

THE
PAPAL CONTROVERSY

*PROPOSITION: "Resolved that the Roman
Catholic Church is the true Church of God."*

**CHURCH PROGRESS,
AFFIRMS.**

**AMERICAN BAPTIST,
DENIES.**

THE
PAPAL CONTROVERSY
INVOLVING THE CLAIM
OF THE
ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH
TO BE THE
CHURCH OF GOD
BETWEEN THE
"AMERICAN BAPTIST"
AND
"CHURCH PROGRESS."

ST. LOUIS, MO.:

NATIONAL BAPTIST PUBLISHING CO.,

1892.

CENTRAL CHRISTIAN COLLEGE

OF THE BIBLE 12, 147

COPYRIGHT, 1892.
By D. B. RAY.

PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION.

In the spring of 1888, Priest Thomas Enright was holding what Romanists call "missions" in northwest Missouri, in the vicinity of the city of Maryville. He was sent out and endorsed by Bishop John J. Hogan, of Kansas City; and during his *mission* lectures he boldly challenged controversy concerning the claims of the Roman Catholic Church. He succeeded in making several proselytes to the Church of Rome. Hearing his bold assertions that the Roman Church was the only true Church of God, out of which there was no salvation, and his challenges for investigation, a friend of the *American Baptist* accepted the challenge for D. B. Ray, the editor-in-chief. Priest Enright seemed delighted with the prospect of an oral discussion of the claims of the Roman Catholic Church.

We republish from the *American Baptist*, March 28th, 1888, as follows:

"The following dispatch was sent from this city to the *St. Louis Globe Democrat* last Friday, and will be of interest to many of our readers. The manner in which Rev. D. B. Ray received the challenge of Father Enright to discuss the question, "Which is the true Church of God, the Catholic or the Baptist?" is considered rather evasive, even by those who might be expected to sympathize with Rev. Mr. Ray doctrinally. But as the people of this section are anxious to have the debate, Father Enright has authorized your correspondent to announce for him that he will discuss the question "Resolved, That the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God," at Maryville, time to be set by Rev. Mr. Ray. Father Enright thinks the insertion of the word Roman in the question answers Mr. Ray's objections, and will give him all the latitude he desires. It is sincerely hoped by all that this meeting may come off, and that Rev. Mr. Ray will now name his day.—*Maryville Chronicle*.

We have just received the above clipping, from the *Maryville*

Chronicle, sent by our correspondent, without giving the date of the *Chronicle* in which it appeared.

Why does Priest Enright hesitate to affirm that the Roman Catholic Church, with which he stands identified, possesses the Bible characteristics which entitle it to be regarded as the Church of Jesus Christ? Is he afraid to appeal to the Bible as the standard authority? Is he conscious that the Bible is against the Roman Catholic Church? But, that he may have no excuse, or way of escape, if he will affirm the proposition that "The Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God," in discussion, we will emphatically deny, and enter the discussion, provided he will bind himself to observe the usual rules regulating religious discussions. The discussion of this proposition must last at least ten days, of two sessions a day, of two hours each. Also, we suggest that the Roman Catholic bear one-half the expense of employing a competent reporter to take down the discussion for publication. Who is authorized to speak for Priest Enright concerning preliminaries, etc. When these points are settled, we will announce the time for the discussion to open."

The *Maryville Chronicle*, which was authorized to speak for Mr. Enright, left "the time to be set by Rev. Mr. Ray." We appointed Thursday, at 10 A. M., July 5th, 1888, for the discussion to open, at Maryville, Mo. We had an interview with the "Rev. Father" Anselm, in the cathedral at St. Joseph, Mo., who was authorized to represent Priest Enright, and he accepted July 5th as the proper time to open the discussion.

"Priest Anselm expressed his desire to have the discussion in the Catholic Church, and charge an admission fee of twenty-five cents for every session for all who might attend. To us this looked as though he was afraid for the people to hear the discussion." h

After the failure of the Roman representative to meet us at Maryville, Mo., as agreed upon, we made the following publication in the *American Baptist* of July 12th, 1888:

"Priest Enright, under the direction of Bishop Hogan, of Kansas City, delivered a series of lectures some time since at Maryville, Pickering, Hopkins and other points in northwest Missouri. He boldly challenged investigation and discussion, asserting his ability to prove that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God. He invited all opposers to ask such questions as they desired concerning the Catholic Church, and he would answer. He succeeded in proselyting eight from the Methodists, at Pickering, and made the impression that he was fully able to defend the Romish Church claims.

Being informed that we would likely meet him in the field of

controversy, Priest Enright boldly challenged us to the discussion of the following proposition:

"Resolved, that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God."

PRIEST ENRIGHT, affirmed,
D. B. RAY, denied.

The Priest, called Father Anselm, of Maryville, Mo., acting for Priest Enright, selected Maryville as the place for discussion, and called on us to appoint the time, which we fixed as July 5, at 10 A. M. Being duly notified of the time, the Roman Catholic leaders made no objection. When the time arrived for discussion, we appeared in Maryville, in the Union Hall, but Mr. Enright failed to appear. It was a square *back out* on the part of the Romish leaders. They know full well that their doctrines and history will not bear the light of investigation. *They have retreated in disgrace.*"—*American Baptist*, July 12, 1888.

March 8, 1891, a sensational article appeared in the daily papers, in which the editor of the *American Baptist* with others, was severely censured, on account of a social interview had in St. Louis, in which it was charged that an effort was about to be made "to secure better city government and better officers," than was had under the Roman Catholic officials then in power. In the review of the criticisms of the daily papers, by the *American Baptist* an invitation was extended to the "Roman Catholic authorities" for discussion, to which the *Church Progress* replied as follows:

We Accept.

The *American Baptist*, edited by D. B. Ray, gave birth to the following in its issue last week:

"As we have been challenged, in the past, to the discussion of the claims of the Roman Catholic Church, and the representative endorsed by Bishop Hogan to meet us backed out, we renew the invitation for the Roman Catholic authorities to furnish a man whom they will endorse as able to sustain the claims of the Papacy. We repeat the proposition, as accepted and endorsed by Priest Enright, who was approved to defend Romanism. The proposition reads: *Resolved, 'That the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.'* As Priest Enright backed out from the discussion at Maryville, Mo., we now invite the Catholic authorities in this city to appoint some representative to support this proposition in a public friendly discussion. In the negative we expect to show that the ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IS A HUGE POLITICAL DISGRACE, which has cursed the world for centuries past. Will Rome risk the light of investigation?"

We accept Mr. Ray's challenge to a public discussion of the proposition he proposes in the columns of the *American Baptist* and the *Church Progress*, under the following condition: *That both journals shall publish verbatim the arguments of its*

opponent. If Mr. Ray is in good faith, this is his opportunity. We are quite willing to risk the light of investigation. All we ask is the acceptance of the above condition.—*Church Progress and Catholic World*, March 27, 1891.

The readers of the *American Baptist* will remember the back-out and retreat of the Roman Catholics from the Maryville discussion. They made the challenge, fixed the place, and demanded that we should fix the time. But they failed to come to the time. It was our firm conviction that the leaders were conscious that the Roman Catholic Church could not afford to endure the light of investigation. And since the *Church Progress* has signified its willingness to enter the discussion, prominent men, not Baptists, expressed their conviction that the Catholic authorities will yet find some pretext to avoid the discussion. Another vaunting editorial squib, in the same issue of the *Church Progress*, reads thus:

"We tender our assistance to Mr. Ray of the *American Baptist*, to investigate the 'Church of Rome.' We believe that Mr. Ray is afraid of cold print. His reply to our acceptance of his challenge will put his good faith to the test. We shall rejoice at the opportunity of showing his Baptist readers what the Church of Rome really is. Will the gentleman pick up our gauntlet?"

We cheerfully pick up the gauntlet as we are not "afraid of cold print." It may warm up a little before the controversy closes. We rejoice in the opportunity to lay before our readers the claims of the Roman Catholic Church in a dignified controversy with the representative of the ablest Romanists in the West. Such a controversy between a Roman Catholic and a Baptist has never occurred. It will be something new under the sun. We also rejoice at the prospect of laying before a host of Roman Catholic readers the contrast between Roman Catholicism and true Christianity. The points of preliminary agreement have been mutually accepted as follows:

First. The *Church Progress* and *American Baptist* mutually agree that the discussion shall last at least six months, provided either party desires it.

Second. That an equal amount of space with the same size type be occupied by the above named papers with the arguments, amounting to two and a half or three columns each, of the *American Baptist* space, each week.

Third. That both journals shall publish verbatim the arguments of its opponent to the amount of space above agreed upon.

Fourth. That due courtesy and respect becoming religious journals shall be strictly observed by each paper towards its opponent.

We mutually for the *American Baptist* and *Church Progress* agree to be governed by the above articles in the forthcoming discussion.

The discussion to be opened April 25, 1891.

D. B. RAY,
Editor of *American Baptist*,
CONDE B. PALLLEN,
Editor of *Church Progress*."

The *Church Progress and Catholic World* is the leading Roman Catholic paper in the West. It is published by the Catholic Publishing Company of St. Louis. The names of the directors of the Publishing Company are as follows:

Very Rev. P. P. Brady, Pres't.; Very Rev. H. Muehl-Isenp, V. P.; Conde B. Pallen, Sect'y.; Rev. C. Kuhlman, Treas., of the *Church Progress*.

We publish its endorsement as follows:

"Published with the approbation of Most Rev. P. A. Feehan, Archbishop of Chicago; Rt. Rev. P. J. Baltes, Bishop of Alton; Rt. Rev. L. M. Fink, O. S. B., Bishop of Leavenworth; Rt. Rev. J. J. Hogan, Bishop of Kansas City and St. Joseph; Rt. Rev. J. Janssen, Bishop of Belleville; Rt. Rev. J. Rademacher, Bishop of Nashville; Rt. Rev. K. C. Flasch, Bishop of La Crosse; Most Rev. F. X. Katzer, Archbishop of Milwaukee and Rt. Rev. J. J. Hennessey, Bishop of Wichita."

Vicar General Brady, of St. Louis, is president of the Board of directors. This paper has the endorsement of the Archbishop of Chicago, the Bishop of Alton, the Bishop of Leavenworth, the Bishop of Kansas City, the Bishop of Belleville, the Bishop of Nashville, the Bishop of La Crosse, the Archbishop of Milwaukee and the Bishop of Wichita. The *Church Progress* has the endorsement and sanction of nine Archbishops and Bishops besides Vicar General Brady and a host of priests. The utterances of the *Church Progress and Catholic World* ought to be as nearly infallible as anything in the Church of Rome.

The first installment of the discussion will appear in the *American Baptist* April 30, 1891.—*American Baptist* March 26, 1891.

In its issue of April 4, the *Church Progress* had the following:

"Our Controversy.

In our issue of the date of April 25, we will begin a controversy on the truth of Catholicity with the *American Baptist*. Week before last we signified our willingness to accept the challenge of the *American Baptist* provided that each journal should publish verbatim the arguments of its opponent. This the *American Baptist* has agreed to. We will begin the controversy, and at the request of the editor of our Protestant contemporary, will delay our first paper, to prove that the Catholic Church is the true church of God until the issue of the 25th of April.

The following are the conditions agreed upon by the editors of the two papers and signed by them, upon which the controversy is to be conducted:

First: The *Church Progress* and *American Baptist* mutually agree that the discussion shall last at least six months provided either party desires it.

Second: That an equal amount of space with the same size type be occupied by the above named papers with the arguments, amounting to two and half or three columns each, of the *American Baptist* space, each week.

Third: That each journal shall publish verbatim the arguments of its opponent to the amount of space above agreed upon.

Fourth: That due courtesy and respect becoming religious journals shall be strictly observed by each paper towards its opponent.

We mutually, for the *American Baptist* and *Church Progress* agree to be governed by the above articles in the forthcoming discussion.

The discussion to open April 25, 1891.

D. B. RAY,
Editor of *American Baptist*.
GOSPEL R. PALLEN,
Editor of *Church Progress*.

Also in its issue of April 18, the *Church Progress* says:

"Our Controversy."

Next week the first paper of the controversy between the *American Baptist* and the *Church Progress* will appear in our columns. Our readers will remember upon what conditions we agreed to enter upon the discussion. Our motive was, and is yet, simply to seize the opportunity of putting true Catholic doctrine before the readers of the *American Baptist*, the vast majority of whom, we are certain, know nothing about the Catholic Church. Here is a chance to enlighten thousands of souls, who unfortunately through sheer ignorance or false teaching imagine the Catholic Church to be the embodiment of iniquity.

The *American Baptist* no doubt entertains the same false notions about the Church, and laboring under the delusion fatuously congratulates itself upon the splendid opportunity of "exposing the errors of Rome" to our 20,000 Catholic readers. We leave the *Baptist* to its phantom.

In next week's issue the first article of the controversy will be found in the first column of the page opposite.

The proposition that we shall prove is as follows: The Catholic Church is the true Church of God.

To judge from the large list of new subscribers pouring into our office, the controversy is unquestionably of the deepest interest.—*Church Progress and Catholic World*, April 18, 1891.

Our readers will certainly appreciate the kind motive of the *Church Progress*, which is "to enlighten thousands of souls, who, unfortunately through sheer ignorance or false teaching, imagine the Catholic Church to be the embodiment of iniquity." The editorial staff, as well as the other ignorant patrons of the *American Baptist*, wish all the light which can possibly emanate from the Church Controversy. If the Church of Rome is the true Church of God Baptists, as well as all others, should certainly have the necessary proofs.

We certainly congratulate ourselves upon the splendid opportunity offered to allow the clear light of truth to penetrate the deep darkness of the Roman Catholic Church. This is the first discussion, for publication, between the Baptists and the Roman Catholics. Let the light shine.—*American Baptist*, April 23, 1891.

OUR CONTROVERSY.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD.

CHURCH PROGRESS' FIRST ALTERNATIVE.

(April 25, 1891.)

We inaugurate in this article the controversy with the *American Baptist* to prove that *The Catholic Church Alone is the True Church of God*. In order to present our argument in a succinct, clear and brief form to the readers of the *American Baptist*, and in order to refer easily and accurately to any one portion of it, we number the paragraphs. Our argument is as follows:

1. As vice and virtue are incompatible, so also are truth and error.
2. Although God may tolerate them both, He cannot have revealed error as He cannot have commanded vice.
3. Whatever system has been revealed by God must therefore be completely free from error.
4. God cannot be the author of two contrary propositions, such for instance as: "Christ is God," "Christ is not God." "Bread is changed into the the body of Christ." "Bread is not changed into the body of Christ."
5. The system which affirms and that which denies Transubstantiation cannot therefore both be true, nor both have God for author.

6. In short, as there is but one God, so there can be but one revelation, one system of truth, *one true religion*.

7. To assert the contrary would be to say that there is no difference between virtue and vice, truth and error, God and the father of lies.

8. Such propositions then as the following, "as long as we do no harm it does not signify what we believe," "all religions are good in their way, and some of them at least are *branches* of the true Church," contain an implicit denial of all first principles of right and wrong, of common sense, and of the very truth and existence of an all wise and all just Being.

9. Eternal punishment is threatened in Scripture as much to those who refuse to believe what God has revealed as to those who refuse to practice what he has commanded—. The same God Who said "this do and live" also says "he who believeth not shall be damned."

10. The question is therefore reduced to the following: what are those Truths revealed by God to be believed under pain of eternal damnation? For when Scripture says, "He who believeth" and "He who believeth not," it is most evident that something definite is pointed at, and it would be absurd to say that belief in anything, or only in part of the revelation of God would suffice for salvation.

11. To "believe," "believe in Christ," "believe in the Lord Jesus," and all such expressions can only have one real meaning, and that is to believe all that God has revealed, all that Christ came to teach to mankind.

12. Again then, as there is but God and one Savior so there is but one true religion, and one way of Salvation.

13. How then are we to reconcile with God's goodness and justice the existence of so many conflicting systems in the world?

14. As well might we ask, how are we to account for so

much vice in the world?—error and vice are the result of the abuse of liberty by man. God is the author of truth, but he tolerates the existence of error as he does that of crime.

15. Which then is the true religion?—It may be recognized by certain signs and essential qualities peculiar to it and to it alone. For instance:

16. As the Revelation made by God to man must be completely free from error, and as it is a vital error to assert that there can be two contrary propositions, both having God for author, or, in other words, two or more religions revealed by God, any religion which does not claim to be the only true one bears within itself the proof of its own falsity.

17. It is then an essential quality of the True Religion to claim to be the true one to the exclusion of all others.

18. As the system revealed by God must be completely free from error, any religion which owns to the possibility of teaching fallibly (*i. e.*, with liability to error) cannot be the true one.

19. It is then an essential quality of the true religion to claim infallibility.

20. There is only one religion which makes these claims: therefore that religion is the only true one.

21. It is the Catholic Religion.

22. The claims of infallibility and of being the exclusive way of salvation are then in reality the most positive indications of Truth.

23. And the violence with which these claims are resisted and denied by all Protestant sects is the most conclusive evidence of error.

24. What is termed by Protestants "intolerance" is in reality nothing more than consistency.—Is it "intolerant" to condemn any one who would assert that 2 and 2 make 5?—the certainty of faith is greater even than mathematical cer-

tainty. Truth is necessarily and of its very essence intolerant of error; and as God cannot give His glory to another, neither can His exponent on earth, the Church. Truth and certainty beget what the world calls "intolerance." Error and doubt beget what the world calls "liberalism."

25. From all the above it may be gathered that the claims of Infallibility and of exclusive Truth constitute what may be termed a negatively essential mark of the true Church—that is to say, no Church can be the true one which does not make these claims; and a conclusive argument may be based thereon in the following manner:

26. Among Christians (and it is assumed that Christ is the founder of the only true religion), the only Church making the above claims is the Church in communion with Rome; therefore she alone can be and is the true Church, the "One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church," of Scripture, of tradition, and of the creeds.

27. Another essential quality of the true Church is unity—for as it is of the very essence of Truth to be one, so also must unity be of the very essence of the true Church.

28. To bind together all the nations of the earth (however different in language, customs, and temporal government) in one great religious society possessing Unity of belief in the same truths, of action in the same mode of government, of participation in the same sacraments, of obedience to the same visible head, is the claim, the badge, and the avowed prerogative of the Catholic Church, and of her alone.

29. Endless vanity and difference of belief is the characteristic, nay, even the very boast of Protestantism.

30. In the United States alone there are over a hundred sects.

31. Visible unity is therefore hopelessly given up by Pro-

testant champions, and two plans are adopted to save appearances.

32. The first is the system of "fundamentals," *i. e.*, Some few great truths on which all ought to agree, however much divided as to all other points of faith.

33. But independently of its being inconsistent with the idea of God's attributes to suppose that anything revealed by Him could be unimportant or trivial, the question remains in all its force, "what are the fundamentals?"—and this question has never been settled by Protestants.

34. Another question equally conclusive against Protestantism is: where is this system of "fundamentals" found in Scripture, which is the sole rule of faith of Protestants?

35. The system of fundamentals is therefore fallacious, as there is no unity among Protestant sects even as to the very starting point of what the fundamentals are, and no proof for it where proof to them would alone be valid, *i. e.*, in Scripture, their sole rule of faith.

36. In any case, this "system of fundamentals" is fatal to the cause of Protestantism; for, either the system is true or it is false. If it is true, then, as the Catholic Church holds and always did hold the fundamentals, (for there is no doctrine called fundamental by Protestants but what is believed by the Catholic Church), it is an inconsistent, unnecessary and wicked act to separate from her, and it is a most dangerous act to remain in open schism with that Church which, avowedly holding the essential Truths of salvation, also holds that out of her bosom there is no salvation. If, on the contrary, it is false, then Protestantism is also false by the very act of having been its author.

37. The other plan adopted by Protestant controversialists is to assert boldly that inviolable unity is all that is required—"God," say they, "knows His own people in every sect or re-

ligion, the good in all religions are the True Church, and the unity of the spirit existing in their hearts is the only true unity."

38. This is as much as to say:

1*. That God has revealed no fixed and definite system of Truth, and that He looks with indifference on all religions, however contrary to one another (a vital error, as is proved above);

2*. That there is no visible Church; and by the very force of the terms an invisible unity can never be ascertained to exist really.

39. This invisible Church of Protestants would have then no exterior sign whatever by which it might be known, and could therefore never fulfill the mission of the true Church, which is to manifest itself, and "teach all nations."

40. Visible unity is then an essential quality of the true Church, and is avowedly possessed by the Catholic Church alone.

41. Thus the claims of infallibility and of exclusive salvation, and the possession of visible unity being proper to the Catholic Church and to her alone, constitute a definite and sufficient proof that she alone is the true Church; and it behooves all who are separated from her, as they value the salvation of their immortal souls, to submit to her teaching and join her communion.

42. Let Protestants then take "warning," and however much their prejudice may incline them to dislike Catholic doctrines and practices, let them remember the two following facts:

1*. As it is evident from the very force of logic and reason that, one God and one revelation being admitted, the Truth of the Catholic Church follows as a necessary consequence; whatever she teaches must be True, and whether they like it or not, mankind must submit to her teaching or incur

the eternal punishment threatened to those who refuse so to do.

2*. If Protestants will only take the trouble to enquire and examine for themselves, they will find that there is not a dogma of the Catholic Church, but what can be victoriously proved both by Scripture, by tradition, and by reason, and that all the objections made by Protestants against her doctrines and practices can be answered and cleared up in the most lucid manner.

43. To conclude: All Protestants in virtue of their very principles are obliged to admit that the Catholic Church may be True, and to own that if she is, they are in imminent danger of eternal damnation.—Let them once more then take warning, and, no longer resting the salvation of their soul on a *may* and an *if*, choose the safest, the only safe side.

A firm grasp on the idea of Death, Judgment, Eternity, a real earnest desire to save the soul, will bring a Protestant very near to the threshold of the Catholic Church. Prayer and study will soon do the rest.

* Bossuet's "Variations of Protestantism."

THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

PROPOSITION: *Resolved that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*

CHURCH PROGRESS, Affirms.
AMERICAN BAPTIST, Denies.

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S FIRST NEGATIVE.

(April 30, 1891.)

It furnishes us no small pleasure to enter this first controversy for publication ever held between Baptists and Roman Catholics.

If the Roman Catholic Church *alone*, is the true church of God, out of which there is no salvation, then all Baptists, Protestants, and all other religionists, dying without membership in that Church are consigned to eternal punishment. But on the other hand, if the Roman Catholic Church is neither the true Church of God, nor teaches the true religion, then hosts of the human family, being deceived, live and die without an experimental knowledge of God and his salvation, and are liable to eternal punishment. With this view of the question, the most momentous interests, for time and eternity, are involved in this controversy.

We enter into the discussion with no unkind feeling toward the editors and supporters of the *Church Progress*, or any other members of the Roman Catholic Church. We pray and trust that this investigation may be conducted in the spirit of Christ, and be the means of leading many ten-thousands to Jesus Christ for salvation and eternal life.

The reader will observe that the *Church Progress* fails to define the terms of the proposition to be proved. Moreover, it fails to state the proposition correctly. The *Church Progress* has agreed to affirm in this discussion "that the Roman

Catholic Church is the true Church of God;" but in its head lines it leaves out the word "Roman." The *Church Progress* doubtless has discovered that the word *Roman* is local and when combined with "Catholic Church" amounts to a contradiction. The Catholic Church would be the general Church, while the Roman Church would be a local church confined to Rome or the Roman Empire. Seeing this difficulty the *Progress* has attempted to dodge the question at the start.

Also, in its head lines the *Church Progress* affirms that "His Church cannot teach error," and then affirms that "the Catholic Church alone is the infallible one. Therefore she is God's church." As these statements are made by *fallible* authority our readers will not accept them as *infallible*. This discussion will show that these statements are wholly erroneous and contrary to God's Revelation.

We are pleased to be able to agree with the *Church Progress* in several of its introductory statements. With slight verbal qualifications, we freely adopt its axiomatic statements, numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8.

9 and 10. Statements 9 and 10 are indefinite and liable to abuse. A failure to understand some of the deep things of God's Revelation is not the ground of the punishment of sinners. "He that believeth on him [Jesus Christ], is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." John 3:18. Every real believer in Jesus Christ is justified, saved and has eternal life. Every unbeliever rests under condemnation.

11. This statement seems confused. The definite object of faith, is Jesus Christ. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." Acts 16:31. The great mistake with the *Church Progress* is that it would have

one believe on the Roman Catholic Church, and thou shalt be saved! This position is unscriptural, untenable, and dangerous.

Statements 12, 13 and 14 lack clearness. It seems that the *Church Progress* wishes to shift the ground of the controversy from the Roman Catholic Church, to the question of "true religion." Does it understand that the true Church and true religion are convertible terms?

Statements 15, 16 and 17. We agree that God's Revelation is free from error, but claiming to hold the only true religion amounts to nothing in the absence of proof. Other religious parties besides the Roman Catholics claim to hold the "truth to the exclusion of all others."

Statements 18 and 19. We hold that the revealed word of God, which is the standard of true religion, is infallible.

20, 21, 22 and 23. This controversy will show that the so-called infallibility of the Roman Catholic religion is an unauthorized assumption. The claim of infallibility by those who bear fruits of fallibility is absurd.

24. While truth is intensely exclusive and cannot compromise with error, yet it does not attempt to *coerce* those who are in error. The *Church Progress* says: "God tolerates the existence of error as he does that of crime," but the Roman Catholic Church is "intolerant of error." This is the great mistake of that Church, refusing to tolerate what God tolerates.

25 and 26. This claim of infallibility is one of the most *fallible* things connected with that Church. The Mormon Church of Latter-Day Saints claimed infallibility for Joseph Smith. This claim only made their errors all the more ridiculous.

27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36 and 37. This discussion will show that among the denominations of Christen-

dom, the Roman Catholic Church has produced more divisions and schisms than any other.

38-41. Protestantism is not the proposition for discussion. We agree that God has a revealed, fixed and definite system of truth, but the Roman Catholic Church is not governed by that system of truth.

42 and 43. It is rather early in the discussion for the *Church Progress* to exhort Protestants to admit the truth of the claims of the Roman Catholic Church, especially as no proof has been offered. As the *Church Progress* failed to define its own proposition for discussion, it falls to us to give the New Testament meaning of "the Church of God." It is necessary to have a clear-cut definition of the Church of God in order that we may compare the characteristics of the Roman Catholic Church, with those of the true Church of God. The true Church of God must be properly *defined* to be properly *identified*. 1st. One who from infancy has been taught to call an elephant a sheep will just as honestly regard that animal as a true sheep as the man who knows the real sheep from all other animals. If one hundred different species, were called sheep, it would be all the more important to have a definition, or description, of a real sheep, in order to distinguish that animal from all the rest which are improperly called sheep. One who has been taught from infancy to call an eagle a dove would just as honestly regard the eagle as a dove as the one who has the correct knowledge of the dove. If one hundred different species of birds were called doves, it would be important to have a correct definition of the real dove, in order to distinguish it from the other so-called doves. In like manner, as there are more than a hundred different institutions called churches of God or the Church of God, it is absolutely necessary to have a correct definition, (or description) of the true church, in order to distinguish it from all the rest,

2. The supposed invisible, inorganic, undefinable, imaginary church has no place in this controversy. It is "the Roman Catholic Church" and "the true Church of God"—are they identical?

3. The large majority of the most intelligent citizens and professors of Christianity in the United States, and other enlightened countries, do not believe that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God. Also, the overwhelming majority of Catholics themselves enter that Church in infancy, without their knowledge or consent. They become members of the Roman Church without the exercise of their reason or judgment. And as Paul exhorts the Corinthian church "with all the saints" to "examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves" (2 Cor. 13:5.) it is the privilege and duty of all Catholics and non-Catholics to examine themselves whether or not they are in the true faith and "the true Church of God." Everyone must examine for himself.

4. This discussion amounts to [the] admission that there is a doubt of the Roman Catholic Church being the true Church of God. It is possible, therefore, that the claims of that Church are not sustained by the revealed word of God. Furthermore, as the everlasting destiny of all Roman Catholics is suspended upon the supposed truth of this proposition, it behooves them especially to examine their Church claims calmly and impartially, in the light of God's Revelation.

5. All should enter this investigation as impartial jurymen should try the most important cases of life and death. This discussion involves the most momentous issues of this world. It involves the eternal destiny of men. Who is sufficient for these things?

In view of the fearful responsibility involved in this discussion, let every one, Catholic and non-Catholic, enter this in-

vestigation without prejudice; and in the light of God's word, in view of solemnities of the judgement of the last day, after weighing the testimony, let him render his verdict for the truth-according to law and evidence.

6. The word church does not properly apply to a house made of brick and mortar, or stone. Such a building may be a "church house" but not a church. The word church in God's Revelation is never applied to a consolidated hierarchy, whether universal or provincial. The application of the word church to the consolidated government called the Roman Catholic Church is wholly unscriptural. It is without warrant in the New Testament. The literal, primary and leading signification of the word church (*ekklesia*) is a *congregation or assembly*. When applied to the institution of Christ in the New Testament it means Christ's assembly.

7. A church of Christ is an assembly of baptized believers associated together in the doctrine and fellowship of the Gospel.

This is the only literal meaning of a New Testament church. Every such local organization is a church of God and authorized to obey and administer his laws and ordinances.

8. Every such local church is fully authorized to administer the laws of the kingdom of Christ in its community, including the discipline of its membership. In the transaction of church business, such a local church is as completely independent of other churches, as though it were the only church of Christ on earth. From its New Testament decision there is no appeal. The final and last appeal of the one who had been trespassed against was to tell it unto the church. Matt. 18:17.

9. In addition to the primary literal meaning of "*ekklesia*" to signify a single local assembly, as an integral part of the organic kingdom of Christ, the term church is used, by a com-

mon figure of speech, to represent the *church institution*, which may apply to the whole extent of the organic kingdom of Christ. When used in this figurative sense the term church is not confined to any one local organization. It means the *church institution*, as where one is taken to represent a class. When we say the lion is the king of beasts we do not wish to convey the idea that there is one *universal lion* composed of all the lions in the lower universe! We simply mean to speak of the lion as a species of animals. In the Scripture it is said, "the ox knoweth his owner." This does not mean one particular ox, neither does it mean a great *universal ox*, composed of all the oxen in the world! We speak of the "jury as the bulwark of English liberty." We do not mean this to specify any one particular local jury, in some district in England, neither do we mean to point out a *universal jury* composed of all the juries of the world! We speak of the jury as a civil institution. In this sense the jury has existed for centuries. In like manner we speak of the church as an institution. In this figurative sense, we do not confine the term to any one local church, neither do we mean to point out a huge ecclesiasticism composed of all the churches. In this sense the Savior used the term church, when he said: "Upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Matt. 16:18. The Savior did not confine this prediction to the local assembly at Jerusalem. He referred to the *church institution* which should exist in the shape of local churches throughout all the coming ages.

In this figurative sense, the term church must be understood in the proposition under discussion. The true church of God has reference to the true *church institution* established by Christ. Matt. 16:18. As the Roman Catholic Church is entirely different from the institution founded by Christ, it cannot possibly be the true church of God.

FIRST NEGATIVE ARGUMENT: The Roman Catholic Church is not the true Church of God, because she makes the Church the savior of men, instead of Jesus Christ alone.

The Roman Church claims that there is no salvation outside of her membership. That all Protestants with their infant children are lost; that even the infants of Roman Catholics themselves, dying without membership in the Church, fail to reach heaven. They teach the doctrine of Church salvation; that in the Church is salvation, out of the Church all are lost. This doctrine is contrary to the Scriptures. The true Church of God, as admitted by the Catholics themselves, was not established until the time of Christ on earth. Yet, thousands were saved by grace, through faith, prior to the New Testament dispensation. They were saved without membership in this true organic church of God. The pardon of sins and salvation is a personal matter between God and the individual. Of Abraham it is said: "And he believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness." Gen. 15:6. Abraham did not join the Church for salvation. Men are now saved upon the same terms that saved Abraham. Paul says: "Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify [the] heathen through faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham." Gal. 3:6-9. The true believers in Christ are saved just as Abraham was. This condemns the doctrine of Church salvation.

