

The book cover features a dark, textured background with a prominent embossed floral border. The border consists of stylized, symmetrical floral motifs in each corner, with intricate scrollwork and leaf patterns. The central text is printed in a gold, serif font.

THE
GREAT APOSTACY

(Jenkins) -

3740. c. 73.

THE
GREAT APOSTACY;

A SERMON

ON ROMANISM.

PREACHED OCTOBER 23, 1852, BY APPOINTMENT, AND
PUBLISHED BY REQUEST OF THE

SYNOD OF VIRGINIA.

By GEORGE JUNKIN, D. D.



PHILADELPHIA:

WILLIAM S. MARTIEN.

1853.



THE GREAT APOSTACY.

And he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying, Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird.—Rev. xviii. 2.

CONSCIENCE is that power by which, when we comprehend our relations to moral beings, we perceive our obligations and feel an impulsion toward their discharge. Impulsion to duty; perception of obligations; comprehension of relations;—this is the historical order inverted. The man of God wishes his auditors to do something—to lead a life of holy obedience; and this as consequent upon true repentance; and this as dependent on faith as its necessary antecedent: but this duty of faith is itself dependent upon an antecedent, or cause;—indeed; two things conspire as

cause—viz. a knowledge of the doctrines to be believed in order to salvation, and the gracious operations of the Holy Spirit in the understanding and the heart.

Obviously, then, to reach the end of holy living, the preacher must begin with teaching men their moral relations. Without this, he cannot produce the conception of obligation, and, of course, must utterly fail of constraining to the practice of duty in a life of holiness. *Teaching*, then, is the prime duty of the gospel ministry; and this deduction of reason, (as do all others) coincides with the revealed law and with the divine commission, "Go and teach all nations." Ministers that do not teach men their relations to God and to one another, cannot impress them with a sense of duty and lead them in the way of righteousness and truth. Unless they succeed in giving a true conception of the relations their people stand in to-

ward the heathen world, for example, and that these are constituted by the Creator, in vain will they appeal to them for missionary contributions. Or, if not in vain, if they secure a little money, it will not be given with the right motive; it may be the rich man's talent—the widow's two mites, it cannot be. In such donations there is no virtue. There may be hollow compliment to the asker, but no devotion in the giver to Christ, the receiver. Hence, the minister who would succeed in this department of benevolence, must communicate to the hearers, information about the condition of the heathen world and the relative position of his own country, his own church, his own family, and his own person, toward the heathen, and their mutual relations to God.

So in regard to the nominally Christian, but really pagan population of our own country.

So in regard to the descendants of

Abraham, who stand in a peculiar condition, and who, consequently, have peculiar claims upon us.

And so it is with reference to the Church of Rome, to whom our relations, according to scriptural teachings and providential arrangements, are very peculiar. These involve duties, intelligible only after the relations shall have been comprehended, and, of course, then only capable of being felt. Toward securing right action, therefore, for the benefit of the unhappy followers of the Priest and the Virgin, you must depict before the mind, the position, character and fate of Rome. Until the people understand the nature of that apostacy and its sad consequences, it is impossible they should feel aright their obligations and be led to discharge their duties.

Now these are largely described in the word of God, and also in his providence; and the exposition of that word,

and its collation with that providence, must surely be a correspondently large item in the labours of the ministry. These labours lie in two distinct fields—prophecy and history; and, of course, like all other important works, require much time and great effort. May not this very fact constitute the reason why it is so little regarded in the pulpit?—why that large and very interesting portion of the Scriptures is so generally left out of view? To my mind, on the contrary, it presents a good reason why they should be studied with special care and expounded to the people. All Scripture is profitable for the man of God, that he may be well furnished for his work of teaching; and it is in the difficult parts chiefly that the people need his aid. Nor is there any more difficult to most of them, than those dependent on historical knowledge. These require many books—much time and research, and, there-

fore, must prove a dead letter to a large portion of most Christian congregations, unless their teacher affords his helping hand. Brethren of the ministry! is it right, that so large a proportion of the Bible should be practically sealed up from our people? Is such sealing, Protestant, or is it Popish policy? Did not our Master reprove the acting ministry of his day for similar negligence? "Ye can discern the face of the sky, but can ye not discern the signs of the times?" And when warning them of coming calamities, in reference to the period of the second grand apostacy of the Church, he refers to the prophet—"When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountain." But inasmuch as three several abominations are spoken of, he cautions them—"Whoso readeth let him understand."

He does not say, "shut your eyes—turn away—the subject is too deep and difficult—prophecy cannot be understood,—nay, but lay your minds to it; by close attention and diligent study you can understand it, and so be prepared for your duty."

In the beginning of this book, he pronounces a benediction upon the diligent student of the revelation of Jesus Christ—"Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein." And at the close—"Blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of the prophecy of this book"—and in chap. xvi. 15, "Blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame." This last is spoken in direct reference to the age in which we live; when the waters of the mystic Euphrates are drying up, and when the agents of despotic Europe, inspired

by the arch-fiend, are gone all abroad, like the frogs of Egypt for number and for uncleanness, though unlike them for openness of dealing; the object of whose mission to "the kings of the earth," or western Roman empire, "and of the whole world," is declared to be, "to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty." Whilst the devil, the despots, and the antichrist are mustering their forces, that people who study the prophecies and learn their own true position, and, consequently, their duty, shall not be taken by surprise, but shall find their blessedness in their preparation.

The ministry in this age are peculiarly invoked to this department of Bible exposition. Without their intelligent, energetic and yet prudent co-operation, the conservative power of this Republic cannot be put forth into such action as is necessary to secure the liberties of the world. The con-

spiracy, whose agents now fill our land and all lands—agents, I am sorry to say, trained at Maynooth in Ireland, to the number of five hundred and twenty, in all the arts of Jesuitism, at the expense of the Protestant government of England—this conspiracy cannot be foiled in its diabolical schemes, unless the clergy of America study the prophecies and preach their doctrines to the people. Will they do it? Assuredly they will; for here is the guarantee—“And after these things, I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power, and the earth was lightened with his glory.” This is the gospel ministry, heralding the Protestant Reformation; by whose agency the earth, that is, the western Roman world, was enlightened once more in the knowledge of the true gospel. “And he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying, Babylon, the great is fallen, is fallen, is fallen, and is become

the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird.”

That this refers to the Protestant clergy is proved irrefragably by a fair exposition of this apocalypse, including, as fairness must, the chronology of the book. The presentation, however, of this proof is not certainly looked for now and here. Allow me only to remark, that an expositor of prophecy who disregards chronology, must, of course, deal in fancies—blind guesses—half seen objects—dim spectra. For chronology is the right eye of history, and prophecy is prescript history.

“The great power” of verse 1st., is displayed in the manner of their delivering themselves. They “cried mightily with a strong voice.” Zuingle, Luther, Calvin, Knox, &c., &c., were characterized by a boldness and courage, which would spring only from

a consciousness of rectitude: they spake as having authority. So in the progress of the Reformation, whenever the times called for their martyr spirit, it appeared. The object of these men was to be heard and understood. Truth gives confidence to its friends and furnishes martyrs whenever they are required.

The specific part of their message, to which our attention must now be confined, is the utter corruption of the Romish church; she has fallen—has apostatized from the true religion—is no longer a true church of God; but is become a synagogue of Satan; the Antichrist—the Man of sin and Son of perdition.

This is our proposition. It was discussed at some length, and with various ability, in the highest court of the Presbyterian Church, in 1845; and decided affirmatively by a vote of one hundred and sixty-nine, to six. The

shape of the question was indeed a little different; viz: Is baptism in the church of Rome valid? But the issue turned upon the question before us. Is the church of Rome a true church of Christ? If she is, then her baptism is valid—is true, Christian baptism. If not—if she is apostate from the true faith—if she is the Babylon of the Apocalypse, the Antichrist of John, and the Man of sin of Rome, then her ministrations are not Christian teachings, her ordinances are not Christian sacraments—her baptism is not valid.

This question was subsequently discussed, in the Princeton Review, for July 1845, January and April, 1846. The last named article is precisely on our question, and is a reply to an argument, in "The Presbyterian," over the signature of "Theophilus;" part of which only was published when the article was written. It will be seen

anon, that the essays of "Theophilus" forced the Review from the ground it at first occupied, and inasmuch as the battery was withdrawn and placed behind the *organization* for which he contended as necessarily included in the idea of a true church, "Theophilus" thought it unnecessary then to prolong the contest.

The present discourse is designed to condense the argument into the smallest practicable limits, and into the strictest logical forms. Allow me to state it syllogistically; thus,

An apostate visible church, is not a true visible church of Christ.

But, The visible church of Rome is an apostate visible church.

Therefore, The visible church of Rome, is not a true visible church of Christ.

This argument will not be assailed on the ground of strict logical construction. Every person capable of

understanding an argument, will at a glance admit it to be in order; and therefore, if there is no vagueness in the terms, and if neither premise is denied, the conclusion necessarily follows. I like to state it in this brief, logical form, because it affords the greatest possible facility for the detection of any fallacy, and, if none can be detected; the greatest possible confidence in the conclusion. If the terms are used in the same identical sense, in both places, where they respectively occur; and if the premises are admitted or proved, no mathematical demonstration can be more conclusive.

Let us then institute the most rigid scrutiny into the terms—let us sift them thoroughly; and first the *major*, “a true visible church of Christ.”

