

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL. IV.

AUGUST 1838.

No. 8

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

THE SINNER LED QUITE TO CHRIST,

OR,

Conversations in an Anxious Room.

THIS is the title of No. 23, of the publications of the Revival Tract Society.—It is interesting, as being a fair and systematic account of the manner in which our new-school ministers, “As instruments in the hands of God, convert sinners from the error of their ways. James v. 20.” (p. 34.) Like all the publications of a kindred origin, it is remarkable for its omissions, and for its covered attacks on the doctrines of the Bible. The title would lead us to expect something respecting the object of faith, the Lord Jesus Christ; but all mention of him as a Redeemer, and as our righteousness is left out; while we are on the contrary distinctly told, “However diverse their views may be relative to the divine efficiency, all evangelical Christians agree, that the sinner has a duty to perform, and that *that duty is to return to his obedience by submitting his will to the righteous government of God Jas. iv. 7. There is necessarily but one way in which, by the exercise of his natural powers, the sinner is thus to return to God, and this way it has been my object to explain.*” (p. 35.) How, it is asked, did you get a willingness to come to this anxious room? “Did God give it to you directly? No, you made it yourself. You reflected upon the reasons for coming, then consented or made up your mind to come, *and immediately you had a disposition or willingness to come.* You made yourself willing by *first* determining to come. You must act on the same principle in submitting. Christ presents his own character and promises as reasons, and you must consent to leave all your interests with him, *without any previous disposition*; your first act must be a consent to God’s

will, and then of course you will be willing or have a disposition ; otherwise you never can be willing ; and remember the command in Ezekiel to make your own disposition or heart." p. 20.

We know not whether words can express the proper estimate of the profound metaphysical acumen, which declares that a disposition or willingness, *of course* follows a determination ; or of the admirable common sense of these instructions, and their high scriptural character. But the perfection of Christian modesty beams in this passage. Why, asks the inquirer, is it that the process of repentance appears to be so much shorter in the present day, than aged Christians represent it to have been in theirs ?

"The reason is evident. The process of repentance must necessarily be always the same. In times of much spiritual declension, the impenitent were left to find out their own way to repentance, with minds crowded with erroneous views, and *with little beneficial instruction*. When any did submit, it was generally *by accident*, if the expression may be allowed. After struggling for feelings of repentance and weeping and praying, perhaps for months, they usually concluded such efforts were unavailing, without knowing to what further means they should resort ; the impression was produced that they were *trying to get to heaven by their own works* ; in the midst of despair they would suddenly stop their mental struggles, or as they called it, *cease from their own efforts*, and consent that God might do with them as he pleased, in reference to that and all other things, which is submission. In the present day, sinners are or should be, extricated from these errors, and the mode of submission distinctly pointed out ; and is it surprising that now, people often learn in twenty minutes, what it took their fathers months to obtain by their own unassisted efforts, and in opposition to all the instructions given them ?" p. 31.

Who can hesitate to say of the author of this language, and of his brethren ? "No doubt ye are the people, and wisdom shall perish with you." Alas, for David Brainard and Jonathan Edwards, and all the godly ministers of the last 1800 years ; they were not successful in winning souls ; if people submitted, it was *by accident*. Could there be a clearer and more soul-sickening renunciation of the effectual teaching and calling of the Holy Spirit ? If souls did submit, it was as it were "*by accident*."

An analysis of the tract may be useful, to acquaint your readers with the manner in which men *are led quite to Christ*. An outcry has been made that *common fame* has been the sole foundation of our suspicions and charges against the self styled revival ministers ; but this tract is evidence that cannot be gainsayed or set aside, that those suspicions are too well grounded, and those charges most justly made.

It is in the form of a dialogue, between a pastor and an inquirer.— It opens with the acknowledgment of the latter, that his peace is not made with God, and that he has sought without finding instruction how to begin his duty, and that his deliberate conclusion is, that he cannot perform it. The pastor expresses his belief that he is honest in the conviction of his inability, and tells him, "Be assured, my friend, if you will *do that which you see is proper and*

right, and within the compass of your power, your salvation is attainable." He then promises to study to use such expressions only as shall be adapted to convey to his mind his full meaning. After some remarks, (on the whole correct) on the subject of conviction, the inquirer says, "I am now convinced not only that the Lord Jesus Christ will send his enemies into ceaseless destruction, but that on account of my sins I deserve a similar fate." Then, replies the other, you are sufficiently convicted. You are in a condition gratefully to accept of mercy and pardon from eternal death, because you are conscious of your desert of that punishment." p. 5.

The question is then put, "In what way do you expect to escape his justice? And in reply, neither here nor in any part of the tract, is any statement of the grand glory of the gospel, the cross of Christ. *Submission* is all that is inculcated—*submission* to an absolute God,—precisely such a submission as any natural man could make, and as a Socinian or Campbellite, Shaker or Deist would require. The turning point is represented to be the willingness to have God do with us as he pleases,—even to leave us to suffer our just deserts, and "the submission is disinterested, and of course genuine, when *the leading motive* is proper, and in itself right." p. 32.

The inquirer declares he has prayed and tried, and has sometimes felt himself so dependent on the Holy Spirit, that he has repeatedly determined to wait for the Lord to be gracious; and this is the reply: "It is evident you have altogether mistaken the nature of the sinner's dependence on the Holy Spirit and of his influences. Without God you will indeed do nothing, because you are indisposed to trust yourself with Christ, *which is all the inability the bible charges on sinners*. The Spirit does not act *directly* on the heart, but he makes use of the truth, Eph. vi. 7; this truth he commands you to regard, by the light of it to consider your ways, to divest yourself of this indisposition, and to turn your feet to his testimonies, but you refuse. As the influences of the Spirit do not give any new powers or faculties to the soul, but excite it to action with respect to these requirements according to its constituted laws, it is therefore incumbent on you to act on this subject as a rational, moral, and accountable being, without reference to the influences of the Spirit. Unless you do so, you will never perform your duty, for you will be constantly leaning on God to do for you that which he never does in regeneration. It is a subject with which you as a rebel and a sinner, have nothing to do except to beware lest you grieve him from you." p. 6.

There are errors enough in these few sentences, to shew how deeply tainted their author was with Pelagianism;—no direct action on the heart, no inability except indisposition to trust oneself with Christ, and no reference to be had to the Holy Spirit. And if the Christian's inability ceases wholly from the moment he believes, why should he have any reference to the Holy Spirit in any of his duties, and why may he not become absolutely perfect and always continue so?

Some definitions are given, which are in part correct, but

"The trail of the serpent is over them all." "Saving faith is an unreserved and cordial trust of yourself, and all your interests in the hands of the Lord Jesus Christ, as he is revealed in the gospel, with an im-

PLICIT confidence in, and approbation of the record given of him. It has been aptly illustrated by the confidence of a little child in its parents. "Submission regards God as the sovereign ruler of all, and is that consent of the mind indicated by our Saviour in the petition 'Thy will be done,' and this not only over the souls and bodies of others, but over yourself and your dearest interests, be that will what it may. This consent is to be given in view of our obligations to God, and of the fact that he will do rightly, and is to be accompanied with a full purpose to obey that will, so far as it shall be made known in his word or by his providence. You are not to consent with a view of being saved, or to commend yourself to his favor by your future obedience. Every act of submission necessarily implies the exercise of saving faith." p. 9.

"Love to God is the simple removal of your present affections from yourself and sin, and placing them upon God and holiness, in preference to all other objects. It is not a *second* heart but a *new one*, because the natural affections of the soul, are then directed into a new channel, and towards new objects." p. 9.

"Repentance is an ingenuous sorrow for your own sins, and hatred and abhorrence of them as evil, irrespective of their consequences to yourself. It is not to be regarded as a primary act or feeling, or the first exercise in the train of yielding to God, but it follows or proceeds from the exercise of faith and submission,—that is, to obtain repentance you must first exercise faith or submission." p. 9.

"Conversion is to prefer or love God and his service, which consists in the constant exercise of benevolence, and to desire his honor or glory above all other objects, thus practising in your own soul that religion which the blessed Saviour described as consisting in loving the Lord our God with all our hearts, and our neighbor as ourselves. Your present rule or habit of action is a mind, will, determination, or choice to please yourself in all things; conversion is the substitution and cordial adoption of a new rule of action, to wit: a mind, will, determination, or choice to please God in all things supremely. It is that act which Joshua required of the Israelites after presenting the Lord before them, "Choose you this day whom you will serve," and it is that act which the people cordially performed, "We will serve the Lord." This same choice all true converts have in fact made, and it manifests itself in the exercise of faith and submission." p. 10.

If the people who survived Joshua were all unconverted up to the time specified in Josh. 24; and if then they performed the act of conversion, we can only say, "Thou bringest strange things to our ears." But it would greatly rejoice us to know that when people now make the choice as confidently, and express their determination, their ministers instead of proceeding to enroll them as converts, would say with Joshua, v. 19. "Ye cannot serve the Lord, for he is a holy God, for he is a jealous God."—Really, we can see no other reason for the quotation of the verse from Joshua, and applying it to the subject of conversion, than to make a show of reliance on scripture; and we do think, it argues a most impudent presuming that the readers of the tract never had and never would read that part of the Bible.

It is worthy of notice that we are distinctly told that conversion,

or the act of choosing God, "manifests itself in the exercise of faith and submission." This is something like an approach to the scriptural doctrine, that regeneration precedes the performance of any good act, and that from it flow repentance and faith. But it is only a *seeming* approach, for the inquirer asks, "Will you now explain how I am to obtain this determination or choice to please and obey God?" The reply is, "By determining, in view of the propriety of the claims and character of the Lord Jesus Christ, and under a consciousness of your *own* true condition, that *his will be done, and that you will obey.*" "But to particularize; as has been observed, the mind acts on this and other subjects on like principles, and is controlled only by truths and facts, acting as arguments. We do not possess a self-determining power of the will, to act and decide when uninfluenced by motives, nor can we be induced to love God through the application of mere force or physical power. *It is necessary first to believe and be convinced by the truths, in the view of which you are to act.* To explain: Before I can be induced to sell my house, appropriate arguments entitled to credit must be urged, and they must be of sufficient weight to convince me it would be right and best to do so. So you will never form the determination to please and obey God, until reasons of sufficient weight are offered to convince you that such an act would be both right and best. To convince you it is right, God in his word reveals his character, plans and claims; and to convince you it is best, he exhibits your depravity, reveals his determination to punish, and promises to pardon, if you comply. It is necessarily our own free act to examine and believe the facts and arguments adduced; if we please, we may entirely discredit them, by averting from them our attention, in which case we should remain unconvinced and consequently not in a situation to act or decide. The next mental act must be *a consent or determination now and forever, unreservedly to be in his hands, and in your future life to please and obey God, knowing it to be best, and in view of the propriety of the duty.* This determination is not to be delayed till you can perceive the existence of love to God in your soul, but it is to be made merely in view of the propriety and fitness of his requirements, as they address themselves to your understandings. It must also be your own voluntary act. In the case supposed, if I should yield to the arguments urged, and determine to sell my house, it would be my own free act. So your yielding to the reasons urged, and determining to please and obey God in view of them, must be your own free act, which neither God nor man can do for you, according to the constitution of things. John vi. 28—9. If from any cause, you refuse to examine, believe and determine, the guilt and consequences must rest upon yourself, *for it is evident you can do these things in the same manner, and as easily as I can, in the case supposed.* THE RESULT OF SUCH A DETERMINATION (as the order of our mental exercises is perceivable by us) WILL BE THE CONSENT OF THE AFFECTIONS, OR CHANGE OF HEART, for the affections of heart are only acts of the mind, and must OF COURSE, follow the convictions or impressions of the judgment. To explain: By the term heart or affections, is meant a willingness, preference, love, desire, choice or disposition toward an object. In the

case supposed, my determination was formed not to sell my house, of course my heart was upon retaining it,—that is, I was willing or prefer not to sell it; but in view of the arguments urged, I first make up my mind to sell it; instantly I am willing, prefer, love to sell it; or, *in consenting to sell, I become willing*. I have thus directed my affections into a new channel, and have made myself a new heart on this subject. So your present determination is to please yourself in all things, by consulting your own interests; consequently your heart is fixed upon the same object. Suppose that in view of its propriety, you now determine to please God and consult his interests supremely; *instantly you will be willing, prefer, love to please God supremely, and thus will actually make yourself a new heart*, in obedience to God's command, Ez. xviii. 31. Having now chosen the ground of right, *you will of course love all those doctrines and duties which commend themselves as right, and will hate those objects and paths which are wrong, and in so doing you will be assimilated to the character of God*. It is now evident that your affections are under your own control, on all subjects which present appropriate motives, and that your free agency is as little impaired in conversion, as in any other voluntary act." p. 12.

Let this extract be read and pondered; let it be remembered that the author of it (the Rev'd Theodore Spencer) is a member of the Presbytery of Montrose; that the whole tract was sanctioned by the Executive Committee of the Revival Tract Society, some of whom are Presbyterian ministers; and then let it be well understood, that the judicatories of the Presbyterian Church, from the church session to the General Assembly, are guilty of unfaithfulness to God and to souls, while they permit such arrant nonsense and wicked heresy to be preached and taught by their ministers and members, as divine truth.

After listening to this account of the simple process of self conversion, we need not be surprised that the inquirer asks, "What agency has the Holy Spirit in this matter?" And the answer is as follows:—"As has been stated, before the sinner can be convinced, or can be in a condition to decide in earnest, he must examine and believe the truths of the gospel; but the shame produced by those which bring to light his exceeding guilt, is so deep,—the lashes of conscience are so severe, and the horror which pervades the soul in the view of the wrath to come, is so distressing, that the sinner will always turn away in desperation and often in anger from these truths; of course he would fail of submission and salvation, were it not for the kind influences of the Holy Ghost. It is his peculiar office work to present to view, and give efficacy to these peculiar truths and arguments, until by them the sinner becomes convinced or conscious of his entire guilt and danger, and is advised of the remedy, John xvi. 18. "He shall reprove the world of sin, of righteousness and of judgment;" that is, shall make their sins manifest to his intelligent creatures. When this sword of the Spirit is applied to the judgment and conscience of the sinner, he may be persuaded to consent to God's terms, as we have seen, and this it appears was the great object at which Paul aimed in all his labours; "Knowing the terrors of the Lord, we persuade men." When

men are thus persuaded, they will decide and become willing to love and obey God; which is the very point to which the Spirit aims to bring them, "*Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power,*" who will thus literally fulfill the language of Paul, "It is God that worketh in us both to *will* and to *do*, of his good pleasure," and in this manner also will entirely overcome the will, the great obstacle alleged by the Saviour to lie in the way. John v. 40. It is with perfect propriety therefore that the work of conversion is ascribed to God. Ex. xi. 19,* and it is evident notwithstanding the sinner's freedom, that when he is converted, it will be through the drawings of God, John vi. 44, and that consequently the whole praise and glory of his conversion as well as of his final salvation belong alone to God. It is thus that God's sovereignty in conversion and man's free agency harmonize and can be clearly understood; while that incomprehensible wisdom and power which can effectually control and bend the wills of men to his own purpose, and yet leave them freely to act according to their own pleasure and wills, presents a theme for the wonder, admiration and praise of his creatures." p. 12. Again he says; "The Spirit's operations are not directly on the heart, but by the use of motives on the reason and conscience; he never does give or directly create a feeling of love or repentance in the soul, in the way you have been desiring him to do. There must be first a decision of the mind, a consent to God's requirements and this will be followed by such emotions whenever the proper objects are placed before the mind. You will then love God as naturally and with the same easy and gentle flow of affection, which you now exercise toward your child." p. 13.