It is evident that there are some of God's children in the various denominations, in spite of the errors of their church organizations. Of the Babylon of Revelation, it is said: "And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, come out of her,

my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not her plagues." Rev. 18: 4. Some of God's people were in Babylon, the false Church. They could not be in the true Church of God and Babylon at the same time. In spite of the errors of the Catholic Church, we believe that there are some of the children of God in that organization. They are commanded to come out of her.

OUR CONTROVERSY.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD.

CHURCH PROGRESS' SECOND AFFIRMATIVE.

(May 2, 1891.)

1. The first exception taken by the *American Baptist* to our argument of last week, is to our omission of the word *Roman* in our thesis. We purposely said the *Catholic* Church and not *Roman Catholic*. The Church herself never uses the terms *Roman Catholic*. The *American Baptist* will nowhere find these terms thus conjoined in any document, whether encyclical, bull or pastoral letter issuing from Pope or Bishop. The epithet *Roman* thus used originated with Protestants, and was designed to place a controversial limitation on her universality. It has never been so used, or claimed by the Catholic Church, and is necessarily repudiated by her. As a practical proof, let any one in any place in the world ask where a *Catholic* Church is, and he will invariably be directed to what is universally recognized as the only one Catholic Church. Make inquiry in any Christian country for a Catholic Church and you will *never* be directed to a Protestant Church.

2. The *American Baptist* has entirely evaded the nexus of our argument.

We will put it in briefer form again:

God's Church must possess certain marks or characteristics, by which it may be known as His to mankind. Two of these points we especially pointed out—Infallibility and Unity. The question then is, in what Church claiming to be God's Church, are these marks found? For plainly, that Church

alone can be His Church, which possesses these characteristics. The first mark is Infallibility, that is to say, God's Church cannot teach false doctrine. Hence any Church claiming to teach God's revealed word, must at the same time *claim* to teach it unerringly, without possibility of teaching error, or infallibility. Now no Protestant Church ever makes this claim. The *American Baptist* says (25 and 26) "This claim of infallibility is one of the most fallible things connected with that (Catholic) Church. The Mormon Church of Latter-Day Saints claimed infallibility for Joseph Smith. The claim only made their errors all the more ridiculous."

Passing over the statement of the Mormon Church's claim for *Joseph Smith*, the *American Baptist* yields the very point we seek to establish. It even declares that to claim infallibility is ridiculous. Clearly enough then its case—the case of all Protestant Churches—is barred out of court. For the *American Baptist* has admitted our 3rd proposition: "Whatever system has been *revealed* by God must therefore be *completely free* from error."

It therefore admits that the Church which teaches God's revealed word, must be *completely free* from error. Hence she cannot teach error; she must teach [3] that revealed word pure and undefiled; she cannot but teach infallibly. Now plainly the only Church making this "ridiculous" claim, as the *Baptist* terms it, of teaching without the possibility of error, is the Catholic Church. But as God has made a revelation in the Person of Jesus Christ Our Lord, and as Jesus Christ has established a Church to perpetuate His work and teach the revelation made through Him to all men, "Going therefore *teach ye* all nations," it necessarily follows that the Church teaching by Christ's authority must know herself as the divinely commissioned teacher sent by Him. Hence must she know her own gift of infallibility.

The Catholic Church is the only Church claiming this divine prerogative, and she claims it as absolutely essential to her.

By way of exclusion then, no other Church can claim to be Christ's Church, for Christ's Church cannot be ignorant of that which essentially constitutes her His. Hence, since Christ has established a Church to teach the truth He revealed, the Catholic Church, by virtue of her sole claim to infallibility, is identified with God's Church. (Texts from Scripture to show the indefectibility of the Church Matt. 16: 18.—Matt. 28: 18-20 Luke 1: 31, 33.—John 14: 16, 17.

3. We laid down as another mark or characteristic of God's Church *Unity*: This mark we showed the Catholic Church alone possessed. Against this the *American Baptist* asserts:

[4] "This discussion will show that among the denomination of Christendom, the Roman (?) Catholic Church has produced more divisions and schisms than any other."

This of course is merely an assertion remaining to be proved. But we will forestall it. The *Baptist* means by this, that out of the Catholic Church have sprung many heresies and schisms. Not a doubt of it. There never could be a negative without a positive: there never could be a falsehood unless there were truth to be denied. From the very beginning there have been heresies coming out of the Church. But it is to be noticed that they always go *out* or *from* the Church. They never remain *in*. She ever throws them off. Like the healthy body disease cannot get a seat within her. She cuts heresies off from communion with her. She will not suffer them to remain *in union* with her, for contradictories, truth and its opposite, cannot dwell in the same subject. And this is proof of the living principle of unity which animates her. No contradiction in doctrine is tolerated within her fold. On the other hand it is a characteristic of heresy that it soon divides against itself. Witness the multiform divisions of the Arian heresy; see

the multiplication of sects, just as soon as Luther threw off the authority of the Church, and behold the endless divisions of Protestantism in our day, reaching into the hundreds of sects.

For this reason, as soon as the integrity of any single Catholic truth is brought into question within her fold, or dangerously assailed from without, the Church defines and declares that truth in precise and formal terms, so that there can be no mistake as to her meaning. Such declarations are what she calls dogmas. They are formally defined truths. In this way she preserves the integrity of the deposit of revelation, in this way, divinely and infallibly guided by the Spirit of all truth, whom Christ has promised abide with her forever (John 14: 16, 17), she preserves the unity of the Catholic Faith.

While touching upon this question of unity, we may appropriately consider the notion contained in the term Church. *Ekklesia* means congregation or assembly in its primary and literal meaning, says the *American Baptist*. Let this pass. In its secondary and specific signification it means a religious assembly united for a common end. The many composing it are united with God and among themselves. In other words it is a religious society for a specific purpose. The Christian Church then is a religious society united together for the purpose of worshipping God in the way pointed out and according to the teachings ordained by Christ.

[5] Now Christ ordained that there should be one Church (*Ekklesia*) and one Shepherd. "And there shall be one fold and one Shepherd." (John 10: 16.) Again He said "And not for them only do I pray, but for them also, who through their word, shall believe in me; that they all may be one, as Thou, Father, in me, and I in Thee; that they may also be one in us; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me. And the glory which Thou hast given me, I have given them; that they may be one, as we also are one."

Christ here plainly declares that His Church shall be one, and that the oneness or unity it possesses shall be a mark or characteristic that it is His Church. He prays that His Church possess unity, as a *sign* for the world to believe that the Father has sent Him. In other words Christ's Church must possess the note of unity in order that it may be known as His. It must be one fold with one shepherd; it must be one in doctrine, and that unity must be visible, for through that unity it is to be known to the world. Therefore Christ's Assembly, Christ's Society, Christ's Church cannot be many. It must be one and *visibly one*. It must be indissolubly one, as Christ and the Father are One. It follows, then, from this, that if you see many assemblies (*ekklesiai*) or societies, or churches, independent of one another in worship and in doctrine, each worshipping after a different manner and teaching different doctrines, then are these assemblies or churches to be known as not Christ's, for they are without the mark of unity, which essentially constitutes the true Church and which He has promised shall stamp it as His Own.

[6] The figurative meaning which the *Baptist* gives the term *ekklesia* or Church is purely arbitrary. Its parallels of a *universal lion*, a *universal ox*, and a *universal jury*, are beside the point at issue, or rather, if to be considered at all, rebut its own argument. It is not really in a figurative sense that the *Baptist* uses the term *ekklesia*, but simply as an abstraction. "It means the *Church Institution* as where one is taken to represent a class," says the *Baptist*. In other words *Ekklesia* or Church is only an abstraction just as the universal idea expressed in the abstract terms, *ox*, *lion*, *jury*. If then Christ "referred to the Church Institution" only in this "figurative" or abstract sense when He said to Peter, the chief of the apostles, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock (Peter) I will build my Church, and the gates of Hell, shall not

prevail against it," He was talking only of an abstraction which was to have no concrete, visible, existence. This is plainly an absurdity. What Christ said and meant, plainly enough to those who wish to see, was that on Peter, the rock, He would build his *religious society*, just as concrete, tangible and visible a body as the American Nation.

One might as well talk of the American Nation as a "figurative," abstract body without real existence. What sense would there have been in Christ's praying for the unity of an abstraction, that an abstraction might be of one fold and one shepherd, or that an abstraction without real existence might be one with itself, as He and the Father are One?

4. We might formally discuss the visibility of the Church, but that note is so clearly bound up in the other arguments, that it need not be touched upon here again. Apostolic succession is another mark of the Church we brought in. This also is so evidently implied in the foregoing, and as the *Baptist* has avoided it, we will let it rest for the present.

Our argument stands then in this wise: God's Church is infallible, one, visible, and apostolic. By these notes or marks it is to be identified.

These marks no Church possesses save the Catholic Church. Therefore is the Catholic Church alone the true Church of God.

There are other points in the *Baptist's* argument, that we might touch upon. But all are, at least implicitly, answered in our main argument. One or two we will notice briefly. The *Baptist* asks us "Does it (*Church Progress*) understand that the true Church and true Religion are convertible terms?" This is exactly what we do understand. The true Religion is the true Church and the true Church is the true religion. The *Baptist* asserts without warrant or shadow of excuse that "This discussion amounts to admission that there is a doubt of the

Roman (?) Catholic Church being the true Church of God."

There is not the vestige of such a doubt. There is never the least doubt of the truth being the truth. God's word is always certainly and universally identified with the truth; God's Church is always certainly and universally identified with the truth. Catholics are as firmly and absolutely convinced of the truth of their faith as they are of their own bodily existence. This conviction reposes in unshaken confidence on the word of God, who can neither deceive nor be deceived. If men cannot know with absolute certainty what God has revealed to them, then is God's revelation a failure, and the human race in darkness and doubt as to the truths of salvation. If God has not spoken infallibly *to us* through His Church, then is our faith in vain. An infallible Church is an absolute necessity for fallible men. Truth is revealed to us, not evolved by us. Men cannot of themselves know the truth. Therefore has Christ given them a Church of His constitution to teach them that truth unerringly.

The *Baptist* complains that some of our propositions are obscure, indefinite and liable to abuse; notably 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. Let the readers of the *American Baptist* refer again to the numbers, and read them over. We believe that they will be perfectly clear. It is only because the *Baptist* has missed the logical nexus of our argument that it fancies these paragraphs obscure. It has taken them apart from their context. Read the entire argument again and you will feel their force, as links in an unbroken chain.

THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

PROPOSITION: *Resolved that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*

CHURCH PROGRESS, Affirms.
AMERICAN BAPTIST, Denies.

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S SECOND NEGATIVE.

(April 30, 1891.)

1st. It is all the worse for the *Church Progress* that it "purposely" left out "Roman" from the proposition which it solemnly agreed to discuss. The proposition, as *accepted* and endorsed by the *Church Progress*, in its issue of March 21, 1891, reads: "*Resolved, That the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*" The *Church Progress* boldly said: "We accept." But now when it sees its own difficulty the *Church Progress*, without our permission, in violation of its own agreement, *purposely*, leaves out a part of the proposition which it *agreed* to discuss! This is a surrender of the proposition. We insist that the proposition shall stand just as endorsed by Priest Enright for the discussion at Maryville, Mo., from which he backed out. Will the *Church Progress* also back out from its own *accepted* proposition, as indefensible? The true *catholic church* is very different from the Roman Catholic Church. We do not deny that the catholic church, in the true sense of the word *catholic*, is the true church of God. By this omission the *Church Progress* admits that the *Roman Catholic Church* cannot be defended.

2nd. We agree that the church of God must possess certain characteristics by which it may be identified; but the Roman Catholic Church does not possess these characteristics. The true church of God possesses an *infallible* Head in the person of Jesus Christ, who is "head over all things to the

church." The true church possesses the *infallible* standard of faith and rule of action, in God's revealed Word. The real members of the true church possess the *infallible* Comforter in the person of the Holy Spirit, to abide with them forever. John 14:16, 17. It is by the Holy Spirit that the love of God has been shed abroad in our hearts. Romans 5:5. This *infallible* Comforter is also the *infallible* witness, bearing witness with our spirit that we are the children of God. Romans 8:16. These are points of *infallibility* possessed by the true church. It has an *infallible* head in the person of Jesus Christ. But, owing to the unrenewed outer man the membership of the true church of God are fallible, liable to err.

The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because of its unscriptural claim of infallibility. "There is not a just man upon the earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not." Ecl. 7:20. The members of the Apostolic churches did not claim infallibility for themselves; therefore this claim of infallibility upon the part of the Roman Catholic Church, is not a mark of the true church of God. It is a claim which is not true. Therefore it is rather a mark of the false church.

We pronounced the Mormon claim of infallibility, ridiculous. Also the same claim by the Roman Catholic Church is absurd. The Bible doctrine of infallibility we accept and teach.

3rd. Not so. The true church claims the infallibility of Christ its head, the infallibility of its rule of faith and the infallibility of the Holy Spirit, its Comforter. The *Church Progress* expects its bare statements for proofs. It is not denied that there is a true church of God possessing certain characteristics. We emphatically deny that the Roman Catholic Church possesses these characteristics. The mere *claim* proves nothing. The Pharisees who "trusted in themselves that they were righteous and despised others," claimed to interpret the Scriptures infallibly. But with all their claims of

infallibility they became the betrayers and murderers of Christ. The Scriptures cited by the *Progress* say nothing about the infallibility of the church. Though the seven churches of Asia were the "golden candlesticks" of Christ, they lacked infallibility in their membership. See Revelation second and third chapters.

4th. Instead of throwing off heresies and remaining pure, Rome has brought forth many heresies while remaining heretical herself.

One of our negative arguments against the claims of the Roman Catholic Church will be that she is not the true church of God because she lacks Scriptural unity. There may be a unity of fundamental errors while destitute of "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." The Roman Church is a vast hive or cage of heretical societies and warring elements. As an example of the unity of the Roman Catholic Church we quote from a letter of Pope Pius IX, given at the Vatican under date of September 19, 1870, and addressed by "His Holiness" to Gen. Kanzler, of the Papal Army of Zouaves at the time when Victor Emanuel, the Roman Catholic King, was about to open fire upon the troops of the Pope. In this extremity Pope Pius said: "Now, when a great sacrilege and a most enormous injustice is on the point of being consummated, when the troops of a Catholic King are besieging the capital of the Catholic universe, my first impulse is to thank you, General," etc. Last Days of Papal Army, page 13.

Victor Emanuel opened fire upon the so-called "Holy City" and the army of the Pope, and his victorious troops entered into the city of the Pope, amidst blood and slaughter. Here were the sons of the "Holy Mother Church" making war upon the Pope himself. This is one example of the *unity* which has existed in the Roman Catholic Church. These Catholic invaders entered Rome shouting: "Death to the Pope!

Death to the Zouaves! Death to the Priests!" See Last Days of the Papal Army.

5th. While there is but one organic kingdom of Christ there are many churches as component parts of that kingdom. The *Church Progress* gives no example where the word church is applied to a vast consolidated hierarchy, such as the Roman Catholic Church. This is as much of an abuse of the word church as to call an elephant a sheep.

"A church of Christ is a congregation of baptized believers joined together in the faith and fellowship of the Gospel."

Under this definition we have examples as follows: "And when they had ordained them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed." Acts 14:23. These were local churches of Christ, not one vast consolidated hierarchy. A difficulty arose in the church at Antioch on account of the Judaizers who taught circumcision for salvation. The Jerusalem church, with the apostles, after deliberating upon the subject made their report. It is recorded: "Then pleased it the apostles and elders, with the whole church, to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas." Acts 15:22. This was the whole church at Jerusalem. Speaking of Aquilla and Priscilla, Paul says: "Greet the church that is in their house." Romans 16:5. Here is a New Testament local church meeting in a private house. Speaking of the Corinthians, Paul says: "If therefore, the whole church be come together in one place," etc. Cor. 14:23. The *whole church* here means the church at Corinth, not one vast consolidated hierarchy. Also, Paul speaks of a church in the house of Nymphas. Col. 4:15.

And in its literal, primary sense, the term church is used in the plural. Thus, "the churches of the Gentiles." (Rom. 16:4); "the churches of Christ" (Roman 16:16); "So ordained I in

all churches" (1 Cor. 7:17; "the churches of Galatia" (1 Cor. 16:1); "the churches of Asia" (1 Cor. 16:19), and "the churches of Macedonia" (2 Cor. 8:1).

The *Church Progress* is mistaken in our use of the term church to indicate the institution of Christ. We were not talking of an abstraction with no concrete visible existence. Christ in person established his church, which was located at Jerusalem, and has been perpetuated in the organic kingdom of Christ, composed of local churches, down to the present. Peter was not the rock on which the church was built. "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. 3:11. The Church of Christ is an organic reality and has existed as an institution to the present time.

6th. "Apostolic Succession" is not a mark of the Scriptural Church. Churches of Christ have existed as his church institution all the time, but when the last apostle died, the apostolic authority and office ceased. Those who claim apostolic authority without being able to furnish the miraculous signs of the apostles are usurpers. This will be discussed under a regular negative argument. The mere claim to possess the Bible marks of the true church amounts to nothing in the absence of proof. The Roman Catholic Church directly contradicts the Scriptures; in fact, it has the leading mark of a false Church. Paul says: "It behooveth therefore a bishop to be blameless, the husband of one wife, sober, prudent, and of good behavior, chaste, given to hospitality, a teacher," etc. 1 Tim. 3:2. (Douay Bible.)

The Catholic translation itself affirms the propriety of the Bishop being "*the husband of one wife*," but that Church, in face of the Scriptures, forbids bishops, priests and nuns to marry. All this forbidding to marry is one mark of the false church. Paul says: "Now the Spirit manifestly saith, that in the last times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed

to spirits of error, and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy, and having their conscience seared. Forbidding to marry, to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving by the faithful, and by them that have known the truth." Catholic Douay Bible. 1 Tim. 4:1-3.

This forbidding to marry and condemning the eating of meats, on the part of the Roman Catholic Church, marks her indelibly as the false Church.

In our first negative we stated our first argument thus: *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true Church of God, because she makes the Church the savior of men, instead of Jesus Christ alone.* We showed that under the Old Testament dispensation, men were saved through faith, without membership in the church of Christ. Also, that the New Testament saints were saved upon the same plan which saved Abraham. Gal. 3. The *Church Progress* made no attempt to answer our argument. There is no passage of Scripture in the whole Bible that makes salvation depend on membership, even in the *true* church of God. Salvation is a personal transaction between God and the sinner. We introduce further proofs:

Those who were pardoned and saved under the personal ministry of Jesus Christ were saved through faith without church membership as a condition. To the weeping, penitent woman the Savior said: "Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace." Luke 7:50. He did not say, thy church membership hath saved thee, but, "THY FAITH HATH SAVED THEE." The Savior said: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3:16. But the Roman Church is thrust, with all its traditions, between the penitent soul and Jesus Christ. It is not the church of God,

because it teaches the unscriptural doctrine of church salvation. Again the Savior says: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." John 5:24. The true believer in Christ "hath everlasting life." It is not joining the church, but accepting Christ by faith, which brings salvation.

NEGATIVE ARGUMENT, 2. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because of its unscriptural claim to infallibility.* Though infallibility is claimed for the Roman Catholic Church, yet Romanists do not believe the claim themselves, except in a greatly modified sense. Infallibility implies absolute freedom from error. In this sense infallibility is not even claimed by Roman Catholics. Even the saints, including the Popes of that Church, are so fallible that it is necessary for them to endure the flames of purgatory, for purification after death! Infallibility of no kind is claimed for the unofficial membership of the Roman Church. Speaking of the criminal classes, a Roman Catholic paper in this city, says:

"People are remarking everywhere, and they are not all enemies, that nearly all the men who are being tried for ballot-stuffing and kindred crimes in different parts of the country are Irish Catholics or bear Irish Catholic names. In this city every man so tried has belonged to that class. In Chicago and New York nearly all the hoodlums are Irish Catholics. It is shameful, but what are we going to do about it?"—*Western Watchman*, April 16, 1887.

Also the *Watchman* says: "The ballot-burglars in St. Louis are our parish hoodlums." Surely this class of the Roman Church lack infallibility. Though many members of the Roman Church are good citizens, these sad facts show that that Church does not make its members infallible or holy either. It is not even claimed that one in ten thousand of the

membership of the Roman Catholic Church possesses infallibility of any kind.

Where then, is the infallibility of the Roman Catholic Church? It is not in the membership, nor the priesthood. Where then is it located? Though some claim infallibility for the Bishops in a modified sense, only one member of the Roman Catholic Church has been declared infallible. This infallibility of the Pope is only claimed for him when speaking *ex cathedra*. He is supposed to be fallible and erring in private judgement and morals. Roman Catholic writers admit that some Popes were so desperately bad that they are now enduring the torments of hell itself. Such is the unfortunate position of the Roman Church that it must claim, even a monster of iniquity as the infallible head of the Church of God! We would ask the *Church Progress* what became of the infallibility of these bad popes who are lost in hell?

OUR CONTROVERSY.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD.

CHURCH PROGRESS' THIRD AFFIRMATIVE.

(May 9, 1891.)

1. The reason we objected to the use of the word Roman was not merely to postpone the difficulty proposed by our adversary, that Roman is local, whilst Catholic is universal, but also because we wished to postpone the treatment of other dogmatic questions which have to be entered on to explain the Catholic sense of the name *Roman Catholic* as distinguished from the Protestant abuse of the term.

The *Roman Catholic* Church is the Church universal whose centre is at Rome. When I localize the centre of a circle I do not deny that that circle may have a world-wide circumference. The Catholic Church is such a circle, and Rome is the centre. The word *Roman* implies that her chief pastor and bishop resides in Rome. As he is the successor of St. Peter, the rock on which the Church is founded, and the Primate of Christ's Church, he has supreme jurisdiction over all the Churches.

These points we had intended to prove later on. We touch on them now to explain the true meaning of the term Roman Catholic. In this sense we are willing to be called Roman Catholics, though we still maintain that the name *Catholic* is quite sufficient to distinguish the one true Church of Christ. The name Anglo-Catholic or Graeco-Catholic applied to a Church is contradictory, because it limits the universal Church

to a nation. The name Roman Catholic as we have explained it, is not contradictory, because it only marks the fact that the Church of all nations has a central see, a supreme head, an organization, a unity, and that her head resides in Rome, the eternal city.

We think that we were prudent in confining ourselves to the name Catholic because we see our adversary toward the end of his last article calls the Church the *Roman* Church, suppressing the Catholic altogether. He objects to our omission, we object still more strongly to his. We are willing to be called the Catholic Church or the Roman Catholic Church but *not* the Roman Church. A centre without a circumference makes a very poor figure. Enough about a name.

2. So far we are agreed on certain very important points. There is one true religion, completely free from error, and there is an infallible standard of truth. What is that standard? There must be some way of knowing with certainty what the standard is, of determining just what is the revelation of Christ. The infallible standard is the Bible, says our adversary. Here we join issue. The question is what is God's revealed word? A certain set of books, according to Protestants. How am I to know what books? For instance is Machabees one of them? Yes, says the Catholic. No, says the Protestant. Who is to decide? A standard which is not a *sure* standard is no standard at all. The Bible is not a sure standard, because it does not tell what belongs to it, it cannot speak or teach at all and so it cannot teach all truth to all men. To make the Bible the standard of truth between Catholics and Protestants is as absurd as to say that the bone between two dogs is the standard by which to judge to which dog it belongs. God did not make what must always be a bone of contention the sole standard of truth. "God's revealed word is the standard," says the Protestant, and "God's

revealed word is contained in the Bible." "Part of it is," says the Catholic, "but part of it is not." Who is to decide between us here?

The Protestant takes everything for granted when he supposes the *whole* of revelation to be in the Bible. How can he prove that it is all there? All scripture is wholesome, but is scripture all-sufficient? We hold it is not. Who can settle our dispute. There is need of a guide, a teacher here evidently, and one with authority from Christ Himself.

Take some one disputed doctrine. "There are two sacraments," says the Protestant. "There are seven," says the Catholic. The Protestant appeals to the Bible. The Catholic appeals to the same Bible, plus Tradition. "I prove seven sacraments from the Bible," says the Catholic, "and also from tradition." "How?" Why hundreds of millions of men for many centuries held this truth as a divine tradition. Not only the Latin Church, but the Greek Church and the oriental Churches. It was never doubted among Christians till the 15th century. It is an apostolic tradition, I *must believe it*. The Bible can't decide between us here, that is evident, we both invoke it. Or take a doctrine clearly taught in the Bible: "*This is my body*," says Christ. "He meant it was his body," says the Catholic. "He did not mean anything of the sort" says the Protestants, and finds 200 other meanings all of which are debated about. Who is to decide whether the Catholic interpretation is right or one of the 200 Protestant ones? The Bible cannot tell what truths are revealed, cannot tell me the meaning of disputed texts, how can it be the guide, the teacher, the ultimate standard of truth?

The *standard* in a word is the source of endless disputes and quarrels and can decide none of them; therefore it is no complete standard at all. It is to mock infinite wisdom to say He has given us a dead book to quarrel over, with no authorized

interpreter of its meaning, and that book is the *standard* of infallible truth. There must be some arbiter. The Bible is not that arbiter, we must therefore look for some other. The Bible says the Church is the "pillar and the ground of truth." 1. Tim. 3: 15.

We both argue that there is a standard of truth. I have shown that the Bible will not do; it cannot settle debates. The Bible tells us to go to "the Church of the living God, the *pillar* and *ground* of truth." The Bible refers us then to the Church as the arbiter of truth. But to which Church?

The one Church which our adversary admits is completely free from errors which we agree has the mission to teach the truth to men—"go ye therefore and *teach* all nations," must know with certainty, unfailing certainty, otherwise it cannot *teach*. If not *sure* how can it teach the truth as God's word. If sure and knowing its own mission and having that mission for all ages, it must be sure always. This is what Catholics mean by infallibility.—That the Church teaching in Christ's place is sure that what she teaches is what Christ taught.

According to our adversary all Churches are infallible, he is fallible in making the Bible the Standard, and there is no way out of the labyrinth. What we say is that there must be some living teacher, some one that can speak in the name of Christ, and with the authority of Christ to clear up all controversies. To deny this is to say that Christ came to throw the apple of discord among men, not to teach them truth. To grant that there is such a voice, such a living teacher is to grant the Catholic doctrine of infallibility, the gift of unfailing faith in the Church. We proceed to show scripturally that the gift we speak of resides in the head of the Church, the Pope of Rome. Only one question before we begin. Our adversary admits the Church to be an organism, but living organisms have a head.

Will he please say in his next who is the living visible head of the organism he calls the Church?

1. Christ chose a man named Simon as an apostle and changed his name solemnly to Peter (Rock).

After Simon Peter had made his famous declaration of faith: [Matt. 16: 17.] "Thou art the Christ, etc.," our Saviour said to Him: "Blessed art thou Simon Barjona: because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee but My Father who is in heaven. And I say to thee, that *thou art Peter* and on this Rock I will build my Church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to *thee* the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth it shall be loosed also in heaven."

Our Savior says that Peter is the rock on which He will build His Church. The *Baptist* says "Peter was not the rock on which the Church was built." It is only by flatly denying God's revealed word that we can deny Peter's headship. Who is unscriptural here? Am I to believe Christ and the Bible or the *Baptist*?

2. When Christ was about to leave this world He met His disciples on the shores of the lake of Galilee. We all remember the scene. It was when the apostles were fishing in Peter's boat and Christ appeared on the shore and caused the net to be filled with fishes. Thrice He made Peter declare his love and thrice He gave him a commission, Jno. 21: 15, 17: "—Feed my lambs," "Feed my sheep."

The Christian fathers interpret this solemn three-fold charge as an appointment of Peter to be chief shepherd. What does the good shepherd mean by telling Peter (the Rock) to feed his lambs and his sheep except to be shepherd in His stead? Why is it Peter again to whom the commission is given? Did Christ leave the world and

leave no one at the head? If so he did not found any Church or religion among men at all. He founded a debating society without a chairman, a parliament without a speaker, a republic without a president, a congregation without a preacher, a city without a mayor, a body without a soul, a moral monstrosity that results in endless jarring and wrangling. No, no, He meant what he said, He made Peter Shepherd, and placed him over the one fold; and his successor is still over it and is the spiritual head of the Christian world to-day. When we poor sheep obey Peter's voice we are obeying Christ and obeying the Bible as interpreted by the early Christians.

3. Christ foresaw all the heresies of the world, the *Baptist* heresy included, and arranged to defeat them: How? By providing for *unity in faith*, the most essential thing in this Church.

He said to this same Peter [Luke 22; 32.] at the last supper: "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath sought *you*, to sift *you* as wheat: But I have prayed for *thee* that *thy* faith fail not: and *thou* being once converted, confirm *thy* brethren." He then foretells Peter's denial.

Now ponder this text. Satan is going to sift the disciples and apostles. Here we have the plural. Christ prays for *one*, notice the "*thou, thee, and thy*," that he may not fail in faith. Christ's prayer must be heard. *Peter never fails in faith*. though he may sin otherwise. And why is this privilege obtained for him by Christ. Do thou "confirm thy brethren." The chance reader must notice the *thou, thee* and *thy* referring to *one* man. The Catholics argues, Christ gave the gift of *unfailing faith* to Peter, the Rock on which He built His Church, and therefore to his successors; the *Rock* stands, the rights and privileges of the Rock must stand too. There is the same need for Peter's successors being *unfailing in faith* as for Peter. The gift was not given for a passing generation, but for all time as long as

the Rock should stand and the Church stand on it. If we take the weight of tradition in connexion with these scripture texts the force of our argument is doubled. We Catholics rest on tradition as well as Scripture.

To sum up: Scripture proves that Christ makes Peter the head of His Church, its chief pastor, gives him the keys of the kingdom of heaven, promises that the gates of hell shall not prevail against His Church. These promises must be realized in Peter's successors, otherwise Christ's promises are vain. These successors are the Bishops of Rome. Therefore these Bishops of Rome are the heads of Christ's Church and hold the keys of the kingdom of heaven. This is very clear and simple. Of course if you deny the plain meaning of the Bible and deny the interpretations of the first fathers of the Church, nothing can be proved from Scripture.

A few brief answers are needed to clear up some misconceptions.

1. Infallibility is confounded by the *Baptist* with impeccability or sinlessness. They have no connection. A man may have *unfailing faith* yet commit murder and so lose his soul. If some Popes did not save their souls that does not prove that they taught false doctrine. If some chief justice of the United States Supreme Court is damned for private vice, that does not prove that he did not interpret the Constitution correctly.

Crimes of Catholics, of Bishops or of Pope's, have nothing to do with the question. What we claim is that God never allowed a Pope to teach heresy as the doctrine of Christ.

2. "The Roman Church is a vast hive or cage of heretical societies, and warring elements." Proof: In brief—A Catholic king, Victor Emmanuel captured the city of Rome. Please give some more proofs like this. They help the cause of truth by showing how silly is that of heresy. Our answer: There is not and cannot be any one heretic within the Roman Catholic

Communion; much less any heretical society. A heresy is a doctrine condemned by the Catholic Church. The moment any man holds such a doctrine he ceases to be Catholic, and every Catholic child knows this.

3. An army composed of Catholics sacked the city of Rome itself: there is no *unity* in the Catholic Church. Please continue to argue thus; your people will soon see that when sound logic is wanting, you are driven far afield to meet solid argument. The unity we claim is: 1. Unity of *faith*, we all believe the same doctrines. 2. Unity of worship, we have one sacrifice, one priesthood, one set of sacraments. 3. Unity of Church government—one head, the Pope; Bishops or successors of the apostles, all subordinate to the Pope; priests subject to Bishops, a regular hierarchy.

4. Your many texts concerning local Churches do not affect the argument for one "vast consolidated hierarchy," for you admit that there is but "one organic kingdom of Christ." One organic kingdom means one head and subordinate members. Please tell us how your scattered congregations are *united* into one *organic* body? What local churches composed the organized whole? How can I know which are now the genuine local churches? Shall we admit Presbyterians, Methodists, Episcopalians? Where shall we draw the line?