By the Greek word *ecclesia*—*church*, is meant any assembly of people called together and met for business. Acts, xix. 38, 41. “The word, *ecclesia*,” (says

the Princeton Review, vol. xvii. 460,) "in its application to Christians, is in the New Testament a collective term for *Cletoi*. *The called* are the church." To this we agree, if by "called" be meant those who have obeyed a lawful call and come out from the mass, and come together, and constituted themselves into one body. But those who do not *come out*, but remain in the mass, notwithstanding the call, invitation or command to come out, are not a *church*. Nor are even the *eclectoi*—the actually *called out*, a *church*, unless they come together and become a unit—a *body* under the authority that called them. *Organization*, by which we mean, their union together, under some constitution or bond of government, is essential to constitute them a *church*—*one church*. We therefore deny the assertion of the Review, that "the church, or the called as such, are not an organized body." And we maintain,

not that the ministry—meaning preachers, are necessary; but *organization*, the adoption and having a constitution and officers. A church does not die and cease to be, when its minister, or preacher dies. But if its government be abolished; if its officers be all dead; if its organization be dissolved, it is no longer a church. Its members have ceased to be *a* body—*one* body: their bond of union is gone; they are merely insulated individuals. It is our Presbyterian custom, always, when a church is dissolved—disorganized—disbanded, to distribute its members to other churches; and so we do when a Presbytery is dissolved. The reverse operation is precisely what is meant by organization, in the nomenclature of the church. A church is said to be *organized* then only, when its officers are appointed and its government instituted; and this is the meaning of the term, the world over. The Prince-

ton Review, upon sober second thought, comes over to this platform. In Vol. xviii., p. 328, they say, "The word church often means an organized society, professing the true religion, united for the purpose of worship and discipline, and subject to the same form of government, and to some common tribunal." So, on p. 333, "We revert therefore to the question, Is the definition given above correct? Is a church an organized society, professing the true religion, united for the worship of God, and the exercise of discipline, and subject to the same form of government and to the same common tribunal?" And again, "This definition is substantially the one given in our standards,—a particular church consists of a number of professing Christians, with their offspring, voluntarily associated together, for divine worship and godly living agreeably to the Holy Scriptures and submitting to a certain

form of government." Our book elsewhere embraces under "living agreeably to the Holy Scriptures," baptism and the Lord's supper; and with this understanding of it, we accept the definition of the Review; it is precisely what we have always advocated. Organization, profession of the truth and the sacraments, these make a visible church, and right glad are we to find such able advocates of the true idea. And as Christ, or God in Christ, has taught us the only true religion, we have here our full major term defined, except the question of visibility.

To the distinction between a visible church and the church which is invisible, we now proceed. And here great caution is requisite; for here lies entrenched the demon of logic, and from this cover of vague terms he lets fly an occasional arrow of annoyance at the true church visible, from Oxford, Mercersburgh, and Princeton.

Equivocation—double meaning—the creation of a fourth term in a process of reasoning, is the *diabolus dialecticus*. He sits at the head of the exchequer of fallacies, and deals out his bills of deception on very moderate terms. Let us caveat his issues, lest we meet a demurrer to the plea in our conclusion.

“The catholic or universal church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect, that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ the head thereof; and is the spouse, the body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.”

“The visible church, which is also catholic or universal under the gospel, (not confined to one nation as before under the law) consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children, and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of

God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.”

“Unto this catholic, visible church, Christ hath given the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of God.”—*Confession*, xxv.

Here remark, (1.) The whole of God's redeemed—all that shall go away into everlasting life, are comprehended by the phrase, *church which is invisible*. But (2.) these as a *unity—one body*. (3.) This unity is created by the bond of the Holy Spirit, His indwelling makes them *one*. (4.) They are organized under one Governor—Jesus is their ruling head. (5.) They are *invisible* by men—that is, there is nothing outward and cognizable by the senses, no visible ordinances, no constitution, no external marks, nothing by which they are distinguished and recognized as a body, segregated from the world and from the great mass who profess the true religion.

As to the *visible church*, remark (1.) It can be seen—its members are known. (2.) They are *diverse*, yet *one*: there is a visible bond uniting them into one. This is the constitution. How could there be a kingdom without government? How could there be government without organization, without officers, without known laws? Is a mass of dissociate individuals, a nation—one nation? Or is the conception an absurdity? (3.) These individuals and their children are “the house and family of God.” What—a house and family, and yet no organization, no government, no rules, no order, no governor!

But to give another aspect. By catholic visible church, our standards mean only, that all visible churches throughout the world—that is, all professors of the true religion, and possessors of the three requisites laid down, viz. the ministry, or officers—oracles, or word of God, and the ordinances,

or sacraments—every organized body of such professors, constitutes a true church of God, however great in number and diverse in location and nationality. Many such exist in the same nation, without any visible bond of unity making these several churches one church. In no other sense do our standards recognize a catholic visible church. Reason repudiates the idea, and history gives it the lie. Such a body never existed, and never will exist; no, not even in the millennium. The attempt to realize this idea—to create one universal ecclesiastical, ghostly empire, covering all the earth, and claiming dominion over all professors of the true religion, made Rome Antichrist. We repudiate it; and maintain, that wherever our standards speak of the visible church as catholic, we are bound, in all fairness and honesty, to take along with us their restricted definition here given.

But again; the three items above, ought to be noted more particularly. (1) The word of God—the doctrines of salvation—and these professed. (2) The officers and government. (3) The sacraments, Baptism, and the Sacred Supper. These are necessary to give visibility to a church. Individuals, truly called, are members of the church invisible, from the moment of their vocation by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Thousands, perchance, of those at Crete, rejoiced in the great salvation, yet was there no visible church, until they professed their faith, and were organized into one body under their proper officers, with word and sacraments. “For this cause left I thee in Crete,” says Paul to Titus, “that thou mightest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city.” This (as Neander says, *Plant.*, p. 98) is the “organization of new churches, or of such as had been in-

jured by many corruptions." Thus, the diverse professors pass into a unity—one body—one church: now it is *visible*. Some of its members are members also of the church *invisible*, some are not; and of this question, God has not made man a judge.

Here, then, we have the distinction—clear, plain, simple, cognizable by all; admitted by all in theory; yet, alas! practically denied in argument by many, and leading often to the most inextricable confusion. It is wearisome, and hardly in taste, to append always the distinguishing epithets, *visible* and *invisible*; for brevity's sake, it is written simply *the church*, and so the reader, and even the writer himself, frequently understands it, at one time of the *visible*, at another of the *invisible* body. This double meaning may be found often in the very same paragraph, and thus a fourth term is created, and argument annihilated. To guard against

this, I have appended, at the expense of euphony, the proper notes of distinction, in my formal statement of the argument; and can see no possibility of mistake from double meaning of the *major term*. By "a true visible church of Christ," both in the premise and the conclusion, is meant—"an organized society, professing the true religion, united for the purpose of worship and discipline, including the two sacraments, and subject to the same form of government, and to some common tribunal."

Our next business, is to scrutinize the middle term—"an apostate visible church." Here our work is greatly abbreviated, by retaining the same identical meaning in the words, *visible church*; this meaning has been settled, so that we have to do now, only with the word *apostate*. What is apostacy? Can a true visible church of Christ apostatize?

The word *apostacy* does not occur in our English Bible. We have it twice, however, in the Greek Testament. Paul was informed by his brethren, (Acts xxi. 22,) the Jews heard he had taught those dispersed among the Gentiles, *apostacy* from Moses; and then the thing is described, viz. "That they ought not to circumcise their children and to walk after the customs." Here, abstaining from the rite of circumcision, one of the seals of the covenant, and from the ceremonial observances, is called *apostacy* from Moses—it is clearly an abandonment of him as leader and head. The other case is in 2 Thess. ii. The brethren at Thessalonica had become alarmed at the supposition, that the day of judgment was approaching and near at hand. Paul quiets their fears, by assuring them, that a fearful calamity to the church, and of long continuance, must intervene between the present and that great

and dreadful day—"it will not come, except there come a falling away—an apostacy beforehand, and that Man of sin be revealed, the Son of perdition." Here the corruption of Rome is expressly called an *apostacy*—a falling away from the gospel.

We have three instances of the cognate *apostasion*—Matt. v. 31, xix. 7, and Mark x. 4. All, however, refer to one case—that of a bill of divorcement—a book of separation—a writing, testifying that the woman was entirely released from the bonds of matrimony. This phrase is borrowed from the Septuagint translation of the law of divorce. Similar is the application of the noun—*apostate*. When the Israelites west of the Jordan, feared that their brethren on the east were about to set up an altar and create a scism, they remonstrated, (Josh. xxii. 19,) and said, "rebel not against the Lord;" which is rendered by the Lxxii., "be not ye apostates from

the Lord." And the Reubenites answered by a solemn protestation, "it is not in rebellion"—which the Lxxii. render—"it is not in *apostacy*." So Num. xiv. 9, "Only, rebel ye not against the Lord"—"be not ye *apostates* from the Lord."

From these, we can easily settle the scriptural idea. Apostacy from Moses, is rejection of him and his system, as shown in neglect of circumcision and the ceremonial observances. Apostacy from a husband, is separation and exclusion from the marriage bonds and privileges. Apostacy from the Lord, is separation from his truth, his worship, his ordinances, his government—rebellion against him. The Man of sin and Son of perdition is, consequently, introduced by apostacy—a falling away from fundamental truth—such corruption as constitutes another gospel. The individual who once professed the truth, and afterwards turns away and renounces it,

either formally or only practically, is an apostate. Of course, a true believer never can finally fall away and perish; the infallible security of the covenant of grace precludes this. But a mere professor, who has not the thing professed, may. A society of professed believers—a church that rejects fundamental truth—truth necessary to be believed in order to salvation, is apostate. Or a church which mixes up damnable doctrines, soul-destroying errors with the truth, and holds to them and enforces them upon its members, is an apostate church; and that, even though it may not formally reject essential truth. If under profession of supplying the children with bread, she administers poison with the bread, she is apostate from God and his truth. Indeed, her apostacy is more deep and deadly, and soul damning, from the fact of her holding, or professing to hold, many important truths, as it makes her

the more dangerous. Hypocrisy, covering real unbelief, is more horribly sinful and hateful than open infidelity. "I would thou wert cold or hot."