The view of depravity is characteristic. "Does not" the inquirer asks, "our natural enmity of heart prevent us from voluntarily submitting to God." The pastor replies, "It is true, while the sinner hates, he can have no love in exercise; but he has no fountain or fund of hatred to God existing in his soul, which incapacitates him for loving him whether he wishes to do so or not. This absurd idea if true, would destroy every vestige of human responsibility. In hating God, the sinner voluntarily exercises his natural affection of hatred, in the same manner as towards any other object. He does it because the holy requirements of God and his threatened wrath, directly cross the path of his inclinations and supposed interests in doing evil. Let him remove the cause,—his determination to do those things which God disapproves and which he knows to be evil, *and he will of course instantly cease hating*, he will then necessarily love the requirements of God, because they are right, and he has impliedly approved of them, by determining to cease his opposition to them. Thus you see, that instead of the sinner's enmity producing an insurmountable obstacle to his freely submitting to Christ, the performance of the duty of submission itself, (for such in substance is the determination to which I have just adverted,) is the only way to destroy or get rid of this enmity. This determination to do evil, or this hating of God, is of course his own act, for neither God nor man can form it for him; conse-

* There is no such verse in the Bible!

quently God is clear of having made his wicked heart and of being the author of sin,—for these the sinner alone is to answer.” p. 33.

There is still one other point in the tract, which the fear of trespassing on the patience of your readers, forces us merely to allude to—it is that every conversion is genuine if the leading motive be right, that is disinterested, or if the person be willing to be finally damned for the glory of God.—This is brought prominently forward and insisted upon. p. 23.

The whole series of revival tracts, ought to be examined, and the names of their authors reported to their respective presbyteries.—Coleridge tells of a stern humorist, who labelled a volume of Socinian tracts, SALVATION MADE EASY, or, every man his own redeemer; it would be a most appropriate descriptive title of these tracts. Mr. Barnes has been employed to write prefaces to a number of books; we should like to see a preface from his pen, accompanying the revival tracts. It is painful to think what the revivals must be, where such instructions as these are given to inquirers; when men are said to be *led quite to Christ* when they are fully convinced of their own sufficiency to determine to please God, and *of course* to love to do it.

ULTRAISM.

THE following communication, is from a perfectly respectable source.—It was written before the developments of the last Assembly proved that the conjectures of the writer were indeed, almost history, while he wrote them.

It is manifest to all, that there are three opinions on the great question of negro slavery, now contending for the mastery, in the church, and in the country. 1. *Abolitionism*: 2. *Pro-slaveryism*: 3. *Gradualism, united as far as possible with colonization*. The first party is confined chiefly to the north; the second to the extreme south; the third embraces the vast majority of the whole American people, and perhaps the actual majority in every state; as it undoubtedly does in every church in the union.—

The course of events has produced a schism from the Presbyterian church, of nearly all the abolitionists who had found their way into it; and who have combined with the semi-pelagian party, to create a new sect. The character and fate of this combination, are yet to be written, though surely, no longer doubtful.

The pro-slavery party, is one of extremely recent origin, and has undoubtedly been produced by the excesses of abolitionism. Its claims at present in regard to ecclesiastical affairs, are not fully agreed on, amongst its own advocates. Some only require total silence on the part of the church; some demand that the church shall declare slavery to be merely a relation of power and subjection, which of itself has no moral quality, and is at any rate, purely a civil and political affair; while others still, require a solemn retraction of the former testimony of the church, and an explicit admission that slavery, as it exists in this country, is perfectly consonant with the spirit of the gospel—and the very word of God.

The gradualist party, rejecting the theories of both the others, and standing, on what has from the beginning, been the testimony of the church, and what was, till within six years, the universal voice of the whole country; deny that slavery is absolutely and universally a sin in any such sense as to require its immediate cessation, irrespective of consequences, while they also deny that it can be innocently made perpetual on earth: reject all right to act for or in regard to slavery, *so far* as it is a merely civil and political affair, or as it relates to those who are without; while they consider its whole *moral* aspects, as much under the care and watch of the church, so far as regards church members, as any other matter;—and refusing to go a crusading for or against any one single thing, good or bad—deem it their peculiar duty, in regard to this matter, to rely on the alterative rather than any direct influences of the gospel, for its final settlement;—mean-time, adding nothing to, and taking nothing from the testimony of the church—but waiting calmly the progress of events.—Such we believe to be a fair statement of the leading views of these three great parties, on the painful subject brought into view, by the following communication.—

It is needless for us to say, that we are cordially the friends of the great middle party—and that we deeply regret, the occurrence of such events as are complained of, by our young correspondent. With the aid of moderation, candour and kindness, the church can easily be saved from serious difficulties, on this agitating subject. But we solemnly admonish our brethren in the middle states, and especially those in the central free states—to remember that this matter involves at present the greatest peril of the church and the country—and therefore requires a double share of wisdom, in its management.—

GENTLEMEN:—It is not a notion, but a practical fact, that there is a very strong sympathy between abolitionists and new school men, or Pelagians. They act in concert. They are both quite flexible, and can sacrifice principle a little in order to accomplish their scheme. I am going to the south, having been denied license to preach because I did not give satisfaction on the subject of slavery. My examination on theology was gone through with, and a motion to sustain it, when an abolitionist rose and wished to ask some questions on the subject of slavery, in connexion with the examination on theology.—One question required was, What is the Bible doctrine respecting slavery as it exists in these United States? Ans. I did not know.—2d. Is slavery a *sin*? Ans. by no reply.—3d. question, Did I expect ever to buy, sell, or own slaves? I decline to answer. On this ground my examination was not sustained, and I was refused license. Among the principal opposers were two ministers who strongly opposed the last General Assembly. One said he did not consider the errors of A. Barnes half so dangerous as the views of southern men on the subject of slavery. And several of the old school ministers thought so too, I suppose, for they all acted together. A division of the church appears to be clearly the design of these two species of men, (new school and abolitionist.) And it may be a division of our united country, if they should be able to effect it.

May 19, 1838.

H—TT.

JUNKIN ON THE MORAL GOVERNMENT

Of God's Covenant with Adam.

(Chap. II Sec. II. Continued.)

Note to the Reader.—The III. Sec. of the SECOND CHAP. of *Doctor Junkin's* able series of articles, broke off very abruptly in the midst, on page 161, in our April No. for this year. What immediately follows should have concluded that section; but the manuscript did not come to hand.—We are happy to state, that matter enough to make four or five articles of considerable length, is now in our possession—and will be regularly presented to our readers.

GOD leaves Adam to choose his course—he does exercise volition and that under no constraining perils calculated to interfere with his choice. This is perfectly plain and indisputable. For the objection that Adam could not refuse—he dare not object to the terms; rests on a very flimsy foundation: because it rests on a positive falsehood—standing out in bold opposition to the plain and undeniable fact. Adam did exercise his volition—he did dare to choose in opposition to God's will and that after he had at first acquiesced in it. The fact of his acquiescence will appear hereafter; but the fact of his choosing to act contrary to God's expressed will, "thou shalt not eat of it," is acknowledged by himself; and all his posterity do the same. Yet is it true, in one sense, that he could not object.—He could not without sin: still he did it. Hence it is undeniable, he did choose the road to death.

(2.) As to the *terms*. They are briefly related in, or inferable from, the language of the Bible. "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Let us now see whether this language contains the five items of a covenant. (1.) We have a stipulation of something required of Adam—in abstinence from the fruit of the tree: in obedience to the divine will. The command is a positive law and a test of Adam's obedience as effectual and even more simple than if it related to some general duty. For his way was hedged up, so that he could sin only in this one thing. All the principles and tendency of his nature were accordant to the moral law of his creation. This then was the only avenue he had to guard. And in narrowing down the field of temptation, God gave him the vantage ground over his enemy.

(2.) We see proffered to Adam life as the reward or consideration of his obedience. For according to the simplest laws of construction, the threatening of death as a consequence of eating, involves the promise of life to obedience. So Adam understood it, so Eve understood it, "ye shall not eat of it—lest ye die." This is alleged as a reason for not eating. Life is desirable, and we shall have it, so long as we abstain. In the laws of the commonwealth, which award death to the murderer, the principle is assumed that the enjoyment of life belongs to him who exercises the opposite feelings and the conduct to which they prompt. So here, the eating, or disobedience is connected with death, and the not eating, or obedience is connected with life.

(3.) Here is the *theoretic* equivalent. The honour done to God and his moral government, He is pleased in condescension and kindness and love to account as an equivalent to the felicity of man to the whole extent of that included in the term life. (4.) These equivalents are in themselves right. Unflinching compliance with the will of God in all things, even the most minute and apparently trifling, is infinitely proper in itself, and infinitely important to the moral universe. The proffer of eternal felicity as a reward for so poor a service as was required of man, was certainly not wrong, but altogether in keeping with the boundless benevolence of the everlasting Father. (5.) The penal sanction is explicitly set forth in the language, and as to its reality there can be no doubt. Some questions we have to settle as to the extent of the blessing and the curse: but the things themselves are indisputable.

(3.) The *voluntary* assent of the parties; and first, as in every covenant, one party must make the proposition—God proposes the terms as an expression of his will, which is an assent or agreement. God's commanding man not to eat, is his consent.

As to man, it has been already observed, he could not without unreasonable opposition to his Creator's will, refuse any terms which the wisdom and benevolence of God would allow him to proffer. Hence we should conclude, Adam must most cheerfully accede to the terms. But this the more readily, when their nature is inspected—when he should see in them every thing adapted for his advantage, and nothing to his disadvantage.

2. The same conclusion we deduce from an inspection of the scripture history. For (1st.) there is not a hint at any thing like a refusal on the part of Adam, before the act of violation. The whole history is perfectly consistent with the supposition that he did cheerfully agree. (2d.) It is evident that Eve thought the command most reasonable and proper. She so expressed herself to the serpent, giving God's command as a reason of her abstinence. This information she must have derived from her husband, for she was not created at the time the covenant was given to Adam. We hence infer Adam's *consent*. (3dly.) Adam was, after his sin, abundantly disposed to excuse himself—he cast the blame upon the woman, and indirectly upon God, for giving her to him. "The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat." Now most assuredly, if Adam could in truth have said, I never *consented* to abstain—I never agreed to the *terms* proposed—I have broken no pledge—he would have presented this apology, or justification. But he was dumb: he offered no such apology. Can any reasonable man want further evidence of his consent? Even this may be had, if he will (4th.) look at the consequences. The penal evils did result—death and sorrow did ensue; and hence, because God is righteous, we infer the legal relations. The judge of all the earth would not punish where there is no crime.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

THE INSTITUTION OF CELIBACY IN THE PAPAL CHURCH.

No. V.

LVIII. THE decree of Siricius was by no means universally observed by the church. Subsequent councils made great efforts to ensure its execution. Montesquieu says that "when celibacy which was merely recommended at first, was imposed by law upon an order of citizens, new laws from day to day became necessary to enforce it. Consequently the legislator wearied himself and society also, in making men execute that *by precept* which those who loved perfection would have executed voluntarily *as advice*." In the 4th century the council of Toledo (either the 1st or the 2d) decreed that a priest or deacon guilty of incontinence could not be promoted to a higher order, and that a clergyman twice married should be degraded to a rank inferior to that which he had previously occupied. This decree was contradicted by the 1st council of Orange and softened by the council of Tours. Other councils however added to its rigour.

LIX. A source of great embarrassment to the operation of the new system, was the multitude of the wives of subaltern priests, who were condemned by it to an afflicting widowhood. Doubtless they were the occasions of many infractions of this unnatural law: for we find the councils of the 5th century incessantly occupied with interposing barriers against such occurrences. First, the councils reposed upon the good faith of the husband and wife. Afterwards several councils (that of Gironne and Tours and many others) required them to lodge separately. This was not always practicable. The next expedient was, that every ecclesiastic should always have with him another, who should eat with him—sleep in the same chamber. Bishops even were subjected to this sort of oversight. Yet this expedient was found inefficacious. Such were the grave occupations of councils for two or three centuries. How much better it would have been to allow the ancient usages of the church to subsist.

LX. The first council of Toledo gave power to an ecclesiastic whose wife should be unfaithful to bind her,—subject her to fasting—and chastise her in any way, provided he did not attempt her life. Other councils (the first of Orleans for example) decreed that if the widow of a priest or deacon marry, and would not quit her second husband, they should both be excommunicated. Why this distinction between the widows of ecclesiastics and of other persons? Thus the wife of an ecclesiastic by the laws of the church, was bound to continence not only during the life of her husband but after his death. The last expedient was to disgrace the wives of the clergy, with the name of concubines, for after the 6th century they were designated scarcely by any other name.

LXI. The children born of these marriages were not treated with less rigour. The council of Seville—the 8th council of Toledo, and many others declared them bastards, and adjudged them

to be the slaves of the church. This was a kind of legislation which one would suppose belonged to the civil state, for nothing appears more foreign to the office of a clergyman than to fix the civil rights of a citizen. Finally, to inspire the clergy with still greater repugnance to marriage, the relation itself was dishonoured. Theodore, Arch-Bishop of Canterbury, writes, that in his time (A. D. 690,) the new married pair must not enter a church for a month after their marriage—that they must undergo penance fifteen days before coming to the communion—that a woman could not enter a church till forty days had elapsed from giving birth to a child. The Manicheans never cast greater reproach than this on the relation of marriage. Hence the prohibition of marriage during a certain portion of the year which has existed till recently, if it does not now. Though it has been allowed to subsist, because it was converted into a means of a revenue, which makes it burthensome chiefly to the poor who cannot find means to pay for a dispensation.

LXII. But these regulations did not prevail in Greece, nor in the East. The Greek and Eastern churches merely required that priests, and deacons should not contract marriage after their election. If the zeal of any particular bishop carried him further, his example, according to Socrates, was without influence out of his diocese. Chrysostom opposed the indiscreet zeal of Epiphanius in Crete.

“Why,” says Chrysostom (*in Epist. ad Tet.*) “Why did the apostle cite in preference to others, the case of a bishop when speaking of marriage? He did it to stop the mouths of heretics who would condemn it—He wished to show, that far from being criminal, it was so honourable, that it might be allied with the most august functions of the ministry,—that it was no impediment to ascending the throne of the altar.” In the east there was no preponderating power which could subject all the churches to its discipline. The sees of Constantinople, Antioch and Alexandria were independent and jealous of each other, and neither allowed the others universal authority. Each remained therefore in possession of its usages; and policy having less occasion for innovation, allowed more of the ancient discipline to remain. Hence the reasons why the first general councils which were held in Greece made no law imposing celibacy on the clergy. The council of Nice, the first and most important was remembered there, and that verified the ancient usage. The west was characterized by greater ignorance than the east—It was further from the place when the first general councils were held. Certain it is that neither the two general councils at Constantinople nor that of Ephesus, nor that of Chalcedon imposed the necessity of continence on the clergy. The last required it only of monks and consecrated virgins.