5. The Roman Catholic Church makes the Church the Savior of men instead of Jesus Christ alone.

This accusation is entirely false. Jesus Christ alone is the Saviour. He is the one mediator of salvation. No one is saved except through the saving merits of His Passion, and the grace that he gives. He is the vine, we are the branches. The Church is merely an instrument to distribute His sacramental graces, to give me His body to eat, to wipe off my sins through power he has given her. She is a living voice to tell me what He taught, but I believe her doctrine because he taught it.

and I believe her teaching because it is His, and she is commissioned by Him as I have proved, and will prove still more conclusively.

6. Salvation is a personal transaction between God and the sinner. Certainly it is, but this does not prove that faith alone will save us. "So faith also *if it have not works* is dead in itself." 1 James. 2: 17.

7. One word as to celibacy. Christ says [Matt. 19: 12.] There are eunuchs who have made themselves such for the kingdom of heaven. He *that can take let him take it*. Was not Christ Himself a virgin? Have not His priests a right to imitate Him? Is not His grace strong enough to help them do so?

Conclusion.—We can make no progress in this controversy unless we can agree upon a rule of faith. You hold that the Bible is that rule, we prove that it cannot be, because, 1st. It was not the rule given by Christ. He taught orally. 2nd. It was not the apostolic rule. The apostles taught orally. 3rd. It was not the rule during the glorious primitive ages, for the Bible had not been compiled. 4th. It was not the sole rule when it was compiled because the New Testament was put together by the authority of the Church. The authority that compiled it and gave it to the people, supplies the Bible as one fountain of revelation, but says it is not the only one. 5th. In the first fourteen centuries of Christianity there were few Bibles to be read, as printing had not been discovered, and few readers to read it, for reading was not a common accomplishment. It was not the rule of faith then for Christendom. 6th. You cannot spring a new rule of faith on the world in the fifteenth or sixteenth century and claim that it is the only infallible rule of faith. What right have you to do so? 7th. As a matter of fact Protestants have the Bible explained to them by a fallible teacher, and so not the Bible only is their rule of faith, but the

fallible explanation of their minister is practically their standard of faith. 8th. Had Christ wished the Bible to be the infallible guide instead of a living teacher, the printing press should have been part of His revelation, the curse of Babel should have been reversed, for we must have *His own words* in order to be sure of the written truth, the art of reading should have been enjoined as a command and the work of modern Bible societies should have been begun forthwith in Jerusalem. Let us try to have some clear understanding about the rule of faith.

THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

PROPOSITION: *Resolved that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*

CHURCH PROGRESS, Affirms.
AMERICAN BAPTIST, Denies.

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S THIRD NEGATIVE.

(May 14, 1891.)

We are sorry that the *Church Progress* is so hard to please. It calls us "our adversary," contrary to the terms of agreement. Instead of being an adversary, we are a *friend* of Roman Catholics, laboring earnestly to win them to the whole truth, as it is in Christ. 1st. The *Church Progress* boldly accepted the proposition, which reads: "*Resolved, that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*" But, seeing its difficulty, the *Progress* deliberately leaves out the word "Roman" from the proposition! If the *Progress* may leave out one important word from the proposition, why may we not leave out the word *Catholic*? In fact, we only left out "Catholic" in repeating, for the sake of brevity. We have an example of this in the creed of Pope Pious IV., which must be believed on pain of damnation. This creed opens thus: "I, N. N., with a firm faith believe and profess all and every one of those things which are contained in that creed which the holy Roman Church maketh use of," etc. Thus the opening sentence of the creed leaves out *Catholic* and uses "Roman Church." Must we be condemned as an *heretic* and "adversary," because we follow the example of the creed of this Church? Also the same creed says: "I acknowledge the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church for the mother and

mistress of all churches," etc. See Mission Book of St. Liguori, pp. 272-275.

The *Church Progress* must acknowledge the "Roman Church," or be denounced as a *heretic* and "adversary." The *Church Progress* well knows that the Greek Church claims to be the Catholic Church. Also, the English Episcopal Church believes in the Catholic Church, as well as all the leading Protestant Churches. Does the *Progress* propose to defend all these parties, as the true Church of God? The *Progress* is willing to be called "the Roman Catholic Church but *not* the Roman Church!" But it must be willing to be called the "Roman Church" according to its own creed. We hope the *Progress* will now leave off its whims and defend the proposition just as it obligated itself to do. *This it must do, or acknowledge that the Roman Catholic Church cannot be sustained.*

2d. The *Progress* does not state our points of agreement correctly. While the true church has the infallible head in the person of Christ, the infallible rule of faith in the Bible, and the infallible comforter in the person of the Holy Spirit, we admitted that the membership are liable to err. At the outset, the *Church Progress* claimed infallibility for the Roman Catholic Church. The word infallible means *freedom from error, in all things*. But we showed by the admission of Romanists themselves, that the members of the "Roman Church" were not only fallible, but many of them the worst of sinners. Now, under pressure, the *Church Progress* admits that "a man may have infallible faith and yet commit murder and lose his own soul!" According to this the infallibility of the "Roman Church" is not sufficient to save even one soul from hell, nor sufficient to save one from committing murder!! Again, the *Church Progress* says: "If some Popes did not save their souls, that does not prove that they taught false

doctrines;" but it does prove that they were fallible and liable to teach false doctrine. The Chief Justice of the United States is liable to err in his opinion of the constitution and laws. His opinion is not infallible; so, the interpretations of the Pope may be erroneous. God's revealed constitution is the supreme standard, just as the constitution and laws form the standard by which the Supreme Judges themselves must be tried. Instead of the Roman Catholic Church being infallible, as at first claimed, it now turns out that the infallibility is only claimed for one member, the Pope; and the quality of his infallibility is so poor that he may commit murder and go to hell! Surely this is a slender thread upon which to hang the salvation of the world! To further illustrate the quality of the infallibility of the Popes, we quote from the Roman Catholic historian, Baronius, as given by Dowling, in his history, p. 219. This is the testimony, not of a Baptist, or Protestant, but of a Roman Catholic. Baronius says:

"O! what was then the face of the holy Roman Church! how filthy, when the vilest and most powerful prostitutes ruled in the court of Rome! by whose arbitrary sway dioceses were made and unmade, bishops were consecrated, and—which is inexpressly horrible to mention!—(FALSE POPES, THEIR PARAMOURS,) were thrust into the chair of St. Peter, who, in being numbered as Popes, serves no purpose except to fill up the catalogue of the Popes of Rome. For who can say that persons thrust into the Popedom without any law by harlots of this sort, were legitimate Popes of Rome? In this manner, LAST, supported by secular power, excited to frenzy, in the rage for domination, RULED IN ALL THINGS."

We do not quote this to reproach any living Romanist, but simply to show the fallibility of the Popes of Rome. It is not only absurd, but superlatively ridiculous. As we advance in the discussion, it will be shown that the Popes were not infallible in doctrine, because often times one Pope contradicted another.

This whole question of Papal infallibility is based on the

supposed supremacy of the apostle Peter. In a former negative argument, we showed positively, that Peter was not the "foundation rock:" on which the church was built. "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. 3:11. Christ himself is the foundation. Neither did Peter have any more authority than the rest of the apostles. The key power was not given to Peter alone. Read Matt. 16:13-19. Please mark the points.

1st. After asking what others said, Jesus put the direct question to his apostles, in the plural: "*But whom say ye that I am?*" 2nd. As it would not have been proper for all to speak at once, Peter answered for the others as well as for himself, "*Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God.*" 3rd. Jesus then addressed Peter as the spokesman, and through him all the other apostles, when he said: "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," etc. 4th. That Peter no more had the keys than the others is clearly seen from the fact that the same power was given to all the apostles. The key power, given through Peter, was simply "*to bind and loose on earth.*"—"whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Matt. 16:19. But the same power is given to all the apostles, where Jesus says:

"Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Matt. 18:18.

The key power was simply to bind and loose on earth. This power was not confined to Peter, as Romish writers contend. Jesus said to the apostles in the plural, "*whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.*" This is the same key power given, through Peter, to all the apostles. Jesus not only here gives the same key power to all the apostles, but he

shows how the "keys" are to be used. The brother who commits a "trespass" if he neglects to hear the Church, is to be treated as "an heathen man"—excluded from fellowship. The gospel steps to be taken are given in Matt. 18:15-17, and in the next verse the Savior explains the exclusion, as the exercise of the key power, to bind and loose. The Savior said:

"Woe unto you, lawyers; for ye have taken away the key of knowledge." Thus it appears that the "keys of the kingdom" refer to the authority and knowledge to execute the laws of Christ on earth. By the power of the keys the inspired writers put in permanent form, the inspired knowledge of the organic kingdom of Jesus Christ. The part of the key power which refers to the reception and exclusion of members and the transaction of other business of the kingdom, is left with the churches of Christ, as his executives. The key power has no reference whatever to the opening and shutting of heaven. If the command to Peter, feed the sheep and lambs, of Christ, made him the infallible pope then the command to the elders at Ephesus to feed the flock made them popes also. Paul says: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." Acts 20:28. Will the *Church Progress* affirm that these bishops were popes, because they were to feed the church of God? That Peter was not a pope may be seen from the following facts:

- 1st. Peter was not Pope over the Church, because Christ neither appointed him, nor any one else, to such an office.
- 2nd. Peter himself made no claim to any supremacy, or Popedom whatever.
- 3rd. No inspired writer ever mentioned the supremacy or Popedom of Peter.

4th. Paul did not receive his commission from Peter, but directly from Jesus Christ. (1 Cor. 1:1.) But if Peter had been universal Pope, then Paul would have received his commission from him.

5th. Peter had a wife, which is not lawful for a pope.

6th. The apostle Paul reprov'd Peter for error, which he would not have done if Peter had been the infallible Pope. (Gal. 2:11.)

7th. Peter's commission was not universal, but was limited to the Jews. (Gal. 2:7, 8.) But if Peter had been Pope in the Romish sense, his commission would have been universal.

8th. "James, Cephas and John" are mentioned by Paul equally as pillars in the Church, which shows that Peter had no office above James and John. (Gal. 2:9.)

9th. When the Samaritans were converted, under the preaching of Phillip, the apostles of Jerusalem "sent unto them Peter and John." If Peter had been the universal Pope, over all the other apostles, he would not have been sent by the other apostles. (Acts 8:14.)

10th. After Christ had said, "thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church," and "unto thee will I give the keys of the kingdom." there was a strife among the Apostles, which of them should be accounted the greatest. Now, if Peter had been made Pope over all the rest, by Christ, in the presence of the apostle, as Romanists contend, then they would have known that Peter was "the greatest," and had no contention.

The *Church Progress* is mistaken. Christ did not make "Peter the shepherd." "There shall be one fold and one shepherd." "I am the good shepherd." John 10:14-16. Peter is nowhere called the shepherd of the fold.

It is hard for the *Church Progress*, it seems, to learn that the Protestant denominations are not involved in this discus-

sion. It is the Roman Catholic Church. God has had witnesses from the time of Christ on earth until the present. The Roman Catholic Church had no existence for several centuries after Christ. It never was the true church of God. These facts will be established as we advance in the discussion.

NEGATIVE ARGUMENT 4. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true Church of God, because it rejects the Bible standard of authority and rule of government for her own traditions.*

The *Church Progress* has so little respect for the Bible as to compare it to the bone of contention between two dogs! We are not surprised that the clergy of the "Roman Church" do not encourage the laity to read and understand the Bible for themselves. They introduce them into the Church in unconscious infancy, and teach them that it is wrong to think for themselves on the subject of religion; and through life they treat them like young birds in the nest, before their eyes are open, which swallow everything the parent bird may put into their mouths. The apostle exhorted the members of the Corinthian church to *examine themselves*, whether they be in the faith.

Again the *Church Progress* charges that the Bible is the source of endless disputes and quarrels! This is equivalent to charging endless disputes and quarrels to God Almighty, because God is the author of the Bible. Must Christ be rejected as the head of the church because men dispute and quarrel concerning his Messiahship? All objections of the *Church Progress* to the Bible as the standard of authority will be fully answered in our line of negative arguments. We contend boldly that the Bible, the inspired Word of God, contains all the information necessary to salvation, and to guide us in our duty to God and men. This is positively denied by the "Roman Church." The creed of Pope Pius IV., which must be endorsed by every Roman Catholic, says:

"I most steadfastly admit and embrace the apostolic and ecclesiastical Traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church. I also admit the holy Scriptures, according to that sense which our holy mother the Church hath held and doth hold, to him it belongeth to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures; neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers. * * * I likewise undoubtedly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and General Councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent. And I condemn, reject, and anathemize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies which the Church hath condemned, rejected, and anathemized." See Ligouri's *Mission Book*, pp. 273, 275.

According to this wonderful, impossible and monstrous creed, every Roman Catholic, on pain of damnation, must embrace the apostolic traditions which he knows nothing about, and all ecclesiastical traditions of fifteen centuries and more, with all other observances and constitutions of the Church, though he has never even heard of one in a thousand of these traditions. How can they embrace and believe in something of which they have never heard? Instead of the so-called mother Church being authorized to judge of the sense of the Scriptures, it turns out that only one member of that Church, in the person of the Pope, has this right to judge, and even that member is so fallible that he may commit murder and go to hell, according to the *Church Progress*. Also, a Roman Catholic must have such enormous faith as to receive and profess all other things delivered in the canons and councils of the Roman Church. Surely it is less difficult to understand, believe and receive the Bible standard of authority and rule of action, than the Roman Catholic rule. The Roman Catholic rule includes the Latin Vulgate imperfect translation of the Bible with the Apocrypha, eight large volumes of Popish Bulls, ten folio volumes of Decretals, thirty-one folio volumes of Acts of Councils, fifty-one volumes of the Doings and Sayings of the Saints, and about thirty-five volumes of the

Greek and Latin Fathers. Added to all these is a swarm of unwritten traditions which, like the locusts from the smoke of the pit, have darkened the ecclesiastical heavens for twelve centuries. All these, including the traditions, would make as much reading matter as would be contained in one hundred and fifty books as large as our Bible. Yet every Roman Catholic must believe, receive and profess all that is contained in this vast unknown and unknowable *rule of faith!* How can the average Romanist understand this enormous creed, even in a thousand years? He must become acquainted with the Greek and Latin languages, and read more than one hundred huge volumes of Bulls, Decretals, Acts of Councils with the Church Fathers, etc., before he can intelligently believe the Roman Catholic standard of faith and practice! This, one could not accomplish in an ordinary lifetime. Will the *Church Progress* say that all this is not necessary? that he is not required really to understand these books; but simply to say he believes in things of which he has never heard? It is impossible and absurd! There is no intimation in the Scriptures that such an enormous creed is necessary to salvation.

3rd. The *Church Progress* is a little off when it flings at "the Baptist heresy." In Paul's celebrated defence against the *infallible* (?) Jewish priest, in the presence of Felix, the governor, he said: "But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets." Acts 24:14. In like manner, after the way which Roman priests call *heresy*, so worship we the God of our fathers. As Paul did not believe in the traditions of those priests, neither do we believe the traditions of Roman Catholic priests.

These "bishops of Rome" are not the head of the church of Christ. There is no Scripture for making either Peter or

the Pope the head of the Church. Jesus Christ himself is the "head over all things to the church." Eph. 1:22.

4th. The *Church Progress* ridicules the idea of a Roman Catholic army under a Roman Catholic king, in battle with the army of the Pope at the city of Rome, disturbing the unity of the Church. Though the Pope at the head of the army may make war upon another Roman Catholic army, the unity is not broken! This may resemble the unity in the bowels of Mount Vesuvius. There may be unity without peace or harmony; but the Bible teaches "unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." The so-called unity of the "Roman Church" is not the unity of the church of Christ.

We agree with the *Church Progress* that a man has a perfect right to abstain from marriage and to fast as oft as he may think best to promote his spiritual devotions. But such abstinence and fasting must be wholly voluntary. The Church, which is guilty of "forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats," is deceived by "seducing spirits and doctrines of devils." Some other minor points are answered in our regular negative arguments.

OUR CONTROVERSY.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD.

CHURCH PROGRESS' FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE.

(May 16, 1891.)

Last week we clearly stated in what sense the term *Roman* could be used in respect to the Catholic Church, viz., as indicative of the headship and the central point of unity in the Church. We distinctly affirmed that we are willing to accept the term as descriptive of the Church, in this sense. We avoided the use of it *purposely*, not because of any difficulty in it, but to free the controversy from just such squibbles as the *Baptist* has brought up. There is no necessity of using the word because when we, or the *Baptist*, or anyone else speaks of the Catholic Church it is as clearly understood that the one Catholic Church is meant as when we speak of the Protestant Church. We pointed this out very clearly when we argued that in any country in the world in answer to the inquiry "Where is a Catholic Church?" you will unfailingly be directed to the only Church universally known to be such. Try this test anywhere; it never fails. We do not propose to waste any more time over the word. We have sufficiently explained its use and its meaning to intelligent people.

2. When we entered upon this controversy we supposed that we were going to argue the question with an antagonist who knew at least something about Catholic doctrine. Imagine our astonishment upon seeing the *Baptist* so helplessly and per-

sistently confusing *infallibility* with *impeccability*. No Catholic child, who has attained to the first use of reason, does not know the distinction between them. It is no part of Catholic doctrine, never was, and never will be to attribute *impeccability* to Pope, cardinal, priest or layman. We refer the *Baptist* to the dictionary for the different meanings of the two words. Freedom from liability to sin, and freedom from liability to teach false doctrine are two very different things. To argue, as the *Baptist* does, that because a man is liable to sin, therefore he must teach false doctrine, is sheer nonsense. I am liable to sin and sin frequently, but there are many things that I infallibly know and to which I give infallible utterance. I know two and two make four. I know the entire multiplication table; all this I know infallibly and have taught infallibly. I know that to lie, to steal, to murder, to slander are wrong, and teach that they are wrong with unerring certainty. None the less am I a sinner.

Let us apply the *Baptist* physic to its own argument. Liability to sin means liability to teach false doctrine, says the *Baptist*; therefore, admitting that Popes have sinned, is to admit that the Church is not infallible. Here are the *Baptist's* own words: "Again, the CHURCH PROGRESS says: 'if some Popes did not save their souls, that does not prove that they taught false doctrines;' but it does prove that they were fallible and liable to teach false doctrines."

3. Now all men are liable to sin, the preachers of the Baptist or any other denomination; all men we say, excepting of course the One Man who could never sin, Our Lord Jesus Christ. All men therefore being liable to sin are consequently liable to teach false doctrine. Now Christ confided the teaching of his doctrine to men. From the beginning, then, until our day, the men who have been teaching Christianity, all having been sinners, may have been teaching false doctrines, may

have been teaching doctrines that are not Christ's. We therefore have no assurance that the doctrine now taught by peccable men, and transmitted to them by peccable men, is Christ's doctrine at all. Are we not being seduced by false teachers? Where shall we turn to find with certainty Christ's doctrines? To the Bible? But I am a peccable man, a sinner, and therefore fallible. How can I interpret that Book with certainty—with infallibility? How do I know that it contains Christ's teachings at all? Where does it come from? Who gives me the assurance that it is true, and that it contains all that Christ taught? Christ himself did not write it. It contains no word saying that he commanded his apostles to write it. It was not collected in its present form for four centuries after Christ Himself had left the earth. Existing contemporaneously with it and as ancient as any parts of it were other gospels, narrating and expounding the same events and doctrines. Why are not these other gospels of the same value and importance as those now in use? Who determined which were spurious and which were not? They were not written in English, but in languages of which I know nothing. How do I know that they were correctly translated? I cannot compare the translation with the original. Where are the original documents? Moreover, as I cannot read at all (there are millions who cannot read) I shall have to depend upon another to read them to me; and as I understand that their meaning is oftentimes abstruse, hard to understand, requiring a knowledge of the times and the manners of the times in which they were written, and as we are warned by the very Book in question that many shall wrest its meaning to their own destruction, how can I rely upon it or my own fallible powers to gather from it, with assurance and certainty, the revelation of Christ and the whole revelation?

4. I am told (according to the *Baptist's* argument, that all

men are peccable and therefore fallible, liable to sin; therefore liable to teach falsely; that there is no living teacher who can infallibly assure me of the truth of the Bible or of the truth of the Church which Christ instituted to teach all men. I see innumerable sects warring over the meaning of the Bible. I see those who profess to understand and to teach the word of God at daggers points over the meaning of the simplest texts. Protestant Christianity I see hopelessly divided into hundreds of sects. But let me narrow the question down. Here are Protestantism and Catholicity, each claiming to be Christianity. According to the *Baptist's* argument, for aught that peccable and fallible men can know, Catholicity may be true Christianity as well as Protestantism, for no peccable, and therefore fallible, man can know infallibly that it is not true. According to the same reasoning Protestantism may not be Christianity at all, or at least only a distorted and perverted Christianity, for no peccable, and therefore fallible, man can know infallibly or unerringly that it is true. The Protestant argument sweeps from under my feet any assurance of the truth of Christianity, where it may be, or how it is to be distinguished; for peccable, and therefore fallible, men have no assurance of the truth of the Christian teachings. The sole rule of faith, which Protestantism declares, I see cannot possibly be the sole rule, for plainly it requires an interpreter to tell me what the Bible truly means, and when I see this asserted rule put into practice I find the Bible interpreted in as many ways as there are sects attempting to interpret it.

5. But the Catholic Church presents the question under quite a different aspect. She tells me that the Bible is not the sole rule of faith, but that there is a living teacher divinely promised to teach unerringly whatsoever Christ taught; she tells me the Bible is the inspired word of God, that *her* priests and Bishops wrote the Bible; that she preserved their books,

collected them together in their present form in the Fourth century, and has since preserved them to the world; moreover that it was she, who determined out of the number of documents written in the first centuries which were genuine and which were not; that these documents are not the rule of faith; because they require an interpreter to explain their meaning, but at the same time they are the inspired word of God, for she alone has the authority to determine them to be such, and that they stand as witnesses to her truth. She declares that she teaches that truth infallibly, without fail; that Christ deposited that truth with her, and promised that she, His Church, should be divinely guarded from teaching any other truth than His. What therefore she teaches as binding on men's faith she teaches without error. This is the position of the Catholic Church; she claims infallibility in her teaching; no other Church purporting to be Christian, makes the same claim. On the contrary all other churches furiously dispute her claim, assert that it is ridiculous, and declare it to be unscriptural; indeed they say, according to the *Baptist's* argument, that *fallibility* is a characteristic of Christianity, and to claim infallibility is an evidence of fallibility.

Let us now turn to some fundamental postulates of reason. We are rational beings and reason is not to be discarded in such questions as these. St. Paul tells us to give a reason for the faith that is in us. Reason declares, that, if God has made a definite revelation to men and for all men, that revelation must be transmitted to men, as it was given, without fail or change. Now God's revelation must have been infallible, and must have been given infallibly. It must therefore be transmitted infallibly, as God gave it; otherwise the generations, succeeding the one to whom the revelation was immediately given, would fail to receive God's revelation, But God is all wise, all powerful; in His omniscience and His omnipotence

He must have provided for the preservation of His revelation intact to the end of time. If He could not do this He would not be God. If He did not do this He never made a revelation, for He could not without stultification have made a revelation which should fail. If therefore God has made a revelation at all, He must have provided for its unerring transmittance to all succeeding generations. To transmit that revelation without error is to teach it infallibly. If therefore I wish to ascertain which Church, claiming to be His Church, is truly His, one of its essential marks will be infallibility. So speaks reason.

Examining all the churches claiming to be Christian, all *except one* actually repudiate the mark of infallibility. They even declare such a claim to be un-Scriptural; they boldly assert it to be ridiculous, and affirm that, because men are peccable there can be no such thing as the infallible teaching of God's revelation. But the Catholic Church does claim this note and alone claims it. She therefore alone has any claim whatsoever to the considerations of reason.

The *Baptist* has never once faced this argument. It constantly replies, with a monotonous reiteration, that to claim infallibility is not to prove it. It has entirely overlooked the point that not to claim infallibility is to give up at once all possible claim to be God's Church. If there be a revelation and if there be a Church, and both of these the *Baptist* admits, then that Church and that revelation must be infallible; for God could not have revealed falsely, nor can He suffer that revelation to be taught falsely. Let the *Baptist* for once meet the argument squarely; Can the Church, established by God, teach falsehood? *Must not the Church established by God teach infallibly?* It is evidence against the truth of any Church to openly reject the note of infallibility.

[6] 3. In connection with this point is it not the function

of *the Church* to teach? When individuals teach in the Church they so teach only by virtue of their official character, just as officers of the government administer their offices in virtue of the authority of the government whose mandates and laws they execute. This brings us to the consideration of another point which the *Baptist* has also shirked, the question of unity as a characteristic of God's Church. The *Baptist* has admitted that the Church of Christ is an organic kingdom. In an organic structure one part is subordinated to another, and all to the highest. That which is highest is first and most important and to it in proper proportion all must be subject. Therefore every organism must have a head. The Catholic Church alone can show such a headship. That head is the Bishop of the Roman See. Protestantism has no such headship. It is divided into some five hundred sects, each independent of the other; without common head; therefore it is not organic. Moreover every organism is animated by a principle of unity, which is its very soul, the very power in virtue of which it is an organization. Organization necessarily implies unity. A Church organization, first of all, necessarily requires a unity of doctrine. Without unity of doctrine there is no unity of faith, therefore no organized faith. One faith is necessary to Church organism. Protestantism has no such unity of doctrine or faith. Now the Catholic Church possesses such unity and she alone possesses it. Moreover, she has not only unity of faith—that is, she not only teaches everywhere and always the same doctrine—but she enjoys unity of worship; she has one sacrifice, one priesthood, one set of sacraments; besides she possesses unity of government—one head—the Pope; Bishops or successors of the apostles, all subordinate to the Pope; priests subject to the Bishops, a regular hierarchy. All these are the tangible, visible, indubitable evidences of her organic substantial existence and she alone

possesses them. Protestantism cannot show them. But the organic Kingdom of Christ must be able to show this mark of unity. It must be a visible unity. An invisible organism is an absurdity. A number of churches teaching conflicting doctrines, independent in worship, without sacrifice or priesthood, without head and without hierarchy, can possess and can show no unity. But unity, as we have shown, is an essential mark of Christ's Church and this mark the Catholic Church alone possesses. The conclusion is evident. The Catholic Church is alone the true Church of God.

[7] The two most vital points so far broached in this controversy, Infallibility and Unity as essential marks of Christ's Church, which we have shown to belong to the Catholic Church alone, have been before the *Baptist* from the beginning. It has shirked both. Will it face them definitely, and at least try and rebut them as we have presented them? Whipping around the stump is of no avail. The *Baptist* is on trial before its own readers. It must face the issue squarely or confess to its own inadequacy in meeting our arguments.

There is no use arguing over the texts advanced by the *Baptist* to sustain its various side-issues until these fundamental points have been determined. Quotations from Baronius or other Catholic historians to substantiate an irrelevant point are of no value and merit no reply. We have made it very plain that we are not discussing the peccability of Popes or any one else. Popes have sinned, and they will be held responsible for their sins. But that is not the question here. For its own sake we advise the *Baptist* not to lay itself open to the ridicule of our readers by confusing so outrageously what every Catholic knows to be so distinctly apart. [8]

Furthermore, what is to be gained by arguing from biblical texts, when the *Baptist* itself patently admits that being peccable it is liable to error, and therefore it may misconstrue the

texts it quotes? In other words how does the *Baptist* know what is the true meaning of the texts it so plentifully advances? If there be not *rule* or *standard* by which either we or the *Baptist* can determine the true meaning of these texts, of what value are they in settling disputed points, when each (according to the *Baptist's* argument) has the right and authority to put his own meaning on them? Let us apply the *Baptist's*—the Protestant principle—to the texts quoted by it in the attempt to disprove Peter's supremacy; we will follow the numbered paragraphs of the *Baptist* in the same order.

1. Peter was Pope over the Church, because Christ appointed him alone to such an office.

2. Peter needed to make no claim to supremacy, for his supremacy was too clearly recognized to be disputed.

3. The four evangelists not only mention but clearly state the supremacy or popedom of Peter.

4. Paul did not receive his commission directly from Christ; for Paul was commanded to go to Ananias by whom he was made a priest of God.

5. Peter *once* had a wife—yes. That Peter had a wife after he had become Pope is another matter. But the question of Peter's wife is utterly beside the point.

6. Paul reproved Peter not for teaching false doctrine, but upon a point of conduct. Saints have reproved Popes in the same way.

7. Peter's commission was not limited to the Jews because he taught them. The Pope is Bishop of Rome, but his jurisdiction and his teaching power is not limited to the citizens of Rome.

8. Because James and John are mentioned by Paul as pillars of the Church along with Peter, it does not follow that Peter was not their ecclesiastical superior. Cardinal Manning and Leo XIII, are both pillars of the Church but Cardinal

Manning is not the Pope, and the Cardinal is subject to the Pope.

9. "Sent" does not here mean that Peter and John were *commissioned*, that is *divinely empowered* by the other apostles to go to the Samaritans, but simply, as in its ordinary sense, that *from* the apostles *to* the Samaritans were sent two of their number to confirm the new converts in their faith.

10. This happened before the spirit of truth had descended on the apostles: before they fully understood what Christ's mission was on earth; they did not comprehend his words, nor even His visible presence amongst them, and imagined he spoke of an earthly power. Their contention was as to who should possess the greatest earthly power.

But enough. Now who shall determine which interpretation of the texts, involved in this question, is correct? If there be no infallible teacher to tell us what the real meaning is, and this is the position of the *Baptist*, who shall solve it? Ours is as good as the *Baptist's*, and we believe much better; more in keeping with the spirit of the context, and in keeping with the best scriptural learning. The *Baptist* will of course deny this. Who, on its own showing, is capable of settling it?

THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

PROPOSITION: *Resolved that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*

CHURCH PROGRESS, Affirms.
AMERICAN BAPTIST, Denies.

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S FOURTH NEGATIVE.

(May 21, 1891.)

In its issue of March 21, the *Church Progress* accepted and endorsed for discussion the following: "Resolved, that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God." It forfeits its word and agreement by leaving out the word "Roman!" The *Progress* said in its second affirmative: "The Church, herself, never uses the term *Roman Catholic!*" In our last rejoinder, we called attention to the fact that the term "Roman Church" is used twice in the creed of Pope Pius IV. Their standard theologian, St. Alphonsus Ligouri, in his "Glories of Mary," endorsed by Archbishop John Hughes, in his preface says: "The holy Roman Catholic Church." p. 4. Thus we have the authority of the creed of the *Roman Church* and the chief theologian, Ligouri, and Archbishop Hughes, indorsing the name of "Roman Church," and "Roman Catholic Church," as the name of that hierarchy over which the Pope presides in the city of Rome. After a solemn agreement to affirm "that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God," the *Church Progress*, endorsed by two Archbishops and seven Bishops, forfeits its word and agreement and attempts to dodge the question by leaving out the word *Roman*. The *Progress* knows full well that Protestants as well as Romanists profess to belong to the Catholic

Church. Let the *Church Progress* assume the full responsibility of the agreement or make an unconditional surrender of the proposition, as untenable. We number certain points in the affirmative of the *Church Progress*, and make such notes as we deem proper, before we resume our regular negative argument.

2. The *Church Progress* knows "the entire multiplication table" and that "two and two make four;" therefore we entertain some hope that it may yet learn the truth concerning the church of Christ. At first it claimed that the "Roman Church" was infallible, but, since the discussion has opened, it only claims infallibility for one member of that Church; and his "infallibility" is so *fallible* that the Pope himself may commit murder, and go to hell. We quoted from the Roman historian, Baronius, to show that the line of succession of popes was completely broken, by their own testimony. For centuries the Roman Church was ruled by false Popes, unlawfully thrust into the so-called chair of St. Peter, by base women. If the Roman Church existed for centuries without a real Pope then the claim to infallibility is annihilated, by their own testimony.

