davis, no one can doubt. He had before him at the same time appointments to the presidency of three colleges, to wit; Yale, Hamilton, and Middlebury, over the last mentioned he then presided. The difficulty seemed to be, that science would not succumb to fanaticism. I attended the commencement at the Oneida Institute in 1835, and aver that there was scarcely a speech from the students that did not touch on abolition before it closed.

5th. Who will deny that Mr. Finney has great influence over many churches in that region, and Mr. Burchard also considerable. Are not Mr. Finney's Revival Lectures handed about from one to another as we may imagine the Epistles of Paul were in primitive times. I hope they will not set up a claim to their inspiration. There may be some danger of this, for some such pretensions was made in the Assembly of 1834 by one from that quarter as to a certain report.—Mr Finney was a great opposer of the church before his conversion, and I appeal to the friends of truth if he has not been a great opposer of the church ever since, if we consider ours the Church of God: for it is imputed to him on all hands, that he said: "There is a jubilee in hell every time the General Assembly meets," and of course, we may presume there is *some exhilaration there*, when the inferior judicatories meet. Besides he is opposed to all the boards of the church, and of course to all that she is doing as *a church* for education and missions, foreign and domestic. He has left the church, but he touches it wherever Oberlin influence is felt, and I fear that in Ohio it is not the most benign.

6th. Will any deny that the effect of many of the meetings conducted by these men, was to build up other denominations, to multiply Universalists, and to prejudice the world so much against religion as to keep them effectually from the house of God, that in many cases few, except the church, attended worship, or paid for its support, and that many nominal converts were added to the churches, who hated our doctrines ten times as much after conversion as before,—Both Mr. Finney and Burchard made special efforts in Brownville, where I was afterwards settled. Mr. Wells, the pastor who was before beloved by every man woman and child, was as a result obliged to give up his charge about the time Mr. Finney was there. Such a course was pursued as exasperated a great portion of the respectable members of the congregation, and they immediately set up an Episcopal church which they have attended ever since. I understood the Presbytery was appealed to for redress, but in vain.

Mr Burchard's meeting there, was equally disastrous in its results. He assumed the airs of a commander, and would turn off

about so many every day, and announce them to be converted. Some of those who then became members, never entered the church afterwards. Some became perfectionists, and of the remainder many were expelled. One of the elders remarked to me, that the church lost much of its vitality at that time. Could full accounts of the state of things in those days have gone up to the General Assemblies, instead of unmingled joy, there would have been some notes of sadness. O! how much subsequent evil might have been averted by a timely interference.

Truly may it be said of error, that its ways are moveable. It is not long since the New School were loud in declaiming against the doctrines of the confession. Their leading men were really insulting in the Presbyteries, on the subject. Now they are hushed into sweet and cordial acquiescence. Is this a change of policy or of sentiment? I may be rather skeptical, but it is my opinion that their views are the same as they were in 1834, when if my memory serves me, after an enumeration of errors nearly equal to those condemned by the last Assembly, one of their leaders declared on the floor that in this way called heresy, so worshipped he the God of his fathers. If the New School would speak out, they would express it as their real opinion, that there are doctrines in our book which in their literal acceptance can no longer be tolerated, and which ought forthwith to be modified or expunged. I am not famed for penetration, yet I think I see Taylorism stretching out its arms like seas and watching every avenue where it may insinuate itself. It once came in my way to observe the movements of one of this tribe. At his entrance into the place he was clamorous for the good old ways—in the next place, he unfolded the views of Taylor, his master, and pretended to dissent from them; in the last place, he defended them as being right. All these transformations were exhibited in the course of a few months, and yet so blinded were the people, that they did not observe his duplicity.

Before I close, I would remark, that connecting these statements with what I have before given, my testimony as to the state of the church has been extensive. I have described a large circle, the periphery of which has only been attempted to be touched. A great body of facts remain to be disposed of. As to their importance and bearing, others must judge. If they can be impeached, it will be done: if it is *not done*, they must be received for what they are worth. My object has been the advancement of the cause of truth. I appeal to God for the truth of my assertion, and depending on his almighty strength, I abide the issue.

