

A D D R E S S

DELIVERED

AT THE OPENING OF THE SESSION

IN THE

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

OF THE

FIRST ASSOCIATE REFORMED SYNOD OF THE WEST,

November 6th, 1850,

BY

JOHN T. PRESSLY, D. D.

Published by Request of the Students.

PITTSBURGH:

PRINTED BY SHRYOCK & HACKE, CORNER OF WOOD AND THIRD STREETS.
1850.

ADDRESS

DELIVERED

AT THE OPENING OF THE SESSION

IN THE

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

OF THE

FIRST ASSOCIATE REFORMED SYNOD OF THE WEST,

25-6
November 6th, 1850,

BY

JOHN T. PRESSLY, D. D.

Published by Request of the Students.

PITTSBURGH:

PRINTED BY SHRYOCK & HACKE, CORNER OF WOOD AND THIRD STREETS.
1850.

4-BL

789

ADDRESS.

MY DEAR YOUNG FRIENDS:

FOR several successive ages there has existed in the world an extensive ecclesiastical organization, of a peculiar character, which has exerted a wide-spread influence among the nations of the earth. This organization claims to be the true church of Christ; denies to all other ecclesiastical associations the right to be regarded as any part of the Christian Church; and excludes from the hope of salvation all who are without its pale. One of the main pillars on which this system of such lofty pretensions rests, is the assumption that the Apostle Peter was by our Lord invested with peculiar authority, and was constituted the Prince of the Apostles, and the Head of the Church on earth. Intimately connected with this position, and equally essential to the support of this system, is the assumption that this Apostle was constituted the Bishop of the Church of Rome. And from these premises the conclusion is drawn, that the existing Bishop of Rome is the successor of the Prince of the Apostles; and consequently that he inherits the peculiar prerogatives of the great Apostle, and is the Vicar of Christ on earth.

It is proposed, on the present occasion, to inquire into the nature of the foundation on which Romanism has erected her towering superstructure. It is reasonable to suppose that principles of fundamental importance in a system professedly Christian must be clearly taught in the Oracles of Truth.

I. Our first inquiry, then, is, *Do the Scriptures furnish satisfactory evidence, that the Apostle Peter was invested with any peculiar authority or dignity among the Apostles?*

1. In the first place I remark, that in the call to the office of the Apostleship, and in the commission which was given to the twelve disciples, there is no intimation of any distinction among them in point of authority. In the early part of his ministry, our Lord selected from among his followers twelve whom he named Apostles. These twelve he ordained that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach the gospel, and have power to heal sicknesses, and to cast out devils. While he was with them, our Lord sent out the Twelve by two and two, and gave them power over unclean spirits. And they went out and preached that men should repent. And they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them.—Mark vi. 7. In this first appointment which was given to the Twelve, there is not the slightest intimation of any peculiar authority being conferred on any one of them. Peter is called and ordained by his Lord and Master, just in the same manner as the other Apostles; he is sent forth accompanied by a companion, in the same way as the rest of his brethren; and between him and them, there is no distinction made in the bestowment of miraculous gifts.

And after the resurrection, when having finished the work of redemption, our Lord was about to ascend to the right hand of the Majesty on high, he invested his Apostles with full authority as his ambassadors to go forth and preach the gospel to the nations, no distinction whatever is made among them. To them all alike he says, “As my father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.”—John xx. 21. And having assert-

ed his claim to universal dominion, saying, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth;" he says to them all "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."—Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

Had it been the design of the Head of the Church to assign to one of his Apostles a station of eminence above the rest, this was surely the appropriate time to make known his mind. But here we see, that when investing fully with the apostolic dignity, those whom he had selected for that purpose, our Lord gives to them all the same commission in the same words; clothes them alike with the same authority; assigns to them the same employment, and gives to them all the same precious promise for their encouragement in the work to which they were called.