But can a true visible church of Christ apostatize? This, we apprehend, will not be denied. Our Confession says, "The purest churches under heaven are subjected both to mixture and error; and some have so degenerated as to become no churches of Christ, but synagogues of Satan." In this process of declension, it is not necessary that any one true believer turn away and renounce formally, or in fact, a single truth; but the faithful of the church die, and others do not rise up to occupy their places. The forms of doctrine and the external order may be kept up, whilst error after error creeps in, and the whole becomes a synagogue of Satan.

Let us note a few instances. Ishmael and Abraham's sons by the second

marriage, were born in the visible church; they were circumcised, and instructed in the true religion, and Ishmael's descendants still bear the external sign and seal of the covenant. Does it follow that the Arabs are a true church of Christ?

The ten tribes of Israel apostatized under Jeroboam, the son of Nebat. God's prophet went, by divine command, and cursed his altar, and the apostacy was final and complete.

The whole house of Judah forsook the covenant, fell away from the true religion, and were cut off from the true olive stock, and landed in utter apostacy. They carried the Bible out with them; they retained the sacraments of circumcision and the passover; but who now affirms the Jews to be a true church of God? Who now asserts they hold truth enough to save the soul?

What has become of the glorious churches of Egypt and Northern Af-

rica? Where are the people to whom Augustine and Cyprian ministered? We conclude that apostacy is possible, and has often occurred; and this we do, without yielding an iota of the doctrine of the final perseverance of the saints. These trees of righteousness are all transplanted into the heavenly paradise, and the ground is occupied by barren fig trees, thorns and briars, whose end is to be burned. Thus, the visibility of a church outlives its spirituality, and that portion of its members who belong also to the church invisible. The name, the frame-work of its professed creed, its visible ordinances, and forms of outward religious acts connected with its worship—the building where it was wont to assemble, and its officers and government, may all abide, and yet the church be thoroughly apostate—separated from God and his gospel, having renounced in practice many essential truths, and embraced many

soul-destroying errors. We might instance many Unitarian churches in our country, and at least one Universalist.

Nor do we suppose that one, or a few plants of righteousness remaining still in a church thus corrupt, can constitute it a garden of God. One swallow does not make summer—one Lot did not save Sodom. This, then, is what we mean by “an apostate visible church”—an organized society that once professed the true religion, united professedly for the purpose of worship and discipline, (including the sacraments,) and subject to a system of government; but which has in fact renounced fundamental truth, or received and practiced soul-destroying error. And in this sense, absolute and fixed, is the term “*apostate visible church*” used, in both premises of our argument.

Our next task is to inspect the *minor* term—“visible Church of Rome”—a task of no small difficulty. For whilst

“her lips drop as an honey-comb, and her mouth is smoother than oil—her steps take hold on hell; and lest thou shouldst ponder the path of life, her ways are moveable, that thou canst not know them.” Like all ladies of this genus, the difficulty is, to detect, define, and expose her character. It is in this versatility that her apologists, Papal, Puseyite and Presbyterian, find the fustian of their fallacies. The changeable silks of the harlot, picked and combed and turned anew, form the woof in the web of their sophistries.

What is the visible Church of Rome?
Answer 1. The pope. 2. The pope and cardinals. 3. The pope, cardinals and bishops. 4. The pope, cardinals, bishops and secular clergy. 5. The pope, cardinals, bishops, secular clergy and regulars. 6. The pope, cardinals, bishops, secular clergy, regulars and people. 7. The pope, cardinals, bishops, secular clergy, regulars, people,

and the entire system of doctrines, rites, ceremonies, and sacraments—the constitution.

Here are seven different answers, and there might be seventy times seven, and each contain some truth. Must we proceed in detail to examine these seven, or the four hundred and ninety? Be not alarmed, dear hearers; we design no such Herculean labour. We mean simply to bind Briareus with the chain already forged and at hand. We have defined, and you have agreed to our definition—which, be it remembered, is the definition of our standards, and even of our Protestant opponents—we have defined the phrase *visible church*, and to our definition we must adhere rigidly, unless we mean to sophisticate, not to reason.

Now, to make short work of what might otherwise seem almost interminable, we affirm, with calm confidence, that this definition of a *visible church*,

is not applicable to any one of the above six, taken by itself; but only to the seventh. The pope is not a visible church. The pope and cardinals are not a visible church. The pope, cardinals and bishops are not; and so on to the sixth. The pope, cardinals, bishops, secular clergy, regulars, and laity or people, are not a visible church. They must have a bond of union—a constitution: hence, you must add the system of doctrines, rites, ceremonies, sacraments. Withhold this constitution, and you destroy the unity. Stop at the third, or the fourth, as the Princeton Review does; take in the hierarchy, and even add the constitutional bond of union, and they are not still a visible church. A visible church is an organized society. But this necessarily implies officers and a body of people over whom official functions are exercised. Officers—pope, cardinals, bishops—rulers—all are relative terms,

which is a logical absurdity, unless there be also the correlates; which last is impossible, unless there be a laity—a body of people to be overseen, ruled, governed. The hierarchy is not a church visible.

But apart from logical precision, I appeal to popular usage. What do men mean every where by the phrase, *Church of Rome—Romish Church—Papal Church—*or *Roman Catholic Church*? Do they ever intend, by either of these, to designate the pope?—the pope and cardinals?—the pope, cardinals, and bishops? or any of the six? Or do all men—does universal custom, by this phrase, design the entire body—officers of all classes—people, rules, rites, ceremonies? Therefore we use the minor term—*visible Church of Rome*—in the strict logical sense, which is also the true and popular sense—meaning thereby what all men mean, unless it be such as intend to use the fallacy of

division, according to which, as Cowper has it, Mohammedans eat up the hog. "The visible Church of Rome" is that organized society, calling itself catholic, professing to be Christian and to promote religion and divine worship, and including its officers, doctrines, rites, ceremonies and sacraments—which is popularly known by this name the world over. This is the sense in which the phrase is used as the minor term of our argument, both in the premises and in the conclusion.

And now, we hope, that having defined our terms, we have shut out the possibility of fallacy from equivocation or double meaning; and if so, the conclusion is inevitable, unless one of the premises be false. But now, the major will be everywhere admitted as true. That "an apostate visible church is not a true visible church of Christ," is here assumed as granted; and we pass on to the only remaining ground where con-

troversy is possible, viz. the minor premises—"the visible Church of Rome is an apostate visible church." If we prove this, the controversy is closed—the conclusion is ours.

We want an affirmative conclusion, and therefore both our premises must be affirmative, and one at least universal. We state the argument in the simplest possible form, thus :

A visible church, which renounces fundamental doctrine, or insists on the belief of soul destroying doctrine, is apostate.

But, the visible Church of Rome renounces fundamental doctrine; or she insists on the belief of soul destroying doctrine,

Therefore, the visible Church of Rome is an apostate visible church.

The first of these is admitted: its truth has been illustrated, not proved, but explained, in the progress of our

definition of apostacy, and we suppose none will deny it.

On the minor premises, as usual, the battle must be fought. A single remark explanatory may be premised. There is an alternative in both premises, either of which being established, the argument is conclusive. This is so stated, because there are two methods of destroying, as to its practical effect upon the minds of men. One is direct, by denying, rejecting, withholding it; the other is by professedly receiving and inculcating it; but, at the same time, inculcating falsehood with it, so as to neutralize it and lead to the belief of error inconsistent with the truth, and thus induce the soul to rest on a foundation that must fail. The latter is the more common, because the more successful method. You might destroy life by withholding food, but will be much more likely to reach the same

result, by supplying good food mixed with deadly poison. A witness who tells much truth along with falsehood, is more likely to mislead the jury and pervert justice, than he who utters only falsehood. We intend, however, to establish both alternatives, and so doubly to fortify our conclusion.

1. The first proof of Rome's apostacy, we borrow from Turretine. "Because she not only is *not built on the foundation of the prophets and apostles*, nor does she rest upon that alone, as does the true church, Ephes. ii. 20, Gal. i. 8, 9; but in various ways *impinges against it*, as well by addition as by subtraction." In other words, Rome rejects the Scriptures and denies their binding authority as the perfect and only rule of faith. What was the issue between Rome and the Reformers? What occasioned the famous protest of Spire? Does not the world know, that it was this very question of

the sufficiency and the only binding power of the Holy Scriptures? Did not Rome reject the Bible as a rule of faith? What says the PROTEST? How readest thou?—"Seeing that there is no sure doctrine but such as is conformable to the word of God; that the Lord forbids the teaching of any other doctrine; that each text of the Holy Scriptures ought to be explained by other and clearer texts; that this holy book is, in all things, necessary for the Christian, easy for the understanding, and calculated to scatter the darkness: we are resolved, by the grace of God, to maintain the pure and exclusive teaching of his only Word, such as it is contained in the biblical books of the Old and New Testaments, without adding any thing thereto that may be contrary to it. This Word is the only truth; it is the sure rule of all doctrine and of all life, and can never fail or deceive us. He who builds on this

foundation shall stand against all the powers of hell, whilst all the human vanities that are set up against it shall fall before the face of God.”*

Here is the issue joined at Spire. Can it be believed in the nineteenth century, that the Protestant Reformers of 1629 did not understand it?—That Rome had not denied the Bible?—That she did not reject fundamental truth? The men of Spire placed this charge of apostacy from the truth, in the very heart of their protest. Could they be mistaken? They demanded the word of God as “the only truth”—“the only foundation.” Rome, represented in the Diet, refused. “This refusal,” says D’Aubigné, “completed the schism; it separated Rome from the gospel.” And how true is this saying! What is the leading point of God’s controversy with the Scarlet Lady, at this hour? Is it

* D’Aubigné, IV. 51.

not on the rule of faith? Does she not still reject the Bible as the rule of faith and manners? As Turretine says, “negata perfectione, integritate, et auctoritate scripturæ”—“she denies the perfection, entireness and authority of Scripture.”