LXIII. Justinian in his edicts goes no farther than the council of Nice, which did not permit priests and deacons to marry after their ordination. (*De. Episc. et Cler. Leg. 44.*) If he required that a person having children or grand children, should not be nominated to the office of bishop, he gives as the reason the fear that they may apply to the benefit of their own, the things which have been

given them for the benefit of the poor. This therefore is a regulation of policy, as well as of the civil state. Whether as a rule of policy it was wise is a different question.

LXIV. Justinian II. convoked a council at Constantinople expressly to regulate discipline, and if possible to establish entire uniformity. This was called the council *in Trullo*, from the dome of the palace where the bishops sat; and sometimes *Quini Sextum*, because it is regarded as a continuation of the fifth general council. The four great patriarchs, and more than two hundred bishops were present. This council decreed (1,) that persons twice married should be excluded from holy orders according to the apostolical canons. (2,) By authority of the same canons, readers and chanters were allowed to marry after their ordination. (3,) The council added that "hereafter we forbid sub-deacons, deacons and priests to marry upon pain of deposition." The word *hereafter* shews that there was no formal prohibition previously, or that it had not been observed. These fathers say that in the Roman Church there was a rule that deacons and priests, should promise to have no intercourse with their wives; but they say that they, following the apostolical canons, will, that the marriage subsist without depriving such of the society of their wives at proper times, and that they allowed it for the sake of not dishonouring marriage which God instituted and blessed. This council supported itself by the decision of the 5th Council of Carthage held (A. D.) 400, which required the superior clergy to abstain from their wives only on the days they were to approach the altar.

Such was the famous council *in Trullo*, which finally fixed the discipline of the Greek Church. It was not received at Rome. Yet the Greeks were considered orthodox, because the churches continued to be united. The great schism did not commence till 150 years afterwards. It follows that neither church regarded the continence of the clergy as essential to salvation. This council *in Trullo* condemned also the practice of the Arminians, who admitted into the clergy only those who were born of a sacerdotal race. Polycrates in the 2d century gloried in being the 8th of his family who had governed the church of Ephesus, (Euseb. Hist. Ecc. L. V. c. 24.) So that it was not this usage in itself that the council condemned, but only the restriction of the choice to the children of priests, thus making the office depend upon birth. (See Hallam's middle ages, ch. 7. p. 278. Harper's ed. 1837.)

LXV. Abulfarages says that until the time of Timothy who presided about the year 778, the bishops of Persia married, and used all kinds of meat indifferently. The early ecclesiastical writers of England assert that before Augustin the monk was sent to that island by Gregory, the same usages prevailed there. So it was in Germany before the preaching of the monk Boniface. This being the practice in remote countries, and among people so different in character proves conclusively, that celibacy was an institution of the popes—a seal of slavery impressed upon all those whom they could by power or policy subjugate. This is not the place to inquire into the supremacy of the church of Rome, or her right to give laws to the church. But it may be asked, why, if that church

were supreme, did not Eusebius in relating the succession of the four great sees, of which Rome was one, give to Rome the pre-eminence? Why, in the multitude of heresies which very early sprung up, did neither the orthodox nor the heretics appeal to Rome for the decision of their quarrels? Why did not Rome interpose of her own authority? Why were the bishops of Rome cast in the controversy about the time of Easter? Why did the rebel churches and the bishops of Asia scorn the threat of excommunication? Why did not Cyprian yield to the authority of Cornelius in their controversy? Why did not Cornelius put the matter upon his own authority? Why did not the popes preside at the general councils? Why did they not claim the right? Why?—but there is scarcely a page in the early history of the church that would not suggest similar questions.

LXVI. Next to the popes the monks were the great props of celibacy. About the middle of the 4th century they were established in Italy and Gaul, upon the Egyptian model. But the monasteries were isolated, having no common rule to unite them. About the beginning of the 6th century St. Benedict devised a code of laws, and soon immense colonies were formed under this new founder upon principles of extreme austerity. They acquired great influence. Soon they began to degenerate, became ambitious and at length the object of ridicule. But the early monks of Europe differed in some respect from those of the East. The latter never amassed great wealth, but they were particularly addicted to theological speculations and disputes. They excited troubles in Alexandria, and for lack of better arguments carried a point against the patriarch by force of arms. The council of Chalcedon to correct the evil resulting from the polemic propensities of the monks, forbade by law the founding of monasteries near large cities. One would suppose this to be a branch of civil legislation. However, the law did not correct the evil, which became one of the principal causes of the ruin of the empire. In Europe the general ignorance was a shield against evils from this quarter. No body disputed about vain subtleties. Dogmas cannot become the subject of dispute until they are known, and the Christians (so called) of Europe were then ignorant in the extreme. Their religion was almost wholly composed of rites and extravagant practices. Their disputes turned chiefly upon temporalities. The monks wrangled with the common people, and sometimes with the bishops, and sometimes among themselves about their temporal possessions, and their disputes were seldom ended without blood shed.

LXVII. It was a deplorable evil to Europe that Christianity (if the system referred to, can be so called) was transmitted to the barbarians who dismembered the Roman Empire, by these monks. Yet so it was. The system which they taught was distorted with monastic ideas and the prejudices of cloisters. Thus adulterated in its origin, in most places it has never recovered its purity. Hence the false ideas so common in Catholic countries, of virtue and vice. Hence the strange practices which so extensively prevail without one syllable in the Gospel for their support.

The apostles and the primitive teachers of the gospel insisted

largely upon the great facts of the death and resurrection of our Saviour—they required faith upon his name, and such fruits of piety as are inculcated by the simple and sublime morality of the gospels. These were the leading topics upon which they insisted in preaching to Jews and Gentiles. But those missionaries of the 6th and 7th centuries mainly insisted upon a profusion of ceremonies—of exterior worship, incompatible even with the common duties of life; because these preachers themselves had no other occupation than that which this worship afforded them. They had a superstitious respect for the clergy—their own devotions were fantastic, and rendered to a great extent to saints or some obscure person who had spent his life in a cloister. In fact, they rather converted the barbarians to the rules of St. Benedict—than to the gospel. We may add, that as their chief object was to turn their converts to the account of the Popes, it was easy to inspire these ignorant people with such prejudices as they chose, and by putting them under the protection of the see of Rome to perpetuate them.

LXVIII. In this way an extravagant admiration for continence was introduced into Europe. Macerations also, and all other monastic practices which passed for the chief virtues, while humanity, charity, benevolence, which form the bond of the social union, as well as its charm, passed for subaltern virtues. No one was canonized for being a good father, a good husband, a faithful son, or a faithful subject. If perchance a saint had practised any of these virtues, the legends scarcely condescend to a passing notice of them: but all the honours of heaven they bestow upon those who practised excessive and injurious fastings, or tormented themselves by severe discipline. The incredulous were silenced by a multitude of miracles, which the monks always had ready to serve their cause. By such a system of religion the monks engrossed a great part of the wealth of Europe, as well as the rights and honours of this world; they became counts, marquises, and even sovereigns, in some countries, notwithstanding their vows of poverty and humility. Such contradictions are worthy only of a grossly barbarous age. But even now, not in Europe only, but in the United States, there are not only advocates for cloisters, but persons perverted or ignorant enough to bury themselves in them.

LXIX. The greater number of victims however were among the females. It has been remarked that they first assumed the yoke of celibacy. But the vows of virgins were not indissoluble, till the 4th century or thereabout. This St. Basil remarks. About this time they began to take a peculiar dress. Jerome describes it thus. *Solent quidam cum futuram virginem sponponderent pullâ tunicâ eam et fulvo operire pallio.* (Ep. ad Gaud.) But some, he tells us, preferred gayer colours, and employed the arts of coquetry customary at that time. Generally these virgins belonged to the lower ranks of the people. The vow of Demetriades who belonged to one of the first families of Rome wrought a kind of revolution. She received the compliments of the great luminaries of the church: of St. Augustine, of St. Jerome, and even of the heretic Pelagius. Jerome compares the joy the Romans had at witnessing the victory she had

gained over herself, to that which their ancestors had on gaining the first victory over Hannibal.—He tells her she had astonished all Italy. The excess of the enthusiasm of Jerome shews how infrequent such occurrences were at that time. Still, notwithstanding the solemnity of their profession, these virgins lived in the world. St. Ambrose says that in his time several would assemble in a house to live together under a superior, but such cases were rare. This saint mentions none at Rome, nor at Milan. He cites only one example at Bologna. In France there were no convents or monasteries for females till the 7th century, and virgins who had taken the vow were not obliged to shut themselves up, till a much later period. An ordinance of Clothaire II. proves this. *Sanctae moniales tam quae in propriis domiciliis resident quam quae in monasterio positae sunt.*

LXX. Soon however the consecrated virgins were compelled to live in monasteries. The age for taking vows varied at different times. Some perverting a passage in St. Paul; (Ep. to Corinth.) consecrated their daughters against their consent. The civil power interposed to prevent this abuse of parental authority. The 8th novel of the Emperor Majorinus forbade fathers and mothers this exercise of power; and also provided that females should not be allowed voluntarily to take a vow of virginity before the age of forty; and this law was not thought at that time an invasion of ecclesiastical rights. Several councils adopted it, as that of Saragossa. St. Leo ordered that virgins should not receive the solemn benediction with the veil before the age of forty. Afterwards some of the popes reduced the period to twenty-five years.—Then the canons fixed it at eighteen years, and finally at fifteen years, which became a general law. The rules in regard to seclusion in monasteries, were adopted and increased in severity by degrees. The experience of the world is, that tyranny in religion as well as in the civil state is reached by degrees. The starting point in all cases is liberty. Nothing can be more free than the primitive church was. Titles, pre-eminences, a multitude of ecclesiastical rights have been engrafted upon a system whose chief characteristics were simplicity and freedom. The first Christians had all things common.

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

No. II.

Sketch of affairs in Illinois.

THE Synod of Illinois was organized, and held its first session in Hillsborough in the autumn of 1830. At that time it was not generally known to the churches that there existed in our bosom, a party, composed chiefly of foreign materials, whose views of doctrine and church order, did not correspond with those standards which all Presbyterians profess to believe. Such a party, however existed, and its leaders in their own covered way to the field, were daily sapping and mining at the foundations of our venerable zion, while scarcely an individual in the whole state had any dream of our approaching danger. The origin of the Pelagian influence in this quarter can be easily traced to an association of young men in the seminary at New Haven, Connecticut. They first originated the plan of "Illinois College," and organized themselves into a Board of Trustees, while yet in New England and before they had ever seen Illinois. Shortly after they succeeded in an arrangement by which "Jacksonville Accademy" in Illinois, was merged in their prospective institution. By guaranteeing a large amount of money, these young theologians secured the trusteeship to themselves to such an extent as to control forever the character and destinies of "Illinois College." As fast as these gentlemen entered the ministry, they located themselves around their darling institution, and commenced, some with more, and some with less wisdom, the work which was to push into operation a second edition of New Haven, with all its peculiarities and influences. Dr. Taylor and the other New Haven divines acted as counsellors and advisers in this whole affair. And the American Education and American Home Missionary Societies afforded all the requisite facilities for deluging our churches with floods of error. Had those birds of passage, who are ever and anon passing and repassing through our region, and defiling or devouring every verdant spot, been left to their own unsustained efforts, they *could* have done us *but little* harm. But "the east," has expended hundreds of thousands of dollars in support of their cause. From "The East" came all those men who have entered our domicil, claiming the right as they pass us in the threshold, to put a padlock on our lips, while they prescribe for our household, whatever regimen they please. Rev'd Edward Beecher, president of Illinois College, is on the whole the most prominent man sent us from New England. Possessing a fine education, and being in the main a gentleman in his manners; he has been able to sustain himself tolerably well in the new-school ranks. His original powers of mind are, however, by no means extraordinary. Professor Sturdevant stands next on the list. He is a man of strong mountain sense; rough unpolished manners—stiff and assuming, and altogether confident, that he is a *great man* and a *philosopher*. Against these two gentlemen, and also against Rev'd Wm. Kirby, in 1833 a charge was tabled by me,

before the Presbytery of Illinois, for teaching doctrines "contrary to the standards of the Presbyterian Church and the word of God." The specifications named the most prominent of the errors testified against by the General Assembly of '37. The witnesses relied upon, were mostly students in Illinois College. After considerable progress had been made in taking testimony, pressing evidently much harder upon the president and professors than they were pleased to bear; they proposed as a substitute for all testimony in the case, a declaration of their faith in writing; which I agreed to accept. The following paper signed by them is a part of the Presbyterial record in the case.

"We believe and teach that—the sinner has power to make himself a new heart without the influence of the Holy Spirit, but that such is his voluntary aversion to his duty that he never will do it without those influences; and that of course he is dependent on them for salvation.

"That the nature of sin is such, that no man can become a sinner, except by his own act: and yet that all men sin in all their moral conduct, from the commencement of their moral agency; and that the reason of this fact is to be found in the original fall of the human race.

"We believe and teach that God, foreseeing from all eternity that such would be the character and condition of men, determined to interpose for the salvation of a certain part of the human race, and to make them willing to do their duty, not from any foreseen good in them, as the exciting cause of his conduct, but from a regard to his own glory and the general good. That those whom he does not thus interpose to save are left to deserved ruin as the natural result and just punishment of their own voluntary depravity; but we do believe that if men were the subjects of an absolute inability to obey the law of God, or accept the offers of the Gospel, such that nothing but the influences of the Spirit of God could give them ability, it would then be tyrannical in God, to withhold from a certain portion of the human race those influences and yet damn them to all eternity for not obeying his law, or accepting his gospel."

Signed, E. BEECHER, J. M. STURDEVANT, WM. KIRBY.