But before they should enter upon the work assigned to them, it was necessary that they should be endowed with peculiar qualifications. Accordingly the divine direction is, "Tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." In obedience to the divine command, "They continued with one accord, in prayer and supplication," until the day of Pentecost, when the interesting promise was fulfilled. "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues, like as of fire, and it sat upon each one of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." Had it been the purpose of Heaven that Peter should occupy a peculiar station of eminence and dignity among his brethren, peculiar endowments would have been necessary to qualify him for the

trust. But there is no indication of any distinction in the qualifications bestowed upon the Apostles. The Holy Spirit descended upon each of them in the same manner; they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance.—Acts. ii, 1.

Since, then, when our Lord clothed his Apostles with authority as his ambassadors, and sent them forth to preach the Gospel and to administer the ordinances of Christianity, he made no distinction among them, but gave them all the same commission; and since they were all alike endowed with the gifts of the Holy Spirit to qualify them for the work to which they were called, the conclusion is irresistible that in point of authority there is among the Apostles perfect equality.

To this conclusion, however, it is objected, that there are certain passages of Scripture which seem to indicate that peculiar dignity and authority were conferred upon the Apostle Peter. Let us, then, examine some of those declarations of the word of God, on which the advocates of the primacy of Peter, chiefly rely for their support. Among these, Mat. xvi, 18, may be regarded as occupying the most prominent place. On the occasion here referred to, our Lord proposed to his disciples the question, "Whom say ye that I am?" Peter replies on behalf of them all, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." After expressing his commendation of this profession of faith, our Lord says to the Apostle, "I say unto thee, that thou art Peter; and on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." On the occasion of our Lord's first interview with this Apostle, he gave him a name descriptive of the character for which he should afterwards be distinguished: "Thou art Simon, the son of Jona; thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation, a stone."—John i, 42. The name *Cephas* in the Syriac language and *Petros* in the Greek, are of the same

import, and signify a stone. By this name it was indicated that when fully qualified for the office to which he was called, Peter should be distinguished for his firmness, his boldness and intrepidity in the service of his Master.

On the occasion to which the words in question refer, when Peter witnessed a good confession, our Lord advertising to the characteristic name which he had given him, says, Thou art Peter. In the noble confession of a fundamental truth of Christianity, which you have made, you have given evidence that the name has not been misapplied. Thou art Peter, a rock. And in connection with Peter's avowal of a great truth which lies at the very foundation of the church, our Lord proceeds to describe the foundation and perpetuity of his church: "On this rock will I build my church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

The question here arises, What is the rock on which our Lord declares, "I will build my church?" The Romanist replies, It is Peter. But in opposition to this hypothesis, I remark, that whatever may be the precise import of our Lord's declaration, it is certain that he does not say that Peter is the rock on which he will build his church. Had it been the design of our Lord to indicate that the person of Peter was the rock on which the church should be founded, the obvious manner of expression would have been, Thou art Peter, a rock; and *on thee* will I build my church. But an important distinction is made between Peter and the rock on which the church should rest. In the original language the distinction is at once apparent. Thou art *Petros*, and on this *petra*, will I build my church. I repeat it, then, that our Lord does not declare his purpose to build his church upon the person of Peter, but on something different from him. And therefore the claim of superiority in behalf of the Apostle Peter, founded upon this passage of Scripture, has its origin in a misconception of our Lord's meaning.

But I reply still further, that the interpretation which represents Peter as the rock on which the church is built, makes this portion of Scripture conflict with what is plainly taught in other parts of the word of God. The Scriptures teach in the most clear and unequivocal manner, that Jesus Christ is the only foundation of the church, and that upon this rock, and not upon any imperfect creature, is the church built. "Thus saith the Lord God, Behold I lay in Zion for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation."—Isa. xxviii, 16. And an Apostle declares, "other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ."—1 Cor. iii. 11. Jesus Christ then, is the living stone which God hath laid in Zion, he is the only foundation of the church; and the Apostle Peter and all true believers are lively stones built up a spiritual house, which rests upon him as the foundation. That interpretation, therefore, which would make Peter the rock on which the church is founded, is manifested to be erroneous, because it conflicts with what the Scriptures elsewhere plainly teach, and arrogates to a creature, the honor which belongs to the Lord Jesus Christ.