3. Our argument is not represented correctly. By proving that a multitude of Popes were demons incarnate we overthrew the claim of infallibility for them. God would never appoint a monster of iniquity to be the supreme head over his church, even if another head besides Christ himself were lawful. But, according to the infallible word of God, no head was ever appointed over his church except Jesus Christ. As Christ is "head over all things to the true church," another head would make a monster out of the church, one body with two heads! The scriptural infallibility claimed for the true church, is absolute freedom from error for Christ its head, for its standard of authority and rule of government in the Bible, and for the in-

fallible witness and comforter, the Holy Spirit. This is a much higher grade of infallibility than that claimed for only one member of the "Roman Church." To the true, humble and obedient children of God the commandments of Christ, the *infallible*, Head are so plain and easy to be understood that they may "keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." God has always had true witness for His truth from the time of Christ on earth until now.

The *Church Progress* propounds a batch of skeptical questions concerning the authority of the Bible. It asks: "Where shall we turn to find with certainty, Christ's doctrines?" It would say turn to the Pope who is infallible. We would say turn to the infallible Scriptures, aided by the Holy Spirit. The teachings of Christ concerning his church and its ordinances, certainly are as plain and easy to be understood as the teachings of the Pope could possibly be, were he infallible. Why then cross oceans to go to the Pope when "the word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart; that is the word of faith, which we preach." Rom. 10:8. But the Romanist says "we need an infallible interpreter." Well, the Holy Spirit is the infallible guide and will enable us to know the truth, if we will follow him. Not one Romanist in ten thousand can ever go to the Pope to receive this infallible (?) teaching, and, as all the Cardinals and Bishops are fallible, then we must receive the Popes instruction through fallible men. Therefore, we cannot be infallibly sure that we have the real doctrine of the Pope. This pretended infallibility of the Pope must come to us through fallible and corrupt channels, therefore, it would be more difficult to comprehend the infallible interpretations of the Pope than to comprehend the plain and obvious teachings of the New Testament. In fact, if so many of the Popes were incarnate demons and went to hell, may not many of the Cardinals and Bishops be as bad? and may not the instructions

which they pretend to give from the Pope, be forged and bogus? How does any Romanist know with absolute certainty what the interpretations of the Pope are? He only has the testimony of fallible priests or fallible Bishops. He cannot possibly know whether the documents which he receives from the hands of the priest contain all the instructions of the Pope, and, besides all this, the Pope's teachings are in a foreign language. His Bulls, Allocutions and Decrees, are in Latin, and may be imperfectly translated by his *fallible* translators. There is more difficulty in determining between real Decretals of the Pope, and false Decretals, than in determining between the inspired books of the word of God, and the false gospels. No Roman Catholic objection to the Bible can be made which will not rebound with double force against the Roman Catholic rule of faith. It is not absolutely necessary to salvation to understand those writings which are difficult to comprehend. The revealed terms of salvation in the word of God are few, simple and easy to be understood. They need no Pope or bishop to stand as a mediator between Christ and the penitent soul.

4. In spite of the warring sects, every humble, contrite, obedient soul may be made "wise unto salvation" by the Holy Scriptures, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament contained the standard of authority for the Old Testament saints. They had no infallible Pope to interpret the Scriptures. They were to go directly to the word of God and accept and obey the truth. The same is true of the New Testament Scriptures. There is no more need of an outside infallible interpreter of the New Testament than there was of the Old Testament. The different warring and antagonistic societies in the Roman Church are as hopelessly divided as the Protestant sects themselves. One Pope has condemned the infallible decrees of another. The Pope has

engaged in battle with a Roman Catholic king and his army, and the so-called unity or the Catholic Church at times has resembled the unity of pandemonium. The New Testament says that the Bishop "must be blameless, the husband of one wife." The Roman Church says he shall not have a wife at all. Therefore the *Roman Church* is wrong and anti-scriptural. Paul speaks of those who would be led astray by "seducing spirits and doctrines of devils" such as "forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats." The Roman Church which *forbids to marry* and commands to abstain from meats stands convicted of heresy. Therefore, the Roman Catholic Church cannot possibly be the true church of Christ.

5. As the Roman Church tells me that "the Bible is not the sole rule of faith," will the *Progress* tell what is the sole rule of faith and practice? Must one understand and believe all the Bulls of the Popes, the Decretals, Acts of Councils, the huge volumes of the Greek and Latin fathers, the commandments of the Church, with the innumerable traditions of the Church? Surely it is easier and better to receive the pure word of God which is able to make one "wise unto salvation." All this claim of infallibility for the Pope, without a line of proof is worse than nonsense. The charges are not correct. The true church claims infallibility for her doctrine, as revealed in the New Testament. The Pope's teachings are tenfold more obscure than the plain teachings of the New Testament. This claim of infallibility for the Pope marks that Church as the anti-Christian Church. Paul says: "Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there be a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself

that he is God." 2 Thess. 2:3, 4. These prophecies of the coming "man of sin" are literally fulfilled in the person of the infallible (?) Pope. The very name, titles and authority of God himself are claimed for the Pope. Therefore the Roman Catholic Church is not the true Church of God.

6. We have already shown that the Roman Catholic Church is destitute of scriptural unity. The term church in the New Testament is never applied to a consolidated hierarchy like the Roman Church. As shown in our first negative, "the church of Christ is an assembly of baptized believers associated together in the doctrine and fellowship of the Gospel." This is the primary and literal meaning of the word church. In this sense there was a plurality of New Testament churches all modeled after the same pattern—the Jerusalem church. In addition to the primary and literal meaning of the word church, it is used, by a figure of speech, to indicate the church institution, where one is used to represent a class. Christ says: "And upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." This church existed centuries before the Roman Church was born. It has existed all the time independent of the Roman Catholic Church, through all ages down to the present time, and will exist forever.

7. Instead of proving that the Roman Catholic Church possesses scriptural infallibility and unity, the *Church Progress* contents itself by affirming and reaffirming and affirming again that it possesses this infallibility and unity! As the *Church Progress* is itself fallible, its statements without proof should not bear the weight of a feather in this controversy.

If the *Church Progress* cannot realize the force of our argument against its pretended infallibility, by showing that the succession of Popes was completely broken for centuries, our readers, whether Romanists or not, will appreciate the argument.

8. It is certainly proper to quote the Bible in this discussion, because it is admitted on both sides as containing the Word of God. These statements of the *Progress* are untrue. Will the *Progress* answer: 1st. What Scripture proves that "Peter was Pope of the Church"? 2nd. What Scripture proves that Peter had "supremacy" over the other apostles? 3rd. Where did the four evangelists mention the "supremacy or popedom" of Peter? 4th. What Scripture teaches that Paul was made a priest by Ananias? 5th. Yes; Peter had a wife when he was called to the apostleship, and the Savior did not violate his own law by ordering him to put her away. Many years afterward Peter was still living with his wife, as Paul testifies. "Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?" 1 Cor. 9:5. Here *Cephas* (Peter) and the "other apostles" were leading about wives. According to this, Pope Peter (if he was a Pope) had a wife. A priest or pope cannot be the successor of Peter in this particular. Other points will be answered as we advance our regular negative arguments.

THIRD NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true Church of God, because she rejects the Bible standard of authority and rule of government for her own traditions.*

We have answered the skeptical questions and quibbles of the *Progress* against the Bible as the rule of faith. But we continue the proofs. The Old Testament, being God's revealed Word, was the standard of authority and rule of government for the Israelites. God speaking through Moses said: "Ye shall not add unto the Word which I commanded you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I commanded you." Deut. 4:2. Solomon said: "Every word of God is pure; he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him. Add thou not unto his

words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." Prov. 30:5, 6. God spake through Jeremiah: "The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord." This Word of God was called his law. The Psalmist says: "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple." Ps. 19:7. The Israelites needed no unwritten traditions of the priests to inform them concerning the will of God. Again the Psalmist says: "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." Ps. 119:105. The Roman Church has rejected the *lamp* and the *light* which should guide the pilgrim's feet in the path of eternal life. She has substituted her miserable traditions for the Word of God. Paul exhorted Timothy:

"But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them; and that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. 3:14-17.

Instead of the traditions of the Church, Paul had been taught and knew from his infancy the "holy Scriptures," which were able to make him "wise unto salvation through faith in Christ." These holy Scriptures were not traditions of the priesthood. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." The Holy Scriptures not only make persons "wise unto salvation," but they furnish "the man of God" thoroughly "unto all good works." That which is not found in the Old Testament Scriptures was not binding on the Old Testament saints as

religious duty. That which is not contained in the New Testament Scriptures, as confirmed by the Old, is not binding on any one as religious duty. These "Holy Scriptures" were not given and perpetuated by unwritten tradition. Peter says: "Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Pet. 1: 20, 21.

Thus the Old Testament Scriptures, that were binding on the Israelites, were given through "holy men," and thoroughly furnished the children of God for every good work. These Scriptures were read and expounded in the presence of the people; but the Roman Church has almost entirely banished the holy Scriptures from her worship. The Savior said to the Jews: "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me." John 5: 36. When Paul and Silas had preached to the Bereans, of them it is said: "These were more noble than those at Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so. Therefore many of them believed: also of honorable women which were Greeks, and of men not a few." Acts 17: 11, 12. These Bereans were commended as doing a noble thing when they "searched the Scriptures daily" to know whether the apostles had preached the truth. This searching was done by men and women. The Roman Church does not encourage its members to search the Scriptures and judge for themselves, whether the priests preach the truth. Instead of the pure Word of God, the Roman Church feeds her children on traditions which are contrary to his word. While on the Mount of Transfiguration, in his confusion, Peter was willing to have three tabernacles for the three great teachers; one for Moses, one for Elijah and one for Christ. But,

being overshadowed by a bright cloud, the voice of the Father settled the matter by saying: "This is my beloved son in whom I am well pleased. *Hear ye Him.*" Matt. 17: 5. When they rose from their fright, they saw no man save *Jesus only*. Jesus was left as our only great Teacher. In fact, the great commission as given by the master confines the teaching to the commandments of Christ. He said: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and the son and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

Any teaching not commanded by Jesus Christ cannot be under the commission, or binding on the conscience of men. "*Teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded.*" The commission, therefore, forbids all the so-called commands of the Church, including saint's days, fast days, lent and all such like traditions and commandments of men. Of such the Savior said: "How be it in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." Mark 7: 7. Paul says: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of any holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days," etc. Col. 2: 16. This is a direct condemnation of the Roman Church which undertakes to judge her children concerning *meats and the holy days*, etc. False teachers had "bewitched" the Galatians with their traditions, for which Paul sharply reproveth them, saying: "Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed labor upon you in vain." Gal. 4: 10, 11. This is the very thing which the Roman Church has done. She observes saint's days, and months, and times, etc. All these traditions are worse than vain.

The proof is overwhelming. The Roman Catholic Church

is not the true church of God, because she willfully and deliberately rejects the Bible standard of authority and rule of government for her own traditions. Her commandments are in direct opposition to the inspired Word of God. Therefore, it is utterly absurd to call that Church the true church of God.

OUR CONTROVERSY.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD.

CHURCH PROGRESS' FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE.

(May 23, 1891.)

1. Twice have we explained in what sense we were willing to accept the word *Roman* as applicable to the Catholic Church, and still the *Baptist* is not satisfied. As indicative of the headship and central point of unity we stated that we admitted the term. To avoid absurd quibbling we omitted it from our proposition as unessential. The *Baptist* drags it violently in that it may quibble over a flagrant absurdity. It is patent enough what Church is meant when we say Catholic Church. We foresaw that the *Baptist* would seek to raise the foolish issue of the supposed local meaning of the term *Roman*. Well, we repudiate that meaning. When we apply a name to ourselves it is to be permitted to us to state in what sense we use it. The federal government is not *local* or circumscribed to the district of Columbia because its *seat* is there. But enough. Space is too valuable for further consideration of an evident point.

2. We are reluctantly compelled to attribute the *Baptist's* confusion of *Infallibility* with *Impeccability* to perverseness and not to sheer ignorance, as we first charitably supposed. It insists that the one is the other. Now to insist that a man means one thing, when he clearly means another, and with emphasis and positiveness plainly distinguishes between what he does mean and what he does not mean, is neither to argue

nor to reason. Once more, infallibility as defined by the Catholic Church, and as claimed by her, means *freedom from liability to teach false doctrine*. That is all that is meant or claimed. *Impeccability* means *freedom from liability to sin*, and this the Church claims for no man, save Jesus Christ Himself. To assail the doctrine of infallibility on the forced and false supposition that it means what we never held it means and plainly *cannot* mean, is to attack, not our position, but a figment of the imagination. It is entirely outside the question under discussion to attack the peccability of Popes or any one else. Neither has the *Baptist* proved that a multitude of Popes were demons incarnate. Because we pass by an irrelevant point it is no indication that we admit every naked *assertion* advanced or that we accept the *authenticity* of the authority quoted to uphold the unproved statement. We have neither time nor space to delay over every assumption of the *Baptist*.

3. The *Baptist* has not missed our argument; it has purposely evaded it. We asked it some point-blank questions. We repeat them here:

CAN THE CHURCH ESTABLISHED BY GOD, TEACH FALSEHOOD?

MUST NOT THE CHURCH ESTABLISHED BY GOD TEACH INFALLIBLY?

These are plain questions. To answer them is to meet the issue squarely, and this issue the *Baptist* evades by insisting upon confounding infallibility with *impeccability*. The gist of the whole matter is this: A characteristic or mark of God's Church is, that it *must* teach God's revelation *without possibility* of teaching it falsely. To teach in this way is to teach infallibly. Such a teacher is therefore infallible. To put the matter in simpler form still: that Church claiming to be God's Church must necessarily claim to teach infallibly. But the Catholic Church alone claims to teach infallibly; therefore the Catholic Church alone is the true Church of God. Again.

Any Church *that fails to make claim to infallibility* cannot be God's Church: But Protestantism repudiates that claim. Therefore Protestantism *cannot be* the true Church of God. *Not to claim* infallibility, as we said last week, is to renounce at the outset all claim to be God's Church. Will the *Baptist* answer this question?

CAN GOD'S CHURCH, ESTABLISHED TO TEACH ALL TRUTH, REJECT THE NOTE OF INFALLIBILITY? YES OR NO?

In No. 3, the *Baptist* says: "The scriptural infallibility claimed for the true Church is absolute freedom from error for Christ its head, for its standard of authority and rule of Government in the Bible, and for the infallible witness and comforter, the Holy Spirit." That Christ is infallible and the Holy Spirit is infallible goes without saying. We need not be told that. This is not the question. The question is, *whom* did Christ leave *here* to teach His doctrine without fail? For His doctrine must be taught here on earth and by peccable men too. That infallible guide, says the *Baptist*, is the Bible alone, and in reply to our criticisms on the insufficiency of this standard, it replies that we propound a batch of skeptical questions. No doubt they are to one who assumes that the sole guide of faith is contained in the pages of the inspired volume. We propounded those questions purposely to force the *Baptist*, if possible, to give a *rational* answer to the crucial point in the controversy, and it absolutely ignores them. To answer those questions is to confess that the Bible is not a sufficient guide to faith. We call the attention of the *Baptist's* readers to those questions and ask them to answer them in their own minds, if the *Baptist* cannot do it for them.

But in order to obscure the point at issue the *Baptist* attempts to drag in a comparison, which is remarkable only for the fact that it does not compare. In reply to the question, "where shall we turn to find with certainty Christ's doctrines?"

the *Baptist* says that the PROGRESS affirms that we should turn to the infallible Pope; whilst it asserts that we should turn to the infallible Scriptures. Now, argues the *Baptist* triumphantly, how can fallible men any more understand the infallible utterances of the Pope than the infallible words of the Bible? There are two answers to this. First the *fact* is that all Catholics the world over do understand the infallible utterances of the infallible Church in one way and one way only. They are all united in the *one meaning*, which is evidence that they *do understand* what is *meant*. Now another noticeable *fact* is that Protestants do not understand their infallible guide in one way and one way only, and that they are not united in the *one meaning*, which is evidence that they do not *comprehend* what is *meant*, for the simple reason that God's infallible word cannot have two opposed meanings. Secondly, a *living teacher* can always explain *his meaning*, and can be *sure* that it is understood as he meant it. There is not the slightest difficulty in the Church making herself understood, which is proved by the fact that all Catholics, whether they read or write or not, or know Latin or reside on this side of the ocean or in Rome or in China, hold exactly the *same doctrine*, which the *Pope himself* holds. As there is no difficulty in the citizens of the United States understanding what the law of the land is, so is there no, or even less, in Catholics understanding the faith taught by the Church. But the case is quite different where there is *no living teacher* to explain his meaning, and where the presumed guide is a written book, difficult to understand, which *cannot explain itself*, and is plainly subject to the *meaning* which the unguided reader may choose to put on it, as is done every day by Protestants. And this brings us to the essential point which the *Baptist* has completely overlooked. We argued against the *principle of private interpretation*, the fundamental principle of Protestantism. Our argument gath-

ers all its force from the fact that it is directed not *against* the *Bible* but against the *private interpretation* of the Bible. The truth is the Bible is not the rule of faith for Protestants. The rule of faith for Protestants is not the Book we call the Bible, but the *private interpretation* which each one puts upon that Book. Plainly, if that Book be God's word, there can be but *one* meaning to it, for God cannot contradict Himself. It is equally plain that there are some five hundred Protestant sects (not to speak of individual opinions) interpreting that book into as many different meanings. The Bible itself cannot mean all these contradictory things. The false meanings, therefore, come from the *people misinterpreting* and *misconstruing* that Book. Their rule of faith is, therefore, not the Book but *themselves*. Each is his own *teacher* and his own *guide*. The truth is that Protestants have no rule of faith at all, neither the Bible nor the Church. Every individual, on the principle of private interpretation, is the law unto himself, and thus the Bible *is made* to mean what *he means*. The pupil is his own teacher.

Let us illustrate by a single text this doctrine of private interpretation. We both agree that Christ said, "This is My Body." We agree that we have to believe what Christ *meant* when he said these words. But we do not agree; on the contrary we disagree hopelessly as to what he meant. Is there any way of deciding which of us is right? Yes or no? I am sure He meant it was His real body. It is evidently a matter of importance, for the consequence is that I adore the Consecrated Host, believing Christ to be there. If you are right, that Christ is not there, then Christ Himself has exposed me to the danger of idolatry by saying words which lead me to regard that as His Body which is only bread. Either there is some one to decide, some authority to teach the truth in this matter, or, when I meet Christ in judgment, I can say to

Him: "Lord, I believed your plain words in their plain meaning and they led me to be an idolator. But you are to blame, not I; and I have a right to tell you that you have led millions into similar idolatry." Please show me that such a speech would not be proper from the soul to Christ, on the supposition (the Protestant position) that there is no judge of the meaning of Christ's words.

"Unless you *eat the flesh* of the Son of Man and *drink his blood* you shall not have life in you." (John 6: 48-61.)

In the same way I can say to Christ: "You commanded me to eat your flesh. I went to the Church that said, 'I will give you the real flesh of Christ to eat.'" What can Christ say to me? will I not be safe? Have I not His own command? Did He not repeat *six* times that I must eat His body and drink His blood? I must believe the Bible literally, if possible. I do so, and believe that Christ Himself must be in the Eucharist. Read the 6th chapter of St. John and what else can you believe? The Catholic Church here holds just what Christ says in its plainest meaning. Please prove that I am not right in believing this. If I am right, then I am right in believing the Church that teaches it. If I am not, convince me that some other meaning is the right one; or answer our former question; who *can decide* between us which is the true meaning?

4. "As the Roman Church tells me that the Bible is not the sole rule of faith, will the *Progress* tell me what is the sole rule of faith and practice?" asks the *Baptist*. We will with pleasure. Whatsoever is the *pillar and ground of truth* is the sole rule of faith; but the *Church of God* is the pillar and ground of truth; therefore the Church of God is the *sole rule of faith*. We have it clearly expressed in the words of St. Paul, Tim. 3: 14, 15. "These things I write unto thee, hoping that I shall come to thee shortly. But if I tarry long, that

thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the *Church* of the Living God, *the pillar and ground of truth*." This is our "standard of authority and rule of government." What better can any man find? The Pillar and the Ground of truth, the Church of the living God, is our infallible authority and guide, and we should not forget that that pillar and ground of truth, because it is the Church of the *living* God, must be an infallible teacher of God's truth. Our Lord Himself promised that His Church should be indefectible, that is, should never fail in teaching the truth. Here are His words: "And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and on this Rock I will build my *Church*, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against *it*." (Matt. 16: 18.) Again, "All power is given to me in heaven and on earth. Going *therefore* teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; *teaching* them to observe all things *whatsoever* I have commanded you; and behold I am *with you all days*, even to the consummation of the world." (Matt. 28: 18-20.) Here Our Lord promises to be with His Church, the pillar and ground of truth, teaching without error, infallibly, even to the consummation of the world. Surely His word cannot fail, His promise cannot be broken. Either Christ told a falsehood when He promised indefectibility in teaching (infallibility) to His Church; or His Church, the pillar and ground of truth, is to this day and will be for all days infallible as He promised it would be. (See also Luke i. 31-33. John xiv. 16, 17.)

5. What the *Baptist* calls its "Third negative argument" we think we have disposed of in the foregoing argument against the Bible as the sole rule of faith, and against its unguided private interpretation. We call the attention of the readers of the *Baptist* to the questions which the *Baptist* has not answered and which we again ask it to answer. We also

wish to call their attention to the fact that the *Baptist* has, in like manner, failed to answer our argument on the *organic unity* necessary to Christ's Church. We advanced several pertinent and vital points on this question of unity. We would like to have them answered. That they may not escape observation we will put them again, with the hope that the *Baptist* will at least attempt to answer them.

DID THE *Baptist* EVER SEE AN ORGANIZED BODY WITHOUT A HEAD?

DID IT EVER SEE AN ORGANISM WITHOUT A PRINCIPLE OF UNITY?

DID IT EVER SEE AN INVISIBLE ORGANISM?

We ask these questions because the *Baptist* has admitted that Christ's is an *Organic Kingdom*. If so, it must have a *Head*, must be *One*, and must be *Visible*. We are trying to find out where that organic kingdom or Church of Christ is, and we will distinguish it from others by these marks or characteristics. It will have a *head*, it will be *one*, it will be *visibly* one. Will the *Baptist* please answer these points, for they are all essential to the question in hand.

5. We will not stop to answer the numerous texts the *Baptist* quotes to sustain its third negative argament. All are answered implicitly in the foregoing argument against the doctrine of private interpretation. The *Baptist* reads its own meaning into these texts, and it has its *sole authority* for this meaning *itself*. In the absence of any other authority we deny their application, for it is nothing more than the application of the principle of private interpretation, which we have shown to be valueless. Private interpretation is in no way *binding* on us or anybody else, not even on the private interpreter, for, if he be the sole authority, he may construe the same text one way to-day and another way to-morrow. Such interpretation is valueless and inapplicable.

In conclusion, in answer to the questions in No. 8 of the *Baptist*, we refer it, as we have not space to give them in full, to the following texts from Scripture to show Peter's Popedom and Supremacy; Matt. xvi. 15-19. Luke xxii. 31, 32. St. John xxi. 15-17. To show that St. Paul was made a priest by Ananias, see Acts ix. 7 to 18 inclusive. In answer to No. 5, the word which the *Baptist* takes to mean *wife* means simply *woman*. The Greek word is *gune*. But as these texts, as interpreted by the *Baptist*, have only the value of their interpreter, they must be taken at that valuation, and, as we have shown, that is nil.

THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

PROPOSITION: *Resolved that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*

CHURCH PROGRESS, Affirms.
AMERICAN BAPTIST, Denies.

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S FIFTH NEGATIVE.

(May 28, 1891.)

1st. The *Church Progress* has forfeited its word, and retreated from the proposition as accepted, and taken refuge under the word "Catholic," which is claimed by all denominations. The proposition as accepted stands thus: "*Resolved, That the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God,*" (2.) The *Progress* now charges "perverseness" instead of "sheer ignorance." The *Progress* must keep cool.

1st. The *infallibility* is not in the membership. 2. It is not in the priesthood. 3. It is not in the bishops. 4. It is not in Cardinals. 5. It is not in the councils. All these are not only sinful, but fallible in faith and morals. The Roman Catholic Church is admitted to be *fallible* in every member and officer except one. Not one in a hundred millions has the least taint of *infallibility*. Therefore, to say the Roman Church is *infallible* is to speak falsely, even according to Romanists themselves. When is the Pope infallible? 1. He is not *infallible* "in his capacity as private teacher." Cardinal Gibbons' "Faith of our Fathers," p. 147. All the *private* teachings of the Popes concerning "faith and morals," as well as everything else, are fallible. 2. The infallibility of the Pope "does not extend to natural sciences, such as astronomy or geology," etc. "It does not therefore concern itself about

the nature and motions of the planets." Faith of our Fathers, p. 148. So when the Pope condemned Galileo for teaching the revolution of the earth, he taught fallibly, though he thought he was teaching infallibly. 3. The Pope is not infallible when he teaches concerning "purely political questions," etc. Gibbons, p. 148. The Pope is *not infallible* as a private teacher, he is *not infallible* as a *scientific teacher*, and he is *not infallible* as a *political teacher*. The Pope is *infallible only in his official capacity when he judges of faith and morals as Head of the Church*. Faith of Our Fathers, p. 147. According to Romanists themselves, nine-tenths of all the teachings of the Popes are *fallible* and may be false. More and worse, the Popes are so fallible that they do not know when their own teachings are really infallible. Therefore there should be some *infallible* judge to decide what teachings of the Popes are infallible. Also these *fallible* and *infallible* teachings of the Popes flow out through fallible and corrupt channels, so there should be an *infallible* interpreter accessible to every one, to decide what teachings of the Popes are fallible, and what *infallible*. Besides all this uncertainty, it is admitted that the Popes are not "inspired." Cardinal Gibbons says: "No Catholic, on the contrary, claims that the Pope is inspired, or endowed with divine revelation, properly so-called." Faith of Our Fathers, p. 146. If the Pope is not "*inspired*" how can he teach *infallibly*? Cardinal Gibbons says: "Peter, it is true, besides the prerogatives inherent in his office, possessed also the power of working miracles, and the gift of inspiration. These two latter gifts are not claimed by the Pope," etc. Gibbons, p. 132. If the Popes are the successors of Peter they ought to be able to confirm their popedom by miracles, especially as the Roman Church abounds in miracles. In the light of the above admitted facts, the claim that the Roman Catholic Church is *infallible* is false

and outrageous. Infallibility is only claimed for a small part of the teachings of only one man in that Church, and no one knows certainly what part of his teachings are infallible. Also, it has been admitted that there were many false popes, only counted to fill the succession! The *Progress* will hardly claim that these *false popes*, thrust into the chair by prostitutes, possessed infallibility. As the succession of the popedom has been completely broken and cut off, the infallibility, if there was any, was forfeited and lost. In debate with Mr. Pope, Mr. Maguire, a Roman priest, says: "I admit the fact of Stephen throwing the body of the Pope in the Tiber, and the greater scoundrel he was, I affirm, for so doing." Priest Maguire admits that "there were eleven monstrous bad Popes." Pope and Maguire Debate, p. 277. Bishop Purcell is his Debate with A. Campbell, said; "I should not be surprised if these bad Popes were at this moment expiating their crimes in the penal fires of hell." Debate p. 145.

On page of debate 146, Bishop Purcell continues: "Stephen VI. had the body of Formosus dug up and cut off his fingers." One so-called infallible Pope tore the lifeless body of another so-called infallible Pope from the grave and cut off his fingers, because of the false doctrine which he penned, and then threw his body into the river. This is the unity of popery!

One infallible (?) Pope suppressed the Society of the Jesuits for their intolerable wickedness, but another infallible (?) Pope restored and indorsed that Society as a necessary aid to true religion.

3. No; "the Church established by Christ," as his church, cannot *ex cathedra* teach falsehood, because her only authorized teaching is found in his infallible Word. Individual members, as such, may and do teach error. Yes; the true church of God teaches the infallibility of Christ, her Head, the infallibil-

ity of her rule of faith, the Word, and the infallibility of the Holy Spirit, as the witness and Comforter. Therefore the true church *will not reject the note of infallibility*.

It is not a fact that all the Roman world understand "the infallible utterances of the Church, in one way, and one way only." The Ultra-montanes claim the divine right of the Popes to temporal supremacy over kings, while the Gallicans, in the Roman Church, bitterly deny this doctrine. The Pope is not a present "living teacher" to one in ten thousand Romanists. They can not go to him, and what he sends out must pass through fallible and corrupt channels. The *Progress* will learn that it is not in discussion with *Protestant* denominations. But neither Baptists nor Protestants contend for "private interpretation" as their rule of faith. This is a gross misrepresentation for which there can be no excuse. *Yes*, every humble, obedient soul may go to the *infallible authority* and know his duty. God is not responsible for the *idolatry of the mass*. The Romish doctrine that every particle of the consecrated bread, and every particle of the consecrated wine contains a whole Christ—flesh, blood, bones, soul and divinity—making millions of whole Christs at once, proves the doctrine false and idolatrous. The Romanists worship more than 30,000,000 of gods. This flatly contradicts the unity of the Godhead. Also, after the consecration, the elements remain *bread* and *wine*. "For as oft as ye *eat* this *bread* and drink this cup ye do show the Lord's death till he come." 1 Cor. 11: 26. It was eaten as "*bread*," not the literal flesh of Jesus. Therefore, the Roman interpretation is untrue.

4. The *Progress* rejects the Bible rule, saying: "The Church of God is the sole rule of faith!" This rules the Word of God out as no part of the rule of faith. Then it is useless to appeal to Scriptures as proof. Is this why the *Progress* makes no attempt to answer our Bible arguments? The Bible

says, a bishop must be the "husband of one wife," but that Church says, he shall *not have a wife!* If the Bible is true the Roman Church is false. The *Church* is only the *pillar ground* of the truth, to hold up the *truth* of God's Word. The "pillar" of the lighthouse is not the light. The Church is only to teach what Christ "commanded."

5th. We answer: 1st. Many organized vegetable bodies are without heads. 2d. Every normal organized, living, animal body has a head. 3d. Every organized ecclesiastical body must have but one head. 4th. Every organized animal or ecclesiastical body with more than one head is a monster. 5th. Christ is the only "head over all things to the church." 6th. The Roman Church, which has the Pope for its head, cannot possibly be the church of Christ. 7th. Christ is the center of unity for his church. 8th. The New Testament government of Christ (manifested in his churches) is an organism which has visible membership, laws, and ordinances.

6th. We did not make "private interpretation" the rule. The Word of God, called the Bible, contains the standard of authority and rule of government, for the kingdom of Christ. Paul says: "Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as the other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas!" 1 Cor. 9:5. The *Progress* says this "wife" simply means "woman." Does this authorize every unmarried priest to lead about an unmarried sister as his companion and house-keeper? We think they had better marry. But this passage of Scripture quoted, amounts to nothing to the *Progress*, because it takes the Roman Church as "the sole rule of faith." This being so, it cannot quote any passage of Scripture as authority to establish the claims of the Roman Catholic Church. Why has it quoted certain scriptures that have no authority whatever? As the Roman Church is the sole authority it must prove its claims alone by its testi-

mony? Therefore, the Scriptures, reason and argument amount to absolutely nothing to the *Progress*, Will the *Church Progress* please answer, IS THE POPE OF ROME, THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH?

In our first reply we stated our first negative argument thus: "*The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because she makes the church the savior of men, instead of Jesus Christ alone.*" We showed that men were saved by grace, through faith, in the old dispensation, independent of church relation, and that the New Testament saints were saved upon the same terms as Abraham. Gal. 3:6-9. Also, we gave a number of examples in the New Testament where salvation was bestowed through faith in Christ, without any church connections whatever. This argument remains unanswered by the *Church Progress*. At the house of Cornelius, in his sermon, Peter said: "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Acts 10:43. Every true believer receives remission of sins. This is in harmony with the testimony of all the Old Testament prophets, It is not every one that joins the church, but every one that "believeth on him shall receive remission of sins."