One would suppose that no sound Presbyterian could for a moment hesitate to condemn such sheer absurdities. But the Presbytery of Illinois, after a protracted discussion decided, that "The accused brethren do not teach doctrines *materially*, or *essentially* at variance with the standards of the Presbyterian Church and the word of God"!!! An appeal was taken from this decision; but when it came up to Synod, it was, with some other matters of minor importance, permitted to drop, because I supposed Dr. Wilson of Cincinnati would in prosecuting before the next ensuing assembly, charges which he had tabled against Dr. Beecher, obtain a decision in regard to these heresies in our church. The errors of Dr. Beecher and his son Edward Beecher, were believed to be of the same character. It is well known that Dr. Wilson's efforts were in a great measure fruitless. Had I gone before that assembly, no better result could have been expected. Since that time, this real heresy, in the public mind has been somewhat better understood in

our churches; and the line which divides us into two parties, is more deeply and more distinctly drawn. Formerly, New-school men were more *in disguise*; and the fact that there were "Cumberland Presbyterians" scattered over the whole state, afforded Congregationalists, and New-school Presbyterians an opportunity by way of distinction, to call themselves "Old Presbyterians," and "Old fashion Presbyterians." And even after the alarm was sounded through our land and the eyes of the more intelligent were opening to our danger, those less informed in relation to the state of our church, supposed, for a time, that we were opposing the "Cumberlands," when we spoke against the new doctrines and new measures. The writer of this article had the honor of being the first individual in the state, that raised the standard of opposition to the torrent of Pelagian heresy, which was rolling its waves of burning lava mountain high, and threatening the very existence of every thing vital in the church of God. The fact that there existed no religious press in the state, prevented the publication of a thousand facts connected with the warfare which ensued. I have often thought however, that any one at all acquainted with what has passed in defending the truth in Philadelphia and Cincinnati, could be at no loss to understand the nature of the conflict through which the church has been carried here. Error is the same every where. Its advocates have recourse to the same base methods of propagating it. The same hatred of the truth, and those who defend it—the same duplicity, and in fact, general want of every thing like strict moral honesty. Those who have made shipwreck of faith, have usually made shipwreck of a good conscience also.—In the Synod of Illinois in 1834, a motion was introduced to adopt the famous "Act and Testimony" which appeared in connexion with so many respectable names before the public; and although the motion was lost, by a vote of twenty-eight, against seven or eight, yet the discussion did much good. It furnished us with some facts in relation to the conduct of certain men, to which we could afterwards refer. But it was supremely ludicrous, to hear such men as John Bergen, and E. Beecher boast, that they were "too good Presbyterians to vote in favour of such an Act and Testimony." Surely after swallowing the Confession of Faith, they might have taken the "Act and Testimony" at least "*for substance of doctrine.*" The Synod of 1837, presented little else than a scene of disorder and confusion. I have been accustomed to attend the courts of the Presbyterian Church from my boyhood; but a more confused and disorderly body of men I never saw. Almost all the important business was transacted in utter disregard of all the rules of ecclesiastical procedure in Christ's house. A paper, from the pen of Rev'd Dr. Blackburn was early introduced into Synod, containing some dozen or more resolutions, all breathing the angriest venom, spleen, and opposition, against the Convention and Assembly of 1837. *Misrepresentation, slander, calumny and falsehood* were declared to characterize those bodies, and their proceedings. Almost the entire batch of resolutions, passed the house by large majorities; and for once we had the opportunity of witnessing, the real spirit of extermination and wrath in its full volume, bearing down all

opposition; and the *march of mind*, striding over all that is venerable, and sacred in the Presbyterian Church. This grand display was arrested by an adjournment. When Synod again came together, the leaders of the New-school host, appeared alarmed at what they themselves had done. It is more than probable that they learned the existence of a protest which denounced their proceedings as rebellious, and called upon the next General Assembly to cut them off as the enemies of the Presbyterian Church. A train of resolutions was now proposed and adopted by way of compromise, in lieu of those which were before the house, and nearly all of which had been adopted. Unfortunately I was not able to procure a copy of the first set of resolutions, and there is no reference whatever to them in the printed minutes of Synod.—Every thing on this subject was suppressed. The following is a copy of the last set of resolutions adopted by Synod.

Whereas, It is clearly stated in the word of God, that it is the will of the great Head of the church that his people should be one, as He and the Father are one, that the world may believe that he was sent of God; and whereas, it is clear that such unity is essential to the conversion of the world, and will occur before that great event takes place; and whereas, the whole church is now professing earnestly to desire a consummation so glorious; therefore,

1. *Resolved*, That this Synod is of opinion that the division of the Presbyterian Church is a great evil, and ought, if possible, to be prevented by all appropriate and Christian means.

2. That as there is not among us unity of views, and feelings, as it regards the doings of the last General Assembly, we at present decline, for the preservation of unity among ourselves, to express any official opinion on the subject.

3. That in the opinion of this Synod, the interval between this and the next meeting of the General Assembly, ought to be spent by all the ministers, elders, and churches under our care, in efforts to elevate the standard of piety; to increase the number, purity, and power of revivals throughout the State; to remove all misunderstanding, and unkind feeling from among our ministers and churches; and in earnest, and fervent prayer to Almighty God for the influences of his Holy Spirit, to heal divisions, and restore holiness, unity, and peace to our beloved and afflicted Church throughout all her bounds.

4. That in accordance with the request of the General Assembly we have directed our attention to the subject of errors in doctrine, and irregularities in government, and find no occasion for action on the subject. The reports, which have been made, as to errors and irregularities in our Presbyteries, were found, so far as inquiry was made, to be founded on misunderstanding; and so far as we are acquainted, we have confidence in the soundness in the faith of all the members of this Synod, and as evidence of this we condemn, unitedly, the errors condemned by the Assembly.

5. That in accordance with these views, we earnestly petition the General Assembly at their next session, to use all possible measures to prevent the final division of the Presbyterian Church.

6. That we agree among ourselves, and recommend to our ministers to avoid the use of such expressions as are unguarded, and may give rise to misunderstanding.

On this subject, a writer in "The Presbyterian," very justly comments. He remarks, of these resolutions, the *fourth* was taken up first; and the design, as stated, was, if it should not be carried by a *unanimous* vote, or

nearly so, to take up the *original* resolutions and pass them entire. This fourth resolution evidently contained the very essence of all that the leaders of the New-school party wished, for the time, to carry. Some of the party, however, it appeared, would have been better pleased with the first set of resolutions—and the whole of these resolutions were at one time well nigh being negatived.

But let us examine a little this singular paper, which, it was said, was drawn up by President Beecher. The preamble itself is made up of a confusion of terms, and a sad misapplication of an important scriptural truth. There is a confounding of the *unity* of the *invisible* Church, with the *visible*. It is the *unity* of the Church in its *outward form*, and *organization*, that the preamble chiefly regards; and it is here laid down as an undisputed axiom, that all believers must belong to *one communion*, must be visibly united in their ecclesiastical capacity—"that *such* unity is essential to the conversion of the world"—and hence so much was said in Synod, (founded on this idea of the unity of God's people,) about a *new organization* of the whole Church, the union of different Christian denominations—and against division, no matter, it seemed, how discordant professing Christians might be in their opinions—"such unity is essential," &c. Now we have always supposed the people of God were *one*, as the Father and Son are one, in a far higher sense than any outward forms can ever make them. Are not all true believers *now* spiritually united? Are they not united to Christ the Head, and by his Spirit, to one another, belong to whatever denomination they may.

The first resolution says, "it is the opinion of Synod that the division of the Presbyterian Church is a great evil." The division in *form* is deprecated, while division in *sentiment*, no matter how wide, is, for the present, perfectly tolerable! The second resolution fully admits "there is not among them unity of views and feelings as it regards the doings of the last General Assembly"—Of this all present were witnesses. And who, but the New-school members, being the majority, opposed, (and some of whom even reviled) the doings of the Assembly as slanderous, tyrannical, cruel, &c. And yet "for the *preservation* of unity," (where unity did not and could not exist) "they declined to express any official opinion!"

The third resolution, admits, there is *misunderstanding* and *unkind feeling* among ministers and churches." And in the sixth the Synod resolves "that we agree among ourselves! and recommend to our ministers to avoid" what it ever was their sacred duty to avoid—"the use of such expressions as are unguarded," &c. Then the majority seem to be conscious they have used "*such expressions!*" And what are these, but expressions at variance with the standards of our church.

But it was evident the fourth resolution contained the principal matter, which, it was desired by the leaders of the New-school party, should be adopted unanimously. And it would have been marvellous indeed if it had been so adopted, when the true state of things is taken into view. It is asserted that the Synod in accordance with the request (injunction) of the General Assembly, directed their attention to the subject of errors, &c. By this I suppose the Assembly are to understand, that the Synod took special order on the subject; but the writer witnessed no such proceeding, and the printed minutes show nothing of this kind, except what is here asserted. It is true the attention of Synod was directed to this subject; but it was incidentally only. That is, while these, and the original resolutions were under discussion, several Old-school members declared they could not vote for them; and particularly in regard to the resolutions affirming soundness in the faith of all the members of this Synod, &c.; and for their reasons asserting that errors in doctrine, and irregularities existed—that they had heard unsound doctrines preached, and inculcated by members of the Synod.—This was the way in which the attention of Synod was directed to this subject.—And to show how they arrived at

the conclusion that "the reports which had been made of errors and irregularities in our Presbyteries, were found, so far as inquiry was made, to be founded on misunderstanding, and so far as we are acquainted, we have confidence in the soundness in the faith of the members of this Synod." I shall give here a specimen of the discussions on the floor of Synod.—One declared that he had heard a member of the Synod advance the doctrine that "the sinner had the moral ability to make himself a new heart." Who, inquired several New-school men, holds this doctrine? Why, such a brother across the way.—This brother then rose and explained. Another, it was said, had preached the doctrine that "mankind are not guilty of the sin of Adam." The name of the preacher was called for, and he also explained his meaning.—Again, it was asserted that a certain member had publicly said, that "the sinner is able to make himself a new heart, and to keep the whole law of God."—He also arose in his place and explained by saying, "that man as a being, constituted by physical ability, can do all that God requires him to do, but he is unwilling."—Another member, it was said, had asserted from the pulpit, "that the doctrine of imputed sin was imputed nonsense."—Who made that assertion? It was answered, the Moderator.—The Moderator then arose and said, "In the sense of imputing one man's sin to another, it is sheer nonsense. But in a proper sense I hold it:" and referred to the case of Shimei begging David not to impute iniquity to him, as illustrating his views on the subject, and concluded his explanation with saying, "he believed that the act of A, is the act of A; and the act of B, is the act of B; and not that the act of A is the act of B."

To those unacquainted with the *Chamelion-like character*, of certain ecclesiastical partizans of the present day, the whole of the proceedings of Synod may appear perfectly inexplicable. It was indeed mysterious, to behold New-school men, of every grade, voting to adopt one of the strongest "testimonies against error" which could well be penned. And if we reflect that this same "testimony" is in fact a testimony against the very errors which occupy a prominent place in the creed of these New-school men; the affair will be involved in the greater mystery. But more mysterious still, the lovers of that testimony, its warmest friends, and constant advocates, either voted against its adoption, or stood aloof from the whole transaction, and did not vote at all!! But why all this? Because men of simple manners and guileless hearts were unwilling to swallow a world of poison, merely on account of this one precious drop of honey mixed up with it. And on the other hand, the New-school men were willing to take this small quantity of honey, notwithstanding the severe Borbornigmi and Cholica, it always subjects them to; provided as an equivalent for their sufferings they could prevail upon us, to declare to the world that their poison is wholesome aliment! Error is as intoxicating and bewitching in its influence over men as ever was alcohol! I have, in this western field for the last ten years, had a very fair opportunity of noticing the general policy of New-school men; and my disgust has but increased at the yearly increasing evidence, that they will do, or say, almost any thing to push forward to its ultimatum their grand design. A cause which requires, for its advancement and defence, such weapons as personal slander, evasions, deception and secret caucusing, cannot be the cause of God. Between our beloved institutions, and such men, and such movements, the lines cannot be

too soon, too deeply, too distinctly drawn. A thorough conviction of this induced me, in 1829, to introduce into the presbytery of Miami a resolution to "exclude from its bounds the operations of the American Home Missionary Society, as calculated to disturb the peace and endanger the purity of our churches." Very few of the Old-school brethren could, at that early day, be induced to believe there was any danger approaching from that quarter. And hence the resolution was negatived. But after eight years more experience, that presbytery adopted the same resolution. I was a member of the Synod of Cincinnati at its first organization, and then took the same grounds; and as far as I can learn, was the first man in the west, that ventured the public declaration, "that the American Home should be excluded from our churches, *because it was sending out men who teach damnable heresies.*" Any one who knows the temper, and spirit, that characterize the leaders, of the American Home, will not be at a loss to understand why I have so long been the object of most violent opposition. Had some grey-headed veteran, well known to fame, "stood proof against their weapons and their wiles," it would not have been so humbling to their pride. But 'tis a youth with nothing but a stone and sling, that leads to glorious war this little band; part of the sacramental host. I was a member of the Synod of Illinois also at its first organization; and from that time until the present hour, have laboured to advance the best interests of the boards of our own church. In a New-school publication I was once held up, as "the only zealous Old-school man in this region." In view of all these circumstances, may I not be presumed to know something in relation to the operations of both the contending parties, in this region; and especially in this Synod? If the enquiry be made, what influence has been exerted, by voluntary associations, upon the destinies of the Presbyterian church? I answer decidedly, a pernicious one. In a church so organized, and so instructed as ours, the introduction of any alien influence must, under any conceivable train of circumstances produce suspicion and alarm. Presbyterians have been accustomed to think their own ecclesiastical organizations, admirably calculated to sustain and advance the kingdom of Christ. To their efficiency nothing more is necessary than for the church to breathe through them an atmosphere of holiness, and a spirit of active enterprise upon the world. All efforts to divert from these consecrated channels, the soul inspiring energies of the church must waken up the active resistance of pious watchmen. Here then is laid the grounds of the conflict; Christ has committed to his church the work of evangelizing the world. To accomplish this was one of the ends for which the church was established in the earth. And whenever this sacred body shall be as fully engaged in obeying the commands of the ascending Saviour as the importance of the work demands, it will be seen that there is a beauty and a majesty in Zion peculiarly her own. Every other organization to perform the work which God has committed to the church, is unauthorised; and it may yet be found, that many of the liberal, and ostentatious offerings of the present day, are but strange fire upon God's altar.

WM. J. FRASER.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE SECOND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF BALTIMORE, AND THE EVANGELICAL CHURCH AT LYONS IN FRANCE.

THE second Presbyterian Church in the city of Baltimore, U. S. A., to the Evangelical Church at Lyons in France, wish grace, mercy and peace from God our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, through the Eternal Spirit.

Brethren, beloved in the Lord. Though we have never seen each other's faces, and doubtless never will, until we stand before the throne of our common Saviour;—your past history, and your present situation are not entirely unknown to us—nor our hearts indifferent to your trials and your welfare.

Our pastor, who was permitted about a year ago, to hear the gospel preached in your place of worship, and to unite with you in celebrating, according to our simple and solemn rites, the dying love of our Lord Jesus Christ, has spoken to us of you. And more recently, another brother, now temporarily resident in Paris, and who also has visited your ancient and renowned city, has made known to us by letter, something of your trials.

We are therefore emboldened to ask your acceptance of a small sum, which we have directed our brother Matthew L. Bevan, of Philadelphia; to remit to Paris, and to inform the Rev'd Charles Cordes, lately, and probably at this time your pastor, of the exact manner and amount for which he may draw. The amount in our currency is just two hundred dollars; but we regret that the state of commercial affairs at this moment, will cause a considerable reduction from this small sum before it reaches your hands. Our other engagements prevent our remitting a larger sum.

Beloved brethren, the Christians of the United States, have no other thought but that the whole world ought to be, and must be converted to God. This is the great idea we hold up continually before our hearts; the field is the world,—and every Christian in it bound by an indissoluble covenant to be a witness for the Spirit, and a fellow-labourer with our divine Lord, in its entire restoration to God.

It is not wonderful therefore, that we should feel a profound interest in the Christians of France, and those especially of your beautiful city—when we call to mind the unspeakable importance of your position to the millions of Europe who speak the French language as their vernacular tongue, and that of this population to the whole world.

Nor are we ashamed to confess the extent and tenderness of our sympathy for the least of those churches that truly represent the ancient and glorious reformed church of France; and for the weakest and humblest that claim kindred in spirit and doctrine with the venerated Hugonots. If France had done nothing else, but give to mankind, *Calvin*, and his illustrious and revered associates, we should esteem the world her great debtor through all time.

Beloved brethren, your habitation is amidst the tombs of the

martyrs of Jesus. Cherish the spirit of your blessed ancestors. God has great things in store for your country and your church. Despise not the day of small things: but let your hearts be set on God—in whose sight nothing is small, nothing great, except as it relates to the kingdom of his dear Son, set up within his people, and extended all around them.

With faithful salutations to all amongst you who love Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours,—and many prayers for your enlargement in God, and perfect steadfastness in the faith once delivered to the saints—we are your brethren by the blood of Christ.