Among those who unite in rejecting that interpretation of this text, which makes Peter the rock on which the church is built, there is some diversity of opinion, in relation to its precise import. All that is necessary to my present purpose, is to show, that it is a forced and erroneous construction which would make it support the doctrine that Peter is the foundation on which our Lord declares his purpose to build his church. Perhaps the most simple interpretation is that which represents the great truth, that Jesus Christ is the Son of the living God, which Peter in the name of the Apostles confessed, as the rock which supports his church, and is essential to its existence. The idea then would be, that Jesus Christ, in his true character, as the Son of the living God, is the rock on which

the church is founded, and on which she shall stand securely amidst the opposition of earth and hell.

In connection with the declaration we have been considering, our Lord says to Peter "I will give unto thee, the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." And these words have been adduced to prove that some peculiar authority was conferred on Peter. The key, being the instrument by means of which the door is opened or shut, so that persons are either admitted into the house, or excluded from it, is an appropriate emblem of government. See Isa. xxii. 22; Rev. iii. 7. And the kingdom of heaven being the Christian Church, to give one the keys of the kingdom of heaven, is to invest him with authority in the Church of Christ, in the exercise of which, he admits men to the enjoyment of Christian fellowship or excludes them from it, according to the laws which the King of Zion has established. And that the term key is here employed as the emblem of government, seems to be made evident, by the additional clause relative to binding and loosing. "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." But that our Lord could not have designed by these words to confer any peculiar authority upon Peter, appears from the fact, that the same language is on another occasion addressed in general to all the Apostles.—Mat. xviii. 18. And on a subsequent occasion language differing in terms, but of the same general import is addressed to them all. Jesus breathed on them, and saith unto them, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained."—John xx. 23. The conclusion then to which we are conducted is, that on this occasion our Lord addressed himself personally to Peter, because he had answered in the name of his brethren

a question which was proposed to them all; and therefore, the language in question, confers no authority on Peter which was not common to all the Apostles.

2. I remark in the next place, that the history of the Apostolic church furnishes no evidence either that Peter claimed the right to exercise any peculiar authority over his brethren, or that the right to exercise any such authority was by them conceded to him. During the period of the ministry of the Apostles, there were various occasions on which, had any one of them possessed any peculiar authority, an opportunity for its exercise was furnished. For example, as the number of the disciples increased, it was found to be inconvenient for the Apostles to attend to the wants of the poor; and consequently that they might not be neglected, it became necessary to appoint a class of officers for this special purpose. And had Peter been clothed with supreme authority among the Apostles, here undoubtedly was presented a fit occasion for its exercise. But is there any indication of the exercise of any peculiar authority by this Apostle on this occasion, when a new regulation was to be introduced for the government of the church? Nothing like it! *The twelve* called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and proposed the matter to them, and directed them to select seven men of honest report, whom, say they, "we may appoint over this business." And when the multitude had made a selection of such persons as were supposed to be qualified for the office, they presented them not to Peter, to receive his authoritative sanction, but they set them before the Apostles; and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them.

In the progress of Christianity, it came to pass that Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and preached Christ unto them. And the people with one accord gave heed to those things which Philip spake, hearing and seeing the miracles which he did. And when intelligence of the success of the gospel in Samaria reached the Apostles

which were at Jerusalem, and it was deemed necessary to send additional laborers to further the work which had been so auspiciously commenced, had there been a Prince among the Apostles, who was invested with supreme authority over the rest, it surely would have been his province to designate the men who should perform this service. But do we find Peter on this occasion exercising any such prerogative? So far from it, Peter himself is one of those who are selected and sent by the brethren, on this important mission. "When the Apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John." In the face of such a fact, how preposterous to pretend that this Apostle was invested with any peculiar authority over his brethren.