In our second reply, we stated our negative argument second, thus: "*The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because of her unscriptural claim of infallibility.*" Instead of the Roman Catholic Church being infallible, as at first claimed, the *Progress* came down to the claim of only partial infallibility for one member. That the Pope *only* is infallible when he speaks *ex-cathedra*. The *Progress* was forced to admit that many of the Popes were desperately bad men—monsters of iniquity. The *Progress* was compelled to yield the question of infallibility when it admitted that a Pope—"a man may have infallible faith, and yet commit

murder and lose his own soul!" According to this the infallibility of the Roman Church is a myth. It has no infallibility, according to its own claim, except for one man who is liable to commit murder and go to hell!! Our quotation from Baronious, the Roman Catholic Historian, showed that a long succession of Popes were only false Popes, so that the chain of the succession of the Popes was completely broken and lost for over a hundred years. Our negative argument third is stated thus: "*The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because she rejects the Bible standard of authority and rule of government, for her own traditions.*" The monstrous, unknown and unknowable creed of the Roman Catholic Church requires them, on pain of damnation, to profess and receive, in addition to a corrupt translation of the Scriptures, over a hundred volumes of Bulls, Decretals, Acts of Councils, and the writings of the Fathers, with innumerable traditions, which, like the frogs of Egypt, have corrupted the whole land for centuries. A church with such an impossible creed cannot possibly be the true church of God. The argument for the Bible standard of authority and rule of government was brought out in our fourth reply.

True religion is a personal affair between the Lord and the individual soul. Every one, in coming to Christ, must hear the word of God, in the Gospel, under which he is convicted of sin; then, in Godly sorrow of soul, he must repent toward God and believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. Every such believer is born of God, and knows God. "The Spirit itself beareth witness, with our spirit, that we are the children of God." Romans 8:16. It is not Church salvation, but personal salvation through Christ. "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother abideth in death." 1 John 3:14. "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself." 1

John 5:10. Thus the children of God have the witness in themselves, bearing testimony to their sonship. Paul says: "And hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." Romans 5:5. We do not know that we have passed from death unto life because we have joined the "holy mother Church" or been baptized, but because of the love of God shed abroad in our hearts. "Every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God." 1 John 4:7. Every loving and obedient soul, by prayerfully searching the Scriptures, or studying the Word of God, may arrive at the truth concerning his duty to God and men. In the temple the Savior said: "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. If any man will do his will he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God or whether I speak of myself." John 7:17. Those who are submissive to the will of God, desiring to obey him "shall know of the doctrine." The Psalmist prayed: "Open thou mine eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law." Ps. 119:18. Those who desire to know and obey the truth have the assistance of the Holy Spirit to open the eyes of their understanding, that they may comprehend the gospel truth of God's word. Paul preached to the Ephesians: "That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him: The eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints," etc. Eph. 1:17, 18. The Holy Spirit is the infallible Comforter and guide of the Christian. They are kept by the power of God, through faith unto salvation. It is the privilege of Christians to pray for wisdom to know the will of God. "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally and unbraideth not; and it shall be given unto

him." James 1:5. The word of God is *infallible*; and, to the humble, obedient disciple, is attended by the *infallible* witness of the Holy Spirit who guides and comforts him in the struggles of life. "For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit and of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart." Heb. 4:12. Yet this Word, by which we are to be judged in the last day, is taken from the people by the Roman Catholic Church and enshrouded in traditions and commandments of men.

OUR CONTROVERSY.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD.

CHURCH PROGRESS' SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE.

(May 31, 1891.)

1. Let us first brush aside some misconceptions of the *Baptist*. As Cardinal Gibbons says, quoted by the *Baptist*, the Pope is infallible "only in his official capacity when he judges of faith and morals as Head of the Church." He is infallible, therefore, by virtue of his Headship, when, as Peter's successor, he defines to the whole Church questions of doctrine and morals. Now let the *Baptist* stick to the text as it has itself given it. If the Pope is infallible in his *official capacity* only, as Head of the Church, this of course excludes any claim to infallibility in any *private capacity*; if he is infallible only when teaching, as Head of the Church, what is or what is not a *doctrine of faith*, this excludes any teaching on any *other subject*. Furthermore, if only in an *official capacity* and only in *questions of faith* he is infallible, this excludes any question as to his *peccability* or liability to sin. This then is the Catholic position. *This* is the position which the *Baptist* must assail, not the utterly irrelevant question of bad or good Popes. If it wishes to argue against the Catholic position it must direct its attack against what the Church claims, not against what it plainly disclaims.

2. Again the Church does not claim that the Pope, thus unerringly guided in defending what is of faith, is *inspired*. Infallibility is not inspiration. Inspiration is the infusing of

new truths into the mind; infallibility is simply the unerring teaching, under divine guidance, of the *old* truth already received in the deposit of revelation. Clearly enough this prerogative of infallibility does not include the power of working miracles. To speak the truth unerringly in matters of faith is by no means the same thing as to work a miracle. We ask the *Baptist* to be honest with itself and argue against our position and not against its own misconceptions or misrepresentations of our position. It only clogs progress by endeavoring to make an issue which is not before us. Another point misapprehended by the *Baptist* we wish to clear here. As the Pope is only infallible in virtue of his official capacity, that is as Head of the Church, when speaking as Head of the Church, he speaks for the Church. Therefore His infallible declaration in matters of faith is the Church's infallible declaration. When the President of the United States issues a proclamation as the official head of the government, his utterance is that of the government; or when the Chief Justice gives a decision from the bench in his official capacity, his decision is the verdict of the government. When then the Pope speaks in this wise it is the Church speaking. When I speak by my mouth, it is not merely my mouth speaking, it is the man speaking. The faculty of speech may reside in the organ of speech, yet it is the man who speaks. The gift or faculty of infallibility resides in the Head of the Church, yet it is the Church who speaks.

3. We have not admitted that there were many false Popes only counted to fill the succession. We plainly denied the *authenticity* of the *Baptist's* quotation from Baronius, upon which it based its assertion. The *Baptist* quoted Baronius translated and at *second hand*. It failed to give work, volume and page of quotation. It may just as well have not quoted at all, or may just as well have quoted from some anonymous

source. Will the *Baptist* please state in what work and where this quotation is to be found in Baronius? But granting its authenticity, it has nothing to do with the question of infallibility. For a false Pope is no Pope. We are not debating the question of whether this or that Pope was a real Pope or not, but the question of infallibility, that is, whether Christ's Church can teach false doctrine or not.

The suppression of the Society of Jesus and its restoration was not matter of faith at all. It was merely a measure of discipline, nor is the question of the Pope's "temporal supremacy over kings" a matter of faith; it has never been defined.

4. Let us now note the first paragraph in No. 3 of the *Baptist*. Firstly it admits that "the Church established by Christ, as his Church, cannot *ex Cathedra* teach falsehood." This is an admission then that God's Church must be infallible, *i. e.*, cannot teach falsehood. The *Baptist* concludes by saying: "Therefore the true Church *will not reject the note of infallibility*." Note this well. IT IS THE CHURCH WHICH IS INFALLIBLE. If the reader will refer back to the *Baptist's* answer to our first installment of this controversy, in the *Church Progress* for the week ending May 2, he will find the *Baptist* using these words in paragraph numbered 25 and 26.

25 and 26. This claim of infallibility is one of the most "fallible" things connected with that (Catholic) Church. The Mormon Church of Latter Day Saints claimed infallibility for Joseph Smith. This claim only made their errors all the more ridiculous.

Again let the reader refer back to the *Baptist's* reply in the controversy under date May 9, and he will find it using these words in Negative Argument 2:

NEGATIVE ARGUMENT 2. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IS NOT THE true Church of God, because of its unscriptural claim to infallibility.

Here is a plain, open and flagrant contradiction. In one

instance the *Baptist*, in order to discountenance our claim to infallibility (see Controversy, 25 and 26, April 25,) declares that such a claim is in itself evidence of fallibility; that to claim it is to make error all the more ridiculous, and it instances the Church of the Latter Day Saints as evidence how ridiculous such a claim makes any religious society. In the other instance, *i. e.*, in its argument above, the *Baptist*, forced to the logic of the situation by our arguments, admits that the Church established by Christ must be infallible. In one instance, in order to disprove our claim to infallibility for the Church, the *Baptist* solemnly lays it down as a conclusive argument that the "Roman Catholic Church is not the true Church of God, BECAUSE OF ITS UNSCRIPTURAL claim to infallibility." According to the first statements of the *Baptist* the true Church *must reject* the note of infallibility, because it is *unscriptural*. Let us take the *Baptist* on its own ground: Where does it find any scriptural warrant for the infallibility of the Church? It has quoted Scripture by the wholesale. Now then, where is the Scripture for the claim of infallibility in the Church? Will the *Baptist* please quote chapter and verse to substantiate its declaration that "the Church established by Christ, as His Church, cannot *ex Cathedra* teach falsehood, because her only authorized teaching is found in His infallible word"? Will the *Baptist* please quote chapter and verse of Scripture to substantiate its declaration that "therefore the true Church WILL NOT REJECT THE NOTE OF INFALLIBILITY"? And again will the *Baptist* please quote chapter and verse of Scripture to substantiate its former statement that this claim of infallibility "only makes their (Catholics' or Mormons') errors all the more ridiculous"? Will it also quote chapter and verse of Scripture to substantiate its former Negative Argument 2, that the Church claiming to be infallible "is not the

true Church of God because of its UNSCRIPTURAL CLAIM to infallibility?"

5. Under No. 3, the *Baptist* states: "But neither Baptists nor Protestants contend for private interpretation as their rule of faith. This is a gross misrepresentation for which there can be no excuse. Yes, every humble obedient soul may go to the *infallible authority*, and know his duty." We do not think we have misrepresented in saying that "private interpretation" is the Protestant or Baptist rule of faith. The *Baptist* has offered no proof that we have in this point misrepresented the Baptist or any other denomination. It is no disproof of our argument to simply state "that every humble obedient soul may go to the *infallible authority*." The very question at issue is *what* is the infallible authority to which we must go? You contend that it is the Bible alone, although you have contradicted this when you admitted that the Church must be infallible. But setting this aside for the moment, let us consider this point: Is the Bible the sole rule of faith? First of all let us state, that there may be no confusion on the *Baptist's* part, that the Catholic Church holds and teaches that the Bible is the *INSPIRED WORD* of God and therefore true; that this written word of God is as true as His spoken word; that the written word is as infallible as His spoken word. But the question in dispute is not that the word of God, written or spoken, is infallible, but *how* are we to know *what* is the word of God, be it written or spoken, and when we are in possession of that word, written or spoken, what is its *true meaning*? Says the Protestant, "the Bible alone is the word of God." How do you know that? I immediately ask; how do you know that the *whole* of revelation is contained in the Bible? Nay, how do you know that the Bible is revelation at all? On what authority do you accept the books called the Bible, as the true unerring word of God?

You, born into the world in this century, find them already here. Where did they come from, and on whose word do you accept them as God's inspired writings? Trace their history back, and who is it vouches for them through all the centuries you are told they have existed? The Catholic answers these questions immediately. I believe the Bible to be the Word of God, because the Church, the pillar and ground of truth, established by Christ to unerringly teach all truth whatever He has commanded to be taught, tells me that they are God's Word; that they are true; that she vouches for them; that she is the infallible witness to their truth, because she is that teaching body appointed by Christ to teach His Word, both spoken and written; that these books were written by *her* bishops and *her* priests, that she compiled them, and determined out of innumerable writings in the early Church which are canonical, that is, which are the inspired word of God; that, as she is the living unfailing witness to the truth whom Christ has promised shall never fail in teaching all truth, and with whom He Himself shall abide teaching to the consummation of the world, her infallible authority may be unhesitatingly accepted to stamp these books as the veritable written word of God; that it is she who has given us the Bible as it stands to-day.

6. The second question (having accepted on the authority of the Church that the Bible is God's Word) now arises; what is the meaning of that word? It is written in Scripture itself that in Scripture there are *things hard to understand, which the unlearned and unstable wrest to their own destruction.* (2 Pet. 3:16.) Protestantism says, in spite of this solemn admonition, let "every humble soul go to the infallible authority (the Bible) and know his duty," that is, let every one read the Bible according to *his own* understanding of it and he will infallibly know the truth. Let each one interpret that book,

which the Apostles warns us is hard to understand, according to his own private opinion of its meaning. Is this not private interpretation, and is not this interpretation the *rule* to the one so interpreting? If I, reading the Bible interpret the text: "This is my Body" in the literal sense of the words and firmly and sincerely believe this to be the true meaning of the words, who on Protestant grounds, shall say I am wrong? Does the Holy Spirit guide me to glean this meaning from this text, and at the same time does the Holy Spirit guide you to glean the contradictory meaning from the same text? Have you any more right to say that the Holy Spirit aids you in gathering that meaning than he does me in gathering a different meaning? If this written word of God be infallible, it has only *one meaning*, and if the Holy Spirit be infallible, He can guide the reader to only the *one* true meaning of God's word. It is as plain as that two and two do not make five, that the Holy Spirit cannot guide to a *false* meaning and it is equally plain that He does not guide both of us to contradictory meanings of the same text. Therefore, as, according to this method each of us arrives at a different and contradictory interpretation, *this method* cannot be the true method of ascertaining the true meaning of Scripture, nor can Holy Scripture, thus used, be the infallible guide or rule of faith. That cannot plainly be an infallible rule of faith which is susceptible to various and contradictory meanings in the hands of "the unlearned and the unstable," however sincere and honest they may be. But the Bible privately interpreted is susceptible, as St. Peter says, to false meanings by the unlearned and unstable, and the Protestant sects stand an undeniable and palpable witness to the fact that Scripture, thus interpreted, is continually wrested to many various and contradictory meanings. Five hundred sects teaching different and contradictory doctrines are unimpeachable evidence to this fact and prove

the utter futility of a rule of faith, the meaning of which none of them can authoritatively determine.

7. In conclusion we answer the minor points of the *Baptist's* argument. To the imputation that "Romanists worship more than 30,000,000 of gods" we retort in the same vein, that the Baptists worship thrice thirty million gods, for God is everywhere, in this room, in the next, in the room where the editor of the *Baptist* sits, in every nook and corner of the universe, and He is *wholly and entirely in every part*; therefore (after the sample of the *Baptist's* logic) there are as many gods as there are rooms, nooks and crannies in the universe; when then Baptists worship God, they worship not one God but billions of gods. To the text quoted by the *Baptist*, 1 Cor. 11: 26, we reply with others the words of Our Lord Himself, "This is My Body," and "This is My Blood;" again "If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever; and the *bread* that I will give is My *flesh* for the life of the world." (John 6: 52.) Again "except you *eat* the *flesh* of the Son of Man, and *drink* His *blood*; you shall not have life in you." (John 6: 54); and Christ said this as a solemn warning to the Jews who, like Protestants to-day, had said, "How can this man give us his *flesh* to eat?" To No. 4 we reply that we do not reject the Bible, as we have made evident; but we do reject the *Baptist's* interpretation of the Bible, which just as evidently is not authoritative. We agree perfectly when the *Baptist* says "the Church is only the pillar and ground of truth, to hold up the truth of God's word." Exactly, the Church *infallibly holds up* the truth of God's word, and is the only one who can. "The pillar is not the light." We agree again. Christ is the light. "The Church is only to teach what Christ commanded." True again; and the Church does teach, and *infallibly* whatsoever Christ commanded; and Christ commanded the Church to teach *all truth*, as we read in John 16: 13.

"But when He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will teach you all things." See also John 14: 16-18. Luke 10; 16. Mark 16: 15. Matt. 28: 18-20. Matt. 18: 17. Matt. 16: 18.

In No. 5 we agree with 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 7th. The 6th we distinguish; that the Pope is the one *visible* head of the Church on earth, and that Christ is the *invisible* head in Heaven we admit. We conclude from this distinction that the Pope on earth is the *vice-regent* of Christ in Heaven. To the 8th we reply. If "the New Testament government of Christ is an organism, which has visible membership, laws and ordinances," then this visible organism, with its visible membership, laws and ordinances, must have *one visible* head. For as the *Baptist* says in 3rd, "Every organized ecclesiastical body must have but one head;" therefore every *visible* organized ecclesiastical body must have but *one visible* head. Christ's visible vice-regent on earth must be the one visible head of the Church on earth, as analogously the Viceroy in India is the head of the Indian government without in the least impairing the sovereign headship of Queen Victoria in England. We have already replied to the assertion that the Catholic Church "makes the Church the Savior of men instead of Jesus Christ." See our answer to this in Controversy, May 9, sixth column, No. 5. It seems that the *Baptist* not only forgets what we have said, but what it has itself said. In conjunction with this we state that the Catholic doctrine in regard to the salvation of Old Testament saints, is that these were saved through the *anticipated merits* of Jesus Christ. In answer to the question is the Pope of Rome the Catholic Church? We answer by asking a question equally absurd, is the president of the United States the whole Federal Government? To the assertion that Catholics are required to read and know hundreds of volumes of Bulls, Decretals, Acts of Councils, the writings of the Fathers, etc., etc., we reply with

a simple denial to a gratuitous assertion; and we would ask, how does the *Baptist* know that the Church has a *corrupt* translation of the Scriptures? Answers to all other objections are sufficiently implied in our main argument above.

THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

PROPOSITION: *Resolved that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*

CHURCH PROGRESS, Affirms.
AMERICAN BAPTIST, Denies.

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S SIXTH NEGATIVE.

(June 4, 1891.)

The *Church Progress* has suppressed the word "Roman" from the proposition it accepted and agreed to prove. This is a surrender of the "Roman Church" as indefensible. Read the proposition at the head of the controversy.

1. At the beginning the *Church Progress* claimed infallibility for the Roman Church, but it has virtually surrendered this claim by the admission that only the Pope is possessed of infallibility, when he speaks in a certain way. Then it turns out that the whole claim of infallibility for the Roman Church is a huge fraud. The *Progress* admits that the Pope is no more the Roman Catholic Church than the president is the United States. If the Pope alone is not the "Roman Church" the claim of infallibility for that Church is utterly absurd and worse than nonsense. Also, it is admitted that the Pope is so fallible and peccable that he may teach falsely concerning science, that he may teach falsely concerning politics, that he may teach falsely concerning faith and morals, when teaching privately, and that he is so fallible that he may commit murder and be lost in hell. We have introduced the proof of the monstrous iniquity of a number of Popes, to show that the claim of infallibility for them is not only unscriptural, but absurd and silly. One might as well claim infallibility for "His

Satanic Majesty" as to claim infallibility for Pope Alexander VII.

2. Cardinal Gibbon's confession that the Pope is not inspired, even when speaking *ex-cathedra*, amounts to the surrender of the claim of infallibility. Inspiration is not necessarily "the infusing of new truths into the mind." The apostles were inspired by the "Holy Ghost" to bring all things to their remembrance that Christ had previously spoken to them. Jno. 14: 26. As the Pope is uninspired, just as other men, it is absolutely impossible for him to remember and teach infallibly the whole truth of Christ, any more than others. Also, as the apostles, who were inspired to speak infallibly, were able to confirm their mission by miracles, surely the Pope, who claims infallibility, should be able to confirm his mission by miracles. The comparison does not hold good. The president being elected by the people, does not sustain the same relation to the government as the Pope does to the Roman Church. The president is selected by the people, while the Pope is appointed ruler over the Church without its knowledge or consent. Neither is the proclamation of the president the proclamation of the United States. The Pope does not speak as the mouth-piece of the Church, but pretends to speak as the mouth-piece of God himself and is the despotic ruler over the Church. Therefore the comparison of the *Progress* is irrelevant and to no purpose.

3. The *Progress* does not admit that there were "many false Popes," but even one false Pope breaks the Papal succession, so that the grace of infallibility is lost, provided it ever existed. As the *Church Progress* repudiates the Bible standard and rule of faith, we are not surprised that it calls in question the quotation from Baronious. We simply quoted the well-known statement of Baronious, a Roman historian, as given by Dowling. But now we give the *Church Progress* a

sample of the infallibility of the Popes directly from the Roman Catholic historian, Rev. Joseph Reeve, published by Patrick Donahoe, in Boston, 1851, and endorsed by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Fitzpatrick, third edition, p. 291, Joseph Reeve, says:

Italy from the end of the ninth century, as we have seen, was become the seat of faction, and civil discord. The ecclesiastical state was kept in a long and disgraceful servitude by the ambition of rival senators, by the Marquises of Tuscany, and the Earls of Tusculum. By these petty tyrants, the patrimony of St. Peter was torn to pieces and sacrilegiously usurped. The Popes were not masters in their own capital. Raised by faction, as it happened, or by intrigue they lost their personal respectability, were often insulted, imprisoned and even murdered by the prevailing party. Two sister prostitutes, Marozia and Theodora, daughters of the lewd Marchioness of Tuscany, governed Rome by their political influence and criminal intrigues. To these disorders the Popes themselves contributed in no small degree. After Stephen VI., who died in 891, succeeded Formosus, Stephen VII., Romanus, Theodore II., John IX., Benedict IV., Leo V., Christophorus, Sergius III., Anastasius III., Lando, John X., Leo VI., Stephen VIII., John XI., Leo VII., Stephen IX., Martinus II., Agapitus II., John XII., Leo VIII., Benedict V., John XIII., Benedict VI., Donus II., Benedict VII., John XIV., Boniface VII., John XV., Gregory V., Sylvester II. Between the years 891 and 999, here are one and thirty Popes; their number is a clear proof that the reigns of many of them were short, and their end dishonorable. Sergius III. exhibited a spectacle of scandal, of which the Christian world had never known an example, a sovereign Pontiff clasped in the lewd embraces of a notorious prostitute, Sergius III., without regard for the dignity or the holiness of his pontifical character, publicly avowed his criminal connections with Marozia, by her he had a son, who, under his mother's influence, crept afterwards into St. Peter's chair by the name of John XI. To the infamy of his spurious birth, he added personal vice, in which he was shamefully imitated by many, who in that century were raised to the papal throne, without the virtues to merit or support their elevation.

According to this testimony of the Roman Catholic historian the "patrimony of St. Peter was torn to pieces and sacrilegiously usurped." This certainly knocks the bottom out of the *unity* of "St. Peter's chair." These devilish Popes were thrust into the papal chair by depraved women, or crept into it by intrigue. If the Papal Succession was not broken or

lost during these hundred years of popish sacrilege and crime, then the devil himself, incarnate, if raised to the chair of St. Peter, could not invalidate the claim to infallibility. The *Progress* admits that "a false Pope is no Pope;" therefore, the Roman Church, for a space of 100 years had no head in St. Peter's chair except false Popes. Will the *Church Progress* dare to say that Sergius III., "clasped in the lewd embraces of a notorious prostitute," was a true Pope? Was Sergius III. infallible? Please answer. If the *Progress* wishes more proofs that a large number of the Popes of Rome were desperately bad men, they will be forthcoming. The "Roman Church" is not the church of God because of its claim of infallibility, for these monsters of iniquity called Popes.

4. While the Roman Church only claims infallibility for her head and ruler when he speaks in a certain way, the true church claims absolute infallibility and impeccability for Jesus Christ her head; she teaches absolute infallibility for her rule of faith in the Bible; she teaches absolute infallibility for the Holy Spirit, the Guide and Comforter. Thus the church truly claims a three-fold infallibility for her head, rule of faith and guide, while the Roman Church claims partial infallibility for its head, the Pope, whose infallibility is so poor that he may commit the most revolting crimes and lose his own soul in hell! Even if there had been no false Popes in the chair of St. Peter, the Papal thread of infallibility is too small and weak upon which to suspend the salvation of the world. The *Progress* is mistaken. We claimed infallibility for the Head of the true church from the beginning, while the *Progress* claimed infallibility for the Roman Catholic Church. This false claim of infallibility for Joseph Smith, a wicked impostor, and for those outrageous blasphemous Popes is certainly an unscriptural claim to infallibility. We have claimed all the while the scriptural infallibility for the Head of the true church.

with her rule of faith and Guide. This is no contradiction, except to contradict the ridiculous claim of infallibility for uninspired men, the Popes of Rome. The infallibility which we claim for Christ, his word, and the Holy Spirit, is admitted by the *Church Progress*. Every scripture that sustains the Godhead of Christ and the Trinity, proves this infallibility. But why quote the Scriptures to the *Progress* when it makes the Church the "sole rule of faith?"

5. Where will the *Progress* find proof that Baptists or Protestants make private interpretation their rule of faith? It is for the *Progress* to prove this charge, or it is in honor bound to withdraw it as a misrepresentation. It wants us to *disprove* its charge! Of course we teach that every humble, obedient soul may go to the infallible authority, God's plainly revealed word, and know his duty. The *Progress* admits that "the Bible is the inspired word of God, true and infallible," yet deliberately rejects that word as no part of its rule of faith. The *Progress* makes the Roman Church the "*sole rule of faith!*" It deliberately and wilfully rejects the word of God as the standard of authority and rule of faith. Therefore the Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God. But we do affirm, with peculiar emphasis, that the Word of God, usually called the Bible, contains our sole standard of authority and rule of action. As the *Progress* has admitted that "the Bible is the inspired Word of God and therefore true," it is not necessary for us to establish the canonicity of the Bible. Though some of Paul's writings are hard to be understood, yet all the Scriptures concerning our duty to God and man are so plain that every humble, obedient soul may easily arrive at the truth, under the guidance of the Spirit. How can a Romanist claim the guidance of the Holy Spirit when he adopts the Church as the "sole rule of faith?"

7. In the so-called "sacrament of the Eucharist," the Ro-

manist contends that a whole Jesus Christ is bodily present in every wafer and every fractional part thereof. Yes, they say the whole personal Jesus Christ is there, living, bodily and entire. Thus, it makes at least thirty millions of living and entire bodies of Christ; and as Romanists devoutly adore this "blessed Eucharist," they worship more than *thirty millions of Gods!* Surely, the Roman Church is not the true church of God, because of her polytheism. We speak it reverently, but we say that Jesus Christ, in body, flesh and bones, cannot be present in different places at the same time. When Jesus Christ was bodily on earth, he was not bodily in heaven. When he ascended to heaven bodily, to remain till his second coming, he was not bodily on earth. If Jesus Christ—entire, bodily—is in every consecrated wafer and every drop of consecrated wine, and every fractional part thereof, then there must be hundreds or millions of bodily Christs. Therefore, the Roman Church is liable to the charge of polytheism in worshipping infinitely more gods than did the ancient Athenians. The Roman Church is not the church of God, because she is guilty of idolatry in worshipping a multitude of gods. If the Pope is "the one visible head of the church on earth," and Christ "is the visible Head of the church in heaven," then the church has two heads, and is therefore a monster. Any organized body with two heads is a monstrosity, and cannot possibly be the church of God. Jesus Christ is "head over all things to the church," which is his body; but the Pope is "head over all things to the Roman Church," which is his body; therefore, that church is not the church of Christ. Christ left no vice-regent on earth. The illustration does not hold. The Viceroy of India is not the real head of the British government in India. The *Progress* admits that the Pope is not the Roman Catholic Church. Then, according to this admission, as the Roman Catholic Church, outside of the Pope, claims no infal-

libility, that Church is destitute, according to their own showing, of any infallibility, except in one member, and that under peculiar circumstances. Why then, in the face of these facts, do Romanists impose upon themselves and others by speaking of that Church as infallible? The *Progress* is mistaken. Every Roman Catholic in his creed embraces "the apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church." And likewise he is to "receive and profess all other things delivered, defined and declared by the sacred canons and general councils, and particularly the Holy Council of Trent." He must not interpret the Scripture "otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers." This tremendous creed must be believed and professed by each one joining the Roman Church. One cannot possibly believe and profess the things about which he knows nothing. Therefore each Romanist must, according to his creed, know and understand all the traditions of the Church and all that is declared in the sacred canons and general councils. Surely it is much easier to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, revealed in the gospel, than to understand the hundred and more huge volumes of bulls, decretals and acts of councils, with untold legions of oral traditions.

As the *Church Progress* not only rejects the Word of God as the rule of faith, but treats every quotation which we make from the Bible with the utmost contempt, we now quote from the Roman Catholic New Testament, first published at Rheims, in 1582, and endorsed by "Right Rev. John Hughes, Catholic Bishop of New York." Paul exhorted the brethren at Rome to greater consecration "which is your reasonable service." Rom. 12:1. But modern Romanists require the acceptance of their *Church* without reasoning. Again, Paul says: "For what things soever were written, were written for our learning; that through patience and the comfort of the

Scriptures we might have hope." Rom. 15:4, Rheims Testament. The disciples were to study the Old Testament Scriptures, for their "*learning*" and "*comfort*." The Old Testament "words of God" were committed to the Jews, as a people, not to the priests only. Romans 3:2. The Old Testament Scriptures were preached and "read every Sabbath" "in the synagogues" for the information of the people. Acts 13:27; 15:21. At least as much is required for the New Testament. Paul required his letter to the Colossians to be read to them, and "that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans." Col. 4:16. The New Testament scriptures were read in the churches and the people were to exercise their *reason* and *judgment* concerning their plain and obvious meaning. John says: "And these things we write to you, that you may rejoice, and your joy may be full." 1 John 1:4. And again, "my little children, these things I write unto you that you sin not." 1 Jno. 2:1. The New Testament Scriptures were written directly to the people, even to "little children." The true disciples are to exercise their common sense and judgment in deciding between true and false doctrines. John says: "Dearly beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits if they be of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world." 1 John 4:1. These disciples of Christ, private members, were to exercise their common sense and judgment in trying the spirits (false doctrines) of the false prophets. They were not to close the eyes of their understanding, and swallow the word of some Pope. The Ephesian church was commended by the Holy Spirit for having "tried them who say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars:" Rev. 2:2. Thus it appears that the private members of the church, as well as officers, had to exercise their judgment in trying false teachers before the church. John admonishes the "the lady elect and

her children": "If any man come to you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither say to him God speed you: For he that saith unto him God speed you, communicateth with his wicked works." 2 Jno. 10, 11. Here this "lady elect" was to exercise her reason and judgment, whether one had the true doctrine or the false. Surely the Roman Church which reject the Holy Scriptures as containing the rule of faith is not the true church of God. We make these quotations from the Roman Catholic New Testament endorsed by Archbishop Hughes. If the *Church Progress* contradicts this book it lays itself liable to the charge of heresy. This Roman Rheinish Testament says: "It behooveth therefore a bishop to be blameless, *the husband of one wife*, sober, prudent, and of good behavior, chaste, given to hospitality, a teacher." "One that ruleth well his own house, having *his children in subjection* with all chastity." 1 Tim. 3:2, 4. But the Roman Church, in contradiction to its own New Testament, which it admits to be "the inspired word of God," forbids a bishop or priest to have a wife at all. God teaches "a bishop to be *the husband of one wife*." But in defiance of God's word, the Roman Church *forbids a bishop to marry*. Therefore the Roman Church cannot possibly be the true church of God. The *Church Progress* must give attention to these Scriptures. Again, we quote the Roman Rheinish Testament: "Now the Spirit manifestly saith that in the last times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to spirits of error, and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy, and having their conscience seared, forbidding to marry, to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving by the faithful, and by them that have known the truth." 1 Tim. 4:1-3. God's word in the New Testament, accepted by the Romanists, declares that "forbidding to marry," and to "abstain from meats" is "the doc-

trines of devils." Surely, the Roman Church which holds and advocates these doctrines of devils cannot possibly be the true church of God. We have to make God a liar, or the Roman Church a false Church.

OUR CONTROVERSY.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD.

CHURCH PROGRESS' SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE.

(June 6, 1891.)

As the *Baptist* still clings to its quibble on the words *Roman Catholic*, we answer it with the great St. Augustine in the fourth century: "ALL HERETICS WISH TO BE CALLED CATHOLIC, YET IF ANY STRANGER ASK WHERE DO CATHOLICS HOLD THEIR ASSEMBLY, NO HERETIC DARE POINT TO HIS OWN CHURCH OR CHAPEL." So also St. Cyril, of the same epoch: "AND IF EVER THOU ART SOJOURNING IN ANY CITY, ENQUIRE NOT SIMPLY WHERE THE LORD'S HOUSE IS, NOR MERELY WHERE THE CHURCH IS, BUT, WHERE IS THE CATHOLIC CHURCH? FOR THIS IS THE PECULIAR NAME OF THIS HOLY BODY, THE MOTHER OF US ALL, WHICH IS THE SPOUSE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, THE ONLY BEGOTTEN SON OF GOD."

1. The *Baptist* tries to evade the glaring contradiction between its statements which we pointed out last week, but in vain. We now place them side by side:

25 and 26. This claim of infallibility is one of the most "fallible" things connected with that Church. The Mormon Church of Later Day Saints claimed infallibility for Joseph Smith. This claim only made their errors all the more ridiculous.—(May 2d.)