Baltimore, October 11, 1837.

Robert J. Breckinridge, Pastor of the church, and chairman of the Board of Trustees. *Archibald George*, *William McDonald*, *James Beatty*, *William McConkey*, *John Wilson*, *Peter Fenby*, *George Carson*, *John Franciscus*, Ruling Elders of the Church.

Robert S. Hollins, *Harmanus Boggs*, *Richard J. Cross*, *Patrick Dinsmore*, *Adam B. Kyle*, *William H. Beatty*, *William Crawford, Jun.*, Trustees of the congregation.

The Evangelical Church at Lyons in France, to the second Presbyterian Church of Baltimore, in the U. S. of America.

May the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all! Amen.

Brethren, beloved in the Lord:—We have received your fraternal epistle, and our hearts have been made glad by its perusal.

It certainly is true, that the great majority of the members of our respective communities have never seen each other in the flesh, nor are likely ever to meet on earth, yet the good Providence of God had in some measure last year brought us together, by the friendly visit your beloved pastor paid us, with his lady, on their passage through this city.—This visit is remembered with great satisfaction by the few brethren who had the advantage of then becoming acquainted with the Rev'd Mr. Breckinridge, and we are thankful to find, that not only we have not been forgotten by that esteemed brother himself, but that our society and its wants have, by him, been brought under your general notice, and that your hearts have, through grace, been drawn out in love towards your poorer brethren. Forgetting the vast distance which separates our city from yours, and the mighty waters that roll between our respective continents, you have only remembered "the Blood of the Lamb," and the identity of the faith, by which we have been made members together with you, of the same body. "The middle wall of partition" which once reared a fearful barrier between one single nation and all others on earth, being "broken down" you have felt, that with it, every other wall of separation has been brought to the ground, and that "by the blood of Christ," *all believers* "are made nigh" both to God and to each other, however "far off" from each other and from God they may have been in times past. You have, therefore, stretched out to us across the broad ocean, a brotherly hand, plentifully filled with the fruits of Christian charity, and are now causing an incense of thanksgivings to ascend unto God, from the altars of a Christian society in the old world, for the friends He has been pleased to raise up for them in the new.

But next to the Lord, dear brethren, to you our thanks are due. Be pleased to accept them as kindly as they are offered cordially and preserve us your fraternal affection.

You will be glad to learn that your kind contribution has been promptly and safely received; and has produced the sum of nine hundred and sixty-five francs of French money, for the benefit of our church.

May the giver of "every good gift and every perfect gift" turn the sacrifice you have made in favor of His people at Lyons, into an abundant source of blessings to yourselves, and "supply *all* your need, according to His riches in glory by Christ Jesus"!

Most heartily do we join you in praying to Him "who hath made of one blood all the nations of men on all the face of the earth," that he may mercifully hasten the coming of that glorious day when "the fulness of the Gentiles coming in" they, together with all Israel shall believe on "Him that died for all," and so "be saved."

You are pleased to remind us of Calvin, as a valiant Christian soldier given by France to the world; and indeed we have reason to rejoice in the privilege of claiming as our countryman, one, for whom and by whom divine grace has done so much, and of whom the present as well as all future generations may say "he being dead yet speaketh."

But hath not America, also in *her* turn greatly enriched the catalogue of men of faith, by the names of such Christians as Edwards, as Brainerd, as Payson, as Dwight, as Bellamy, as Huntington, as Judson, and hundreds more of a kindred spirit, to whom she has given birth? Yes dear brethren, if, on your shores, Christianity be as yet *comparatively* in its infancy, the cradle the Lord has planted for her there, has already borne many a young hero for the church. Yet, however bright be the lustre which such and similar names may shed on the best and most glorious pages of our world's or our time's history, let us remember that "we have nothing that we did not receive," and that it is the Lord who gave, not only these brave Christian soldiers to the church, but also, their gifts and graces to themselves. "Who is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man? I have planted (says the apostle) and Apollos watered; but God gave the increase; so then neither is he that planteth any thing, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase." Let not then either the vigorous youth of Christian America, or the ripening maturity of evangelical Europe seduce any of us into vain glory; but humbly and harmoniously uniting our voices of praise, let both worlds exclaim: "not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto Thy name give glory, for Thy mercy and for Thy truth sake"!

We indeed of the eastern hemisphere, while we rejoice and wonder at the rapid growth of young Christianity on your western shores, have peculiar reason to be humble, on beholding the lines of decrepitude which unhappily deform the native features of the church in many of even our oldest Protestant communities. Pray, therefore, brethren, pray with us, that "the sun of righteousness" may not ultimately prove to them, like the material sun of the heavens, a transient luminary, which while its bright morning rays are

gilding *your* horizon leaves *theirs* enveloped in the dark shades of night ; but that basking beneath the cheering beams of the Saviour's spiritual light, these churches may, *with all believers*, soon rejoice in the blessed omnipresence of Him who is at once and for ever "the light of the world" !

Brethren, pray *for us*, that we may be enabled to be faithful, and that surrounded by the tombs of the martyrs, among which you do well to call to our remembrance that we are living, we may be seriously sensible of our duty to fight courageously for that faith, in defence of which they laid down their lives.—Much, very much land remaineth yet to be possessed, in these regions of ignorance, superstition and unbelief. Our calls of duty are imposing.—Many thousands of souls perishing around us, in this great city, "for lack of knowledge," seem to cry to us for help. But what shall we do for their relief? The doors of the evangelical chapel are virtually closed against all but the three hundred or three hundred and fifty persons, who can be accommodated with sittings, and who regularly, with only some exceptions, fill their seats every Lord's day ; whilst others frequently return from the doors for want of room within, or leave the chapel itself, overcome with heat.—This fact at once so pleasing and so painful, we are witnessing in spite of an enlargement of the room, by which one-fifth has been gained, since we had the privilege of seeing our revered friend your pastor amongst us !

A system of domestic visiting has been commenced and is continued with happy instances of success ; but these results, whilst they increase our joy and our gratitude, also add much to our distress. We need a new chapel as the *only* means of satisfying the vast demands of a city like ours, and yet we are too poor to build it without assistance.—An appeal has been kindly forwarded to America, on our behalf, by an excellent Christian minister from the United States, now in this country, and that document will, we trust, be published there, and meet your eye.

Brethren, aid us by your prayers to God, and by your influence amongst men, that our appeal be not sent in vain.—Time is pressing, and souls are perishing. *Sixty-two* new members (four-fifths of whom were formerly R. C.) have been added, through the grace of God, to the church at Lyons, within the last twelve months, among them, one, a female, received very recently, is *ninety-three* years of age !*

Pray and plead for us, that we may be enabled to accomplish what is written by the prophet Isaiah : "enlarge the place of thy tent, and stretch forth the curtain of thy habitations ; spare not ; lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes," in order that the "little one may become a thousand, and the small one a strong nation" !

Finally dear brethren, farewell, and receive our most affectionate

* This aged pilgrim is in a remarkably vigorous state of health, and reads her Bible fluently ; the day of her reception at the Lord's table was one of great joy to her and to us.

and grateful salutations in the love of Christ our common Lord and Saviour! Amen.

C. A. CORDES, <i>Pastor</i>	}	<i>Deacons</i>	}	of the
L. MONRETON,				evangelical
FELIX PAY,				Church in
DENIS ZENTLERY, Jr.,				this city.

Lyons, in France, the 6th Dec. 1837.

ACTION OF THE BALTIMORE PRESBYTERY, IN RELATION TO THE
SCHISM OF 1838.

THE Baltimore Presbytery, in *pro re nata* meeting, convened on the 10th of July 1838, in the city of Baltimore,—for the purpose, (amongst other things,) of taking into consideration the present state of the church; and upon the report of a committee, consisting of ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE, *Minister*, and Dr. MAXWELL McDOWELL, and JOHN McCANE, *Ruling Elders*; adopted the following minute, expressive of its views and principles, in the present important crisis in the Presbyterian Church, viz:

HERESY is the sin against the truth: Schism that against the church. A portion of the bishops of the Presbyterian Church, in the United States of America—for a long period, guilty of the former offence, have at length consummated the latter. Failing of their attempts to undermine and subvert the church, they have renounced it.

This is, concisely, the history of all our troubles for a long course of years; and most especially since 1830. And if the troublers of our Zion had been just to us, or faithful to themselves, this record would have been sufficient. We need but have written, "The Pelagian heresy arose, under a new aspect, early in the nineteenth century; it spread from the congregational churches of New England, into the Presbyterian body through the wide doors, which the unsuspecting piety of our fathers opened; it entered into conflict with every thing peculiar to us; it leagued itself with every thing offensive to us; it was rebuked; it went out from us; the church was saved."

Such will be the award of history; the verdict of posterity. With candid opponents it would be the verdict entered to-day, by universal consent.

Widely different, are the pretensions set up. If these be true, then the Presbyterian Church has ceased to be; and another and opposite system, is henceforth the only real Presbyterianism. Evangelical doctrine, hereafter means, a modification of the system of Pelagius. Four-fifths of our churches, and church members, are to be swallowed up, as a fraction, into one-fifth of themselves. The great majority of our pastors, and ruling elders, are absorbed into a small minority of their own body. Nine parts out of ten, of the territory once covered by our church, are to be merged and lost in the remaining tenth. And all these fatal novelties, spring, as from their germ, from the appalling necessity, not yet explained, by

which the General Assembly of 1838—(which in the judgment of all parties, as now held, was lawfully called and lawfully convened)—suddenly perished; leaving about one-fourth part of itself, to be its very self; while the remaining three-fourths perishing—not only survived, unchanged, their own destruction; but believing this terrible metamorphosis, outlived the entity into which they had been so unexplicably recreated!

These pretensions outreach all human credulity. They shock every sober form of thought and feeling.

Was it before, ever imagined that man ceased to be a moral being by committing a single offence? That states vanished away—in the perpetration of their first wicked deed? That bodies constitutionally created, die in the commission of their first unconstitutional act?—Yet this is precisely the doctrine, upon which the minority of the assembly of 1838, maintain themselves to be the true assembly; even admitting every statement and allegation they have made, or can make, to be just as they declare.

Was it ever before conceived, that the clear minority of a body, may not only become the body itself, at whatever moment that minority, however small, shall elect to declare itself the body; and for whatever cause it shall elect to make that declaration: but that this is pre-eminently a constitutional right, even though the alledged constitution be wholly silent, or flatly against them; a Christian privilege, even though submission to the other and larger portion, be a covenanted duty; and a high civil function, even while it is believed, as of faith, that the church and the state are wholly and eternally separate? Yet these are the sum of the principles on which the organization of the Pelagian assembly proceeded!

And for what end are these outrageous pretensions set up?

Is it to obtain collateral and constructive decisions of the civil tribunals, that Pelagianism is not only orthodox, but that our doctrines are, and have always been, themselves after a sort Pelagian: in the hope, to save in this manner, the characters of those, who shrink from the open avowal of their doctrines—and interpose the opinion of the judge, to ward off that of the church?

Or is it, in the real desire, of thus getting hold of the funds of the church; funds given by those, who abhorred the doctrines of those who now sue for them; and to which they have no more claim, *in foro conscientiae*, than they have, to the cathedral of St. Peter's at Rome, or the mosque of St. Sophia at Constantinople?

Or is it, that they expect, in this manner, to keep the public mind in a state of agitation and indecision, while they may operate upon and through the great voluntary societies professing to be Catholic; and upon the various sects holding correspondence with us, and who seem not unwilling, in a carnal policy, to build themselves up, at the expense of fidelity to the truth; and upon society at large, which as yet ignorant of the real merits of the case, they seek to deceive and seduce; they in the interim seizing every opportunity to adjust to their advantage, a thousand local and personal questions?

Or is it, indeed, that they are so mad for contention, as to desire to be forced back by the action of law, into a body they have first

convulsed and then voluntarily forsaken ; so fierce for the destruction of Christian liberty as to expect and aim to establish the enormous doctrines, (1) that the church of God is incompetent both as to right and as to capacity, to settle every spiritual affair; and (2) that the civil tribunals are competent of right and of capacity to controul the church, in the last resort, as to its doctrine, discipline, and order ?

This aspect of the subject is full of importance. We are indeed, well convinced that these appeals to the civil power will end to the great dishonour of those who have made them. And we are ready, were it otherwise, not only as peaceable citizens to submit to the due course of the laws ; but as good Christians, to disregard all possible loss of property or franchises claimed by the church, or any of her parts, or dependencies, in following a clear course of duty. Nay, we have always manifested, as we have always felt, a sincere alacrity, to give all that was just, all that could be asked, or ever was demanded ;—more, far more, than ever can be obtained, except from our free surrender ; so that, all vile controversy about mere temporal rights, might be kept far away, from our great contending for God's truth.

It must be manifest, however, that if the whole machinery of ecclesiastical affairs can be drawn into the courts of justice, and an authoritative decision rendered upon them ; so as to controul the free action of the church, either directly by the mandate of the judge, or indirectly through questions of property and right ; then the true independence of the church, is at an end :—there exists no real separation of it, from the state ; and the state itself is in danger, from the first dominant superstition. In that case the church has no alternative, but to give up every point of contact by which it touches the state, and in virtue of which this supervision is claimed ; or else for the Christian sentiment of the country to rise in its might, and set free the church, if she be indeed in bonds ; and to remodel our laws in such a way as shall give to Cæsar, all that is his, and nothing that is God's.—It is striking to observe, that but for the charters and franchises and equivocal advantages in the details of property, conferred on the churches by the civil power ; this controversy would have ended, as to its form, as well as in reality, with the Assembly of 1838. As the truth is implicated, we fear no tribunal, before which we may be haled on its behalf. But as the church of Christ may be involved, we recognise no tribunal exterior to herself.

In this affair, it cannot be pretended that the church has acted, for an instant, out of the sphere of clear spiritual authority. More than this, it is our strong conviction, that all the leading acts for the Reform of the church, carried through the Assemblies of 1835 and '7, were wise, constitutional, necessary, and Christian. And we again record our gratitude to God, for his evident blessings upon them, and his gracious smiles, upon their authors and friends.

The action of the Assembly of 1838, divides itself into three distinct departments. The first regards the carrying forward of the plans of the preceding Assembly : the second consists of the important and difficult duties devolved on it, by the schism created in

itself and in the church by the Semi-Pelagian commissioners, and their adherents: the third has reference to the general business of the church, too long neglected amidst more agitating affairs, or defeated by the settled and violent hostility, of those who are now gone out from us.

We fully and cordially approve of the general action of the Assembly, in all these various and difficult departments of its work. And being required by its authority, to take into our serious consideration, the present state of the church—a duty to which also, our own hearts inclined us; we have met together, and have prayed, and meditated, and consulted over the subject. Besides which we have been from the first, no idle spectators of the progress of these affairs. And now as we seem to draw nigh their issue; as we anticipate the future, and look calmly back upon the current of the past; we are but the more thoroughly convinced that the reform effected in the church, is from first to last, the work of God; and that he ought to receive for this great deliverance, the open, signal and hearty thanks of all who love his precious truth, or are jealous for the honour of his holy name, or anxious for the extension of his glorious kingdom.