Again; on a subsequent occasion, in the history of Christianity, the peace of the church in Antioch was disturbed by an effort to incorporate the peculiarities of Judaism with Christianity. Certain men who came down from Judea, taught the brethren and said, "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses ye cannot be saved." In this instance a serious doctrinal error was propagated. And if there had been among the Apostles one who was the Head of the Church, on whom it devolved in a peculiar manner to maintain the integrity and purity of the church, this certainly was an occasion which called for the exercise of his authority. But to what tribunal was this question involving the peace and purity of the church referred? Not to any one individual who was regarded as an infallible and authoritative expounder of the faith; not to Peter, but to the Apostles and Elders. The sacred historian informs us, that Paul and Barnabas went up from Antioch to Jerusalem to the *Apostles and Elders* about this question.

And when the assembly convened to deliberate in relation to this matter, and to decide a question in which

the vital interests of Christianity were involved, did Peter claim any pre-eminence over his brethren? Or was there any peculiar deference to his authority? So far from it, he appears on terms of perfect equality with them; and without making pretensions to superiority in any respect, takes part in the deliberations which led to a decision of the question at issue. In his turn Peter rose up and submitted his views to the consideration of the assembly. He calls the attention of the brethren to some things which had occurred under his own observation while engaged in the exercise of his ministry; and from facts he reasons in relation to the indications of the will of God, as to the course which ought to be pursued. And after he and others had expressed their views, the Apostle James proceeded to review the facts which had been stated, and the arguments which had been offered; and in conclusion, submitted a motion for the disposal of the subject, which was unanimously adopted.

Here, then, in an assembly of the Christian ministry, on an occasion when a question of vital importance to the interests of Christianity was to be decided, we find Peter meeting with his brethren on terms of perfect equality, taking part with them in their deliberations, laying claim to no peculiar prerogatives, exercising no peculiar authority. And the whole proceedings of this deliberative assembly are utterly irreconcilable with the supposition that the Apostle Peter was clothed with any peculiar authority over the church.

II. But let us proceed in the next place to inquire into the nature of the foundation on which the other pillar of the Roman Hierarchy rests. Not only does Romanism claim for the Apostle Peter peculiar prerogatives, but likewise maintains that it is the distinguished honor of the Church of Rome, to have had the Prince of the Apostles as her first Bishop. And from this it is inferred, that the existing Bishop of Rome is the successor of Peter, and

inherits from him all the peculiar prerogatives for which he was distinguished. In opposition to all such lofty pretensions, it may be said, that not only are the Scriptures perfectly silent on this subject, but they give us no information which would enable us to determine that the Apostle was ever at any time during his life in the city of Rome. And it surely argues a great degree of boldness in any system which lays claim to the character of Christian, to maintain a principle essential to its very existence, to which the word of God affords no support.

The first time the sacred history introduces this venerable Apostle to our notice, we find him in the city of Jerusalem taking part in the deliberations of an assembly of the Christian ministry. After the adjournment of this assembly, Paul and Barnabas returned to Antioch, where they had been previously employed in preaching the gospel. From an incident introduced in the Epistle to the Galatians, it appears that Peter likewise, shortly after this time, visited Antioch: "When Peter was come to Antioch," says the Apostle Paul, "I withstood him to the face, for he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles; but when they were come, he withdrew, and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision."—Gal. ii. 11.

At what particular time this interview took place between the two Apostles; or what was the occasion of Peter's visit to Antioch at this time; or how long he remained there; we have not the means to determine. All that appears certainly is, that this visit to Antioch was some time subsequent to the meeting of the council at Jerusalem. On the subject of the travels and labors of the Apostle from this time to the end of his life, the sacred history gives us no information. It may be regarded, however, as a probable opinion, that he may have been employed in preaching the gospel in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, to the strangers dispersed throughout which countries his two Epistles are addressed.—1 Pet. i. 1.

In the first Epistle, the salutation of the church at Babylon is sent to the brethren to whom it is addressed: "The church that is at Babylon, elected together with you, saluteth you."—1 Pet. v. 13. From this it appears, that at the time the Epistle was written, the Apostle was at Babylon. And on this circumstance the advocates of the Roman Hierarchy have endeavored to found an argument in support of the hypothesis, that the Apostle Peter was Bishop of Rome. They contend that the Apostle here applies to Rome the mystical name of Babylon, as descriptive of the wickedness and idolatry of that city. It may be a sufficient reply to this argument to say, that it is founded upon a pure assumption, which cannot claim even probability in its favor. The language in question occurs in a plain and familiar Epistle, addressed to Christian brethren; and it is the salutation of a Christian church addressed to their brethren. And there is no conceivable reason why, on such an occasion, this Christian church should assume any other than her proper name.