The Roman Catholic Church is not the true Church of God,

3. No; "the Church established by Christ," as his church, cannot "ex cathedra" teach falsehood, because her only authorized teaching is found in his infallible Word. Individual members, as such, may and do teach error. Yes; the true Church of God teaches the infallibility of Christ, her Head, the infallibility of her rule of

because of its unscriptural claim of infallibility. "There is not a just man upon the earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not." Ecl. 7:20. The members of the Apostolic churches did not claim infallibility for themselves; therefore, this claim of infallibility upon the part of the Roman Catholic Church is not a mark of the true Church of God. It is a claim which is not true. Therefore it is rather a mark of the false Church.—(May 9th.)

The *Baptist* endeavors to avoid the issue by shifting it to the ground that we claimed only partial infallibility for the Head of the Church. But the question of the Pope's infallibility had not been broached by us at that stage of the controversy. The question was simply whether the *Church* was infallible, and it was against the claim of an infallible *Church* the *Baptist* was then arguing, and which it then asserted was "rather a mark of the false Church." To its own confusion it witnesses to this, as the state of the case at that stage of the argument, in its reply above. In trying to shift the ground of debate, when we pointed out its denial of an infallible Church, and then its admission that the Church must be infallible, it distinctly says: "The *Progress* is mistaken; we claimed infallibility for the head of the true Church from the beginning, while the *Progress* claimed infallibility for the *Roman Catholic Church*." Exactly. That claim, the *Baptist* asserted in its argument, May 2, to be "ridiculous," and, May 9, to be "unscriptural" and "a mark of the false Church." Let the reader compare the statements in parallel columns above, and let him not forget that the subject about which the claim of infallibility is there made, is THE CHURCH. Is not the contradiction as plain as daylight? Will the *Baptist* explain it? Last week we asked the *Baptist* to quote Scripture to sustain

faith, the Word, and the infallibility of the Holy Spirit, as the witness and Comforter. Therefore the true Church "will not reject the note of infallibility."—(May 30th.)

its statement that the claim of infallibility for the Church is "ridiculous," "unscriptural" and "a mark of the false Church." We also asked for Scripture to sustain its contradictory position that the Church established by Christ is infallible, and that "therefore the true Church will not reject the note of infallibility." According to the *Baptist* everything not scriptural is false. We repeat our question and ask for an answer. Where is your Scripture for these contradictions?

2. The *Baptist* still persists in insisting that Infallibility is impeccability; nay more, it insists now that infallibility necessarily means *inspiration* and *miraculous power*. As there is no better way of showing a man the futility of his own physic than by making him take it, we will administer its own dose to the *Baptist*. Infallibility, impeccability, inspiration and miraculous power all go together, the *Baptist* insists. Therefore, is its conclusion, as the Popes were not impeccable, inspired, nor possessed of miraculous power, they could not be infallible. Their claim to infallibility is consequently disproved. In other words unless the teacher of God's truth be impeccable, inspired and possess miraculous power, he cannot teach God's word without error. Hence from the beginning the teachers of God's word must have been impeccable, inspired and miracle workers or they could not have taught God's word truthfully. But God's word has been taught truthfully without error from the very beginning. The Popes could not have so taught, argues the *Baptist*, because they were plainly not impeccable, nor inspired nor miracle workers. Well we ask then, WHERE IS THAT SUCCESSIVE LINE OF IMPECCABLE, INSPIRED, AND MIRACLE-WORKING MEN, WHO HAVE TAUGHT GOD'S WORD INFALLIBLY? WHERE ARE THESE IMPECCABLE, INSPIRED MIRACLE-WORKING TEACHERS TO-DAY? Will the *Baptist* point them out to us? Nor must the *Baptist* here forget what it has distinctly admitted; this impeccable, inspired, and miracle-

working body must have been always *visible*, and must be *now* visible; for, we quote from the *Baptist's* argument May 2: "2. The supposed invisible, inorganic, undefinable, imaginary church has no place in this controversy." And again May 30: "8. The New Testament government of Christ (manifested in His churches) is an organism which has visible membership, laws and ordinances." Where then is that *visible* body now, and where has it been during these nineteen hundred years? Its existence must be plainly traced from the time of Christ to our own day, and it must be plainly discernible *now*. Unless you can point out such a body existing throughout the past and also now existing, on your own theory the word of God has failed, for you have emphatically asserted that only impeccable, inspired miracle-working men can infallibly teach that word. If there has been no such impeccable, inspired miracle-working body from apostolic times to our own, then that word has not been so taught. On this theory, therefore, God's revelation has failed utterly, and what men imagine to be Christianity may be anything but Christianity. The point is clear; please answer it.

2. Utterly ignoring our clear and explicit explanation how, while the gift of infallibility resides in the Head, it is the Church herself which is infallible, and how the Head speaking in his official capacity spoke for and to the Church, the *Baptist* without scruple affirms that we claimed only a partial infallibility for the Church. We call the readers of the *Baptist* to witness to the integrity of our explanation and the *Baptist's* unblushing refusal to consider it when given in good faith and in the interests of truth. But, for the sake of the utmost possible clearness and to place the matter in its entirety before the readers of the *Baptist*, we will show that it is the *entire Church* which is infallible. We have already made plain what we mean by the infallibility of the Pope, viz., that in his official

capacity when declaring *ex cathedra* what are matters of faith, he cannot teach falsehood. This is what theologians call *active* infallibility, that is, it is the active exercise of the divine gift of teaching-God's Word, as revealed by Our Lord, without error. Now it is plain that the exercise of this gift in teaching would be valueless and fail in its end, unless that teaching be received by those taught with the same *unerring certainty* with which it is given; for if an infallible teacher cannot make himself infallibly, that is unerringly, *understood*, what is the use of the gift and what is the sense of his possessing it? When Our Lord, promised that his Church should teach unerringly, for *He* promised to be with it teaching to the end of time, He necessarily implied in that promise that that teaching would be *unerringly accepted* by those who would hear His Church, and He distinctly declares to those, whom He commissions to teach His word, in regard to any one refusing to hear them, "And if he will not hear thee, tell the Church. And if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican." Matt. xviii. 17. And again He says, "He that heareth you heareth me; and he that despiseth you despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth Him that sent me." Luke 16. He, therefore, who hears the Church teaching, which is Christ teaching, will receive that teaching without error, that is infallibly. He, therefore, who believes the Church, in whom Christ teaches, believes infallibly what is taught. Therefore every member of the Catholic Church be he peasant or king, rich or poor, man or child, infallibly believes what the Church teaches. His faith is therefore infallible, that is without error, and this is what theologians call *passive* or receptive infallibility. This is why Catholics are so absolutely sure in their faith; this is why they are so firm and certain in their belief; this is why they repose, without the least fear or doubt, in the integrity of their faith. Therefore is the

Pope not only infallible in *teaching* God's word, but every Catholic in the Church is infallible in *receiving* that teaching. Hence infallibility is not a partial claim, but a claim for the entire Church, for those teaching and those taught.

4. We ask again for the volume and page of the quotation from Baronius. We want to see that quotation in its *context*. Why does the *Baptist* refuse to indicate where it is to be found? The quotation from Rev. Joseph Reeves' history simply goes to show there were bad Popes in the ninth century. But we are not discussing good or bad Popes. We may yet come to that later in this controversy, and then we shall take occasion to show the *Baptist* that bad Popes are mostly the manufactured product of Protestant malignity. Out of 256 Popes *six alone* can be called immoral. Protestants have done their best to besmirch the characters of the Popes, but recent historical research has vindicated many of them, and shown the charges against them to be unfounded. But this is not the present question. We can very readily take exception to some of Dr. Reeves' statements in the passage quoted by the *Baptist*, for he is out of date, and show that even in the ninth century many of the Popes, whose good name Reeves implicitly impugns, are unjustly accused. But we refrain, because this is not the question at issue. We will note, however, that the expression "the patrimony of St. Peter," does not here signify the spiritualities of the office, but the temporalities, and particularly the territorial possessions. And, again, we note the violence was inflicted by lay lords, temporal princes, whom the historian characterizes as "petty tyrants." Furthermore, it is to be noted the distractions were due to *civil discord*. We will simply quote another Catholic historian to show how far beside the mark the *Baptist* is, and how absurd it is in attempting to confuse civil discord and physical violence at the hands of lay lords, and even the wickedness of bad Popes, with the doctrine

of Papal infallibility. Speaking of this same period, Darras says: "Not a single decree, even though issued in those days of disorder and ignorance, has afforded a clause *containing aught at variance with faith and morals*, or with the general discipline of the Church." Hist. Cath. Church, Vol. II, page 575. Does it not seem too absurd to think that Catholic historians would characterize certain Popes as bad men, if their wickedness had anything to do with the doctrine of infallibility? Would they thus witness against themselves? We have only noticed the *Baptist's* quotation from Reeves to show its utter irrelevancy and its absurdity when violently forced into relation with the doctrine of infallibility. But before the *Baptist* seeks to impugn the doctrine of infallibility with the peccability of any Pope, let it first establish that succession of *impeccable, inspired and miracle-working teachers* of God's Word from the apostolic to our own times. Its own rule is as applicable to itself as to us. Indeed more so, for it *requires* such a succession to establish the doctrinal integrity of Christianity, and we do not.

5. Let us now come to the *real question* at issue, and which the *Baptist* perpetually begs. We are asked to prove that "Baptists or Protestants made private interpretation their rule of faith." Why the entire concluding paragraph in the *Baptist's* argument above is an open plea for private interpretation. The "plain and obvious" meaning of Scripture is to be left to the *reason and judgment* of "private members." As usual, the *Baptist* witnesses against itself. We *have* proved it. The *Baptist* has simply ignored our proof, as usual, when it cannot meet it. We will put it in simpler form again. The *Baptist* has asserted that the Bible is the sole rule of faith. The Bible without any authorized interpreter is then the rule of faith. It is denied that the Church can be the interpreter. Who then? The Bible itself is *sufficient in itself*. "Yes, every humble

obedient soul may go to the *infallible authority*, and know his duty." Well, let him go. What does he do when he gets there? Reads the Bible, does he not, according to his own light? Does any one tell him authoritatively that this or that is the meaning? If so, *who* tells him? Who has the *right* to tell him? You assert that he only has to go and he will know his duty. Pray how? Simply from reading the Bible? Well, here are two humble obedient souls who go to the Bible, and each arrives at a different conclusion as to what is his duty. "This is my body," reads one, and believes the words to mean what they literally express. Another reads the same words and concludes they are to be taken figuratively, and mean "This is not my body." Each knows his duty, does he? Well, one adores the Eucharist and the other declares the adoration to be idolatry. One reads, "The Word was God," and takes the words literally, and therefore holds that *Jesus Christ is actually God*. Another reads the same words, and then affirms that these words are not to be taken literally but figuratively, and so concludes that *Jesus Christ is not God*, as the Socinians and the Unitarians, for instance, do. Is this not *private interpretation*? If not, what is it? It is the Protestant way at any rate, and we would like the *Baptist* to draw the distinction between this way and private interpretation. And still the *Baptist* calls this the *plainly* revealed word of God! "Make unto you friends of the Mammon of iniquity," says Our Lord Himself. Is this such a plain text that anyone can understand it by reading it? Misers and plutocrats can quote that text with effect. The Devil can quote Scripture. He did to our Lord Himself.

6. St. Peter did not say that there were some things hard to understand *only* in St. Paul's epistles: "Some things hard to understand, which the unlearned and unstable wrest, *as they do all other Scripture*, unto their own destruction." (2 Pet.

3:16.) And so with innumerable other texts, hard to understand which the unlearned and unstable wrest to their own destruction. Open the Bible at any page, and then say, honestly, if you can, the meaning is *very plain and simple*. The *Baptist* is bound to establish the *canonicity* of the Bible; for the very reason that it does make the Bible the *sole rule* of faith, it must give *reason* for its rule. Unless your Bible be canonical it is not God's Word. We establish the canonicity of the Bible by the Church, for the Church determined that canon. We accept the Bible on the infallible word of the Church. But WHERE DO YOU GET YOUR BIBLE? When you have answered this you have solved the whole question. We ask for you to *answer*. The question is simply begged by quoting the Bible. We want to know how you determine the value and the authenticity of the book you quote? We accept the Bible, Tradition and the Church. You reject tradition and the Church. On what ground? Show that the Bible *alone* is to be accepted. You will solve the whole matter by answering our question, WHERE DID YOU GET YOUR BIBLE? When you answer that question satisfactorily we will discuss the various texts you quote. They are outside the issue now. As for your reiterated assertion that Catholics have to know all the bulls, decretals, encyclicals, the Fathers, etc., in order to know their faith, we answer that all they have to know, and a child can understand it, is their *catechism*. It is all in the little catechism. We recommend its perusal to the *Baptist*, and its readers. It will throw much light on this controversy and save many misunderstandings.

How does the *Baptist* know that it is *impossible* for our Lord to be present in many places at once?

THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

PROPOSITION: *Resolved that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*

CHURCH PROGRESS, Affirms.
AMERICAN BAPTIST, Denies.

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S SEVENTH NEGATIVE.

(June 11, 1891.)

The *Progress* calls it a "quibble," because we ask it to stand by its own proposition, which it solemnly accepted and pledged itself to prove. But it shows the *white feather*, and begs for quarters, by striking the word "Roman" from the proposition. It affirmed, contrary to facts, that the "epithet Roman" is repudiated by the "Catholic Church," etc. We showed that "Roman Church" is part of the creed of Pope Pius IV., which every Romanist must accept and believe on pain of damnation. There was no Roman Church, in the modern sense, in existence in the time of Augustine and Cyril of the fourth century.

1. The *Progress* charges us with contradiction. We drove the *Progress* to the virtual admission that there was no infallibility of any sort in the Roman Church, except as it resided in the Pope, when he speaks from the chair, *ex-cathedra*. This infallibility is claimed alone for the head of the Roman Church, the Pope. This false claim of infallibility for uninspired and wicked men, marks the Roman Church as a false Church. This claim marks the Pope, as "a man of sin," "who opposeth, and is lifted up above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, so that he sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself as if he were God." 2 Thes. 2:4. There-

fore, the Roman Church, which has the Pope for her head, claiming the prerogatives of God himself, is not the true church of God. But on the contrary, in full accord with the Holy Scriptures, we claim absolute infallibility and impeccability for Christ the Head of the true church, for her rule of faith in his Word, and for the Holy Spirit, the Guide and Comforter. In this sense alone we claim infallibility for the church of Christ. We said distinctly, that "individual members, as such, may and do teach error." This scriptural infallibility is claimed by Baptists and Protestants, and even admitted by the Romanists themselves. But the false claim of infallibility for the Popes, who are so fallible, and many so desperately bad, that they may commit murder and be lost, is unscriptural, absurd and supremely ridiculous. We have neither contradicted the Scriptures nor our own position.

2. (a) We gave examples of the superlative blasphemy and wickedness of those Popes, as proofs of the absurdity and folly of claiming infallibility, in any sense, for such monsters of iniquity. The *Progress* failed to answer our question. *Was Sergious III. infallible? Was he a true Pope? Was the bastard son of Pope Sergious III., Pope John XI., (who "crept into St. Peter's chair,") a true Pope? Was this Pope John infallible?* The *Progress* must answer or surrender the whole claim of Papal supremacy. (b) The "successive line" of infallibility has ever resided in Jesus Christ, the Head of the church, who said: "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." Matt. 28:20 Roman Testament. Christ himself, has been with his true disciples through all days to the present, and will continue with them to the end of the world. The infallible rule of faith in his Word, has continued to give forth the light of the gospel through all ages to the present. The infallible Guide,

the Holy Spirit, has remained with his people through all the persecutions of the past, and will continue with them to the end. This threefold absolute infallibility and impeccability has remained, undimmed and untarnished, with the true disciples and will continue forever. This is the scriptural infallibility. This infallibility has been confirmed by "infallible proofs" in the shape of miracles. (c) The *Progress* is playing the part of the mother bird that flutters away to save her nest from danger. The proposition does not require us to trace the succession of the church of Christ for 1900 years. The true succession lies outside of, and independent of the Roman Catholic Church. The true church furnished the *saints* and *martyrs* on whose blood the Babylonish woman was drunken during the dark ages. Rev. 17:6.

3. This corruption of the Popes proves positively that these "false popes" were not God-appointed representatives of Jesus Christ on earth. If the head of the Church is totally corrupt, then per consequence, the body is also tainted and corrupt. But now, the *Progress*, seeing its own difficulty, claims "that it is the entire Church which is infallible," and resorts to hair-splitting casuistry "concerning *active* infallibility" and "*passive* or receptive infallibility!" That the Pope is infallible in *teaching God's word*, and "that every Catholic in the Church is infallible in receiving that teaching" "His faith is therefore, infallible," etc. It appears that this "passive" infallibility might properly be called *sponge* infallibility, because it is absorbed without the use of reason or judgment. Also, it must be a very sorry sort of infallibility, because its possessor does not know personally that he possesses such infallibility. It does not aid him in acquiring a knowledge of the truth, for he is not to exercise his judgment concerning things of religion. He must not read and understand the Bible for himself. More, this infallible faith of Romanists does not protect them against

the commission of the most abominable crimes and going to hell at last. But the New Testament *faith*, which works by love, secures the real possessor in the possession "of eternal life." Jesus said: "Amen, amen, I say unto you, that he that heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, hath life everlasting; and cometh not into judgment, but is passed from death unto life," John 5:24, Rom. Tes. The true believer in the infallible Savior, already "hath life everlasting." Do Romanists manifest the fruits of infallibility? As seen in our second reply, a Romanish paper admits that "Nearly all the men who are being tried for ballot-stuffing and kindred crimes in different parts of the country are Irish-Catholics or bear Irish-Catholic names. In this city every man so tried has belonged to that class. In Chicago and New York nearly all the boodlers are Irish-Catholics." *Western Watchman*, April 16th, 1887. Will the *Church Progress* affirm that these ballot-stuffing, criminal boodlers are infallible? Such is the ridiculous so-called infallibility of the Romanists.

4. (a) We quoted Baronious, as given by Dowling in his "History of Romanism" p. 219. We gave this reference when we first made the quotation. Dowling cites his authority. Does the *Progress* call in question this quotation? Is the quotation true or false? *Please answer.* (b) The *Progress* admits that there were six "immoral Popes;" *i. e.*, six *false Popes*. Also, the *Progress* admits that "*a false Pope is no Pope.*" According to the *Progress* itself, six so-called Popes were false and immoral; therefore, the succession of the Popedom has been hopelessly broken. (c) Joseph Reeve, a Roman Catholic historian, testifies that there were about 30 desperately bad Popes, some of whom were guilty of the most revolting crimes. Were these arch-hypocrites infallible?

5. (a) This is a misrepresentation. Neither Baptists nor Protestants make private interpretation their rule of faith.

We claim emphatically, that the rule of faith is contained in the Word of God, called the Bible, and that every accountable man or woman has the privilege, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to go to the Word of God for instruction concerning his duty. (b) Not exactly. We have never said that it was necessary for one to understand the whole Bible in order to obtain a knowledge of his duty to God and man. All the teachings of the Bible concerning our duty, as disciples of Christ, are so plain that every one, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, may know his duty. The assistance of Christ himself, as the present Savior, and the Holy Spirit, as the Guide, is guaranteed to every humble and obedient soul. The scriptural proofs of this have been totally ignored by the *Progress*. (c) Those things hard to be understood mentioned by Peter, while important in their place, are not essential to be understood in order to salvation, or our obedience to Christ.

6. It is not the canonicity of the Bible, but the canonicity of the Roman Catholic Church which is under discussion. The present canon of revelation, as accepted by Baptists and Protestants, was accepted and established before the Roman Catholic Church existed. The Roman Church nominally accepts the same books of the Bible as accepted by us, but they add the traditions and commandments of the Roman Church which are directly contrary to their own received translation of the Bible. The *Progress* admits the canonicity of the books which we regard as the Bible. In its 6th affirmative the *Progress* says: "that the Catholic Church holds and teaches that the Bible is the INSPIRED WORD OF GOD and therefore true; that this written word of God is as true as his spoken word; that the written word is as infallible as his spoken word." We have quoted from the word of God as translated and indorsed by the Roman Catholic authorities themselves, in what is known as the Rhemish Testament and Douay Bible. This

"inspired word of God," as translated by Romanists themselves, we propose to use as a sword in this conflict. When David was about to sever the hostile head of the giant, Goliath, he was under no obligation whatever to stop to explain to the giant the process of making the sword. We have no time to follow the fluttering bird, but must remain by the Romanish nest which is so full. The *Progress* fails to answer our Bible arguments. We re-state a sample, thus:

"Now the Spirit manifestly saith that in the last times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to spirits of error, and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy, and having their conscience seared, forbidding to marry, to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving by the faithful, and by them that have known the truth." 1 Tim. 4:1-3. God's word in the New Testament, accepted by the Romanists, declares that, "forbidding to marry" and to "abstain from meats" are the "doctrines of devils." Surely, the Roman Church which holds and advocates these doctrines of devils can not possibly be the true church of God. We have to make God a liar, or the Roman Church a false Church."

The *Progress* must answer these infallible arguments, or else by its silence confess that they are just and true. The Roman Church, which directly contradicts and opposes the "infallible" "inspired word of God," cannot possibly be the true church of God. There was no Roman Catholic Church, or anything like it, in the apostolic age, nor until after the third century. Neither Peter, nor any one else, except Christ himself, had any official supremacy over the other apostles in the apostolic age, or for centuries. The present Roman Catholic Church is several centuries too young to be regarded as the true church of God. These facts will be established as we proceed in the discussion. The bare statements and affirmations of the *Progress* amount to nothing. It is high time that it was attempting to prove its proposition by competent witnesses. As the Roman Catholic Church herself, is on trial before the public, her own statements alone, are not sufficient.

7. In favor of Papal infallibility, the *Progress* has frequently referred to Matt. 18:17. The passage reads:

"But if thy brother shall offend against thee, go, and rebuke him between him and thee alone. If he shall hear thee, thou shalt gain thy brother. And if he will not hear thee, take with thee one or two more: that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may stand. And if he will not hear them, tell the church. And if he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican." Matt. 18:15-17.

1st. This passage cannot possibly support the papal doctrine, because it applies directly to *personal discipline*, where, according to papal theology, the Pope has no infallibility. 2nd. The offended person is to "tell the church," *not the Pope*. 3d. This interpretation is in perfect harmony with every recorded case of church discipline in the New Testament. See Scripture quotations in our last. 4th. The Roman interpretation is absurd and impossible. Every offended member cannot possibly have access to the Pope, as an infallible judge. It is not possible for one member in a hundred thousand to tell his or her grievance to the Pope. 5th. Every principle of common sense and Scripture example show, with infallible certainty, that the command "tell the church" refers to the local congregation of which the offended is a member.

FOURTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because of her idolatrous sacrament of the Eucharist, or Mass.*

The Roman Theologian, Ligouri, in his Mission Book, page 267, has the following:

"Q. What is the Holy Eucharist? A. The Holy Eucharist is the most holy of all Sacraments; *it is the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ under the appearance of bread and wine.* Q. Are the soul and divinity of our Lord also present in this sacrament? A. Yes; the whole person of Jesus is there, living and entire. Q. Is it right to adore the Blessed Eucharist? A. Yes: we may and ought to adore it. Q. How and when are the bread and wine changed into the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ? A. This change is wrought by virtue of the words of consecration

pronounced by the Priest during the Holy Mass? Q. What is the Holy Mass? A. Holy Mass is the unbloody sacrifice of the new covenant, the perpetual memorial of the bloody sacrifice of Jesus Christ upon the cross."

This Eucharist Savior is worshipped by Romanists as though it was the great Jehovah, the Creator of all things. The priest is supposed to transubstantiate the bread and wine into living bodily Christs. The Catechism of the Council of Trent, which is regarded as authority akin to infallibility, affirms that "the words of consecration accomplish" "that the true and real body of Christ, the same that was born of the Virgin, and is now seated at the right hand of the Father in heaven, is rendered present in the Holy Eucharist!" Cat. Coun. Trent, p. 156. Not only do Romanists hold that the real literal body (flesh, blood and bones of Christ) is present, but they also contend, that in the Eucharist, "the divinity and humanity whole and entire, the soul, the body and blood of Christ, with all their component parts," are present. Trent Cat. p. 159. Still more, Romanists contend "that Christ, whole and entire, is contained not only under either species, but also in each particle of either species." Trent Cat. p. 160. Here is the astounding doctrine that there is a whole body of Christ "in each particle" of the bread and wine. This makes as many whole bodily Christs as there are particles of the broken bread and poured wine in the world. Every average member of the Roman Church has devoutly devoured and taken into his stomach not less than ten thousand particles of the consecrated bread, equivalent to as many whole bodily Christs. If there are 200,000,000 Romanists in the world, then this number multiplied by 10,000 will not approximate the number of whole and entire bodily Christs, eaten and worshipped in the Roman Church. As the *Church Progress* understands "the entire multiplication table," it will please make the calculation and see if this will not give the Roman

Church 2,000,000,000,000 of real, living, whole and entire, bodily Christs. This beats, a thousand-fold, all the other idolatries in the lower universe. Also, as there is a whole bodily Christ in every particle of the wine, as well as the bread, then, as the priest drinks all the wine of the Eucharist (he likes the wine better than he does the bread), he drinks at least 30,000 bodily Christs during the celebration of one mass. The *Progress* need not attempt to dodge this difficulty by the omnipresence of Christ spiriuually. Jesus Christ bodily, is not in two different localities at the same time. When he was bodily in the manger at Bethlehem, he was bodily nowhere else in the universe. When he was bodily on the cross, he was not bodily in heaven, nor in any other locality beneath the sky. When Jesus Christ was bodily in the tomb, he was not bodily in a thousand other places at the same time. While Jesus is bodily in heaven, at the right hand of God, he is not bodily on earth at all. This doctrine of the Roman Eucharist is a direct contradiction to the plainest teachings of the Word of God, and common sense as well. The Roman Church is not the true church of God, because of its idolatrous sacrament of the mass, in which they worship an infinite number of deities.

OUR CONTROVERSY.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD.

CHURCH PROGRESS' EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE.

(June 13, 1891.)

1. Have we not said that the Catholic Church is Roman, because its head and center of unity is the Bishop of Rome? In *that sense* of the word we have told the *Baptist* we are establishing the thesis, "The Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God." This is the meaning and usage of the word *Roman* with Catholics. But a Church cannot be Roman and Catholic at the same time, argues the *Baptist*, for *Catholic* is universal, *Roman* particular. We retort, a Church can't be *Christian* and Baptist at the same time, for *Christian* is a universal and Baptist a particular term. Therefore the Baptist Church is not Christian. "There was no Roman Church, in the modern sense, in existence in the time of Augustine and Cyril of the fourth century," so declares the *Baptist*. What does St. Augustine himself say. He is appealing to the heretics of his day to return to the Catholic Church, and he bases his appeal on the ground that the papal succession from Peter down is conclusive evidence of the truth of the Catholic Church; "Come then to us brothers, if you will, and be grafted on the vine. It grieves us to see you lying as you are, lopped off from the tree. Reckon, then, ONE BY ONE, THE PONTIFFS WHO HAVE SAT FROM HIS TIME DOWNWARDS ON PETER'S VERY SEAT, AND MARK THE REGULAR SUCCESSION IN THAT ORDER OF FATHERS. THAT SEAT IS THE ROCK, WHICH THE PROUD GATES

OF HELL OVERCOME NOT." Says St. Cyril in the same strain: "That these things are so, let us produce a witness most worthy of faith, a most holy man; AND ARCHBISHOP OF THE HABITABLE WORLD, that Celestine, who is both father and patriarch of the mighty city of Rome, etc." An appeal to the Pope in matters of faith is very plainly the Catholic position to-day as it was in St. Cyril's time.

2. The quotation from 2 Thes. 2:4, (rather 3:4) refers to anti-Christ coming just before "the Day of the Lord," the day of judgment. How the unlearned, and unstable wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction! "We claim absolute infallibility and impeccability for Christ the Head of the true Church, for her rule of faith in his word, and for the Holy Spirit, the Guide and Comforter" so says the *Baptist*. Exactly. But the question is WHERE IS THAT CHURCH AND WHAT IS HER RULE OF FAITH? The infallibility of Christ and the Holy Spirit is not in dispute. Her (the Church's) rule of faith is infallible. What is that rule? You said the claim of infallibility was unscriptural, and a mark of the false Church, that "the members of the Apostolic Church did not claim infallibility for themselves," (May 9th). This week you turn and contradict yourself saying, "This threefold infallibility and impeccability has remained, undimmed and untarnished, with the *true disciples* and will continue forever." The Apostolic Churches did not possess this infallibility and impeccability, you averred, and now you claim it for the true disciples afterwards. You have contradicted yourself and scripture too palpably to need further consideration on this point.

3. Every Pope from St. Peter to Leo XIII. has been infallible. No *Pope can teach false doctrine*; neither Sergious III., nor John IX. Six *immoral* Popes don't mean six *false* Popes. No *conclusion* whatever. Six *immoral* presidents; *i. e.* six *false* presidents. See the absurdity of such logic!

Equally nonsensical the conclusion that given six immoral Popes therefore no Popes at all! Six immoral Presidents; therefore no Presidents at all! We do question the quotation from Baronius until you authenticate it. Give volume and page of Baronius or cease harping on it. We don't know that it comes from Baronius.

4. In answer to your quotation Matt. 28:20, we ask where are *those whom* Christ commanded to teach and *with whom* He promises to be all days? WHERE are those *infallible, impeccable, inspired teachers and disciples*, and how are we to distinguish them from other men? WHERE are those infallible, impeccable, inspired *people* with whom the Holy Spirit "has remained through all the persecutions of the past," and who alone can possibly teach God's word with unerring certainty? WHERE are those infallible *proofs* in the shape of *miracles*? WHERE is that infallible rule of faith in His Word, which has given the light of the gospel through all ages to the present?

WHERE were and are those saints and martyrs who attest to the true Church? The proposition does *require* you to trace the *succession* of the Church of Christ for 1900 years. True succession is a mark of Christ's Church. We point to the Roman pontiffs from Peter to Leo. "The true succession lies outside of and independent of the Roman Catholic Church" asserts the *Baptist*. POINT IT OUT. It must be visible. An invisible succession is no succession. WHERE IS THAT TRUE SUCCESSION OF INFALLIBLY, IMPECCABLE, INSPIRED, MIRACLE-WORKING MEN OUTSIDE OF AND INDEPENDENT OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH? We ask again.

5. "He (the Catholic) must not read and understand the Bible for himself" asserts the *Baptist*; granted, if by this the *Baptist* means that a Catholic must not interpret the Bible *privately*, for as St. Peter tells us "no prophecy of the Scrip-

ture is made by private interpretation." But that a Catholic is forbidden to read the Bible for his own edification and instruction we deny. The contradictory assertion is false. The *Baptist* disclaims private interpretation and yet asserts it in the same breath. The above assertion that no Catholic must read and understand the Bible for himself clearly implies for private interpretation. All that one has to do is to *read* the Bible and, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the teachings of the Bible "are so plain" that "every one knows his duty." It is stated here that it is not the Church that gives him the meaning of Scripture, but he himself personally and immediately reading, through the assisting illumination of the Holy Spirit, understands the Scriptures. If this is not private interpretation what is it? Private interpretation means personally interpreting the meaning of Scriptures for oneself. Will the *Baptist* now show that "the Holy Spirit is *guaranteed* to every humble and obedient soul," thus undertaking to understand and interpret the Scriptures? Those things mentioned by St. Paul "are not essential to be understood in order to salvation," says the *Baptist*. Now who told the *Baptist* that they were not? By what *authority* does the *Baptist* assert this in face of St. Peter's express declaration that these very things, as well as other Scriptures, many wrest to their own destruction? How does the *Baptist* determine what is and is not *essential* to salvation.