Besides, the indirect is as thorough and complete a denial and rejection, as the direct corrupt additions to the Bible—the decrees of councils, and the whole confused mass of unknowable traditions, superadded and equalled in authority to the holy books, are equally subversive of them as a supreme rule. “Sic qui addit,” &c., says Turretine; i. e., “Whosoever adds unwritten traditions, to be received with equal authority and reverence, to Scripture, by that very fact denies that the Scripture is a rule, to which nothing is to be added, and from which nothing is to be taken away.” And she anathematizes all who refuse to acknowledge her addi-

tions as of equal authority with the Bible.

But we are told, by way of apology, that Rome "believes the Scriptures to be the word of God." I answer, so did Mahomet, and with equal sincerity: so do the Jews, as to the Old Testament, in which is found every doctrine necessary to salvation. Are the Arabs a true visible church of Christ? Are the Jewish synagogues? Do not the followers of Socinus believe the Scriptures as truly as Rome? Are there any more learned works on biblical criticism, than the *Poloni Fratres*? Do not the followers of Priestly? Are, therefore, the Socinian and the Humanitarian churches true visible churches of Christ?

I admit it. Rome does profess to believe the Scriptures, and all the orthodox creeds, and all that the fathers have written, and all the Bible contains. What then? Does she believe

them in the sense we mean? Why, then did she burn John Huss, and Jerome of Prague, and the books and bones of Wyckliffe? What would she do to-morrow, if she had the power, with the leading men in the Synod of Virginia; aye, and the Synod of New Jersey too, and all the Protestant world? Ask the Council of Trent. *Anathema sit.* Let them be accursed.

2. The second proof of Rome's apostacy is, that she denies and rejects the fundamental doctrine of justification by the righteousness of Christ, imputed to us and received by faith alone—usually known as the *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiæ*.—The article whose acceptance indicates a standing, and whose rejection, an apostate church. "Rejecta," says Turretine, "imputata Christi solus justitia ad justificationem nostram coram Deo." "The righteousness of Christ alone, imputed for our justification before God, she rejects." Accord-

ingly, at the sixth session of the Council of Trent, she entered up, among others, the following rule, viz. "Si quis dixerit," &c.; that is, "Whosoever shall say that men are justified, either by the imputation of Christ's righteousness alone, or by the alone remission of sins, grace and charity being excluded, which is shed abroad in their hearts by the Holy Spirit, and inheres in them; or even that the grace, by which we are justified, is only a favour of God—let him be accursed."

So, for affirming that "Justification is not preserved and increased by good works, but that works are only fruits and evidences of justification," the curse is pronounced.

Again, "Si quis post acceptam," &c.; i. e. "Whoever shall affirm, that after the grace of justification is accepted, the offence and guilt of eternal punishment is so blotted out to any penitent sinner, that there remains no

guilt of temporal punishment, to be endured either in this world, or in the future in purgatory, before the door into the kingdom of heaven lies open to him—let him be accursed.”

Let it now be borne in mind, that the Council of Trent had steadily before its eye, the great work of concealing the plague spots of the harlot. Their whole ingenuity was expended, not in telling exactly what Rome was—what she really did believe; but in keeping back the points on which she had been charged before the world with heresy and corruption. We have, therefore, in her decrees, the very best glosses which all her talent, learning and wily policy could produce in a seven years' labour. And, after all, here is fundamental heresy, a rejection of *the vital doctrine*, without true faith in which, no sinner can be saved. More than thirty years of controversy had transpired on this leading doctrine;

can it then be believed, three hundred years afterward, that the Reformers misunderstood Rome! Were Zuingle and Luther, and Estaples, and Melancthon, and Calvin, indeed so dull as not to discover what Rome did really mean!! Or were they so uncharitable as to rend the church on a feigned issue? Are those who now set up a nice distinction between justification *ex opere operato*, and sanctification, and plead for Rome an abatement of condemnation, on the ground of her slight mistake in confounding the two—are these brethren prepared to table either of these charges against the Reformers? Is it indeed so? Did it remain for the learned divines of the nineteenth century, to make the most astounding discovery, that the Reformation sprang, not from fundamental error in Rome, as its occasion, but only from a slight philological inaccuracy of the Romish doctors, whereby they com-

mingled *works* after justification with the grace of justification; and so led the Reformers to misunderstand them as affirming works to be partly the grounds of man's acceptance as righteous in the sight of God? If this be so, what then? What does common sense and common honesty dictate to these Reformers? Why, certainly, apologize for the philological mistake, and return with suitable tokens of sorrow, to the arms of holy mother. It is not too late yet to correct the error, make the *amende honorable* and restore the church to its unity and catholicity. Let there be no more time lost, Brethren; let us all haste away by car and steamer to fair Italy, and lay our submissions at the feet of the pope and holy Mary, ever virgin!

These two are the most important items in Rome's apostacy, and having stated them in the foreground of my proof, I am shut up to the necessity of

great brevity in regard to the others, and also to the impolicy of an anti-climax as to order.

3. The visible Church of Rome rejects the doctrine of *one Mediator* between God and man. She insists, professedly and practically, upon a great multitude of mediators and intercessors. All the saints—by which term she means, those whom she has elevated to saintship; that is, in real truth, to the state of demi-gods—all the saints, but especially Mary, are authorized advocates with the Lord, to plead for mortals here below, and through them sinners are encouraged to approach God. So fully and completely has she carried out this idea, that Christ, appointed of God the Father as the only Mediator, is virtually supplanted and his office practically abrogated.

4. Rome rejects the one atonement of Christ. Paul assures us, that “Christ

was once offered to bear the sins of many"—“now once hath he appeared to put away sin, by the sacrifice of himself”—“by one offering he hath perfected for ever all them that are sanctified.” And he argues most conclusively from the repetition of the typical sacrifices, to prove their essential defect and utter inefficiency to take away sin. But Rome teaches, holds and believes, and anathematizes every man who does not believe, that in every celebration of mass, a real and true sacrifice is offered up for sin. Thus, Christ’s sufficiency as the great atoning sacrifice is denied.

5. The doctrine of transubstantiation is blasphemy. The priest—often a polluted, drunken wretch—by his prayers and mutterings and manipulations, converts the bread and wine into the real body and blood and bones and divinity of Christ.

6. Nearly allied to this, is the idola-

try of Rome. This bread and wine, now no longer bread and wine, is the object of religious veneration and worship. Let it not be said, it is not the bread and wine, but the divinity they adore, under the appearance of bread and wine. The same may be apologized for the worship of Apis, of Dagon, of Baal, of Juggernaut. Their votaries are equally advocated in this plea. But God condemns it as idolatry. "These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." Aaron and the Israelites worshipped God in the calf; but did Moses and God sustain their plea? "Oh! this people have sinned a great sin; and have made them gods of gold" — "And the Lord plagued the people, because they made the calf which Aaron made" — "and there fell of the people that day about three thousand men."

The idols of the Romish worship

are numberless: from the old pagan statue of Jupiter, now worshipped at Rome as St. Peter, to the paintings of the Virgin and other saints, and the crucifixes and beads on which a foul priest has daubed his spittle. These aids to devotion are all forbidden in the fourth commandment—"thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them." This condemnation is obviously the reason why Rome rejects the fourth commandment out of the decalogue.

7. Rome has corrupted and destroyed both the sacraments. That of the supper, as we have just seen, by its blasphemy and idolatry. Moreover, according to them, it is not bread at all that is eaten, nor wine that is drunken: and the withholding of the cup from the people is a radical perversion.

The other sacrament they reject by corrupt additions. Baptism, with them, is not a washing with water in the

name of Christ or the Trinity, but a smearing of the person with a filthy mixture of water, oil, salt, spittle, and I know not what. Such mixture is not water, no more than whiskey is. Would a baptism with whiskey be accounted Christian baptism? Should a member of a cold water society be accused of violating his pledge; and should he put in the plea, that he drank cold water, but it had indeed a little brandy in it, would the plea be sustained? Water with spittle, salt and oil in it, is not water; no more than water saturated with arsenic, is water. This corruption, together with the administration by laics and women, vitiates the ordinance.

8. Take, in this connexion also, the superaddition of five sacraments; viz. confirmation, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony. These are made necessary to salvation, though not all necessary to every person. "Si

quis dixerit," &c., says the decree; i. e. "Whosoever shall affirm, that grace is not confirmed by the sacraments of the new law, by the work wrought—(ex opere operato) but that faith alone in the divine promise is sufficient for obtaining grace, let him be accursed."

Thus, belief in the infallible promise of God for salvation, is anathematized by Rome; and reliance upon her self-established sacraments, from one of which her own clergy are excluded, is made the ground of salvation.

But we cannot run farther into detail, in this direction. Time flies. We have grouped these last six items of destructive heresy together, by little more than a simple enumeration, and must pass on, after we note an attempt to ward off these blows.