That the Apostle Peter should be called to evidence his unyielding attachment to the cause of Christ, by laying down his life, had been distinctly foretold. In an interview with the Apostles, just before his ascension into heaven, our Lord addressed to Peter these memorable words: "When thou wast young, thou girdedst thyself and walkedst whither thou wouldest; but when thou shalt be old thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not. This spake he, signifying by what death he should glorify God."—John xxi. 18. But in relation to the place where this event occurred, the Scriptures are perfectly silent.

But not only is the sacred history silent on the subject of Peter's labors in Rome; in so far as any light is reflected on this subject, it is rendered doubtful whether he ever honored that city with his presence. Among the canonical Epistles, we have one addressed by the Apostle Paul

to the church in Rome. At the time this Epistle was written, Paul had never visited the church in this city; but such was the character of the church, that he says, "your faith is spoken of throughout the whole world," and he longed to see the brethren there, that he might impart unto them some spiritual gift, to the end they might be established. Had this church been founded by the labors of the Apostle of the circumcision, it is not to be supposed that Paul would have passed over, without notice, a circumstance of such interest. And yet we do not find in the whole Epistle, the remotest allusion to the person by whose ministry this famous church was established.

But still further; in the conclusion of this Epistle, the Apostle sends affectionate Christian salutation to various members of this Church, some of whom at least, it would seem, were private individuals. But Peter's name is not found in the catalogue of those dear brethren, to whom the Apostle sends the expression of his Christian regard: nor is there the most distant allusion to him. And can it be believed that the church in Rome was at this time under the pastoral care of Peter; and yet, that while affectionate salutation is addressed to particular members of his flock by name, the noble minded Paul would pass unnoticed his beloved brother, their pastor? The supposition is utterly destitute of all credibility. And it may be regarded as a matter beyond all reasonable doubt, that at the date of this Epistle, Peter could not have been in Rome; much less could he have been the Bishop of that distinguished church.

Still further; in the Acts of the Apostles, we have a particular account of the labors and travels of the Apostle Paul; of his apprehension by the Jews; of his appeal to Cæsar, and of his journey to Rome as a prisoner. When the brethren in Rome heard of the approach of the Apostle, we are informed that they came as far as Appii Forum and the Three Taverns to meet him. But among those who came to express their sympathy for a brother in bonds,

there is no mention of the name of Peter. And though Paul remained a prisoner in Rome, and dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, there is no intimation, during all this period, of an interview between him and his beloved brother Peter.

But this is not all. During these two years' imprisonment in Rome, various Epistles were written by the Apostle to individuals and to churches. Of these we may notice the Epistles to the Ephesians, to the Philippians, to the Colossians, and to Philemon. The period of the Apostle's imprisonment in Rome is supposed to extend from the year of our Lord 61 to 63. But in none of these Epistles written from Rome, does the Apostle make any mention of Peter, nor in any way refer to his connection with that church. In the Epistle addressed to the Philippians, the saints generally, chiefly they that are of Cæsar's household, unite with the Apostle in sending Christian salutation; in the Epistle to the Colossians, various individuals by name unite with him, in the expression of their Christian regard; and the same is true in relation to the Epistle to Philemon. But in none of these Epistles do we find the name of Peter among those who unite with Paul in the expression of brotherly love to the saints. And the only credible account which can be given of Paul's silence in relation to Peter in these Epistles written from Rome is, that Peter did not reside there at that time, and consequently could not be the pastor of the church in that city. According to the most probable calculations of chronologers, the martyrdom of Peter took place about the year of our Lord 64. And consequently, if it was in Rome that the Apostle glorified God by suffering the death of a martyr, he must have come to the city only a short time previous to his death.