6. "The present canon of revelation, as accepted by Baptists and Protestants, was accepted and established before the Roman Catholic Church existed" says the *Baptist*. By whom? WHEN AND WHERE? "The PROGRESS admits the canonicity of the books which we regard as the Bible" the *Baptist* asserts. We admit nothing of the sort; on the contrary we emphatically deny that the *Protestant* Bible is the infallible word of God. Your Bible is a corrupt book and omits certain canonical parts

of the true Scriptures. But we do hold that the Bible, canonized and sanctioned and interpreted by the Catholic Church is the inspired, infallible word of God. This is the reason we asked you WHERE DID YOU GET YOUR BIBLE? We ask this question again. Dare you answer it? The answer will solve the whole question. You said you accepted and established the Bible before the Roman Catholic Church existed. PROVE THAT, and you have proved your case. Here is the crucial point of the whole question. Meet it, if you can. As the *Baptist* is not David, it will have to account for "its sword." Where was its weapon forged, by whom? *

6. We have shown repeatedly that the Bible without an authorized interpreter cannot be the rule of faith; we now proceed to the positive side and prove that "the rule of faith is the teaching of Christ in the mouth of a living body of teachers."

(a) This was the rule of faith whilst Christ was on earth. A living teacher, sending other teachers and teaching Himself by word of mouth. The plan which Christ employed to teach truth was the plan He wanted His church to employ. He taught *how* to teach, as well as *what* to teach.

(b.) The rule of faith in Apostolic times was certainly the *perfect rule* of faith. It was not the Bible, because that did not exist. It was the teaching of the living voice of the Apostles. Therefore the perfect rule of faith is the teaching of a living body of teachers.

(c.) This rule did not cease or change when the last Apostle died, about the year A. D. 100. For if it did there was then *no rule of faith at all*, not the New Testament; that had not been compiled. Not the dead Apostles, as is evident. What then? Either admit that there was at the moment *no rule of faith at all*, that is that Christ had failed, or that that rule was

* See Appendix A.

something else besides the New Testament. Well, what else?

We insist *the rule of faith in the year A. D. 100 was the same as the rule of faith in the year A. D. 1900.* In the year A. D. 100, it was not the New Testament. Therefore in the year A. D. 1900, it will not be the New Testament.

(d.) If after the death of the Apostles the rule of faith changed and the written word became the rule of faith, the Apostles would have been obliged to write out, arrange, and deliver to Christians the teachings of Christ. Which of them did so? They neglected the most important of all duties. Their writings are fragmentary, not in the shape of clear doctrinal treatises at all, and evidently therefore not intended to be the rule of faith.

In summary: The method of teaching of Christ and His Apostles in practice and precept, the method by which the Christian society was established, must also be the method by which that society is preserved and continued, *unless the contrary can be clearly proved.* But that method was oral teaching; therefore oral teaching is the approved way of imparting Christ's doctrine; the oral teaching of a body of men properly appointed is the living rule of faith. This does not exclude writing as an *aid* in embodying and preserving doctrine as is evident. It only excludes writings as teachers formally so called.

We insist that you beg the question when you assume that the Bible is the rule of faith, and we now prove from the Bible that another rule must be admitted. Let us have before our minds clearly that the rule of faith is the *guide*, the *standard*, the *measure*, that to which we can refer to know what Christ taught. With the Catholic it is "*what the Church teaches*," with the Protestant generally what he supposes that the Bible teaches, with the Baptist what the Protestant New Testament teaches. Christ said: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations."

A few men cannot teach all nations, and did not. The command was then given to them as a *body corporate*. "Behold I am with you all days," that is to say, in your teaching, "even to the consummation of the world." What is plainer than that Christ is still with the *same body of teachers*, otherwise his promise is void. They are his commissioned officers till the end of time. Where are to-day the officers holding Christ's commission? "I am with you," says Christ. "With whom?" says the soul. "With the Bible," says the Protestant. "With the successors of the Apostles," says the Catholic. Which of us is *scriptural*?

And when Christ promises the spirit of truth who is *to teach* all truth, it is to the *Apostles*, Jno. 14: 16-26, not to *Christians in general*, that the promise is made. What right have you and I to assume the apostolic office? What right has every Christian to say: "Christ promised *me* the spirit to suggest to *me* all truth." *Christ did nothing of the kind.* He expressly promised the Spirit to the *apostolic body*, and in that body we must seek to find the Spirit still abiding. Christ points out the way of life and truth most clearly. A body of living teachers are commissioned to teach and hand down His doctrines, and they are preserved from error by the assistance of the Spirit, which is given in the highest degree to the chief of this band "whose faith cannot fail."

7. In conclusion to the text from Tim. iv. 1-3, we answer (for the *Baptist* imagines it has a text against the Catholic Church) that St. Paul in the words "forbidding to marry" and "abstaining from meats" is here speaking of the Gnostics, the Encratites, the Manichaeans and other ancient heretics, who absolutely condemned marriage and the use of all kinds of meat, because they pertended that all *flesh* was from an evil principle; whereas the Church of God so far from condemning marriage, holds it to be a holy sacrament, and forbids it to

none but such as by *vow* have chosen, what St. Paul calls, the better part, and prohibits not the use of any meats whatever, in proper times and seasons, though she does not judge all kind of diet proper for days of fasting and penance. The *Baptist's* perversion of the text is an illustration of the apostles words how the unstable and unlearned wrest the Scriptures to a false meaning. We did not quote Matt. xxviii. 17, to prove *infallibility*, but to show the *authority* of the Church and the *obligation* of the faithful to hear the Church. When you tell the Church you tell the Pope.

In answer to the so-called negative argument against the Blessed Eucharist, the *Baptist* assumes its argument, does not demonstrate it. Our Lord Himself established this Sacrament at the last supper. See Matt. xxvi. 26-28. St. Mark xiv. 22-24. St. Luke xxii. 19-20. John vi. 51-70. Also 1. Corin. x. 16, 17-21. Also 1. Corin. xi. 23-30. Especially note these words in this last. "But let a man prove himself and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of the chalice. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, NOT DISCERNING THE BODY OF THE LORD." Therefore the doctrine of the real presence is a mark of the true Church. We reply to the very foolish quibble over the manifold presence of our Lord in the Blessed Eucharist as we did before. God is everywhere, and whole and entire everywhere. But God is whole and entire in every nook and cranny of the universe; therefore there are as many Gods as there are nooks and crannies in the universe, a whole and entire God in every grain of sand, in every particle of matter. *Ergo* (*Baptist's* logic) there are billions upon billions of Gods, whom the Baptists adore! ! !

The *Baptist* argues that the doctrine of the Eucharist "is a direct contradiction to common sense because of its idolatrous sacrament of the Mass, in which they worship an infinite num-

ber of deities." We suppose the *Baptist* would call the resurrection of our Lord from the dead a doctrine in contradiction to *common sense* and also His passing through closed doors and walls. Common sense, as the *Baptist* uses it, is a very meagre and unprofitable rule of faith.

We wish to remind the *Baptist* that this controversy is to be conducted with proper courtesy. In its last argument it has been grossly discourteous. When it says "he (the priest) likes the wine better than he does the bread," it is simply insulting. We very frankly and plainly tell the *Baptist*, that if it proposes to conduct the controversy on that level, we decline to argue further with it. We do not propose to soil our columns with this kind of matter, nor disgust our readers. We trust that the *Baptist* will be careful henceforth to keep in proper bounds.

THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

PROPOSITION: *Resolved that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*

CHURCH PROGRESS, Affirms.
AMERICAN BAPTIST, Denies.

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S EIGHTH NEGATIVE.

(June 18, 1891.)

1. The *Progress* admits that the Church is "Roman, because its head center of unity is the bishop of Rome." But, in the apostolic age and the centuries immediately following, there was no great ecclesiastical hierarchy having its center of unity with the bishop of Rome. Therefore, the Roman Church with its head center at Rome, is not the apostolic Church. We have no disposition to take advantage of the contradiction in the name "Roman Catholic Church." Also the *Progress* should know that the term Catholic was used in the early centuries, before the establishment of the hierarchy with its head at Rome. The retort about "Christian and Baptist" does not apply, because the apostolic churches, called Christian, were the same in doctrine, ordinances and government as Baptist churches are now. But the *Progress* will not dare to attempt to prove that the present Roman Church, with the Pope as its head, is identical with the apostolic churches. Even before the time of Augustine and Cyril, several rich and powerful churches in the chief cities; such as Antioch, Alexandria, Ephesus, Corinth and Rome, had so far departed from the simplicity of the New Testament church government, that their pastors had assumed and received extravagant and unscriptural titles. These churches were called "apostolic seats"

and the chief pastors were spoken of as "chief priests," "chief pontiffs" and "popes." In this honorary sense there were a plurality of pontiffs or popes. Though widely departed from the apostolic example, they claimed succession from the apostolic churches. Neither Augustine nor Cyril used the term "pontiff" in the present sense of that term applied to a Pope with universal supremacy and jurisdiction. It was a common thing, in the third or fourth centuries, to speak of a prominent pastor as father (papa,) as a mere title of respect. It finally became a special title of bishops, and it was not until the time of Pope Gregory VII., in the Roman Council of 1073, that the title of Pope was prohibited to all except the Roman Bishops.

2. (a) Some of the disciples had adopted the view that the second coming of Christ was at hand. Paul corrected their error by telling them that there would "come a falling away first," or "revolt" as the Rheimish Testament has it. This "falling away" was the departure upon the part of vast numbers in the third century, from the simplicity of the apostolic faith and practice; from which time the "mystery of iniquity" began to work rapidly, until the early part of the fourth century, when those who had fallen away from the truth entered into an adulterous union with the state, under Constantine. The "man of sin" was afterwards revealed, and in the early part of the seventh century, claimed universal dominion over all the churches of Christ, still later he was established on a temporal throne. The Roman Church was evidently developed out of this "falling away" party. Paul in 2 Thes. 2: 4, exactly describes the haughty claims of the Pope of Rome "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God;" or as the Rheimish Testament has it, "showing himself as if he were God,"

(b) We still affirm that the claim of infallibility for the Popes of Rome, marks that church as the false Church. While the true Church does not claim infallibility for her members, she does claim infallibility for Christ her head, the rule of faith in his Word, and the Holy Spirit as the Guide and Comforter. There is no contradiction in this, except to contradict the false infallibility of the Pope.

3. (a) It seems that the *Progress* has opened its mouth wide and swallowed the whole line of Popes, saying: "Every Pope from St. Peter to Leo XIII has been infallible. No Pope can teach false doctrine; neither Sergius III, nor John IX [XI]. Six immoral Popes don't mean six false Popes!" (b) The illustration is not true. The President does not sustain the same relation to the United States that the Pope does to the Church. Even if Popery were true, Jesus would not appoint a monster of iniquity as his vice-gerent and head of His Church, If the President should violate the Constitution of the United States and become a traitor, his office would be vacated and his acts null and void. These bad, immoral Popes were unlawfully placed in office, and their lives were made up of crime. A President thrust into the chair unlawfully would be no President. Those monstrous bad Popes, thrust into the chair contrary to law, were certainly "false Popes," and according to the *Progress*, no Popes at all. (c) Dowling's quotation from Baronius is overwhelmingly sustained by other Roman historians. Joseph Reeve, the endorsed historian of the Roman Church, of these bad Popes who were raised to power by faction and intrigue, says:

"Two sister prostitutes, Marozia and Theodora, daughters of the lewd Marchioness of Tuscany, governed Rome by their political influence and criminal intrigues. To these disorders the Popes, themselves, contributed in no small degree. Sergius III. exhibited a spectacle of scandal, of which the Christian world had never known an example, a sovereign Pontiff clasped in the lewd embraces of a notorious prostitute, Sergius III.,

without regard for the dignity or holiness of his pontifical character, publicly avowed his criminal connections with Marozia: by her he had a son, who, under his mother's influence, crept afterwards into St. Peter's chair by the name of John XI. To the infamy of his spurious birth, he added personal vice, in which he was shamefully imitated by many, who in that century were raised to the papal throne, without the virtues to merit or support their elevation."

Joseph Reeve here presents the character of the false Popes just as black as portrayed by Baronius himself. The Roman Catholic historian, DuPin, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. VII. p. 5, concerning these unlawful and disorderly Popes, says:

"Though historians have differed in their judgment, concerning the tenth century in general, yet they all agree in their accounts of the wretched state and condition of the Church of Rome, and those who have been most favorable in their censures, could not but own that it was in a strange disorder. 'At that time (crys Cardinal Baronius) how deformed, how frightful was the face of the Church of Rome! The Holy See was fallen under the tyranny of two loose and disorderly women, who placed and displaced Bishops as their humor led them, and, (what I tremble to think and speak of) they placed their gallants upon St. Peter's chair, who did not so much as deserve the very name of Popes. For who dare say that these infamous persons, who intruded without any form of justice, were lawful Popes? We do not find that they were chosen by the clergy; or that they consented in the least to their election. All the canons of councils were infringed, the decrees of Popes trampled under foot, the ancient traditions despised, the customs and ceremonies usually observed in the election of Popes neglected, and the Holy See became a prey to avarice and ambition.' In such terms as these does this Cardinal, who cannot be supposed to be an enemy to the Church of Rome, lament the sad estate wherein it was in this tenth century; and a long time before him, Arnold Bishop of Orleans, who probably might have been an eye witness of some of these disorders, breaks out into this complaint: 'Oh miserable Rome! Thou that formerly didst hold out so many great and glorious luminaries to our ancestors, into what prodigious darkness art thou now fallen, which will render thee infamous to all succeeding ages?'"

The Roman historian, Du Pin, confirms the testimony of Baronius concerning these unlawful and desperately depraved Popes. As they were "unlawful Popes" they were no Popes at all. They were not elected according to the "Canons of

Councils," nor chosen by the clergy. They were put into the supposed St. Peter's chair "by the tyranny of two loose and disorderly women." Thus the myth of the infallibility of the Popes is hopelessly broken and lost. These are the testimonies of Roman Catholics themselves concerning what they erroneously call "the holy mother Church." The Roman Bishop of Orleans exclaims: "O miserable Rome! Into what prodigious darkness art thou fallen, which will render thee infamous to all the succeeding ages!" Du Pin traces these fearful disorders to the promotion of Formosus to the popedom. Formosus, who was guilty of perjury and murder, was received to the popedom in the year 891, but died about the end of 896. After Boniface had ruled as Pope only a few days, Stephen VI. got possession of the chair. Of this Stephen VI. the Roman historian, Du Pin, says:

"This man immediately declares himself an enemy to the memory of Formosus; calls a Council, where he nulls all the ordinations made by Formosus; dug up his corpse, and having dressed him up in his Pontifical robes, he condemned him as if he had been alive; and after he had censured him for his ambition in quitting the bishoprick of Ostia and usurping St. Peter's chair, contrary to the Canons of the Church, he caused him to be stripped of his robes, cut off his three fingers, wherewith he gave the blessing, and threw him into the Tiber. A base and barbarous proceeding this! and such as has struck horror into all those who have wrote about it." Vol. 7. p. 7.

Thus the hyena infallible Pope, Stephen VI. dragged the corpse of the *infallible* (?) Pope, Formosus, from the grave, had all his infallible acts nullified, and condemned as false, cut off his fingers and threw his body into the river? Here are two *infallible* Popes speaking *ex-cathedra*, from St. Peter's chair, in direct contradiction to each other. Such is the *unity* and *infallibility* of the Roman Church. The succession of the Popedom has been broken and scattered to the four winds. The Roman Church is not the true church of God, because of her false claim of infallibility for the Popes. The dogma of

the infallibility of the Pope is a new doctrine imposed on the Church in 1870. Instead of the Roman Church being always and every where the same, she has made more changes than any other religious sect. Prior to the Vatican Council in 1870, no one was obliged to believe in the infallibility of the Pope, in any sense. Bishop John B. Purcell, in his debate with A. Campbell, in 1827, says:

"No enlightened Catholic holds the Pope's infallibility to be an article of faith. I do not: and none of my brethren, that I know of, do. The Catholic believes the Pope, as a man, to be as liable to error, as almost any other man in the universe. Man is man, and no man is infallible, either in doctrine or morals. Many of the Pope's have sinned, and some of them have been bad men." See Debate p. 23.

Now, since the decree establishing the Pope's infallibility has been delivered, all Romanists must believe in his infallibility on pain of damnation. The Roman Church, which has changed her creed and terms of salvation so often, cannot possibly be the true church of God.

4. The *Progress* seems exceedingly anxious to draw us from the discussion of the claims of the Roman Catholic Church to something else. It plays in vain the fluttering bird from the nest.

5. The *Progress* certainly mistakes the meaning of, "no prophecy of Scripture is made by private interpretation." 2 Peter 1:20. This passage has reference to the origin of the prophecy, not to the manner of understanding it. The idea is that the prophecies of the Bible did not originate from the personal knowledge or invention of the prophet himself; "but the holy men of God spoke, inspired by the Holy Ghost." Ver. 21. It is a bad mistake of the *Progress*.

6. The *Progress*, in its sixth affirmative, did say that "the Catholic Church holds and teaches that the Bible is the INSPIRED WORD OF GOD, and therefore true; that this written word of God is as true as his spoken word; that the written

word is as infallible as his spoken word." Does the *Progress* contradict this? As the *Progress* gives its full sanction and endorsement to the canonicity of the Bible which contains our standard of doctrine and rule of faith, then we are under no obligation to stop and argue the canonicity of the Bible. Surely the *Progress* does not intend to turn infidel and argue against the canonicity of the Bible?

The *Progress* is again mistaken. The chief editor of the AMERICAN BAPTIST is named "David." But we do not mention this to intimidate the *Progress*.

8. (7.) The *Progress* claims that 1 Tim. 4:1-3, refers to the doctrine of the Gnostics and others who condemned marriage and the use of meats. But the Roman Church is guilty of the same heresy of "forbidding to marry, to abstain from meats;" which the Rhemish Testament calls the "doctrines of devils." The *Progress* says, "when you tell the Pope you tell the Church." According to this, the Pope is the Church! But the command, Matt. 18 17, to "tell the church," cannot possibly be obeyed, if it means to "tell the Pope." Must we read: "And if he will not hear them, tell the Pope; and if he will not hear the Pope," etc. But how can the millions of Romanists, men, women and children, throughout the nations tell their grievances to the Pope, who is shut up in the Vatican in Rome? This interpretation, which makes the Pope the Church and the Church the Pope, is certainly copying after the "unlearned and unstable who wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction."

9. (a) The *Progress* shows its wisdom in failing to attempt an answer to our fourth negative argument showing that the Roman Church is not the true church of God, because of her idolatrous Sacrament of the Eucharist. The *Progress* misrepresents our statement. We said "this doctrine of the Roman Eucharist is in direct contradiction to the plainest

teaching of the Word of God, and common sense as well." If there is a whole and entire body of Jesus Christ, flesh, blood and bones, in every fraction of the broken bread and poured wine, then there are as many whole and entire bodily Christs as there are dusts of the consecrated bread and particles of the consecrated wine. This would make millions more than all the heathen Gods in the universe. The *Progress* has offered no proofs that Jesus Christ can be bodily present in two places at the same time. When he is bodily present in heaven he is not bodily present on the Roman altar. (b) The quibble is not true. God the Father, is not whole and entire in every "cranny and grain of sand in the universe." It requires a whole universe of space to contain the omni-present God. Solomon at the dedication of the temple had some conception of the omni-presence of the great God, when he said: "Is it then thought to be that God should indeed dwell upon the earth? for if heaven, and the heavens of heavens cannot contain thee, how much less this house which I have built." 3 Kings 8:27. Douay Bible. If all heaven and the heavens of heavens are not large enough to contain the great God of the universe, how can he be whole and entire in every grain of sand? The Eucharist, of the Roman Church is unscriptural and in direct conflict with reason. The service of God is a reasonable service. Rom. 12:1.

We assure the *Progress* that we meant no discourtesy or "insult" to it or any one else by the parenthetic intimation that the priest liked the wine better than the bread. If the *Progress* will observe the same courtesy to the BAPTIST as the BAPTIST to it, there will certainly be no room for complaint.

When of the bread and wine, the Savior said: "This is my body" and "this is my blood" his body had not been broken, nor his blood shed. His disciples were to understand him as speaking figuratively; that the broken bread was to represent

his broken body, and the poured wine to represent his blood. It is absurd to say that he literally held his own body and blood in his hands. Also, Jesus said: "Do this for a commemoration of me." Luke 22: 19. After his departure they were to observe the Lord's supper for a *commemoration* of their ascended Savior. But, if the Roman theory is correct, they need no commemoration of Christ. He is bodily and personally present in the mouth and stomach of every communicant. Paul says: "For as often as you shall eat this bread and drink this chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord, until he come." The Roman interpretation is clearly wrong, because they do not profess to "eat the bread," but the living flesh of Christ. The Lord's Supper was eaten, as *bread* in the apostolic churches. In this commemoration they were to show the death of the Lord *till he come*. But according to Roman theology, he is present all the while and needs no commemoration.

OUR CONTROVERSY.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD.

CHURCH PROGRESS' NINTH AFFIRMATIVE.

(June 20, 1891.)

1. The *Baptist* is extremely careful *not* to reply to our arguments, and with studied diligence neglects to answer our questions. We will summarize the points the *Baptist* has conspicuously failed to meet:

(a.) The *Baptist* persistently, openly and purposely confounds impeccability with infallibility. We have carefully defined and distinguished them. The *Baptist* ignores the difference, patent to any one with ordinary intelligence. Its attempts, therefore, to show that the Popes are not impeccable, are utterly foreign to the issue in hand.

(b.) We argued (April 25) that infallibility was an *essential mark* of Christ's Church, and as the Catholic Church, amongst all so-called Christian Churches, alone claimed that mark, she alone can be and is the true Church. The *Baptist* answered this by declaring (May 2) that this claim of infallibility was actually evidence of *fallibility*, and was plainly *ridiculous*. When we urged this argument again the *Baptist*, seeking to confute it, declared (May 9) that the Apostolic Churches did not claim infallibility for themselves. "Therefore it (the claim of infallibility) is rather a mark of the false Church," were the very words of the *Baptist*. It also declared in the same issue (May 9) that the claim of infallibility was *unscriptural*, and asserted this to be *evidence* of the *falsity* of the Catholic

Church. Pushed to the wall by our reiterated arguments and questions, the *Baptist* admitted that "the Church established by Christ cannot *ex cathedra* teach falsehood," that "the true Church will not reject the note of infallibility." Now no Church, except the Catholic Church, claims this note of infallibility; and every other Church, except the Catholic Church, does reject it. What Church amongst all Protestant Churches accepts the note of infallibility and does not reject it? Does the Baptist Church? NOT A SINGLE ONE. Therefore the Catholic Church alone can be and is the true Church of God.

(c.) Unity we also showed to be an *essential mark* of Christ's Church. That unity is threefold: 1. Unity of Doctrine; 2. Unity of Worship; 3. Unity of Government. This threefold unity we saw the Catholic Church alone possesses. Protestantism is divided into hundreds of sects without, 1. Unity of Doctrine; without, 2. Unity of Worship; without, 3. Unity of Government. Therefore as the Catholic Church alone possesses unity, an essential mark of Christ's Church, she alone can be and is the true Church of God. Here we may properly note the *Baptist's* assertion above that the doctrine of the infallibility is a *new* doctrine. Let us premise by first stating that if the *Baptist* would take the trouble to inform itself *what is and what is not Catholic* doctrine before attempting to controvert, it would save itself much useless trouble, space and time. The formal definition of a doctrine in the formulation of a dogmatic declaration is not *new* doctrine. It is merely the formal declaration and formulation of a doctrinal truth *already held*, but never found necessary to define before. It is only when *the truth* of a doctrine is brought into question either in the Church or without it in such a way as to require an explicit and official declaration of that doctrine, in order that there may no longer be any possible question about it, that the Church sets to work to define and formulate it.

Thus the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ was not dogmatically defined until the Oecumenic Council of Nice in the fourth century; after it had been subtly attacked by the Arian heresy. The dogma of the infallibility was not therefore the *introduction* of a *new* doctrine, but simply the explicit formulation of an old truth. The citation of Bishop Purcell's words in his debate with Campbell does not in the least conflict with the doctrine of infallibility. Bishop Purcell is there speaking of the Pope *in his private*, not in his official capacity as Vicar of Christ and Head of the Church; and he is careful to say "the Catholic believes the Pope, *as a man*, to be as liable to error as almost any other man in the universe." We can say the same thing, for we never claimed for the Pope, *as a man*, the gift of infallibility. It is only when speaking officially *ex-cathedra*, as Vicar of Christ and Head of the Universal Church and to the Universal Church, when defining matters of doctrine and morals, that he is infallibly guarded from teaching error.

(c.) There are some questions we have asked which the *Baptist* has steadily ignored. WE WANT THEM ANSWERED. That they may not be *forgotten* or *overlooked* we repeat them here.

WHERE IS THE SCRIPTURE TO SHOW THAT THE CHURCH WILL NOT REJECT THE NOTE OF INFALLIBILITY ?

WHERE IS THE SCRIPTURE TO SHOW THAT THE CLAIM OF INFALLIBILITY IS UNSCRIPTURAL ?

WHERE IS THAT SUCCESSIVE LINE OF INFALLIBLE, IMPECCABLE, INSPIRED, MIRACLE-WORKING MEN, WHO HAVE ALWAYS TAUGHT GOD'S WORD INFALLIBLY ?

WHERE ARE THESE INFALLIBLE, INSPIRED, MIRACLE-WORKING TEACHERS TO-DAY ? WHERE IS THAT VISIBLE BODY NOW, AND WHERE HAS IT BEEN DURING THESE NINETEEN HUNDRED YEARS ?

WHERE ARE THOSE INFALLIBLE PROOFS IN THE SHAPE OF MIRACLES ?

WHERE IS THAT INFALLIBLE RULE OF FAITH WHICH HAS GIVEN THE LIGHT OF THE GOSPEL THROUGH ALL AGES TO THE PRESENT ?

WHERE IS THAT TRUE SUCCESSION OF INFALLIBLE TEACHERS AND DISCIPLES OUTSIDE OF AND INDEPENDENT OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH ?

BY WHAT AUTHORITY DOES THE BAPTIST ASSERT THAT THE THINGS WHICH ST. PETER SAYS MANY WREST TO THEIR OWN DESTRUCTION, ARE NOT ESSENTIAL TO SALVATION ?

HOW DOES THE BAPTIST DETERMINE WHAT IS AND WHAT IS NOT ESSENTIAL TO SALVATION ?

BY WHOM, WHEN AND WHERE WAS THE PRESENT CANON OF REVELATION, AS ACCEPTED BY BAPTISTS AND PROTESTANTS, ACCEPTED AND ESTABLISHED BEFORE THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH EXISTED ?

WHERE DID YOU GET YOUR BIBLE ?

These are crucial questions. In fact upon them *hangs the whole controversy*, and they are the very points the *Baptist* most persistently and carefully avoids.

2. The extract from Reeve, again cited by the *Baptist*, we have already answered, and also shown to be irrelevant to the question of infallibility. Likewise may it be said of the passages quoted from DuPin. But we may also state that DuPin is not Catholic authority. He was a Jansenist and consequently a heretic, and has no more weight than any other heretic. He was censured by Pope Clement XI. and deposed from his chair in the Sorbonne by Louis XIV. for doctrinal errors. So much for DuPin. But where is that quotation to be found in Baronius? Is it not *curious* that the *Baptist* can't give volume and page?

3. So the text, "no prophesy of Scripture is made by pri-

vate interpretation" has no reference to the *manner of understanding* Scripture? We thought the *Baptist* denied the right of private interpretation. It asserted over and over again that we misrepresented Protestants when we declared that they held the doctrine of private interpretation, and when we quote a text to show that according to Scripture itself private interpretation, is forbidden, the *Baptist* turns from its first position and tells us, that this text does not mean that the Scriptures are not to be privately interpreted *in understanding them* but only that prophesy in its origin was not of private interpretation, that is, "did not originate in the personal knowledge or invention of the prophet himself." The *Baptist* evidently likes to contradict itself. But the passage in question *does* mean that Scriptures are not to be privately interpreted *in the manner of understanding them*. What St. Peter says here is, that as Scripture is the inspired word of God, not the private fancy of the prophet, so they cannot be properly expounded by private spirit or fancy, but by the spirit wherewith they were written, which is resident in the Church. He had just said "And *we* have the surer word of prophecy: to which you do well to attend as a light shining in a dark place," etc. With us (the Church) says St. Peter, abides the surer prophecy; to us it was delivered by Christ Himself and inspired by the Holy Spirit, and by *us* is it to be explained, in whom resides that spirit; therefore do you attend to *our* interpretation, and not to any private fancy of your own. Now we do not contradict what we said before; that *the* Bible is the inspired, infallible word of God; but we do deny that *your* Bible is *that* Bible. YOU DO NOT EVEN KNOW WHERE YOU GOT WHAT YOU CALL YOUR BIBLE. We do *not* admit its canonicity. We deny it most emphatically. and hold that you have a corrupted book, not the word of God, but a perverted and false book. You declare this book to be your rule of faith and the only rule. We showed

last week that "the true rule of faith is the teaching of Christ in the mouth of a living body of teachers." We showed, (a) that this was the rule of faith while Christ was on earth; that He taught *how* as well as *what* to teach; (b) that the rule of faith in Apostolic times was a *perfect* rule; that that rule was the living voice of the Apostles, (c) that this rule did not cease or change when the last apostle died; that the rule of faith A. D., 100 and the rule of faith A. D., 1900 must be the same. In the year 100 it was not the Bible therefore in the year 1900 it cannot be the Bible.

4. Tradition, which is not mere hearsay or rumor, *the word of God handed down from generation to generation*, is just as much part of God's revelation as the Bible is and must be as firmly believed; and the Church, the living body of teachers, is the guardian and preserver of both, which she expounds and interprets to the people. This theory can stand all the storms of rationalism and scepticism, for it is logical and complete.

We will show the need of tradition still further. When our government was formed the fathers left the question unsettled whether the States could withdraw from the Union when they pleased. The doubt has already cost us a million lives, millions of treasure; the desolation of half a continent, an *iliad* of woes. Could the men who framed the government have foreseen the struggle and had they the means of preventing it, would it not have been their duty to settle the question? Now Christ foresaw all the religious strifes that were to lay desolate the world, and had the means to prevent discord among men of good will. Did He use none? Most certainly. He made use of some sure, safe and easy way to make of one accord all who believe in Him. He did not attempt to force the free will of His creatures, however, but He did give us an *easy way of making sure of the truth. The Bible was not that way for Christ did not give us the Bible. He DID GIVE US THE CHURCH.*

He did tell us to hear the Church. He did promise to be with the teaching Church always. He did promise the Spirit of Truth to the Church. The living tradition in the Church was the means He used to keep believers of one accord.

Again, what would our constitution, simple as it is, be worth to us without a skilled court to interpret and decide upon its meaning? Language cannot be made so plain that men will not find a hundred meanings in the simplest phrase. The Court can *add* nothing to the law, but tells us what the law is. The Church can *add* nothing to Christ's truth, but tells us what that truth is. How does she know what that truth is? By tradition and the Scripture, of which she is the guardian and interpreter. Tradition becomes embodied in writings just as the interpretation of the law becomes so embodied, but the *living voice* is always there to interpret, to separate the chaff from the wheat, to tell you what comes down from the past, with which she is always in touch, and what is added by human opinion and conjecture, what must be believed as taught by Christ, what is certain from the teaching of the fathers, what is probable, doubtful, rash, false or heretical.

Protestants and Catholics alike take many things from tradition, for instance the *observance of Sunday* (*We want the Baptist to explain why it accepts Sunday observance from the Catholic Church*), the *acceptance* of the Old and New Testament, of infant Baptism (excepting the Baptist denomination), and so on. For in Christendom you have a great chain or rather net work of generations, a living energizing organism that never dies, and that is in living communication still with the early ages through countless impressions passed from mother to child through the ages. How find, among all these views and impressions, those that are authentic and reliable, those that embody what the Master said and wished? Here again we see the need of the living teacher wearing the King's

signet ring, the herald with the royal arms on his escutcheon, and if he bears a letter from the King, and that letter is doubtful and needs explaining, then the King must have some officer to whom I can appeal to know the meaning of his letter, otherwise He has left me in the dark as to His will, and I can fairly blame Him for the dissension arising from varying comments on His written command. You say this is blasphemous. That is to say blasphemy follows logically from the acceptance of your rule of faith. A "bone of contention" cannot be a rule of faith. We repeat that *the Bible without an authorized interpreter* becomes "a bone of contention" in the hands of the unlearned and unstable who wrest it to their own destruction. Therefore the Bible without an authorized interpreter is not the rule of faith.