With these sentiments, and in humble dependence on divine grace, we renew the expression of our unabated love for the cause we have espoused, and of our immoveable confidence in the Master, whose we are, and whom we try to serve. We rejoice in the hope, that our eyes will soon behold our beloved church, go forth a more efficient, and thoroughly organized band of Christians, as it is undoubtedly at the present moment, a more united, pure, and homogeneous one, than ever before. And while in the spirit of our Master, our Bible, and our Confession, we shall not only allow, but contend for all proper and needful indulgence to tender consciences; we will strive to leave nothing undone, that can promote, in the bounds of this Presbytery, and elsewhere as we have opportunity, the purity, the peace, the unity and the prosperity of the church, which Jesus Christ has purchased with his blood, and in the midst of which he has set us, for a little while, as stewards of his manifold grace.

In testimony whereof, it is ordered that this minute be entered on our records; that it be published from all our pulpits, during public worship on some sabbath day, between the present time, and the fall meeting of the Presbytery; and that it be properly attested and printed. And the stated clerk will cause a certified copy thereof, to be sent to every minister, licentiate, and church session, belonging to this Presbytery, as soon as convenient.

By order,

ANDREW B. CROSS, *Moderator.*

G. W. MUSGRAVE, *Stated Clerk.*

NOTE.—The editors of this Magazine forbear, at the present moment, to add any thing to this important document. It is their purpose, however, to enter somewhat at large, into the leading points which mark the conclusion—as they have done, and are doing, in regard to those which have characterized the progress of the

great Pelagian controversy in the Presbyterian church. Henceforth, thanks be to God, it is a controversy out of that church:—important to us, no doubt,—but only as we are Christians, and not any longer as we are Presbyterians.—We have fought and won the great battle. We may now breathe, and look around to behold how other denominations acquit themselves.—What say the orthodox churches of New England? How goes it with the Dutch Reformed? The German? The Episcopal? The Lutheran? The Methodists? The Baptists? *What of the night, Watchmen?*

THE MYSTERY OF JESUITISM.

No. V.

Rise and nature of the doctrine of Assassination in the Papal Church.

Although since the time of *Hildebrand* or **Gregory* the seventh, the antichristian pride or tyranny of the Pope and his party, has been exceeding great, and pernicious to the western part of the world; they both approving and practising the excommunications and depositions of kings and emperors, absolutions of their subjects from all oaths of allegiance, with injunctions (against the law of nature and scripture) never to obey them: yet I do not find that the popes or their party approved or practised the assassination of princes before *Ignatius Loyola*, and the unhappy approbation and confirmation of his society, *Anno*. 1540. Nay I find it condemned, as impious, inhuman, and barbarous; not only by their learned men, (even their canonists) but by their popes and councils. That this may appear, I desire it may be considered,

I. That Pope *Innocent IV.* about the year 1245 or 1246, makes a constitution in the General Council at *Lyons*, (and with the approbation of that council) wherein he calls assassinations §horrid inhumanity, and detestable cruelty, and an endeavour to slay body and soul: and then adds, “That if any prince or prelate, any person ecclesiastical or civil, shall procure any assassin to kill any

*It was the saying of this *Gregory*; *Intelligent omnes, Imperia, Regna, Principatu, et quicquid habere mortales possunt, auferre et dare nos posse.* Plat. in vitâ Greg. 7. Edit. 1485. And *Baronius* tells us, that this, and such dictates of that Pope—*In Ecclesia Catholica Hactenus usu recepti sunt.* Annal. Tom. II. ad Ann. 1076. § 31

†Constitutio illa extat, in Corpore Juris Can. de Homicidio, cap. pro humani. 1 In. 6.

‡“Sacri approbatione Concilij Statuimus. Ibid.”

§“Qui Horrenda impietate Detestandaque Sævitia Mortem sitiunt aliorum, ut Ipsos faciunt per assassinos occidi, non solum corporum, sed mortem procurent Animarum—Statuimus, ut quicumque Princeps vel Prælatu quempiam Christianorum per prædictos assassinos interfici fecerit, vel mandaverit (quanquam mors non sequatur) Excommunicatus & Depositus à Dignitate, Honore, & Officio, Ipso facto, sit bonis, etiam Mundanis Omnibus à toto Christiano populo perpetuo diffidatus.” Ibid. & Conc. Tom. 11. part 1. p. 672. Edit. per Labbe, Paris, 1671.

Christian, (though the effect do not follow) or receive, conceal, or any way favour such assassin, then such person is (Ipso facto) excommunicate, deposed, and deprived of all his honour, dignity and revenue." This was the judgment of Pope *Innocent IV.* about the matter; and although for Anti-Christian pride and tyranny (as in other things, so) in his impious excommunication and deposition of the Emperor *Frederick*, he was as bad as his predecessors; yet neither they nor he, were (as yet) arrived at the height of impiety to approve Mahometan and Turkish assassinations of kings and emperors.

2. About eight and forty years after the making of this constitution by *Innocent* the fourth, *Boniface* the eighth (as impious and tyrannical as his predecessors) was made pope, and approved this constitution of *Innocent* against assassinations, and referred it into the body of their *cannon law; where it still †remains in all editions of that law, even to this day: and that (to give ‡authority to it) with the approbation and confirmation of succeeding popes; particularly of *Pius* the fourth, *Pius* the fifth, and *Gregory* the thirteenth.

3. And hence it is, that eminent writers of the church of *Rome* (except the Jesuits and their party) do, even to this day, generally condemn all such assassinations, as impious, and to the public pernicious. This evidently appears (to say nothing of the gloss) by cardinal §*Turrecremata*, cardinal ||*Cajetan*, cardinal ¶*Tuscius*, *Henry* ***Spondanus* (bishop of *Pamiez* in *France*), *Didacus* ††*Convarruvias* (bishop of *Segobia* in *Spain*, &c.) And here it is further observable; 1, that pope *Innocent* the fourth, in the aforesaid decretal constitution, speaks only of those ancient, and properly so called *Mahometan assassins*; and though he censures their assassinations as impious, yet he appoints not their punishment. I know that the author of the gloss upon that constitution (*John Andreas Bononiensis*, was the man) tells us; ††" that the punishments expressed there, are denounced against the assassins, as well as those who procured or hired them to assassinate any Christians." But the man is miserably mistaken; for it is evident, and §§confessed, " that

* Cap. *pro humani*. 1. De homicidio, In. 6, Decretalium.

† Vid. Edit. Juris canonici. Paris. 1612 and 1618. Lugduni, 1661. &c.

‡ " Ut hujus utilissimi & gravissimi Codicis non vacillaret autoritas, placuit Pio 4. dein Pio 5. & Greg. 13. ut illi Corrigendo Summa opera daretur, &c." Ita admonitio ad Lect. præfixa Corpori Juris Can. Paris. 1612. & Lugd. 1661

§ Summa de ecclesia, l. 25, 35 and 36, as he is cited (for I have not the book by me) in the margin of the canon law; ad. cap. i. de homicidio in. 6.

|| In Summula. verbo assassinus.

¶ Conclus. Pract. Juris, Lit. A. verbo Assassinus. Conclus. 531.

** Continuar. Annal. Baronij, ad Ann. 1231. § 3, 4, 5, &c.

†† Operum, Tom. i. p. 528. De Delict. & Conat. §. 9.

‡‡ *Papa volens obviare hujusmodi malis, profert plures pœnas in istos assassinos, & illos qui eis mandabant.* Glossa ad dictum Cap. 1. De Homicidio. In. 6.

§§ Non contra ipsos assassinos, utpote Infideles sed contra Mandantes, per ipsos aliquem occidi; Innocentius 4. Excommunicationem promulgavit." *Cajetan*. in Summula. verbo assassinus.

the punishments contained in the constitution, are denounced only against those Christians who hire and employ those impious assassins." Excommunication (and the consequents of it) is the punishment mentioned in that constitution; which neither did, nor possibly could concern those Mahometan assassins. For although the said author of the gloss, elsewhere tells us, *that the pope is *more than a pure man; and God's Vice Roy*; yet certainly, he cannot do impossibilities, and excommunicate Mahometans and Infidels; unless he can turn those out of the Christian church, who never were, nor would be in it; and deprive them of that communion, which they never had. But although pope *Innocent the fourth* (in the afore-mentioned constitution) speaks only of the Infidel and Mahometan assassins, and of those Christians who procure or hire them to murder princes, and has nothing of any other, who are not of that Mahometan society; though they undertake and act the same villanies; yet those great and learned canonists and writers of the Popish church (before-named) upon proportion and parity of reason, justly condemn all Christians who shall undertake and effect, or endeavour such assassinations. Of these Christian assassins, cardinal *Cajetan* says—†“ that though they be not comprehended under the censures of that constitution, yet they deserve both a temporal and eternal death.” And to the same purpose *Covarruvias* tells us, (and he says it is the common opinion) †“ That whoever he be (Christian or Mahometan) who for money given or promised, undertakes the assassination of any Christian; in this case, both the Mandans and Mandatarius, both he that hires, and he who is hired to do such villany, are highly guilty, and under the censures, and the severity of them: though he who is hired, do not actually effect the assassination, if he really endeavour it.” Nor is it only these I have named, who damn this impious, Mahometan and Turkish doctrine of assassinating kings and princes. I believe, and from good authority know, that many thousands more in the communion of the church of *Rome* do equally abhor and detest it, especially in *France*, where their divines and parliaments (famous for learning and their general defence of the liberties of the *Gallican Church*, against the usurpations and tyranny of *Rome*) in the year 1594, publicly condemned this Mahometan and Jesuitical doctrine, and declared it to be (what indeed it is) §heretical, prodigious, and diabolical.

4. But all this notwithstanding, the *Jesuits* (and others of their

* Papa cum prius esset Purus Homo, nunc Vices Veri Dei gerit. Johan. Andreas, in glossa ad Proœmium. 6. Decret. verbo Bonifacius.

† Et hi non comprehenduntur sub Censura dicta, quamvis digni sunt & morte temporali & æternâ. Cajetan. Ibid.

‡ Qui cum quolibet Christiano aut Infideli, pecunia data vel promissa pactionem inierit, de homine Christiano occidendo, in ipso Mandatario, si ad actum proximum processerit, ut per eum minime steterit; quin scelus peregerit, notant puniendum fore pœna ordinariâ; id est, Morte. D. Covarruvias, Part. 2. Relect. Clem. Si furiosus, de Homicidio, de lictis & Conat. num. 9. Operum. Tom. 1. p. 258. Col. 1.

§ Hen. Carter Davila in his history of the civil wars of France, ad Ann. 1594, in Calce istius Anni.

party and principles) did, and do approve and practise that diabolical doctrine; and when they conceive princes to be enemies to their interest, or the Catholic cause, (as they call it) endeavour (by lying calumnies) to disaffect the people, and to raise rebellions against those princes; that so they may cut them off, by public war and seditions; and when this succeeds not, by private assassinations. This is (by sad experience) notoriously known to our western world; as may appear by the premises, and further testimonies of their own *Roman Catholic historians* (in this case) of indubitable truth and veracity. *Thuanus* tells us, **“That in those bloody wars in France, in the reign of Henry the third; it was some of the religious and regulars, especially the Jesuits, who by an industrious, and (I add) impious diligence, did first alienate the people from their obedience to their prince, and then solicited them to rebellion.”* I know that those words (*Ac Jesuitarum Patrum Imprimis*) are not to be found in those editions of *Thuanus* we have, being left out by the arts and frauds of those who corrupt all authors who have any thing against their errors or impieties; but we are assured that those words were in the †*original copy of Thuanus’s history*. But when this would not do, and they saw the king could not be cut off by a rebellious war, and publicly; they persuaded and encouraged *Jaques Clement* (a desperate villain) to assassinate his prince; who *August* the first, 1589, did the execrable act, and murdered his king. *Thuanus* tells us, ‡*“that friar Clement was encouraged to commit that prodigious parricide by the furious sermons and declamations of their new divines, §especially of the Jesuits who publicly taught them, that it was lawful, nay ||meritorious to kill a tyrant, and if he outlived the fact, he should be a*

* *Accedente ad hoc Sacri ordinis favore & quorundam religiosorum non ægni Opera, & Jesuitarum Patrum Imprimis, qui fascinatum per scrupulosas in Arcanis Confessionibus questiones, plebem sensim à principis obsequio alienatam, Ad defectionem Sollicitabant.* *Thuanus Hist. Tom. 3. lib. 75. p. 561. A. B. Edit. 1620. & Tom. 4. l. 86. p. 170. ad Ann. 1587.* And the same excellent person (*Thuanus*) gives us this account of the society of the Jesuits.

Nata Magistratum convellere, nata Ministris
Subtrapere obsequium, præsulibusque suum.
Et viles regnantum animas, ipsosque necandos
Horrenda regis proditione docet;
Servandamque fidem negat, argutisque cavillis
Detorquet magni jussa severa dei.

Hi sunt Ampliff. Præsidis Thuani versus de Jesuitarum secta, in Elegia sua eleganti in Parricidas, sub finem Sacræ Poeseos.

† Vide *Thuanum Restitutum Amstoladami. Ann. 1663, p. 49.*

‡ *Thuanus Hist. Tom. 4. l. 95. p. 454. A. Facundis Concionatorum Declamationibus, & Novitiorum, Theologorum, ac præcipuè Jesuitarum disputationibus, qui Tyrannum Impune occidere Licere affirmabant, Incitatus Clemens, &c.*

§ Vide *Thuanum Restitutum. p. 84.*

|| Non solum inoffensa conscientia facere posse, sed multum apud deum Meritorium. *Thuanus dicto. Tom. 4. & p. 454.*

cardinal at *Rome; and if he died, a †saint in heaven. And accordingly when he was dead (by a death he deserved) his party caused his ‡picture to be cut in brass, adorned their churches and chambers with it, counted him a saint and martyr, and (as such) made their addresses and prayers to him. Horrid superstition and popish blindness, not to put a vast difference between a martyr of *Jesus Christ*, and an *impious traitor and murderer of his king*. After this, in the year 1594, *Johan Chastell* undertakes and endeavours the assassination of *Henry* the fourth of *France*, struck him in the mouth, but (the good Providence of heaven protecting that prince) did not effect his impious design. Now if you ask, how any who pretends to be a Christian, could have a conscience so seared, or a soul possessed with so prodigious an insensibility, as not to tremble at the very thought of committing such a horrid and inhuman villany? §*Davila* will tell you, “that he was disciple of the Jesuits; that he himself freely confessed, that he was bred up in the schools of the Jesuits, and had often heard it discoursed and disputed, that it was not only lawful, but meritorious to kill *Henry* of Bourbon, a relapsed Heretic, and persecutor of the holy church; that father *Gueret*, a Jesuit, was his confessor, &c. so that being possessed with their impious principles and persuasions, he undertook that prodigious and damnable parricide.” In short, it was notoriously known to all *France*, that the Jesuits both approved and designed the execrable assassination of their king. Whence it was, (as *Davila* goes on) “that the parliament of Paris passed this sentence—That father *Guignard* and *Gueret* (Jesuits) should be condemned to the gallows; that the rest of the Jesuits (professed or not professed) should be banished out of *France*, as enemies to the crown and public tranquility, their goods and revenues seized and distributed to pious uses,” &c. And it had been well for *France* had they stood banished still, and never returned. For about sixteen years after, what *Johan Chastell* impiously endeavoured, that bloody villain *Raviliac*, May the fourteenth, 1610, effected; and with monstrous impiety, and a cursed hand murdered his king *Henry* the fourth. And it was the Jesuits, and their traitorous principles, which moved and encouraged him to commit that monstrous un-Christian and anti-Christian parricide. For (after the fact was done) *Raviliac* freely and publicly confessed, “that it was the Jesuit *Mariana*’s book which moved and encouraged

* Hen Cart. *Davila*, in his hist. of the civil wars in *France*, Lib. 10. ad Ann. 1589.