But, it is not the only inconvenience with which this fundamental principle of Romanism is burdened, that it is en-

tirely destitute of the support of Scripture. Not only are the Scriptures perfectly silent in relation to Peter's residence in Rome, as well as with regard to a pastoral charge in that city; but it is, moreover, inconsistent with the nature of the Apostolic office, to suppose that his charge was confined to a particular church. The Apostles were an extraordinary class of officers, whose ministry was employed in laying the foundations of the Christian Church. They were called immediately by our Lord, and were endowed with miraculous gifts to qualify them for the peculiar service which they were appointed to perform. Their commission was general, not confined to any particular city or country. Their field of labor was the world. "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." And from the inspired history of their labors, it appears that in the execution of their commission they went from city to city and from country to country; preaching the gospel, founding and organizing churches. Having preached the gospel with success in a particular place, and having collected a congregation of professing Christians, they appointed officers to take charge of them, while they passed on to other fields of labor. And accordingly in the history of the Apostle Paul's labors, who, accompanied by Barnabas, preached the gospel in Derbe, Lystra, Iconium and Antioch, it is said, "And when they had ordained them Elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting they commended them to the Lord on whom they believed." —Acts xiv. 23. The Apostles were not, therefore, pastors, of particular churches. Their peculiar work was to plant and organize churches, wherever their labors in preaching the gospel were successful; and then to commit these churches to the care of pastors appointed over them. And Peter, instead of being the Bishop of Rome, enjoyed a more distinguished title, THE APOSTLE OF THE CIRCUMCISION, as Paul was the Apostle of the Gentiles.

It is not my design, upon the present occasion, to enter upon the investigation of the question relative to Peter's

episcopacy, in the light of history and tradition. Our faith in matters of religion, does not rely upon the uncertain testimony of uninspired history, but upon the word of God. It is, therefore, enough for us to know, that in so far as the authority of Scripture is concerned, not only have we no evidence that this Apostle was Bishop of Rome; but there is nothing to show that he ever preached the gospel in that famous city.

And with regard to the testimony of history, it may be sufficient to remark, that so indistinct is the light which it reflects upon the subject, that eminently learned men, after a patient and laborious investigation, have come to the conclusion, that it is a matter involved in much uncertainty, whether the Apostle Peter was ever within the limits of the city of Rome. It may, however, be regarded as upon the whole probable, from the testimony of some ancient writers and prevalent tradition, that in his old age and near the close of his life, the Apostle came to the city and there suffered martyrdom in the cause of his Lord and Master.

In conclusion, then, since as we have seen, the principle, which maintains that our Lord conferred upon the Apostle Peter peculiar prerogatives, constituting him the visible head of the church, is utterly unsupported by the word of God; and since the allegation that this Apostle was the first Bishop of Rome can lay claim to no Scriptural authority, we are brought to the conclusion, that the superstructure which Romanism has erected rests upon a foundation of sand. And the claim which the existing Bishop of Rome sets up to be regarded as the successor of the Prince of the Apostles, and the inheritor of his peculiar prerogatives, is worthy of him who in the height of his presumption opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that as God he sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. Whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF OUR SEMINARY.

The THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION, to the students of which, the above Address was delivered, was established in the year 1825. The Rev. JOSEPH KERR, D. D. at that time pastor of the St. Clair congregation was chosen Professor. After having discharged the duties of his office for four years, this excellent man was removed by death. After the death of Dr. Kerr, such of the students as found it convenient to repair to his residence, pursued their theological studies under the care of Rev. MUNGO DICK, for the two following years. At the meeting of Synod, in Pittsburgh, 19th October, 1831, the present Senior Professor was chosen.

In the year 1843, Synod established three Professorships in the Institution:

A Professorship of Theology—Didactic, Polemic, and Pastoral;

A Professorship of Biblical Literature and Criticism;

A Professorship of Ecclesiastical History and Church Government.