It has been alleged, that there is a way of explaining many or all of them, without involving real heresy. *Ex gr.* The idolatry of the host or consecrated

wafer, the picture, the image, the crucifix, is abated, by the assertion, that Christ in the wafer, and not the wafer itself, is adored; and that the Virgin and other saints are not adored as mediators or as God, with a religious veneration.

Again, these additional sacraments and mediators do not necessarily amount to a rejection of the true. That after all, Rome professes the true religion, holds the true sacraments, worships the true God in a Trinity; whatever more she may hold, profess and worship—that she is an organized society, has government, discipline, &c., &c.

This, for substance, has been anticipated above, and is the same which Turretine takes up in his treatise *De necessaria secessione*, p. 27. “Quid enim juvat retinere,” &c., i. e. “For what advantage is there in retaining them, if along with them you join destructive corruptions, (corruptelas exi-

tiales) by which they are perverted? What will it profit the adultress to proclaim, that she has a man for her own legitimate husband, to whom she has been united in marriage, if she receives the adulterer into her bosom, and pollutes the sanctity of the marriage-bed? Is she therefore to be esteemed less guilty of the crime, when it is evident that her protestation is contrary to fact? It is therefore one thing *to profess merely with the mouth*, another *to believe in the heart*; to retain the name is one thing, to acknowledge the very substance and mystery, is another. Grant that they *profess* Christ, and constantly thrust his name forward; but that they sincerely receive him, and truly adhere to him, we deny; because, whilst proclaiming his glory in words, they deny him in very deed, whilst they divide between themselves and him the work of salvation."

We repeat it—To add poison to the

children's bread and furnish them with a full supply, is not to feed them. There can be no salvation in such a church, if by *in such a church*, be meant, *in the belief of her doctrines*. The incantations of the great sorceress are not the bread and the water of life. He that believes Rome's doctrines must go with her to perdition. She is essentially, radically, and hopelessly apostate.

9. The visible church of Rome is the Babylon of the Apocalypse, the Antichrist of John, and the Man of Sin of Paul.

For proof of the first, let us look into the context. Mark her location. She sits upon seven hills; that is, the seat of her power is the Roman city. "The woman which thou sawest is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth." Let all history be ransacked, and you will not find the semblance of such a power, but this one.

Bellarmino and other Romanists admit it; for they deem its admission a necessary part of their argument to prove that Peter was Bishop of Rome. In his first epistle he says,—“the church that is at Babylon saluteth you.” This is one of the pillars of the pope’s throne; for, say they, it proves that Peter was Bishop of Rome. Yet it does not refer to Rome Christian, but Rome pagan. Peter calls Rome Babylon, because she, in his day, persecuted the Church, as ancient Babylon did the Jews.

We take the admission, but reject the exposition. For the chronology of the prophecy renders it impossible that the place and the power should be Rome pagan. The scarlet coloured woman of the preceding chapter—whose name is Mystery, Babylon, &c., springs up and co-exists along with the ten horns of the beast—i. e. after the western empire is divided into ten

kingdoms: and in v. 16, we are assured, that "they shall hate her and make her desolate—and burn her with fire." These ten kingdoms are to survive Mystery, Babylon; whereas, the pagan Babylon had passed away thirteen centuries before the era of these events.

Then again, there is no power known to history which at all meets the other characteristics of this Babylon. Where shall we find, since the rise of the ten kingdoms, any other vast menagerie of demons but Papal Rome? What kingdom, what great society, power, or church, has been and is, characterized by demonology—the worship of the souls of departed patriots, heroes, saints? The whole three hundred and sixty-five days of the calender are appropriated to saint or demon worship. The records of the whole world contain not another example of the kind.

And where is the church that has a prison—phulake—for foul spirits—polluted, filthy, and lazy monks? Where, but in papal Babylon, can you find a cage—phulake—a prison for every unclean and hateful bird? Is not this a most graphic description of the popish nunneries? This word, translated *hold* and *cage*—for it is the same in both places—occurs forty-seven times in the New Testament, and thirty-eight times it is truly and correctly translated, prison; and it presents us with a glance at the moral pollutions of Babylon. The celibacy of the clergy, made nunneries necessary. Without both these agencies, Diabolus, with all his powers and malignity, could not, in so short a time, have so horribly corrupted the mass of human society. This is the chef-d'œuvre of the arch-fiend. To St. Peter's chair must the eye be turned, if a man will truly answer the question—“where, in all history, do you find the

most perfect example of human wickedness?" Hell could disgorge nothing so unlike heaven, as Pope Alexander VI. And even when the individual is a good man, the cardinals, bishops, and priests are so fearfully depraved, as to outdo Pandemonium in wickedness: and so it continues up to this present. In Protestant countries they are under check; although perhaps two-thirds of all that are hung for murder in the United States are Romanists. Yet, even in Italy there is some restraint on corruption now, by the presence of Protestant strangers. But what says Kirwan in his late excellent letters, addressed to Chief Justice Taney, a Romanist. Hear him speaking what he saw and heard. On p. 30, "It is no more a church of God than is St. Peter's a temple for his true worship." P. 34—"Romanism, then, is a system of policy, formed to sustain and extend its power, and by means which we

now state to you. Can it be a, or the church of God?" And p. 64—"Popery adopts from Pagan mythology this very principle, and in its pilgrimages and penances, we have an exact counterpart of those of the heathen in ancient and modern times. Are you not beginning to see, that Romanism is far more Pagan than Christian; that it bears a nearer resemblance to the teachings of the Shaster than to those of the Holy Scriptures?" And p. 71, speaking of the Pantheon, he shows the change from Pagan divinities to the Christian idols—that the change is only in name, the idolatry is as base. "I assure you, sir, that I regarded the dirty and clumsy priests I saw there more as the priests of Jupiter than of Jesus, and the persons I saw worship there more as Pagans than as Christians." And p. 89—"Popery, therefore, is little less than Paganism extended." And p. 139—"Romanism is

not Christianity; and its ministers, whatever they may be, are not ministers of Christ, nor of his glorious gospel. If this conclusion is just, another immediately follows, *neither is its worship the worship of God.*" And p. 259, "Romanism is heathenism extended, and its priests are no more Christian ministers than were the priests of Jupiter." And p. 162. On her idolatry, he shows that Mary is their great goddess; they call her "the Mother of God;" "Advocate of sinners;" "Refuge of sinners;" Gate of heaven;" "Most faithful;" "Most merciful." And in the psalter of David, as reformed by Bonaventura, we find this sentence, "Come unto Mary, all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and she shall refresh your souls." "Why, sir, while Mary is in the mouth of every body, the common people do not know enough about Jesus Christ even to swear by him. Mary is to the Romans

what Diana was to the Ephesians. Rome is a city given to idolatry." And then, as to morals, p. 167—"You have priests here, too," said I to an intelligent Italian at Civita Vecchia. "Plenty," said he, with excited emphasis, and gritting his teeth. "What good do they do you?" asked I. "Much good," he replied, with a scornful toss of the head; "they eat up a man's own property—they suck his own blood—and they go with his own wife." And a little before, p. 164—"Perhaps you may not know, sir, that it is quite a common occurrence for the popes to leave behind them many 'nephews' and 'neices,' the names by which their illegitimate offspring are designated. But so it is. Their progeny are not counted by units. And the example set by pontiffs, the cardinals and priests are not slow to copy."

Now the world knows, that the abominations, of which these are only

faint and imperfect sketches, cannot be openly spoken of; they cannot even be printed with decency. The very ink blushes and shrinks back from the darkness of their pollution. The public ear is so refined and chaste, that the consecrated language of God's book, describing these more than bestial pollutions, dare not be read from the pulpit. There is a depth of crime, filth and iniquity, to which language refuses to descend. This depth is found in Rome. "For all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her." Is it then any wonder that another voice from heaven was heard, saying, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partaker of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues: for her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities."

Surely Rome is Babylon—the Mother of harlots.

She is also Antichrist. This term John (1 Epis. ii.) applies first in its generic sense—"there are many Antichrists"—many opposers of Christ. But he refers to some one as *the* Antichrist—some agency pre-eminently distinguished for its energy and power in resisting Christ and destroying his works. This power was to rise up in the last time, or gospel dispensation. But none has yet appeared, which may at all compare with the Church of Rome, in successful opposition to the true religion, and in its power and efficiency in destroying the works of Christ. Hence the conclusion, that this must be the power intended.

Rome is also the Man of Sin, mentioned in 2 Thess. chap. ii. We have space for only a few brief notes, and in them shall state the generally received

exposition. (1) The day of Christ, whose approach was the occasion of deep anxiety to the Thessalonians, was the day of Christ's second advent to the judgment. Your fears as to this are groundless. For (2) there is a chain of prophecy which plainly points out great and sore, and long continued calamity to the true Church, before the final day shall come. (3) But preceding this protracted calamity, as cause, there must be a fearful apostacy from God and his truth; which is to introduce and generate a terrible, destructive power, which will tyrannize over the church, and persecute the true worshippers of God, and wear out, as Daniel says, the saints of the Most High. (4) This destructive power, once professed the true religion, which was necessary as antecedent to apostacy. (5) The spirit of evil toward its production, was even then at work, as John says of the many antichrists of

his day; but was hindered from full development by a counteracting influence—viz. the civil power of the empire; and not until that power shall be divided, and thus broken, can this secretly working apostacy reveal itself and arrogate supremacy. (6) This power is a blasphemer—claims divine honours and usurps divine prerogatives in the church, and over the nations. (7) It is further characterized by great pretensions to mystery and lying wonders, for purposes of deception.

Now, the apostate, persecuting, blasphemous, deceitful, impudent, polluted power here set forth, cannot be Pagan Rome; for apostatize it never could, and in the church it did not spring up.