Your Friend, and Brother,

EBENEZAR HAZARD SNOWDEN.

Kingston, March 23d. 1838.

MIRACLES, ATTESTING THE REAL BODILY PRESENCE OF CHRIST IN THE EUCHARIST.

THE last argument which Bellarmine uses in this treatise on the sacrament of the eucharist, to prove that God desired and appointed that the real body of Christ should be present, is the one from miracles. To shew that God has so appointed, and so confirms this doctrine to the confuting of heretics, he adduces the following miracles, which are taken from the works *John Garetius and Tilmanus Bredenbachius*, and will be found in the viii ch. of the III. book on the Sac. of the Eucharist.

"The first, is in the life of the blessed Gregory, written by Paul the deacon, and also in the life of the same Gregory, written by John the deacon, in the II. B. 41. ch. The substance of it is as follows. When the holy Gregory had distributed the eucharist to the people, he came to a woman, who, it happens, had made with her hands the bread which he had consecrated at the altar. So when holy Gregory had said to her; *the body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul*; being tempted by the devil, she laughed; the priest withdrew his hand, and placed the piece upon the altar. When he had completed the solemnity, he asked the woman before all the people, why she had laughed in so solemn an action. She remaining for a long time afraid to speak, at length replied. *That she recognised the bread which she had made with her own hands, and so could not believe that it was the real body of the Lord.* Then Gregory sought of the Lord, and obtained an answer;—*that the bread in its external appearance should be changed into flesh, which being done, she was brought back to the faith, and the whole people confirmed.*"

"Another miracle is recorded by Paschasius in the 14th chap. of his book, on the Body of the Lord, where he relates that a certain very pious and holy presbyter had for a long time wished to see with his bodily eyes the appearance of that which he with a firm faith believes to be hidden under the appearance of bread and wine: at length, he obtained that which he sought, and saw the body of Christ in human form, but as of a boy, which also he had sought. In that place, Paschasius relates that God was accustomed to work these miracles for two reasons, for confirming the faith of those that were doubting and for consoling those by whom he was ardently loved."

The third, is of St. Malachias related in the life of Bernard. There was a priest who sometimes presumed to say, that in the eucharist there was only a sacrament, and not the true body. St. Malachias often privately conferred with, and admonished him of his error, but not repenting, he persuaded him before an assembly of priests, and there having given him liberty of speaking in defence of his error, disputed with, and confuted him publicly, denounced him as a heretic, and with the other bishops who happened to be present, he struck him with the anathema. But when in rage he would speak, they all favoured the man, saving Malachias alone who would not receive his appearances, nor desert the truth, but said, *the Lord maketh thee to confess the truth, even of necessity*, to which he said, *amen.* And behold on that very day, he was seized with a most grievous and deadly disease, was restored to his right mind, was

reconciled to the church, and expired. In what way could God more clearly shew what was the truth?

The *fourth*, is of this Bernard, as it is written in his life, of one possessed of a devil, whose restoration to health seems hopeless. The devil had possessed her for many years, and had taken from her the use of her eyes, ears, and tongue; also her tongue was extended from her mouth like an elephant's trunk, so that she looked not like a woman, but some horrible monster. Having placed the host in the platin, and holding it above the head of the dæmoniac, and addressing him after this manner, he expelled the devil. *O wicked spirit, thy judge is present—the supreme power is present; now resist if you can—he is present who suffered for our salvation. Now says he, the prince of this world is cast out. This is that body, which was taken from the body of the virgin, which was extended upon the cross, which was laid in the tomb, which arose from the dead, which ascended into heaven in the presence of his disciples. Therefore in the terrible power of his majesty, I command thee, O malignant spirit, that you go out from this handmaid, and never again presume to touch her. This power by which the devil was cast out, would not have been exerted by God, if that was false which Bernard said, and which the whole church believes."*