† Si in actu ipso moriatur, proculdubio inter Beatorum choros animam ejus Evoluturam. Thuan. dicto Tom. 5. & p. 454, & *Davila* l. 10. ad Ann. 1589.

‡ Historical collections of the most memorable accidents, and tragical massacres in *France*, under *Henry 2*, *Francis 2*, *Charles 9*, *Henry 3*, and *Henry 4*, ad Ann. 1589, in the beginning of *Henry 4*, & Thuan. Tom. 4. ad dictum Ann. p. 458.

§ Hen. Carter *Davila*, in his history of the civil wars of *France*, lib. 14. ad Ann. 1594, sub sinem istus Anni. See to the same purpose the author of the civil wars of *France* under *Hen. 2*, *Franc. 2*, *Charl. 9*, *Hen. 3* and *Hen. 4*, In *Henry* the fourth, ad Ann. 1594, a little before the end of that year.

him to that impious design." I know that the Jesuits did then endeavour to *free themselves from the odium of that impious fact; as if they had neither approved nor encouraged that monstrous and Mahometan assassination. Sed quid verba audiam, cum facta videam? This †was only a ridiculous endeavour, *Æthiopem Lavare*, to wash a blackamore, and to do impossibilities. It is evident, "that their approved doctrine and principles in Mariana, (and many others) was the motive which induced Raviliac to murder his prince." Which doctrine has never been condemned by any public act of their society, nor by the inquisitors in any *Index Expurgatorius*; now for them to approve those traitorous principles, and deny the consequents of them, is most irrationally to approve and grant the premises, and yet deny the conclusion.

5. But this (though bad enough) is not all. For it is not only the Jesuits and their accomplices, but the pope too, (their supreme judge, whom they †believe to be infallible, both in matters of faith and fact) who approved their seditious and traitorous principles of rebellion and assassination of princes. *Thuanus* speaking of the Jesuits' practices to stir up the people to rebellion in the time of *Henry* the third of *France*, he adds—§"That these things were well known to the pope, who sent breves and bulls secretly to the heads of those rebels, whereby they were encouraged to rebel." Afterwards, when that prodigious villain *Jaques Clement* had murdered the said king, ||*Sixtus* the Fifth then pope, did not only approve the fact, but in a premeditated oration, publicly spake in the consistory blasphemously compares it in respect of its greatness and amiableness to our blessed Saviour's incarnation and resurrection: and then highly commends the murderer (for his virtue, courage, and zealous love of God) above *Eleazer* and *Judith*, &c. And (to omit the rest) pronounceth the murdered king eternally damned, as having committed the †sin against the Holy Ghost. This the historian (though a Papist) modestly and justly censures, as a fact **extreme-

* See father *Cotton*, the Jesuits declaration, with the bishop of *Paris's* preface prefixed to it, to this purpose.

† See *Anti-Cotton* by *Peter Du Moulin*.

‡ *Christus Petro & Successoribus Ecclesiæ regimen commisit, & eandemquam habebat ipse, Infallibilitatem concessit, quoties è cathedra loquerentur. Datur, Ergo, in Rom Ecclesiâ, controversiarum Fidei Judex Infallibilis, etiam extra Concilium Generale, tum in questionibus Juris, tum facti. Hæc erat Thesis in Coll Claromontano à Jesuitis proposita & expositâ Decem, 12. Ann. 1661.*

§ *Quæ omnia Conscio Pontifice gerebantur, crebro commeantibus ad eum Emissariis, qui breviam & occulta Diplomata ad partium Duces adserebant, & indies magis plebem ad seditionem incendebant. Vid. Thuanum Restitutum, p. 49.*

|| *Sixtus Papa 5. Oratione præmeditata. 3. Idus Sept. in consistorio habita, factum Clementis Operi assumptæ à Domino carnis, & Resurrectionis, propter magnitudinem, & rei administrationem comparat. Tum virtutem hominis, animi Robur, & ferventem Erga Deum Amorem, supra Eleazarum & Juditham, multis verbis, Extollit, &c. Thuanus Hist. Tom. 4. l. 95. ad Ann. 1589. p. 458. Edit. 1620.*

† *Peccato in spiritum sanctum admissio, quale erat Regis peccatum. Ibid. p. 458. E.*

** *Thuanus ibid. Summè insolens, & Pastoris moderatione indignum*

ly insolent, and unworthy the moderation of a pastor, especially the supreme pastor of the church, Christ's Vicar, and *St. Peter's* successor, as they call him. And then he tells us of *Anti-Sixtus*, (or the answer to pope *Sixtus's* oration) and says, 1. That it had been more for the *credit of the Pope and the holy apostolic see, that his oration had been suppressed, than (as it was by those of the league) published. 2. That *Anti-Sixtus* (or the answer to it) though it was something sharp and bitter, yet the pope's oration abundantly deserved it, in which were many things absurd and impious. This was the judgment of that faithful and excellent historian, (though a Papist) concerning the erroneous and impious principles of the pope and Jesuits.

6. Nor is this all; for although, only privately to approve and encourage rebellion and assassination of kings and princes, be an execrable villany, to be abhorred by all men (especially Christians) as being repugnant to that clear light of nature and scripture, to common reason and religion; yet in public writings to vindicate and justify such actions, to persuade the world, "that they are not only morally good, but meritorious:" This argues a higher degree of impiety and impudence. We know (by sad experience) that many pagans and Christians, have blasphemed their gods, committed adulteries, murders, perjuries, &c. yet we do not find, that any Christians, (the Jesuits and their accomplices excepted) or any sober Pagan (who acknowledged a God) did ever justify blasphemy, adultery, murder, or perjury; but when they were apprehended, convict and brought to execution, they would confess the crime, pray for pardon, and desire others to pray for them. But the Jesuits (and those possessed with their principles) though they be convict, and legally condemned for rebellion and assassination of princes, yet they neither do, nor can repent; believing such actions not to be any vices, but virtues, and themselves (if they suffer for them) not traitors or murderers, but holy martyrs. That this is their approved and received doctrine, which they publicly defend, and industriously (in their public writings) endeavour to justify, is evident to the western world, and may appear by the premises. Yet being a thing of such great concern, (omitting *Mariana*, *Emanuel Sa*, *Sanctarellus*, and others before mentioned) I shall only add two or three eminent testimonies, in further confirmation of it. First then, *Fran. †Suarez*, public and prime professor of divinity in the university of *Coimbra* in *Portugal*, handling that point, how and in what cases a tyrant may, (by any private person) be murdered: and having told us that a tyrant was either, 1. *Tyrannus § Titulo*; one who, (without any just title) usurped the government, to the ruin

* *Suprimi potiusquam publicari, famæ Sixti sanctæ Sedis Intersuit. Ibid.*

† *Responsio acerbius, sed tali oratione prorsus Digna, in qua Multa absurda & Impia notantur. Ibidem.*

‡ *Franc. Suarez. in Defens. Fidei Cathol. adversus Angl. Sectæ errores cum Respons. ad Apolog. Jacobi Regis, &c. Colon. Agrip. 1614. l. 6. c. 4. pag. 814, &c.*

§ *Tyrannus titulo, qui vi, & injustè Regnum occupat, qui revera Rex non est, sed locum illius occupat. Ibid. § 1.*

of common-weal. 2. *Tyrannus *administracione*; one who, having a just title, ruled tyrannically. And he there tells us, "that all Christian †kings are such tyrants, who induce their subjects to heresy, apostasy, or schism." So that all Protestant princes (we may be sure) are such tyrants, though he there name only king *James* of happy memory. Having premised this, he gives the state of the question: Thus,

1. He does (in the general) give us two cases, wherein it is lawful for a subject to kill his king. 1. In defence of his †own life. If a king invade *Sempronius* to kill him, he may, in defence of his own life, take away the king's. 2. In defence of the ‡common-wealth. This in the general. But then

2. For a tyrant in title, he absolutely declares it, as a thing ||commonly received amongst them; "that such a tyrant may be lawfully killed, by any private person, who is a member of that common-wealth, if there be no other means to free it from such a tyranny." And least it should not be observed, it is set in the ¶margin, "that such a tyrant may lawfully be killed." So that the case is (with him) out of all doubt, that any private man may kill a tyrant in title; and the pope is judge who is such a tyrant. Whence it evidently follows, "that no princes can have any security (as to the preservation of their kingdoms or lives) longer than they please the pope. For if he declare any of them tyrants, (as many times, with execrable pride and impiety, he has done) excommunicate and depose them; then by this Jesuitical and Papal doctrine, any private person, (any of their subjects especially) may assassinate and murder them.

3. For those princes who have a just title to their dominions, and are (as they call them) tyrants not in title, but in their injustice and impious government: he tells us, 1. that **all Protestant princes being heretics are such tyrants: 2. that being heretics, they are by their ††heresy, *Ipsa facto*, and presently deprived (*aliquo modo*) in

* *Qui licet justo Titulo Regnum possideat, quoad usum tamen & gubernationem, tyrannicè regnat. Ibid.*

† *Inter Christianos, maximè est numerandus in hoc ordine princeps, qui Subditos suos in Hæresin, aut aliud Apostasiæ genus, aut Schisma inducit. Ib. § 2. p. 814. Col. 1.*

‡ *Si defensio sit propriæ vitæ, quam Rex violentèr auferre aggreditur, tunc quidem Ordinarie licebit subdito, seipsum defendere, etiamsi Mors Principis sequatur, quia justuendæ vitæ est Maximum, &c. Ibid. p. 815. B.*

§ *Si Rex Actu aggrediatur civitatem, ut civis perdat, &c. tunc certe licebit Principi resistere, Etiam Occidere illum, si aliter fieri defensio, &c. Ibid. § 6. C. Tunc enim civitas habet justum bellum defensivum, contra injustum invasorem, etiamsi proprius Rex sit. Ibid. D.*

|| *Communitèr asseritur tyrannum quoad titulum, interfici posse, à Quacunque privata persona, quæ sit Membrum Reipubl. quæ tyrannidem patitur, &c. Ibid. § 7. F.*

¶ *Tyrannus in Titulo Licite occiditur. Ibid. § 7. Margin.*

** *Inter Christianos Maximè in hoc ordine (tyrannorum ex administratione tyrannicâ) numerandus est Princeps, qui subditos in Hæresin aut aliud Apostasiæ Genus, aut publicum schisma inducit. Ibid. c. 4. § 1.*

†† *Rex Hæreticus Statim per Hæresin ipso Facto privatur, Aliquo Modo, proprietate & Dominio Regni sui. Ibid. c. 4. § 14. p. 819.*

some manner, of all right to their dominions. 3. That the pope (as their *superior, to whom even supreme princes are subjects) may totally and absolutely depose and deprive them of all their dominions and right to govern. 4. When the pope has passed such sentence, and deprived them of their dominions; if afterwards they meddle with the government, they become every †way tyrants (both Titulo & Administratione) and then, 5. after such ‡sentence passed by the pope, such kings or supreme princes may be dealt with, as altogether, and every way tyrants, and consequently may be killed by any private person.

4. And though these be prodigious errors, unchristian, and indeed anti-Christian impieties; such as neither ours, nor any language can fully express; yet this is not all: the Jesuit further declares, "that though §Pagans anciently had, and still have power, to depose their tyrannical kings; yet in Christian commonwealths, they have such dependence upon the ||pope, that without his knowledge and authority, they should not depose their king: for he may command and prohibit the people to do it." And he gives instances, when people have consulted the popes, and by their counsel and consent deposed their kings. So (he says) ¶Chilperick was deposed in France, and Sancius Secundus in Portugal. And (to make up their errors and impieties full) he further tells us,—**"that all Christian kingdoms and commonwealths do so far depend upon the pope, that he may not only counsel the people, and consent to their deposition and assassination of their tyrannical princes; but he may command and compel them to do it, when he shall think it fit, for avoiding schisms and heresies": that is indeed, for the rooting out and ruin of the true Protestant religion, and establishing their Roman superstition and idolatry. And to conclude, he further declares, that (in such cases the pope's command to murder a deposed king) is so far from being any crime, that it

* In summo pontifice est hæc potestas tanquam in superiori habente jurisdictionem ad corripendum Reges, etiam supremos, tanquam sibi subditos, &c. Ibidem.

† Si Rex post depositionem Legitimam, in sua pertinacia perseverans, Regnum per vim retineat, incipit esse tyrannus in Titulo, quia non est Legitimus Rex, nec justo Titulo Regnum possidet. Ibidem.

‡ Ergo Extunc poterit Rex tanquam Omnino tyrannus tractari; & consequenter A Quocunque Privato Poterit Interfici. Ibidem. p. 819. B.

§ Respublica (prout inter Gentiles, & nunc inter Ethnicos) habet potestatem, se defendendi à Rege tyrannò, & illum deponendi si necessarium fuerit, &c. Ibid. § 17. p. 820. A.

|| Regna Christiana quod hoc (scilicet depositionem Regum suorum) habent dependentiam & subordinationem ad Pontificem Romanum; qui potest Regno præcipere, ut se Inconsulto, Regem non deponat, nisi prius causa & ratione Ab Ipso Cognita propter pericula, & Animarum dispendia, quæ in his tumultibus popularibus interveniunt. Ibid. A.

¶ Ibid. p. 820. C.

** Pendet Regnum Christianum à Pontifice in hoc, ut posset Pont. non solum consulere, aut consentire, ut Regem sibi perniciosum deponat, sed etiam præcipere, & cogere ut id faciat, præsertim cum ad vitandas Hæreses & Schismata necessarium esse Judicaverit. Suarez. ibid. p. 820. B. C.

is *superlatively just. I might here cite cardinal †*Tolet*, *Guliel* †*Rossæus*, and a hundred such others, who approve, and in their public writings (approved and licensed, according to the decree of their §*Trent* Council, by the authority of their church) justified this impious and anti-Christian doctrine of deposing and assassinating heretical kings: but this I conceive a needless work, for, 1. *Suarez* himself declares it to be the received doctrine of their church, and cites many of their eminent writers to prove it; which, any may see, who is not satisfied with those before cited. 2. The licensers of *Suarez* and his book are (for dignity in their church and for learning) so great, and (for number) so many, and the commendations they give *Suarez* and his work so high, that there neither is, nor can be any just reason to doubt, but this doctrine was approved at *Rome*, and by the ruling part of that church the pope and his party, believed and encouraged, as a doctrine asserting the pope's extravagant, and (as they call it) supernatural ||power, and so their common interest. Let the reader consult the censures prefixed to *Suarez's* book, and he will find all these following to approve and license it: 1. Three great bishops, all of them counsellors to his Catholic majesty. 2. Two provincials of the society; one of the Jesuits in *Portugal*, the other of those in *Germany*. 3. *Academia Complutensis*, the university of *Al de Henares* approves it too. 4. Lastly, the ¶supreme senate (court or congregation) of the inquisitors, do also approve and license it, and this they do by **commission from Peter de Castello, viceroy of *Portugal*, and in matters of faith supreme inquisitor. The premises impartially considered, I think we may truly say, that it is not only *Suarez*, or some particular or private persons, but the church of *Rome*, and her ruling part, which approves this impious and traitorous doctrine: which may further appear (besides their approbations and licenses) from the great commendations they give *Suarez*, and his book and doctrine. And here,

1. For *Suarez*; they say, ††that he is a contemner of human things, and a most valiant defender only of piety and Catholic religion. And (for his excellent wisdom) the common master, and another Augustine of that age.—That for this great zeal for the Catholic faith, he was a most famous author, and a most eminent

* Quia tale præceptum in illo Casu Justissimum est. Idem Ibidem.