The Jews, as contradistinguished from the Christian church, it could not be. Whitby's attempt to establish this is an utter failure. For the Jews never acquired such influence in the ecclesiastical or civil world, as is here

described. Their temple was very soon destroyed, their worship abolished, their control never became great. They destroyed in hostile bands much life ; but not the lives of Christians particularly. They never became an organized, systematic, permanent power.

There is no other but the true alternative ; this Man of Sin is apostate Rome. After the breaking of the imperial power, and *pari passu* with the division of the western empire, this little horn of Daniel's fourth beast—this wilful king, "who shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god—neither shall he regard the God of his fathers, nor the desire of women"—gradually developed himself, and stood without cloak or cover, the most gigantic despot the world ever beheld. All his characteristics are found in the Roman, apostate Church, and in no other power presented on the page of history. This, therefore, we again conclude, is

Babylon, Antichrist, and the Man of Sin.

But it is objected by some Protestant expositors, that this power rises up in the church, and sitteth in the temple; and therefore, cannot itself be the visible Church of Rome, for how could she rise up within herself, and sit within herself, and claim worship and adulation of herself? Hence they infer, this Man of Sin, this Antichrist, is a power distinct from the Church. The Church of Rome must continue a true—(meaning a *real*)—Church, or then there can be no Man of Sin. If you deny him a habitation, you deny him an existence.

From the frequency with which this objection or argument is adduced, and the apparent confidence, we presume it is relied on as a strong tower of defence. Turretine, after all his masterly demonstration of Rome's apostacy, seems evidently confounded by it, and staggers backward under the blow: he,

at least, seems to agree with Princeton. But whilst this fact commands caution, it does not forbid discussion; for we believe truth may be discovered.

Let it be remembered, we have defined apostacy to be *departure from fundamental truth*, or the *reception of soul-destroying error*: and we have shown that apostacy is possible. In these two points, the present litigants are agreed.

I should like to settle another preliminary with our friends, before we proceed to the argument: viz.—May a Church be properly called *apostate*, whilst yet one, two—a small number of members—do hold all the saving truths of the gospel and no soul-destroying errors, and whilst the great mass of the controlling power has gone off the foundation?

If this be answered negatively, then, it seems to me, that the second concession just above named, is retracted:

and it is impossible for a church to apostatize, or, at least, for any one to affirm the fact. • If it be answered affirmatively, the argument need not long detain us. “A church is an organized society.” Now, how is the sentiment of a society to be ascertained? How can it be known whether this society holds all fundamental doctrines? Certainly, by asking them. How can I ask a society its opinions? And how can it answer? Can no answer be given without absolute unanimity? Must every individual member be present and vote, before the society can be said to answer? Or if nine-tenths of its members reject a fundamental doctrine, and crush down the remaining tenth, and drive them into a corner, and rule over and overrule them, is the society heretical? We fall back here, upon a fundamental law of association; viz. that a majority is the body—that the moral character and the legitimate acts

of a body are determined and may be known, by the character and action of a majority, which may vary between a proportion of its individuals over one-half, and under an absolute universality. Abandon this, and societies can rarely have a character and act at all.

With our definition of apostacy, and the admission of its possibility, and that the knowledge of this possibility having become a reality, is derivable and derived from the character and action of the great majority of its members, let us proceed.

My next remark is, that apostacy must have a beginning. And is not this self-evident? An apostate church is possible only in the case of its having been a true church. The mass cannot be galvanized instantaneously into corruption. Error springs up and gains dominion in some one mind—it is communicated to another and another—the leaven spreads, slowly, silently, yet ef-

fectively, until the people in mass become radically unsound, and renounce the truth—less or more openly—but renounce it. The gangrene starts from a small spot—it creeps over the system—slowly it reaches the vitals—and death ensues. If the start-point be near the seat of life, on the breast, the eating gangrene or cancer suppresses life before the extremities are corroded. Now, manifestly, the start-point is a question of little consequence, when the whole body is diseased. Whether heresy begins with the bishops, the seculars, the people, or the popes, if it becomes all-pervading, the Church is apostate.

As little concerned are we on the question of *time*, as of *place*. When did a fatal error first appear? or when did it so pervade the mass, that it might then be pronounced apostate? This is the question which our brethren delight to press upon us—it is their sally-port, which they suppose to be protect-

ed by an impregnable crown work. But we anticipate the fusee, snatch it away, and throw back their own shell. We ask, when did the ten tribes apostatize? At what precise hour did the Jewish Church become apostate? When did the Church in which John Calvin ministered so gloriously, become apostate? When did the body of the Jewish people cease to be branches of the olive tree?—(see Rom. xi.) Can the blight of infidelity not strike a branch of the good olive tree, so that it shall wither and die and drop off, whilst yet the tree lives and other branches flourish? This we insist is the very thing which did occur. The olive tree is the visible church: not the Jewish people, but the visible Church of Christ. The seed of Abraham, as to the flesh, were embraced in it; Ishmael's branch fell off—Jeroboam's apostacy carried off the ten tribes. Still the visible church remained—the olive tree stood.

Most of the Jewish branches in the apostolic age, were broken off, and simultaneously many Gentile branches were grafted upon the stock among the remaining Jewish branches. The identity of the tree is not disturbed. The sap (true doctrines) which kept up the functions of life in them, left the dying branches, and passed into the living, and to the formation of new ones; and so Israel after the flesh apostatized, but Israel according to the Spirit, still lives. So, exactly, of the Church of Rome. A true church visible she once was. *The* visible church she never was; but only one of its numerous branches. The *catholic* church she never was; the very name is a gross and deceitful falsehood. The church visible at Jerusalem, and others of Asia; the church at Alexandria, and others in Africa; the church at Corinth, and others in Greece; the churches in Northern Italy; the church at Lyons, and others in

France; the numerous churches of Britain and of Ireland—all equally with that at Rome, contained all the essential elements of true visible churches: which elements, Calvin has demonstrated against the Papists to be *the ministry*—or officers; the *word*—or doctrines of salvation; and the *sacraments*. Rome attempted, it is true, and with partial success, to reduce all to her dominion, so as to have but one visible organization. This attempt—the assumption of the name *catholic* by Boniface III., Bishop of Rome, upon the appointment of the Emperor Phocas, in 606—made Rome Antichrist; as Gregory the Great, predecessor of Boniface, charged upon John, Bishop of Constantinople, for the same assumption: “I speak it confidently,” says he, “that whosoever calleth himself universal bishop, or desireth to be called, in the pride of heart, he doth forerun Antichrist.” (Newton’s *Disser.* XXII.)

Rome never was catholic; she was a true visible church—one of the branches of the olive tree ecclesiastic. She, like many others, apostatized—rejected truth after truth, as had done the true visible church under the Mosaic institutions. Still, however, she held to the outward forms, the organization, the name of a church; whilst some of the others, as that at Jerusalem, in Egypt and Northern Africa, lost both form and thing and name; and the people composing them melted away, and were lost in the mass of their Saracenic conquerors. Now, if our brethren will inform us the precise time when these apostacies occurred, they may perplex us with this great difficulty of dates; till then, we deny their right to hurl this harmless ball at our heads.

But again, as the chief use of logic is to detect fallacy, let us give this argument another turn. The life and power

of it lies just here—"The Man of Sin" springs up in the Church, therefore, the Romish Hierarchy, and not the church itself in which the Hierarchy exists, must be the Antichrist—the Man of Sin. For if the visible Church of Rome itself be "the Man of sin," and became such by apostacy, then "the Man of Sin" is no longer within the church—there is no longer a visible church around him. Do not they assume that there is no visible church but Rome? And is not this *petitio principii* the very life of their argument? Deny this gratuitous and false assumption, and where is the argument? Rome has apostatized, this branch of the olive tree is broken off by unbelief—there she is, a dead and rotten branch; but lo! other branches, very numerous, remain all around, alive and flourishing; whilst there stands the apostate Man of Sin amidst the churches. A misnomer, we admit it

is, to call her a visible church, whilst she stands revealed a synagogue of Satan.

But there is another slip in the logic here. The fallacy of division is not of unfrequent occurrence. The defence for the accused takes up the testimony *seriatim*. Here is the testimony of A. Does this prove that my client committed the crime of murder? Certainly not. All that you can admit, is, that a man was found dead and a bloody knife lay near him.—Now let us proceed, Gentlemen of the jury, (to witness B.) Does he prove murder upon us? Not at all. The whole front of our offending, according to witness B., is that six months ago, we bought a knife out of his store, and that this bloody knife he believes to be the same. Must my client hang for the mighty crime of buying a knife out of his store? Is there here proof of murder? Well, what does Mr. C.

say? Why simply, that he saw the accused going in the direction where the dead man was found, on the evening before. And what of that? Must a man be executed for travelling on the public highway in the twilight? And thus he proceeds through all the testimony, and finds not a single witness to prove the fact of murder. All the witnesses, taken *distributively*, utterly fail of proof, and he claims the verdict.

But next comes the prosecution, and with a different logic. He admits that no one witness proves the murder; he did not introduce one for that purpose. Each however proves a certain fact, bearing relations to other facts proved by other witnesses. He takes the witnesses *conjointly*. He gathers up the small cords of testimony, and combines these numerous strands, all of which, *taken separately*, would fail to support the body, and twists them into

one rope, with which he hangs him by the neck until he is dead.

The defendants' attorney is the advocate of Rome. The pope, says he, is not the Antichrist—the Man of Sin—the apostate church; there is no proof of it. Well, I admit he is not. He proceeds—The cardinals are not the Man of Sin. Agreed. The bishops are not Antichrist. To this, too, I agree. The priests are not the Son of perdition—and so of the monks, the nuns, the laity. Here I agree to the negations all in the detail—taken *distributively*; and yet I contend that the same pope, cardinals, &c., taken *conjointly*, do constitute the grand apostacy. These strands, united into one cord—these links of evidence combined into one chain, bind the monster for perdition.