At the same time, the Rev. JAMES L. DINWIDDIE, D. D. was appointed Professor of Biblical Literature and Criticism; and the Professorship of Theology was assigned to the Senior Professor. It being at that time, inconvenient for Synod, to fill the chair of Ecclesiastical History and Church Government, the duties connected with that department were discharged by the Senior Professor.

About the middle of the third Session after Dr. DINWIDDIE was elected, it pleased God in his mysterious providence, to lay his afflicting hand upon him, so that he was disqualified for rendering any further service to the Church. By this dispensation, the Senior Professor, was once more left alone in the charge of the Seminary; and on him devolved the duties connected with the three Professorships in the Institution. In this situation, he remained until the meeting of Synod in 1847; at which time the Rev. ALEXANDER D. CLARKE, President of Franklin College, in New Athens, Ohio, was elected Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Government. Professor CLARKE entered upon the discharge of the duties of his Professorship, at the commencement of the Session in 1848.

As yet the Seminary possesses no buildings of its own. Through the liberality of the congregation forming the pastoral charge of the senior Professor, a spacious and convenient Lecture Room, and a room for the accommodation of the Library, are furnished free of charge, in the basement story of their Church. The Library, though not large, numbering about 1500 volumes, is yet select and valuable. And in consequence of various bequests left by friends of the Institution, the means are now in possession of Synod, which will enable us to enlarge the Library to an extent which will meet all necessary demands.

The term of study in the Seminary at present is four years; there being one session of five months in each year, commencing on the first Monday in November. During the whole course, the Bible is our text-book. The grand design of every exercise in the Seminary is to lead the student to a correct understanding of the lively Oracles, and to enable him to acquire the faculty of unfolding the truths of the Bible plainly and intelligibly to others. It is not the object of the Instructors to communicate a large amount of knowledge, but to aid the student in the investigation of truth for himself; that thus knowledge may be acquired as the fruit of his own labor.

The following outline of the course of study and the laws for the government of the Institution, adopted by the Synod, will give a general view of the manner in which the course of instruction is conducted in the Seminary:

C O U R S E O F S T U D Y .

1. The reading and critical investigation of the Sacred Scriptures, in the Hebrew and Greek languages, shall occupy a prominent place in the whole course. Every thing included under the head of Biblical Antiquities, Natural History, Chronology and Sacred Geography, shall here be introduced. The great design of this branch of theological study shall be to qualify the Student for the correct and perspicuous interpretation of the Sacred Text.

2. The study of the doctrines of the Bible in systematic order. In this department the attention of the Student shall be occupied with every thing included under the heads of Didactic and Polemic Theology. Here the first subject of inquiry shall be, what are the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures as exhibited in our ecclesiastical standards, and what their connection and dependence? The great object in this branch of study shall be, to qualify the Student for holding forth the Faithful Word, and to enable him by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers.

3. The careful examination of the history of the Church of Christ from its first establishment till the present time. Here the attention of the Student shall be directed to the origin and progress of the Church;

the ordinances of religious worship; and the corruptions, whether of doctrine, worship, or government, which have been at different times introduced into the Church. The principal design in this department shall be to enable the Student to know how he ought to behave himself in the House of God, which is the Church of the Living God, the Pillar and Ground of the truth.

LAWS FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE INSTITUTION.

1. Particular attention shall be paid to the cultivation of practical godliness. For this purpose not only shall the Student attend to the devotional exercises of the closet and of the family with whom he may reside, but shall likewise attend punctually the meetings of his fellow-students for social worship, and also some place of public worship on the Lord's day.

2. Regular and punctual attendance shall be given to all the exercises for improvement connected with the Seminary; nor shall any Student be absent on any occasion, without being able to assign to his instructor a satisfactory reason.

3. No Student shall, while connected with the Seminary, defend, or endeavor to propagate any doctrine inconsistent with the received standards of the Associate Reformed Church.

Present Faculty.

JOHN T. PRESSLY, D. D.

Professor of Theology, Didactic, Polemic and Pastoral.

REV. A. D. CLARKE,

Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Government.

[The Professorship of Biblical Literature and Criticism, as yet remains vacant, and the duties of this department, are at present divided between the two existing Professors.]