† Instruct. Sacerd. l. 5. c. 6. § 17. p. 733.

‡ G. Rossæus de Justa Reipub. Christiani in Impios, &c. Autoritate, Cap. 3.

§ Conc. Trid. Sess. 4. in Decreto de Editione & usu Sacrorum librorum.

|| Firmis & Inconcussis argumentis potestatem summi pontificis supernaturalæ ruetur. Ita in Censura Illust. D. D. Alphon. A Mello, Epis. Lamecensis, Suaresij Libro præfixa.

¶ Facultas Supremi Senatus S. Inquisitionis.

** Ex Commissione illustrissimi Episcopi, D. Petri de Castillo, Lusitanæ Proregis, & supremi in rebus Fidei Inquisitoris. In Censura Alphonsiæ. Castello, Episc. Coninbricensis, à Consiliis Catholicæ Majestati.

†† Humanarum rerum Religiosus contemtor, & unius Pietatis & religionis fortissimus Defensor, & propter Eximiam Sapientiam, Communis humanarum Magister, & Alter Augustinus.

divine. That he was a *most grave, and most religious writer, whose works the world, (the popish world) does honour, admire, and love, &c.

2. And for this book, and the doctrine contained in it, they say, that all things in his book, are religiously consonant to sacred scripture, to apostolical traditions, general councils, and papal decrees; (this last we admit, and they profess it to be true). And hence, if they may be believed, who expressly affirm it themselves, it evidently follows, that this traitorous doctrine is approved by the pope, and is consonant to his decrees. And those public censors of *Suarez's* book severally add; that they find †nothing (and therefore not the assassinations of kings) in it, against the orthodox faith, (the Roman faith they mean) but many things which do defend the faith. The university of *Alcala de Henares* (to omit the rest) more fully testifies—That they read *Suarez's* book with all possible diligence, and found nothing in it repugnant to the Catholic faith; nor was there any thing in it which ought not to be approved and commended. And then add, (that we may be sure they spoke cordially and deliberately) that there was nothing in that whole work, which all of them did not approve; so that they were all of the same mind and judgment. Nay, we are further told, that he had composed that work, by ||more than human helps; and therefore they judge it ¶most worthy to be published, for the public, and common benefit of the whole Christian world, and a signal victory of their faith over heresies. Such are the commendations of *Suarez's* book and doctrine; so that we may be sure that it is approved and received at *Rome*. [*Brutum Fulmen*.

* Religiosissimus juxta ac Gravissimus Auctor, cujus Ingenij monumenta, Orbis Suspicit, Miratur, Amat.

† In qua non solum S. Scripturæ Authoritati, omnia Religiosè consonant, Apostolicis traditionibus Pie correspondent, Oecumenicis Conciliis, summorum Pontificum Decretis erudite consentiunt.

‡ Quâ in defensione nihil planè offendi, quod Fidem offendat, quæ vero defendant, inveni multa. So it is in the censure of Ferdinand Martinez, counsellor to his Catholic majesty.

§ Librum Suaresij quanta potuimus diligentia, evolvimus, in quo Opere nihil veritate Catholicæ fidei Alienum, nihil devium, nihil dissonum deprehenditur: Nihil quod probari laudarique non debeat. Denique nihil à nostro omnium Sensu discordans, cum hac in re, sit omnium nostrum eadem vox, idem Animus, Eadèmq; Sententia.

|| Plusquam Humano Studio. In Censura Alphon. A Castello, Epis. Conimbricensi.

¶ Dignissimum ut in Lucem eat, ad Fidei nostræ Victoriam de Hæresibus Insignem, & totius Orbis Christiani Publicam & communem utilitatem. In censura Illustris. D. D. Alphons. A. Mello Episc. Lamec. A. Consilii Cathol. Majestati.

THE GENERAL COUNCILS ; WITH THEIR PRINCIPAL DECREES.

No. I.

Councils of the First Seven Centuries.

I. NICE, A. D. 325.

The first consisted of 318 Bishops assembled at Nice in Bithynia, at the command of the emperor Constantine, to decide the genuine and Apostolic Faith of the Church concerning the divinity of the Son, Jesus Christ, which had been assailed by Arius, who denied that he was really God. This dispute gave rise to the adoption of the term Homooousion ὁμοουσιον, with which the orthodox bishops endeavoured to guard the identity in substance and essence of the Divinity of the Son with that of the Father. The 318 bishops condemned Arius, and set forth a creed which is the foundation of that usually known as the Nicene, though on account of the additions which were made to it at the council of Constantinople, A. D. 381, it is more correctly styled the Constantinopolitan creed. The historian Theodoret mentions that there were present in the council many who still exercised apostolical gifts, of whom he instances James, Bishop of Antioch, who had raised the dead to life. There were also many who, as he says, "bore in their bodies the marks of the Lord Jesus," being maimed and scarred with the cruelties they had suffered from heathen persecutors on account of their religion; and he instances Paul, Bishop of Neocæsarea, who had had both hands seared with hot irons; others had lost their right eyes; others had been ham-strung in the right leg: so that he says it was a band of martyrs met together. Besides the creed, they put forth twenty canons relating to discipline. They also determined the time for keeping Easter, according to the method which has since obtained. Which subject had previously been, and continued for some time afterwards to be, a fruitful source of dispute.

The following is the creed put forth in this council:—

We believe in one God the Father, Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, only-begotten, that is, of the substance of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father. By whom all things were made, both which are in heaven and which are in earth. Who for us men and for our salvation came down, and was incarnate, and was made man: he suffered, and rose the third day, ascended into heaven, and will come again to judge the quick and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost. But those who say, there was a time when He was not, and that He was not before He was begotten, and that He was of things which were not, or who say that He was of another subject or substance, or that the Son of God is subject to conversion and change, such

persons the Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematizes. (See Eusebius' Life of Constantine, books ii. c. 64—73, and iii. c. 5—14; the Eccles. Hist. of Socrates, i. c. 8.; Sozomen, i. c. 17; and Theodoret, book i. ch. 7—10, 12. iv. 3.)

Sardica, A. D. 347.

The Roman writers (see Labbé and Cossart, vol. ii. p. 623), have laboured hard to give the authority of a general council to a synod of western bishops, to the number of eighty (see Beveridge's Pandect. ii. 199), who assembled at Sardica in Illyricum, against the Arians, in the year 347. Their apparent motive for this has been that certain canons (of doubtful authenticity), ascribed to this council somewhat favour the Roman claim for supremacy. But the council was never acknowledged in the East as general, nor was it ever contained in that list of general councils, to which, as appears by the second profession of faith in *libro diurno Roman. Pontif.* published by Garner the Jesuit, and reprinted lately by the learned Routh (*Script. Eccles. Opusc.* ii. 501.) the Roman pontiffs were required to profess their adherence.

Arimini, A. D. 359.

The title of a General Council is also claimed by the Roman writers (Labbé and Cossart, ii. 791), for the council of 400 Western bishops assembled at Arimini in Italy, likewise against the Arians, in the year 359. But it was never so considered by the Church at large, neither in the East nor West, and all its acts have been lost.

II. CONSTANTINOPLE, A. D. 381.

The second General Council consisted of 150 bishops assembled at Constantinople in the year 381, by the Emperor Theodosius to pass sentence upon Macedonius, who had broached a double heresy, partly in respect of the Son, whose substance and divinity he asserted to be *similar* to that of the Father, denying the *identity*: and partly in respect of the Holy Ghost, whom he expressly affirmed to be a creature. (Theodoret. Eccles. Hist. ii. c. 6.) This council condemned the Macedonian and some other heresies: revised and enlarged the Nicene creed, (this was the work of Gregory of Nyssa), and passed some canons affecting ecclesiastical order and discipline, and wrote a synodical epistle of thanks to the Emperor Theodosius, by whom they had been convened. The creed put forth by this council is the same with that in the English Communion Service, excepting the words "and the Son," speaking of the procession of the Holy Ghost. There are, besides, slight variations in the different copies cited. (Socrates, Hist. Eccles. v. 8; Sozomen, vii. 9; Labbé and Cossart, ii. 911; Beveridge's Pandect, ii. 89; Routh, Scr. Eccles. Opusc. ii. 382.)

III. EPHEBUS, A. D. 431.

The third Council to which the style and authority of a General Synod has been allowed by the Church, is that composed of 200 bishops assembled at Ephesus, by command of the Emperor Theodosius in the year 431. The purpose of their meeting was to pass sentence upon Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, who refused to

acknowledge the Virgin Mary to be the Mother of God, denying that Christ was God and man in one and the same person, by what is called the hypostatical union; and asserting that the Godhead of the Son merely dwelt in the body of Christ, so that he was composed of two persons. The council was convened at the instigation of Cyril, bishop of Alexandria. The only Western bishops present at it, were Arcadius and Projectus, legates from the Roman See. John, bishop of Antioch, assembled a synod in opposition to this, which passed censure upon Cyril and those with him, who in their turn pronounced the same upon John and his adherents. By the interposition of the Emperor this breach was subsequently bound up, and the decrees of this council received at Antioch as elsewhere. Besides the condemnation of Nestorius, the synod passed two decrees, one concerning the faith, and the other concerning usurped ecclesiastical jurisdiction, by both of which the modern Church of Rome stands openly convicted of schism. (Socrates, *Eccles. Hist.* vii. 34; Evagrius, i. 3; Labbé and Cossart, iii. 1.)

Ephesus, A. D. 449.

The style of a General Council was assumed by the synod of 128 bishops, who at the command of the Emperor Theodosius assembled at Ephesus in the year 449: the style of a general council was allowed it by Gregory the Great, who is cited by Labbé and Cossart (iii. 1471): and as far as regards the members of which the synod was composed, there being the four Eastern patriarchs present in person, and the Western represented by his legates, it has greater claim to be considered general than many of those which have been generally received. But its proceedings having been interrupted by the rude and tumultuous violence of the soldiery and others, the council was broken up, and nothing which it determined has ever been recognized by the Catholic Church. It was convened at the instigation of Dioscorus, patriarch of Alexandria, to obtain a reversal of the sentence of condemnation passed against the heretic Eutyches, at the council of Constantinople the preceding year, by Flavianus, the patriarch of that see, and thirty other bishops. The Emperor Theodosius was himself a favourer of Eutyches. Dioscorus interrupted the proceedings with a band of soldiers, and 300 armed monks; compelled the bishops to pass sentence of condemnation upon Flavianus and others, and committed them to prison. It may serve to show the barbarity of the age to mention, that, upon Flavianus remonstrating, Dioscorus fell foul of him, and so kicked and bruised him, that he died of the injuries which he then received. (Labbé and Cossart, iv. 4, 5.)

IV. CHALCEDON, A. D. 451.

The fourth Council to which the style and authority of a General Synod has been allowed by the Church, is that of 630 bishops convened by the Emperor Marcian, first at Nice, and thence transferred to Chalcedon, in the year 451. It was assembled at the earnest entreaty of all the orthodox bishops, for the purpose of reversing the unlawful and heretical proceedings at Ephesus, and of obtaining

the judgment of the whole Church upon the opinions which had been broached by the monk Eutyches. This individual had fallen into the exactly opposite error to that of Nestorius, which was condemned at the first council of Ephesus. For so far from allowing our Lord to have had two persons, he denied that he had two natures; maintaining that the human body which he received of the Virgin was not real flesh and blood, but merely the appearance of it, so that all his sufferings were in appearance also, and not real. (We find Ignatius in the second century contending against a similar error, as appears by his epistle to the Trallians.) The council condemned and deposed Dioscorus for his proceedings above-mentioned, reversed the acts of the second synod of Ephesus, and confirmed the Catholic faith in the reality of the two natures in the One Person of our Lord. They also passed thirty canons relating to ecclesiastical jurisdiction and discipline in general. They confirmed also the decree of the first synod of Ephesus concerning the faith. (Labbé and Cossart, iv. 1—10.)

V. CONSTANTINOPLE II. A. D. 553.

The fifth synod, to which the style and authority of a General Council has been allowed by the Catholic Church, is that of 165 bishops, assembled under the command of the Emperor Justinian the younger, in the year 553, at Constantinople; in which certain writings of Ibas, bishop of Edessa, Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia, and of Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, (commonly known as "the three chapters,") which savoured of the Nestorian heresy, were condemned. There were no Western bishops present at it. Vigilius, bishop of Rome, who was in Constantinople at the time, refused to be present, and sent to the Emperor a decree contrary to the course which the council was taking. The council, notwithstanding, persisted, and passed with anathema, resolutions contrary to his decrees. (Baron. *Annal. Eccles. ad. ann. 553.*) Vigilius, refusing to subscribe to these resolutions, was sent into exile by the Emperor, and at last consented to give his approbation. The Roman writers are hard put to it to vindicate the authority of the bishop of Rome in this matter; and it is curious to see the different and inconsistent grounds of defence adopted by Baronius, Binius, De Marca, and which may be found in Labbé and Cossart, v. 601, 731. They might have spared themselves the trouble, as far as Vigilius is concerned. When it is known that this wretched being procured the uncanonical deposition of his predecessor, Silverius, by bribery to the Roman general Belisarius; that he procured his own election to the Popedom, during the lifetime of his uncanonically deposed predecessor, by violence; and secured himself in it by putting Silverius to death; impartial persons will agree in thinking that the See of Rome must be considered to have been at this time *vacant*. The account is given in the *Breviarium Literati Diaconi*, in Labbé and Cossart, v. 775.

VI. CONSTANTINOPLE III. A. D. 680.

The sixth synod to which the name and authority of a General Council has been ascribed by the Catholic Church, is that composed of 289 bishops, assembled under the command of the Emperor

Constantine Pogonatus, in the year 680. They met to condemn a new heresy—a branch of the Eutychian; by which it was asserted that after the *union* of the *two natures* of Christ, there remained but *one will*; hence those who advocated this doctrine were called *Monothelites*. In this council Honorius, the deceased Bishop of Rome, was condemned of heresy, and his books ordered to be burned.—Labbé and Cossart, vi. 587, et seq.

Constantinople, A. D. 692.

The two last councils having edited no canons, the Emperor Justinian, at the request of the bishops, ordered another General Council to be assembled at Constantinople, in the year 692; for the purpose of supplying the deficiencies of the former. The assembly, as far as its constitution went, had more claim to the character of a General Council than many to which both the title and authority have been ascribed. It consisted of upwards of 200 bishops, among whom were representatives of the bishop of Rome, the other great patriarchs being all present in person; and the decrees were signed by all, not omitting the emperor, whose name appears first on the list. The council assumed the style of “the Holy and Universal Synod.” But its decrees were not received at Rome, because many of them were contrary to the Roman customs. Thus another proof is afforded that the claim of a synod to the estimation of a General Council does not depend upon the general or even universal reception of its decrees by the Catholic Church; but that *no council has been accounted general or universal, whose decrees are not received by the Papal Church.*—Labbé and Cossart, vi. 1123—31—85, 1317.