I am aware of but two other buttresses to this tower of defence. One is the alleged fact, that there may be

true believers, lingering in Sodom—who have not obeyed the divine command, “Come out of her, my people.” Admit this, and what then? Was Sodom a true visible church, because Lot lived in it? Will any man maintain, that there are no members of the true church invisible—no true believers outside of the visible church? This is indeed Rome’s doctrine—there is no salvation out of the church. This is true, if you mean the church *invisible*. It is false, if you mean the Church of Rome, or any other visible church, or all visible churches together. Who believes that no converted Hindoo, Chinese, or African has died and gone to glory, before he was admitted into visible membership, by profession and baptism? Any body but Rome? Who, in all the world, believes that all infants dying in pagan lands go to hell? Is profession—outward, visible profession—necessary to salvation? Is

baptism?—Visible baptism? Baptism with the Holy Ghost, is, indeed, indispensable to salvation. But this does not make the person a member of the visible, but only of the invisible church.

Now, on our hypothesis, that the Romish Church is not a Christian but a heathen society—or, as our confession says, “a synagogue of Satan”—is it not intuitively demonstrated, that a converted man, yet within her pale, and his dying infant, stand in the same identical relation to the visible church, in which the converted Chinese and his dying infant do? Stand away from beneath this buttress.

The other, is the question of time—*when* did Rome become apostate? This I have inadvertently answered already; and shall only add the two counter questions—Cannot a man give abundant evidence of his being alive in Christ without being able to tell the precise time of his regeneration? Can

you not have full evidence of a man's being dead, without being able to tell the exact day of his death? Is this Egyptian mummy dead? When did it die?

But the end draws nigh; let us recapitulate. In proof of Rome's apostacy, we have shown, as we fondly trust,

1. That the visible Church of Rome has gone off the foundations of Holy Scripture—she rejects the Bible as the only infallible rule of faith and manners.

2. That she rejects the fundamental doctrine of justification by faith in the imputed righteousness of Christ.

3. That she denies, in theory and practice, the one Mediator between God and man—the man Christ Jesus.

4. That she renounces the sacrifice of the Son of God, as the all-sufficient and only atonement for the sins of lost men.

5. That she blasphemés God in the doctrine of transubstantiation.

6. That she is guilty of habitual idolatry in worshipping the wafer, the pictures and images of Christ, the virgin and other saints, crucifixes, relicts, &c., &c.

7. That she rejects, by corrupting, both the sacraments of the New Testament.

8. That she destroys these sacraments also, by the addition of five of her own invention, and by making them necessary to salvation.

9. That she is the Babylon of the Apocalypse; the Antichrist of John; and the Man of Sin and Son of perdition of Paul.

10. That there is not now on earth, and never has been, any power, association, or church, but the visible Church of Rome; that, for despotic and persecuting malignity; for depth of moral turpitude; and for ineffable spiritual

abominations, can at all compare with the execrable characteristics of the Babylon of our text.

Having thus proved our minor premiss, viz. "That the Church of Rome" renounces fundamental, and that she insists on the belief of soul-destroying doctrine; we are entitled by the eternal rules of reasoning to our conclusion; viz. that "The visible Church of Rome is an apostate visible church."

But this conclusion of our second syllogism, is the minor premiss of our first: which having been thus established, entitles us incontrovertibly to our grand conclusion, viz. "THE VISIBLE CHURCH OF ROME IS NOT A TRUE VISIBLE CHURCH OF CHRIST."

In full view of this conclusion, what is our duty?

1. We ought to direct our efforts towards the destruction of this false apostate; and not towards her reformation. She is never to be reformed.

Her own doctrine of infallibility, precludes this, infallibly and for ever. Equally peremptory is its preclusion, by the word of God. She is to be destroyed. "Reward her," is God's commission to his true Church, "even as she rewardeth you; and double unto her double according to her works; in the cup which she hath filled, fill to her double. Her plagues shall come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine, and she shall be utterly burned with fire."

Nor does all this necessarily imply the destruction eternal, of the persons—the individuals; but of the organization, the system, the church. The persons deluded by her, we are bound, by all the means in our power to save from ruin, by saving them *from* Rome, not *in* Rome.

2. And this calls up my second remark. The Church of Rome covers much territory, which is therefore mis-

sionary ground, to be occupied by the true Church, just as she occupies other heathen territory. And is not this deduction the very doctrine on which we are practising? What are Protestants aiming at, in Romish countries? At reforming that church, or at saving souls out of it? This work goes on bravely in France, in Britain, in Ireland, in the United States. Though here we are by no means up to the line of duty. Much more might be done, and therefore ought to be done, toward presenting gospel truth before the minds of that large and labouring population, who are still under the delusions of Rome. Or, to present another phase :

3. We learn the duty of kindly treatment of these our deluded neighbours—the worshippers of the virgin, the image and the crucifix. No people in the world have such favourable opportunities for rescuing from ignorance

and vice and eternal ruin, these unhappy people, as the Americans. Manifestly, God designs this to be *the missionary* nation. Ours, pre-eminently it is, to send out the glad tidings. And that it might be so, He sends in the heathen among us. Africa, Ireland, China, have poured in their tens of thousands. What is God's purpose in this? Manifestly, that we may Christianize, and civilize, and send them back to perform this heavenly work among the millions of their father-lands respectively. Thus, the paganism of Irish Rome, of China, of Africa, are doomed to die on our peaceful shores. Already, more than three millions of Afric's sable sons have here quaffed the waters of life, and have begun to flow back upon the scores of millions of their father-land. This is *the problem* of this problematic age; the finger of God is demonstrating it upon the broadest pages in the books

of his providence—This, the sublimest mystery in the Apocalypse of the nineteenth century.

About an equal number, of the equally degraded victims of the Man of Sin, have here been rescued, partially at least, from the despotism of the priests and of Rome. This work is however but begun, and on, it will go. As the Christianized African goes out, with the lamp of life in his hand, the heathenized Irishman comes in with the wax-candle of popery in his. This soon burns out and is replaced by the candle of the Lord, which is the light of the world. We defy the powers of Rome, Austria, and Diabolus, to keep away the Bible from the cottage of the Americanized Irishman.

4. Once more. Let us, notwithstanding all this, not suppose that the grand apostate power is to perish by this process only. All the language—or at least a great proportion of

the language of the Bible on this subject, implies destruction by violent means. It is impossible to apply the laws of exegesis to the sacred text, without reaching this painful result.

“Rome shall perish; write that word,
In the blood that she has spilt;
Perish hopeless, and abhorred,
Deep in ruin as in guilt.”

Nor can I believe the predictions of God on her ruin, will ever be accomplished, but in view of the ample folds of the stars and stripes, and within the booming range of the American artillery. To me, there appears no other way of accounting, philosophically, for the lingering, if it be not the increasing, among us, of the war spirit, so intrinsically hostile in its nature to the genius of free governments. But on this hypothesis, that American steel is destined of God, to pierce the heart of the gigantic despot, we can see a reason why the King of Zion and the

Prince of Peace, permits the science of bloodshedding to be studied in our schools; and the vulture spirit of demon war to hover over our Legislative Halls.

On the other hand, if, after all, our conclusion is wrong—if there still lurks in our logic a fallacy, which our best researches have failed to detect and drag forth—if the Protestants have been up to this day in a sad mistake—if Rome never did deny fundamental truth, or insist upon the belief of soul-destroying error:—if she has never corrupted the sacraments into diabolical incantations:—if she has not rejected the Bible as the only rule of faith:—if she is not guilty of horrible idolatry and blasphemy:—if she is not apostate from God and his Gospel:—if she is not Antichrist, the Man of Sin, Mystery, Babylon the Great, the scarlet courtesan, the Mother of abominations:—if she is not doomed to be the object of

God's most terrific judgments and desolating vengeance:—then what?

I answer, then, 1st. She is the Bride, the Lamb's wife; and all that is necessary for her full preparation for the marriage festivities, is, that she undergo a brief period of purification, and adorn herself anew with the ornaments which He has bestowed. Reformation of abuses is all that ought to be looked for, and aimed at. Her offences not having amounted to adultery, she has not been divorced, and may not therefore be led forth and "stoned with stones till she die!" Therefore, 2dly. All Protestants are unkind and cruel children; they have shamefully maltreated their mother, and forsaken their own proper home. Instead of throwing the mantle of charity over the frailties of their dishonoured parent, they have trumpeted her shame, hated her, and made her desolate and naked. Again, therefore,

3d. It is the duty of all those erring children, to return with shame and sorrow to their deeply injured mother; to recognize Rome as a true church of Christ; to open the doors of their communion to all her members; to enter her mass-houses, as Christian temples; and, thus to restore the unity of the church. Our standing aloof is the continuance of the sin of schism. And though it may not be expedient or necessary to constitute an organic union with her—though, that she will demand, as a conditional evidence of our sincere sorrow for the schism—yet, it is clearly wrong for us to break communion with her.

Rome sees this; and with fond longing in her parental bosom, exults over it, and seems eagerly preparing seats near the pope's feet for Oxfordites, Nevinites, &c., &c. Let them hasten to New York. Perhaps they may be received into favour, and may

obtain a sight, or even a touch, of the Pallium, made of holy wool, clipped by holy hands off holy sheep, and spun on a holy wheel, and woven on a holy loom, by holy nuns.