CATALOGUE OF STUDENTS,

FOR THE SESSION OF 1850 AND 1851.

FIRST YEAR.

NAMES.	RESIDENCE.	GRADUATED.
D. D. CHRISTY,	<i>Butler, Pa.</i>	Madison College.
R. N. DICK,	<i>Brush Valley, Pa.</i>	Jefferson " 1850
P. H. DRENNEN,	<i>Elizabeth, "</i>	Washington " 1850
JAMES GIVEN,	<i>Allegheny City, "</i>	Franklin " 1850
JAS. M. GORSUCH,	<i>Hookstown, "</i>	Jefferson " 1850
JOHN JAMESON,	<i>Middletown, "</i>	Franklin " 1850
THOMAS LOVE,	<i>Shepherdstown, O.</i>	" "
ROBERT M'WATTY,	<i>Lawrence Co. Pa.</i>	" " 1850
C. K. POTTER,	<i>Fayette " "</i>	Washington " 1850
SAM'L F. THOMPSON,	<i>Tyro, Ohio,</i>	Franklin " 1850
SAMUEL F. VANATA,	<i>West Alexander, Pa.</i>	" " 1849
W. W. WADDLE,	<i>Wheeling, Va.</i>	Muskingum " 1850
R. H. YOUNG,	<i>Allegheny City, Pa.</i>	Duquesne "

First Year, - - - - 13

SECOND YEAR.

GEORGE C. ARNOLD,	<i>Frankfort, Pa.</i>	Jefferson " 1849
JOHN B. CLARKE,	<i>Washington, O.</i>	Franklin " 1847
J. R. M'CALLISTER,	<i>York County, Pa.</i>	" " 1848
THOS. H. M'EWEN,	<i>West Middletown, Pa.</i>	" "
JAMES C. M'KNIGHT,	<i>Meadville, Pa.</i>	Allegheny " 1850
S. M. HUTCHISON,	<i>Washington Co. Pa.</i>	Muskingum " 1848
A. G. WALLACE,	<i>Herriottsville, "</i>	Jefferson " 1847

Second Year, - - - - 7

THIRD YEAR.

MATHEW CLARKE,	<i>Indiana, Pa.</i>	Jefferson " 1848
T. M. CUNNINGHAM,	<i>New Concord, O.</i>	Muskingum " 1848
SAMUEL DOUGAN,	<i>Pittsburgh, Pa.</i>	Duquesne " 1848
THOMAS DRENNEN,	<i>St. Clairsville, O.</i>	Franklin " 1848
JAMES C. FORSYTHE,	<i>Finleyville, Pa.</i>	Washington " 1848
HUGH H. HERVEY,	<i>Tarentum, "</i>	West. Univ. 1848
ELIJAH M'CAUGHEY,	<i>Fredericksburg, O.</i>	Franklin College.
H. C. M'FARLAND,	<i>Shirland, Pa.</i>	Jefferson " 1848
GEORGE ORMOND,	<i>Rural Valley, Pa.</i>	Union " 1847

Third Year, - - - - 9



FOURTH YEAR.

NAMES.	RESIDENCE.	GRADUATED.
JAMES BORROWS,	<i>New Concord, O.</i>	Muskingum Coll. 1847
JOHN L. CRAIG,	<i>Allegheny City, Pa.</i>	Jefferson " 1847
WM. R. ERSKINE,	<i>Washington Co. "</i>	Washington " 1845
ALEX. G. FERGUS,	<i>Elizabeth, "</i>	" " 1845
WM. M'MILLAN,	<i>Allegheny City, "</i>	Duquesne " 1847
J. R. WALKER,	" " "	" " 1847

Fourth Year, - - - - 6

SUMMARY.

FIRST YEAR,	-	-	-	-	13
SECOND YEAR,	-	-	-	-	7
THIRD YEAR,	-	-	-	-	9
FOURTH YEAR,	-	-	-	-	6
					—
Total,	-	-	-	-	35

The whole number of Students who have entered the Institution from its origin in 1825, up to the present time, is *two hundred and nine*.