The *fifth*, is of St. Antonius of Padua, which is remarkable, though not recorded by John Garetius or Tilmannus Bredenbachius. It is described by Swrius, vol. 3, and by St. Antonius. St. Antonius disputing with a certain heretic in the country of Tolouse, on the truth of the body of the Lord in the eucharist, (for at that time the Albigenses troubled the church, who together with many others, were infected with this error.) The heretic sought of Antonius, whom he knew was endowed with the gift of miracles, this sign. *'I have,'* says he, *'a mule, to whom I will not give food for the space of three days. When the three days are ended, do you be present with the sacrament, and I will be present with the mule, and before him I will pour out the barley; if the mule will leave the barley, and to approach the worshipping of the sacrament, I will believe.'* It was done as he wished, and after three days were past, Antonius came with a number of his companions, holding the venerable sacrament in his hands, he thus addressed the mule. *"In truth, and in the name of thy Creator, whom I truly hold in my hand, although unworthy, oh animal, I speak to thee, and command, that at once, you come and humbly after your manner, exhibit your reverence for it, that from this, heretical pravity, may know that every creature is subject to thy Creator, which the sacerdotal dignity continually offers at the altar."* These words being spoken, the mule ran to the sacred host, forgetful of its hunger, and of the barley poured out before it, and with inclined head and bended knees, in the way which it could, adored the Lord, and confuted the heretic.

The *sixth*, Thomas Waldenses relates as an eye-witness, that a heretical cobbler being called before, the archbishop and other prelates, assembled in the church of St. Paul, in London, said that a spider was more worthy of worship and reverence than the eucharist: immediately a horrible spider from the high top of the house, leaving his web, hastened to his mouth, and with the help of many hands, he could scarcely be kept from entering."

Here we have a specimen of the proofs adduced by one of the most prominent, and able advocates of the papal system, in defence of the absurd dogma, which every papist is bound upon oath, and on the penalty of his soul's ruin, to believe, that *the body whole and entire, of our Lord Jesus Christ* is contained in the wafer which the priest mumbles over, and then worships, and requires all his people to worship as God. They are specimens which the cardinal has selected from many of the same character, that are scattered through nearly all the papal historians that have endeavoured to record the wonders of her existence during her long night of darkness and corruption.

We give them place more readily in our pages from the bearing that they will have directly upon those who have been accustomed to hear the wonders that have in these latter days appeared at the cathedral of this city. It would argue ignorance indeed, of this building and of its interior, not to know the heroine that acts as the turnkey to visitors, and the organ to ignorant and unsuspecting protestants, of the arguments of her father confessors, on the great and distinctive points of this system.

No one of all their errors strikes the common sense of mankind more readily and powerfully, than that greatest of all absurdities ; the existence in a wafer, of the body, blood, soul and divinity of our Lord and Saviour, and so no one is more commonly the subject of discussion, during the moments spent in traversing the isles of this great building.

In the visit of a gentleman from a neighboring city some few years since, while passing the altar, a question was asked as to the possibility of heretics coming among them, and even the possibility of some partaking of the wafer, and thus sacrilegiously eating the body of Christ. Oh yes sir, responded the guide, such things may happen, and once a female who did not believe our doctrines, and who treated this with sport came to the altar and partook with those of the faithful. But no sooner had she returned to her seat, than she became very sick, and after a short period threw up a piece of flesh which was in the shape of a human body.

Little did we think some two or three years back when we heard this narrated that in reading over a chapter of cardinal Bellarmine, we should find the account of the same sort of a miracle, saving that the unbelieving heretic had the audacity to laugh right out, and thus give the priest the opportunity of publicly confounding her and strengthening the faith of his companions, without her being guilty of the sacrilege of swallowing their God.

But the same tales and lying wonders that formerly led the credulous and ignorant multitude to embrace and profess whatever the priests should teach and assert was confirmed by miracles, are now made use of to lead the lower classes of their deluded followers blindly to obey their dictates. We wonder not when we read such things, when we hear of such instructions, that they prefer their people being in ignorance, and undertake to answer for them as a foolish duke once said he had found those that would answer for him at the day of judgment if the system which he was about to embrace should prove false.