Such is the other alternative, and to our poor eyes it does appear inevitable, if our position is not proved. But if it is demonstrated—Rome is apostate—if she has upon her forehead the name written “Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of harlots and abominations of the earth,” she is not the Bride, the Lamb’s wife—the mother of a holy seed—but is drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus. The Protestants are not schismatics in breaking and refusing communion with her; but are true churches of God, and bound to come out of her, and at her destruction to be exceeding glad. “Rejoice over her, thou heaven, and ye holy apostles and prophets, for God hath avenged you on

her. And a mighty angel took up a stone, like a great mill-stone, and cast it into the sea, saying, Thus, with violence, shall that great city Babylon be thrown down, and be found no more at all." Amen, so let it be.

THE END.

2 AU 53

VALUABLE BOOKS

PUBLISHED BY

WILLIAM S. MARTIEN.

A HISTORY OF THE ISRAELITISH NATION.

A HISTORY OF THE ISRAELITISH NATION, from their Origin to their Dispersion at the Destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. By the late Archibald Alexander, D.D. 8vo.

By the same Author.

A HISTORY OF COLONIZATION ON THE WESTERN COAST OF AFRICA. Second edition. 8vo.

SCOTT'S COMMENTARY.

QUARTO EDITION.

A COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY BIBLE, containing the Old and New Testaments, according to the authorized version, with Explanatory Notes, Practical Observations, and copious Marginal References. Arranged for Family and Private Reading, and adapted to the wants of Sabbath-school Teachers and Bible Classes. By Thomas Scott, D. D. In five volumes, quarto, from the last London edition, with the author's Final Corrections and Additions. To which are added a Concordance, numerous useful Tables, and a Family Record.

The admirable arrangement and superior character of this Commentary are too well known and admitted to require any commendation, but attention may be called to this edition of the work as being more desirable, in many respects, than any other now published. The type is large, clear, and bold, the

paper white, and the binding neat and durable. Its value has been enhanced by the addition of a Concordance, Family Record, Psalms in Metre, and numerous useful Tables, rendering it altogether the best Family Commentary that is published.

A MOST ATTRACTIVE BOOK FOR THE YOUNG.

ROBERT AND HAROLD;

OR THE

YOUNG MAROONERS ON THE FLORIDA COAST.

By F. R. Goulding. With fine Engravings.

This book of adventures on the Florida coast, will suit readers *all along shore*. It is a capital production. The writer understands pen and pencil; knows how to tell a good story, and sketch incidents exceedingly well. The book is Robinson Crusoe-like. Indeed, it is much more instructive than that famous narrative, whilst its adventures are scarcely less exciting. The peculiarity of the book is, that with all its incidents it communicates the knowledge of many interesting *facts in nature*, and of many *expedients* in practical life. The moral tone is religious throughout. We have never read a story got up on a more unexceptional plan. By the bye, the incidents are founded in real life, and not in fiction. The fiction consists in putting the facts together. Mr. Goulding is entitled to a vote of thanks from the rising generation for this spiritual contribution to their reading.—*Presbyterian Magazine*.

This is a charming Story for Youth, The Young Marooners are children, who, while in a boat in Tampa Bay, are carried out to sea by a fish that seizes their cable, and after much anxiety succeeded in reaching an uninhabited island, where they go through many strange adventures. The author's object is to instruct young people in regard to natural history, and to teach a lesson of self-dependence. He succeeds in his purpose admirably, and at the same time furnishes one of the most delightful stories of the Robinson Crusoe stamp that we have seen for years.—*Evening Bulletin*.

There is in this little volume for the young, a singular

bleeding of fact with fiction, of curious and useful information with exciting adventure; such as almost tempts us to set it apart as a new species of juvenile literature. The adventures of the Young Marooners are nearly as wild and exciting as Robinson Crusoe; and yet we understand the author to say they are substantially true. The incidents of the story are adroitly arranged to bring into view a great variety of curious information, much of which is as useful as it is novel and stirring. Without, for example, once suspecting any such-utilitarian or unromantic design, the young reader is led by the interest of the story, to master the best methods of treating an animal struck with lightning, or securing the accidental wound of an artery, and other such like things; to say nothing of the knowledge of geographical localities, and the curious habits and instincts of animals. Altogether we do not hesitate to say that it is a remarkable little book; and will undoubtedly become a great favourite with the young, as it well deserves the confidence and favour of parents.—*Biblical Repertory.*

CHAPTERS

ON THE SHORTER CATECHISM.

A Tale for the Instruction of Youth. By a Clergyman's Daughter. Second edition. 12mo.

The writer has made what we consider a successful attempt to render attractive that deservedly popular manual, the Assembly's Shorter Catechism. No young person can peruse the work without amusement and instruction; indeed, it is calculated to please and edify at any age.—*Glasgow Constitutional.*

The volume only requires to be known to become a favourite in every family. Parents, Sunday-school teachers, and every one interested in the young, will receive hints which will be of great service to them.—*Montrose Standard.*

The work would form excellent reading in the family on Sabbath evenings, as its pages would not only interest young people, but impress on their memories the important truths taught in the Shorter Catechism.—*Greenock Advertiser.*

This is an admirable book for the family circle. The tale, or rather the various tales it comprises, very happily illustrate the doctrines taught in that excellent manual the Assembly's Catechism.—*Christian Observer.*

NOTES FOR TEACHERS.

NOTES FOR TEACHERS; being a series of Scripture Lessons for Sabbath Schools, with Notes on the Shorter Catechism. 18mo.

This series of Notes of Lessons proposes to give a complete course of instruction in Old and New Testament History and Scripture doctrine, extending through a course of three years. In that time the children will have gone over all the chief incidents of gospel History, the Acts of the Apostles, the Shorter Catechism and a portion of the Old Testament History. The selections from both Old and New Testament History are in chronological order, and contain almost all that is suited for Sabbath School instruction, and the passages to be committed to memory are carefully selected, the sayings of our Lord being first in order.

Great care and labour have been spent in the preparation of these Notes. Clergymen and others to whom they have been submitted for examination, unite in recommending their adoption generally by superintendents and teachers of Sabbath-schools.

Superintendents will be furnished gratuitously with copies for examination upon application, either personally or by letter pre-paid to the publisher.

NOTES ON THE PSALMS.

Intended to elucidate their true spirit, and to render them a more important aid to devotion. With questions appended for three months' study of Sunday Schools and Bible Classes. By Joel Parker, D. D. 18mo.

JUNKIN ON THE OATH.

The Oath, a Divine Ordinance, and an element of the Social Constitution; its origin, nature, ends, efficacy, lawfulness, obligations, interpretation, form and abuses. By D. X. Junkin, A. M. Second edition. 12mo.

We know of no fuller or more satisfactory manual on this subject in our language.—*Watchman and Observer*.

A thousand editions of this work should be published and scattered broadcast throughout our land.—*Spectator*.

MANUALS FOR PRESBYTERAN FAMILIES.

I.

WHY AM I A PRESBYTERIAN? Being a vindication of Church Order, Doctrine, and Practical Holiness, as enjoined in that portion of Christ's heritage. By a Mother. In three parts. 1 vol. 18mo.

Every young person in all our Presbyterian families and churches throughout the whole bounds of our Zion ought to possess this sweet little honey-comb.—*Presbyterian Advocate.*

II.

WHY SHOULD I BE A PASTOR? Or Conversations on the Authority for the Gospel Ministry, its Trials, Importance, Qualifications, Duties, and Privileges. By the author of "Why am I a Presbyterian?" 18mo.

THE CHRISTIAN'S POCKET LIBRARY.

I.

THE BLOOD OF THE CROSS. By Rev. Horatius Bonar, author of "Night of Weeping," &c. 24mo.

Every professor of religion should read such a book as this, and try himself by its every page. To professors and non-professors we most cordially recommend it.—*Presbyterian.*

This book is eminently practical, and founds its practical instructions upon the grandest and most stirring themes of the gospel, may it be widely read.—*Christian Instructor.*

This little volume is written in a very energetic style. It contains much that is valuable and true.—*Christian Chronicle.*

H.

LOOKING TO THE CROSS: or, the Right Use of Marks and Evidences in ascertaining our Spiritual State.

By Rev. W. Cudworth. With Preface and Notes.
By Rev. H. Bonar. 24mo.

A small volume of great practical value.—*Christian News*.

We cordially recommend this small volume to the careful perusal of every professing Christian.—*Berwick War-der*.

Though small in bulk, this little work contains more practical truth, and displays more true piety, than will be found in many of the more ponderous volumes of the present day.—*Brechtin Advertiser*.

A BOOK FOR EVERY FAMILY.

A PRACTICAL EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS, in a series of Lectures adapted to be read in Families and Social Meetings. By Rev. William Neill, D.D. 18mo.

There are more voluminous expositions of this Epistle, yet we believe the brief work before us will be both welcome and edifying.—*Biblical Repertory*.

It is a lucid epitome of the leading doctrines and duties of the Christian system, beautifully printed, and, like the "Biblical History"—from the same improving pen—beautifully written, and a book of general utility.—*American Courier*.

The volume is one that should occupy a place in every religious family, and occupying such a place, should be studied and heeded.—*Daily News*.

All classes may read this book with pleasure and profit, as the learning and experience of the venerable author, presented in familiar, yet dignified and elegant language, and the subjects it treats upon are so numerous, that there appears to be a word in season to all.—*Pennsylvania Inquirer*.

The press is put to its legitimate uses in producing such books as this, adapted, as it is, to instruct and profit its readers.—*Presbyterian*.

It is a work whose sound doctrine, evangelical spirit, and able exposition will fit it for the interesting sphere it aspires to.—*New York Evangelist*.