5. As for us, we can no more ignore the testimony of the early fathers to the meaning of Christ than we can ignore the testimony of Patrick Henry and Alex. Hamilton to the meaning of the framers of our government. And when we hear men like Ignatius, the martyr, living close up to the time of the apostles, and contemporary with St. John, averring that "the Bishops appointed throughout the world are one in the teaching of the Father," we hear the echo of Christ's words: "Go and teach," "I am with you," and when this same Ignatius compares a bishop to the leading chord of an instrument and the faithful to the other chords that should vibrate in harmony with it, making music in the ears of the Most High, we feel that this is but a poetic expression of the same great truth. And when Irenaeus in the same century describes the Church as having one soul and one heart *and one mouth* by which she preaches, teaches and *hands on* the doctrine of Christ, so that in Ireland, Egypt, Germany, Syria—in all lands the same truth is heard proclaimed in divers tongues; when he goes on to compare this unity with the sun's rays, one in-light and heat;

when he shows that the *human* qualities of the teacher, his eloquence or his stammering, can neither *add* to nor *diminish* their own truth, which is of God, we wonder whether these beautiful comparisons can be made to fit the teaching of the sects?

Where are the many bishops, one in doctrine, save in the Catholic Church? Where the truth taught throughout the world without variety, save in the Catholic Church? Where the harmonious accord of many minds bowing to the one teaching which is of God?

Recalling the fact that Irenaeus and Ignatius, too, lived at a time, when by your theory, there was no rule of faith in existence at all, when the New Testament had not been compiled, when the apostles were all gone to rest, remarking that Christianity was already broad as the great Roman Empire and one as Christ is one with the Father, we have a right to ask what held that vast body of Christians together and preserved them in the one faith?

The answer comes to us in the words of the same Ignatius Bishop of Antioch in the second century (cf. letter to Pope Nicholas Migne. v. 129, p. 60.) in which he tells us that "the blessed words of Christ to Peter" were intended for "all who after him were to be supreme pastors and most sacred pontiffs of ancient Rome" and therefore "from the beginning destroyers of heresies that have arisen, and uprooters of the cockle among the wheat" * * * "being successors of the prince of the Apostles and imitators of his zeal for the faith which is according to Christ."

In time we will show you that the voice of Ignatius is the voice of ages, and that so far from the papacy having been interrupted or destroyed we can name every successor of St. Peter from the first. If at times the succession has been disputed, the very dispute only emphasized the need of unity,

and rallied Christendom to render more secure the methods of election.

Lack of space crowds out our answer to argument on the Eucharist. We will hold it back for next week.

THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

PROPOSITION: *Resolved that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*

CHURCH PROGRESS, Affirms.
AMERICAN BAPTIST, Denies.

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S NINTH NEGATIVE.

(June 25, 1891.)

The *Progress* is making very little *progress* towards the establishment of its proposition. It occupies its space in repeated attempts to draw us from the investigation of the proposition. In its first affirmative, April 30th, the *Progress* boldly said: "There is not a dogma of the Catholic Church but what can be victoriously proved both by Scripture, by tradition, and by reason, and that all objections made by Protestants against her doctrines and practices can be answered and cleared up in the most lucid manner." It started "to prove that the Catholic Church alone is the true Church of God." But, realizing the impossibility of its undertaking, the *Progress* spends its time in affirming without proof, and asking questions by which it hopes to draw us from the proposition. What has the *Progress* done towards *proving*, "by Scripture" and "by reason," its seven so-called sacraments? What proofs has it brought to establish its Confessional? What Scripture proof has it introduced to establish its baptismal salvation?

1. (a) It is not so. We have clearly stated the Bible infallibility, and by showing that many Popes were monsters of iniquity, unlawfully obtruded into the chair, we proved that the succession of the popedom had been broken. According to the ablest Roman theologians and historians, those devilish

Popes, raised to Peter's chair, contrary to all law, by these base "prostitutes," were *false Popes*. It is contrary to "reason" to believe that a monster of iniquity, placed in the Papal Chair by these *shameless harlots*, could be the *infallible* vicar of Christ on earth! But the *Progress*, in the agony of the situation; claims infallibility for these incarnate demons, unlawfully thrust into the Papal Chair. It claims infallibility for Pope John XI., the bastard son of Pope Sergius III., and elected to the throne by his outrageous prostitute mother, Marozia. The outrageous character of these unlawful Popes, is portrayed in the darkest colors by Roman historians themselves. Even the hyena Pope, Stephen VI., who tore the corpse of his predecessor, Pope Formosus, from the grave and, *ex-cathedra* condemned him and all his *infallible* acts, and then threw his corpse into the river. Yet this demon incarnate is claimed to be infallible, by the *Progress*. Such is the dreadful necessity to which the *Progress* has been forced. No wonder it tries to draw us from the proposition and the investigation of the claims of the Roman Church, by its infidel questions and quibbles against the authenticity of the Bible. (b) We only condemned the false claim of infallibility for the Popes, while admitting the true *infallibility* of Christ the head of the church, of his word and of the Holy Spirit. (c) The unity of the Roman Church is illustrated by the conduct of Pope Stephen VI., who anathematized, *ex-cathedra*, all the infallible acts of Formosus. It is the unity of war, where hostile Roman Catholic armies have met to slaughter each other. This question of Rome's lack of unity will be discussed under a separate argument. (d) The dogma of the infallibility of the Pope, as an essential article of faith, is a new doctrine, never required to be believed until 1870. Bishop Purcell did not believe in the Pope's infallibility in any sense. When Purcell speaks of the Pope "as a man" and therefore fallible, he

taught positively that the Pope is no more than a man. Does the *Progress* dare say that the Pope is a god, as some have pretended? If so, what does it have to say for the godship of the "holy fathers," Sergius III., John XI., and Stephen VI.? In fact, the present creed of the Roman Church was never required to be believed until the council of Trent in the 16th century. Now all Romanists, and others too, must believe that enormous impossible creed, or be lost. The terms of salvation in the Roman Church, before the Council of Trent, were different from its terms of salvation since that Council. Such is the unity of the Roman Church. It is the unity of contradictions and schisms, as will be shown later. (e) The *Progress* refuses to define "the true church of God," from the Bible!

In further answer to its batch of questions, we again define: "A church of Christ is a congregation of baptized believers associated together in the faith and fellowship of the gospel." This church institution has the following marks of identity by which it may be known: 1. The true church has Jesus Christ *as the foundation*. 1 Cor. 3:11. 2. Its membership is composed of Christian believers, baptized in the name of the father and the Son and of the Holy Spirit." Matt. 28:20. 3. The true church has Jesus Christ alone for its *founder* and *head*. Matt. 16:18; Eph. 1:22. 4. The true church has the word of God alone, as found in the Bible, as its rule of faith and practice. See 4th, 5th and 6th Negatives for Bible proofs. 5. The church of Christ continues steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, keeping the ordinances as they were delivered and giving the pure gospel to the nations, through her living ministry. Acts 2:42; 1 Cor. 11-2; Matt. 24:14. The Roman Church, which is wholly destitute of these marks, cannot possibly be the true church of God.

2. DuPin was a learned Roman Catholic Doctor of the Sorbon and Regious Professor of Divinity at Paris, and highly

endorsed by the learned doctors of the Sorbon, of the University of Paris. The *Progress* is ready to condemn its own historians for telling the truth concerning their own Church.

3. (a) The *Progress*, with other Romanists, has become so accustomed to charging others with making *private interpretation* their rule of faith, that they cannot correct this evil habit. Neither Baptists nor Protestants ever made such a claim. We have the Bible from God, through inspired men, independent of Rome; but we are now looking after the *canonicity* of that huge hierarchy called the Roman Catholic Church. The *Progress* seems utterly confused. At one time it makes the Pope the only infallible teacher, but now it has a "living body of teachers." Does it mean to claim a plurality of Popes at the same time?

4. According to the *Progress* there has been only one infallible teacher existing at a time in the Roman Church, and his infallibility only existed while speaking *ex-cathedra* from the chair. It did not help him in preserving traditions from generation to generation. The living body of teachers who are expounders of these traditions, all being fallible, their traditions are also fallible and liable to be false. The stream never rises above its source. (b) The Judge who attempts to interpret the constitution of the United States is not infallible. The constitution remains the supreme standard, not the interpretation of a judge. So whatever may be the interpretations of uninspired men, the Bible rule remains the same. The interpretation is not the law. (c) The *Progress* says: "Language cannot be made so plain that men will not find a hundred meanings in the simplest phrase." Then how do Romanists know that they have the infallible interpretations of the Pope? The Pope to them is *invisible*. He is shut up in the Vatican. He issues his *ex-cathedra* teachings in Latin. His so-called interpretations are translated by fallible men who are

liable to put a hundred meanings to his language. Then these translations by fallible men, pass to different parts of the country through corrupt and fallible channels; so by the time these infallible teachings pass through fallible Cardinals, fallible Bishops, and fallible Priests, no Romanist has any assurance that he knows the infallible will of the Pope. Then, if there is a necessity for an infallible interpreter at all, in the shape of an infallible man, then every Romanist must have an infallible interpreter within easy access. This would require 200,000 infallible Popes, more or less. Besides all this, the creed of every Romanist requires him to believe the traditions of the Church, the huge volumes of the Father's with the Bulls and Decretals of the Popes. Such is the insuperable difficulties that surround the Romanist. (d) The Christian Sabbath, as the Lord's day was established by the example of Christ and his inspired apostles, centuries before the Roman hierarchy was born. Baptists reject "infant baptism," with other uninspired traditions. "And in vain do they worship me, teaching doctrines and precepts, of men." Mark 7:7. Rheim. Test. Like these Jewish priests, the Roman priests by their traditions, are "teaching doctrines and precepts of men." (e) Jesus Christ is the Great Teacher who aids every humble obedient soul in understanding his plain teachings, concerning salvation and duty. Christ and the Holy Spirit are present, with the one that sincerely asks, to aid and guide him in the knowledge of the truth. Surely, it is blasphemy to charge the Savior with originating such an hierarchy as the Roman Church.

5. Though the hierarchy had not yet been organized, yet these early Fathers, quoted by Romanists, were rather "fathers" of tradition than of true Bible interpretation. Christ says:

"But be not you called Rabbi. For one is your Master, and all

you are brethren. And call none your father upon earth: for one is your father, who is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your master, Christ. He that is greatest among you shall be your servant." Matt. 23:8-11, Rhem. Test.

The command is positive, "CALL NONE YOUR FATHER UPON EARTH." Those who acknowledge the Pope as their ecclesiastical father positively and directly disobey Christ. Claiming the Pope as the great "father upon earth" is a sure mark of anti-Christ. These Bishops, in the time of Ignatius and Irenaeus, were only pastors of churches. At that time they were not bishops over a diocese or province. Of course there were many pastors holding the same doctrine of Christ. In the time of Ignatius, though some pastors were receiving unscriptural titles, there was no "Pope Nicholas," or any one else, in the present sense of the Pope of Rome. The *Progress* would have plenty of space to prove its proposition, provided it had any proofs; therefore it manifests some shrewdness in wasting its space in multiplying questions and sophistries, concerning outside matters.

At the beginning the *Progress* promised to prove every dogma of the Roman Church, "by Scripture." In its third affirmative the *Progress* said: "The Protestant appeals to the Bible. The Catholic appeals to the same Bible, plus tradition." But, after being pressed to the wall by "the same Bible," the *Progress* goes back on the Bible, saying: "Your Bible is a corrupt book," etc. In order to leave the *Progress* without excuse, we have quoted largely from the Douay Roman Catholic Bible and Rhemish Testament, endorsed by Romanists themselves. But the *Progress* goes back on its own Bible, comparing it to "a bone between two dogs!" It rejects the Bible by saying: "Therefore, the Church of God is the sole rule of faith." In its fifth affirmative the *Progress* said:

"The Catholic Church holds and teaches that the Bible is the inspired word of God and therefore true; and this written word of

God is as true as his spoken word: that the written word is as infallible as the spoken word."

With this good confession and the positive promise at the outset that the *Progress* would prove every dogma of the Roman Church "by Scripture,"—the Bible—the "same Bible" as used by Protestants, we are under no obligation to quit the discussion of the Church question, in order to debate with the *Progress* its infidel quibbles about the authenticity of the Scriptures. But to remove every excuse we expect, to a large extent, to use the Roman Catholic translation of the Bible. Though with many defects, it is sufficient to set aside and overthrow every claim of the Roman Church. In our fourth negative argument we showed that the Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God because of the idolatry of the Eucharist. Romanists are guilty of a greivous mistake when they interpret the language of Christ. (John 6:48-56) to mean the literal flesh and blood of Jesus. To the Jews, who were following him for the loaves and fishes, Jesus represented himself as the "bread that came down from heaven," of which if a man eats he shall live forever. John 6:41-58. Romanists themselves admit, that the human body of Christ, including the flesh and blood of Christ did not come down from heaven, but was derived from the Virgin Mary. Therefore, eating this bread of heaven, cannot possibly refer to eating his literal flesh. Jesus explains by saying: "I am the bread of life, he that cometh to me shall not hunger; and he that believeth in me, shall never thirst." John 6:35. Thus, to eat this "bread of heaven;" is to come to Jesus, and believe in him. As we cannot now come to Jesus physically and bodily, then we cannot bodily and literally eat his flesh and drink his blood. This eating and drinking of the flesh and blood of Christ is the spiritual reception of Christ by faith into the soul. Also, this bread that came down from heaven gives eternal life to every

partaker: "If any man eat of this bread he shall live forever." But Romanists who eat the Eucharist, not only die bodily, but are liable to fall from grace and go to hell. But if they, as they profess, truly and really receive the living flesh and blood of Jesus into their physical bodies, then after once partaking of the Eucharist every Romanist would live forever physically! This proves that their interpretation is absolutely unsound and false. The death of every Romanist is a demonstration that their interpretation is untrue. Jesus said: "If any man thirst let him come to me, and drink." John 7:37. If the eating and drinking the flesh and blood of Christ is literal and physical, then the drinking Christ must be literal and physical, also. Those who receive the benefit of the gospel by faith into the soul spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, drink his blood, and partake of the water of life. Jesus says? "I am the vine." According to the Roman interpretation, we must understand that Jesus is a literal, real living grape vine! It seems that Romanists cannot understand the beauty of the Gospel metaphors. The worship of the Eucharist, as if each particle were a literal, bodily and physical Lord Jesus Christ, is *certainly gross idolatry*. The Roman Church is not the true church of God, because of her idolatrous sacrifice of the Mass. Also the Roman Church has violated the command and example of Christ by withholding the cup from the laity. The priest drinks all the wine himself, and gives the bread to the laity. Speaking to the whole church at Corinth Paul says: "For as often as ye shall eat this bread, and drink the chalice, you shall shew the death of the Lord, until he come." 1 Cor. 11:26. All the members were to partake of the bread and wine. But the Roman Church deliberately *disobeys* and *contradicts* the command of the Lord, by withholding the wine from the laity. In excuse they say there is a whole sacrifice in each element. Then why did the Savior use wine at all? And if the wine

may be withheld from the laity, on the same principle why not withhold it from the priesthood, especially when it is known that the wine is liable to make the priest sick, by which the sacrament is scandalized. Why not change the plan and let the people drink all the wine, and let the priest eat all the bread? The wine divided among so many would not likely produce nausea. If the Roman Church may disobey one command of Christ in withholding one of the elements; why not *disobey* the other, and abolish the sacrament, totally? Is the *Progress* prepared to prove the dogma of the Eucharist "by Scripture" and "by reason?"

FIFTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true Church of God, because of her unscriptural sacrament of Baptism.* In its Session VII. the Council of Trent on Baptism, CANON V., says: "If anyone saith that baptism is free, that is, not necessary unto salvation; let him be anathema." In Canon XIII: "If anyone saith that little children, for that they have not actual faith, are not, after having received baptism, to be reckoned among the faithful; * * * let him be anathema." Also, we quote from the Catechism of the Council of Trent, which is regarded as having the same authority as the Canons. "Baptism may be administered by immersion, infusion or aspersion; and that administered in either of these forms is equally valid." Catechism 117. "This ablution takes place as effectually by immersion, which was for a considerable time the practice in the early ages of the Church, as by infusion, which is now the general practice," etc. Cat. 118.

Speaking of those who "may administer baptism" in addition to the priesthood, the Catechism says:

"Are included all, even the laity, men and women, to whatever sect they may belong. This power extends, in case of necessity, even to Jews, infidels, and heretics; provided, however, they in-

tend to do what the Catholic Church does in that act of her ministry." Cat. 120.

The Catechism further says "that the law of baptism, as established by our Lord, extends to all, in so much, that unless they are regenerated through the grace of baptism, be their parents Christians or infidels, they are born to eternal misery and everlasting destruction." Cat. 123. Thus, according to the Roman Church, all unbaptized infants, however young, are "*born to eternal misery and everlasting destruction.*" This unreasonable, unscriptural and abominable doctrine, has originated the practice, among Romanists, of the so-called prenatal baptism! The Catechism, on page 124, says: "Infants, unless baptized, cannot enter heaven." The Roman Church teaches the horrible doctrine that all infants, unless baptized, are damned. This doctrine of baptismal salvation, as held by the Roman Church, marks that Church as the anti-Christian Church. The Savior said to the weeping, penitent woman: "Thy faith hath made thee safe, go in peace." Luke 7:50. The Savior said: "Amen, amen, I say unto you, that he who heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, hath life everlasting; and cometh not into judgment, but is passed from death unto life." John 5:24. Also, "For God so loved the world, as to give his only begotten Son; that whosoever believeth in him, may not perish, but have life everlasting." John 3:16.

OUR CONTROVERSY.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD.

CHURCH PROGRESS' TENTH AFFIRMATIVE.

(July 4, 1891.)

1. The *Baptist* has assumed the position that only impeccable men can teach truth without error. This is the sum total of its attempt, ridiculous enough, to disprove our argument for the infallibility of the Church. As bad Popes are not, but the characteristics of the true Church are the issue, we do not propose to abandon the real question by running after the *Baptist* in its futile evasions. In its proper place it can be proved that even Sergius III. and John XI., and Stephen VI. were not the bad Popes they are so often painted; that the charges against them are sustained by very dubious evidence brought by avowed enemies and finally magnified by Protestants in order to besmirch the Papacy just as the *Baptist* is doing. This is not now the place to discuss a point so irrelevant. But there is a point involved here, which makes the *Baptist's* argument utterly absurd. The Popes could not have been *infallible* because they were *peccable*, argues the *Baptist*. That is to say, *none but impeccable men can teach the truth.* The *Baptist*, therefore, asserts that Christianity cannot be taught at all except by, not merely infallible, but also by *impeccable*, teachers. In its anxiety to impugn infallibility, which we established as a mark of the true Church, it has actually run into a trap fatal to Christianity altogether; for it has required

an impeccable body of teachers without whom Christian truth cannot now be, and could not have been taught for the past eighteen hundred years! As no impeccable body of teachers now exist nor has existed through all these centuries, the conclusion, from the *Baptist's* premise, is that we have no Christianity at all. We ask the *Baptist*: CAN IMPECCABLE MEN ALONE TEACH THE TRUTH?

2. The *Baptist* has lost sight of, or rather shut its eyes to, the question at issue. That question is, What are the marks or characteristics of the true church of God? Infallibility and Unity we have demonstrated to be two of these marks, and these the Catholic Church alone possesses and alone claims. She is infallible because she teaches truth without fear of error—with unflinching certainty; she is *one* because she is perfectly united in, 1. Doctrine, 2. Worship, and 3. Government. Implied in our argument was another note, Visibility, and this note it is clear must be possessed from the very beginning by the true Church. This note from the beginning the Catholic Church has possessed. This leads us immediately to another note, *apostolic succession*. The true Church must be able to be traced back to its foundation. This the *Baptist* admits when enumerating the five marks by which it claims the true Church must be identified: "The true Church has Jesus Christ as its foundation." Therefore the true Church must clearly *be traced back through all ages to its foundation*. Its succession from Jesus Christ must be established or it cannot show its foundation in Jesus Christ. Therefore *succession* is a necessary note of the true Church. This note the Catholic Church alone can show. She victoriously establishes apostolic succession through the Sovereign Pontiffs from Leo XIII. to St. Peter, whom our Lord Himself made *chief pastor* over his flock. (See John .xxi, 15, 16, 17.) Therefore NO CHURCH HAS ITS FOUNDATION IN JESUS CHRIST WHICH CANNOT ESTAB-

LISH AN UNBROKEN SUCCESSION OF PASTORS BACK TO THAT PASTOR APPOINTED BY CHRIST HIMSELF. The second mark laid down by the *Baptist* we pass over for the present. With the third we agree, for it is nothing more than the re-statement of the first. We put this question to the *Baptist*: *If Jesus Christ is not the founder of the Catholic Church, who is?* The fourth mark the *Baptist* enumerates we very emphatically deny. Does not the *Baptist* see that it is the very point in dispute? It involves the question: What is the rule of faith? We argue on the contrary, that the Bible alone cannot be the rule of faith, for it is not the rule given to us by Christ Himself. The rule of faith given to us by Christ is the perfect rule of faith. But Christ gave us the Church as the rule of faith. Therefore the Church is the perfect rule of faith. *Does the Baptist deny that Christ gave us a perfect rule of faith? Will the Baptist assert that Christ gave us the Bible?* The Bible alone, therefore, cannot be the rule of faith, and hence any church, which claims that the Bible alone is the rule of faith, cannot be the Church established by Christ. The fifth mark which the *Baptist* postulates, is simply tradition. "The Church of Christ continues steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, *keeping* the ordinances as they were *delivered*, and *giving* the pure gospel to the nations through her *living ministry!*" This is nothing more nor less than tradition. For tradition is HANDING DOWN THE WORD OF GOD from generation to generation, and this by a living ministry—by living teachers—as we said, the teaching of Christ in the mouth of a living body of teachers. Now this fifth mark of the *Baptist* is a practical contradiction of its fourth; for if the Bible *alone* is the word of God, what use or reason is there for a living ministry to keep and give that Word to the nations? If every humble soul can go to the Bible, as the *Baptist* has repeatedly asserted, and know all that is necessary for him to know for

salvation, what is the use or the value of a *living ministry* to keep and give the word of God to the nations? Does the *Baptist* mean that this living ministry are the guardians of the Bible, that they preserve it intact and pure, that they are the authorized interpreters of its meaning, that they are the guardians and the custodians of the word of God, who infallibly give and explain it to the nations? If it does not mean this, it means nothing. Unless this living ministry do this much, it has no reason to be. Furthermore, this living ministry, so guarding, explaining and giving the word of God, is the *guide* of faith, in other words, the *living rule* by which we may know what is, and what is not of faith. Again: if this living ministry has been appointed to so guard, expound and explain the word, delivered to it by Christ, it must *be capable in itself* of distinguishing what is not of faith. It itself must be the measure or rule. How does it so distinguish what is of faith and what is not? By that *LIVING TRADITION*, which it, a *perpetually* living ministry, always preserves as it was delivered to it by our Lord Himself. It is a *living* ministry, whose life has never ceased from the time of our Lord to this day. Therefore is it a *LIVING WITNESS* to what He said, and I am as certain that what it keeps and gives to me is Christ's word, as if I were listening to St. John or St. Peter or St. Luke or St. Matthew or St. Mark, for that *apostolic body being always living*, can never die, and *hands down* the actual teaching of Christ to the nations as securely, certainly and unerringly today as it did in the time of St. John himself. It is the same apostolic body, the identical body which spread the light of the gospel in the year 100 BY THE VERY SAME MEANS, THE WORD OF MOUTH, which it does in the year 1891. Therefore a true mark of Christ's Church is *TRADITIONAL TEACHING*, the teaching of the word of God by word of mouth to the nations, the apostolic way and the apostolic rule. The Church therefore

which rejects tradition cannot be the Church of God, *i. e.* the Church established by Christ.

3. "We have the Bible through inspired men independent of Rome." We challenge you to the proof. THE BIBLE, WHICH YOU HAVE CORRUPTED AND PERVERTED, YOU GOT FROM THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH. You accepted it on her *authority* and her's alone. It was she who determined its canon.* That canon remained unsettled for four centuries nearly. What were or were not authentic and *divinely inspired* books had not been authoritatively determined. Who determined this? The Catholic Church; and as St. Augustine said, who was present at the council of Hippo which first passed upon the canon of the Scripture in the year 393, "For my part, I should not believe the Gospel (written word) were I not moved thereto by the authority of the Catholic Church." We thus answer the question which the *Baptist* has been afraid to answer. Where did you get your Bible? From the Catholic Church whose Bishops and priests wrote the Bible; from the Catholic Church, which gathered and compiled the books of the Bible; from the Catholic Church; which selected the true from the false gospels; from the Catholic Church that living apostolic body, which determined by its own authority what books were inspired and what were not, and rejected as uninspired a gospel written by one of the apostles, the gospel of St. Barnaby. From this same Catholic Church you have accepted your Sunday, and that Sunday, as the Lord's day, she has handed down as a tradition; and the entire Protestant world has accepted it as tradition, for you have not an iota of Scripture to establish it. Therefore that which you have accepted as your rule of faith, inadequate as it of course is, as well as your Sunday, you have accepted on the *authority* of the Roman Catholic Church.

* See Appendix A.

4. To 4 (a.) we reply that you cannot separate the head from the body; an infallible head means an infallible body. (b.) The judge who interprets the constitution is not infallible. No body supposed he was, but he is the *interpreter* of the law. We simply wanted to show that there is always *need* of an *interpreter* of the *written word*. The judge may interpret wrongly; but the Church by divine promise must always interpret rightly. We have shown that the Bible is not the rule. (c.) Yes, the simplest written phrase *without an authorized interpreter* is open to innumerable constructions. When the Supreme Court of the United States or of this state decides what is and is not the law there is no trouble in ascertaining what it means. So when the Pope, speaking as head of the Church, says what is or is not of faith, there is no difficulty in knowing what he means. Witness the last Encyclical. There is no difficulty in understanding the Pope's meaning. There is no difficulty in understanding that Socialism is clearly condemned. The Church is careful to see that her meaning is understood by the faithful. The *Baptist* argument here descends to trivialities.

5. So Ignatius who was *contemporary with St. John*, is only a father of "tradition"? Irenaeus contemporary of Polycarp, *the pupil St. John*, is also only a father of "tradition"? St. John himself at this rate will become a father of "tradition." Tradition, however, we have shown to be essential to the Church. Our "infidel quibbles" about Scripture are simply *rational tests* as to their authenticity, and these the *Baptist* dare not meet. So much then for the Bible as the rule of faith. As long as Christ has said, "This is My Body" "This is My Blood" and commands us to eat His Body and drink His Blood, John 6: 51-70, and did not tell the Jews, who turned from Him and the disciples who abandoned Him because of this *hard command*, that He meant His words only as a figure, a metaphor, but let them go because *they would not accept them literally*, and as that living

ministry which keeps and gives the word of God to the nations, teaches the same thing, we accept the teaching on that indisputable authority. When the *Baptist* disproves that authority, we are willing to reject its teachings. "Call none your father upon earth." Shall we then stop calling Washington the father of his country, and shall children stop calling their male parents father? See to what foolish lengths such distortions of Scripture may be pushed. As the Church teaches that communion under one kind is perfectly proper and as the Church teaches on Christ's authority we accept that teaching. If the *Baptist* accept one thing, viz., Sunday on the authority of the Catholic Church why not other things? The Catholic Church teaches that baptism is necessary for salvation because Christ said so: "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost he shall not enter into the kingdom of God." (Greek original: "*ean tis gennaethae ex udatos kai pneumatos, ou dunatai eiselthein eis taen basileian tou Theou.*") John III.

5. The Church does *not* teach that unbaptized infants are condemned to Hell. It teaches that they will not see the face of God in the supernatural order of grace. But they will enjoy a natural felicity, such for instance as Adam and Eve enjoyed in Eden before the fall.

6. The *Baptist* has recklessly rushed into the discussion of a mystery, and meets the usual fate of those who "rush in where angels fear to tread." *How* our Lord is present in the Eucharist we do not pretend to say, nor does any one else. Sufficient for us that we have *his word* for it. This *mystery* we no more understand than that other *mystery*, which we suppose the *Baptist* accepts, *how* there are *three persons in one God*. But because it is *above* our understanding we do not reject it. That our Lord in His divine and glorified humanity can both be present on earth and in heaven, neither the *Baptist* nor any one else can show to be *impossible* or *against*

reason. It is not for us to prove that it is possible, but it is incumbent upon the *Baptist* to show that it is *impossible*. The *Baptist* might as well argue that it is against common-sense to believe or hold that there are three persons in one God. Will the *Baptist* show how that is *possible*? We think not, especially after its astounding assertion that "God the Father is not whole and entire in every cranny and grain of sand in the universe. It requires a whole universe of space to contain the Omnipresent God!" Does it? Well then, before this universe of space was created where was God? Or does the *Baptist* hold that space is not a creature? Of course the heaven of heavens and the entire universe of space cannot contain God; but this does not conflict with God's omnipresence in every part of the universe. God is everywhere; therefore God is in every grain of sand and cranny of the universe, and he is whole and entire in every grain and cranny; for if he is not *whole* and *entire* in every grain, and cranny, then he is *partly* only in every grain and cranny; but that which has parts cannot be spiritual; therefore, according to the *Baptist's* argument, God is not a spirit. Again: If it *requires* universal space to contain God, He cannot be everywhere unless there is space everywhere to contain Him; therefore space is co-eternal and co-equal with God. Furthermore, if God is entire only in the whole universe, and partly only in parts of this universe, and as every part is distinct from every other part; then God is hopelessly divided and of course his unity is destroyed.

Moreover on the supposition that it requires universal space to contain God and He is in space by parts and not wholly and entirely present in every part of the universe, then He is not omnipresent; for to be omnipresent means not only to be present everywhere, but *always* and *wholly* present in every place. But sufficient. The *Baptist's* blundering attempt to

answer our retort, which was intended to show the absurdity of its own argument, makes God material, divided, dependent and denies his omnipresence. The *Baptist* has thus plunged into a terrible metaphysical mire.

THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

PROPOSITION: *Resolved that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*

CHURCH PROGRESS, Affirms.
AMERICAN BAPTIST, Denies.

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S TENTH NEGATIVE.

(July 9, 1891.)

These bad Popes that were no Popes at all, break and destroy forever the mythical chain of papal infallibility. In writing the holy Scriptures, "holy men of God spoke, inspired by the Holy Ghost." It is contrary to the holiness of God and his divine plan, to suppose that he would confer the grace of infallibility upon such perjured, blasphemous murderers and hypocrites, such as the Popes described by Roman historians, as shown in former articles. Neither Protestants nor Baptists have portrayed the black character of these Popes in darker colors than the approved Roman historians. The charge that the BAPTIST is *besmirching* the papacy is not correct, and is a violation of the agreement at the opening of the controversy. It is impossible for us to say harder things about the Popes than the Roman historians have said. We did not argue that none but impeccable men can teach the truth. But we did argue that the monstrous crimes of those *uninspired* Popes prove their utter fallibility in everything.

2. By what Scriptures has the *Progress* proved the infallibility of the Popes? The proof is wanting. How does Rome teach truth with unfailling certainty, when she contradicts herself a thousand times? She is entirely destitute of Scriptural unity. Also, her "apostolic succession" is a myth, unless it be

a succession of false apostles. If one of the true apostles has a line of successors, so has every other. According to this theory, there should be twelve lines of infallible Popes! Any Scripture that would support the idea of a succession from one apostle would support the succession from the other eleven. That God has had a succession of witnesses, there is no doubt, who kept the ordinances as they were delivered. The succession of these witnesses is traced in the prophetic Scriptures, and may now be identified, as having the same characteristics as the apostolic churches. There were "false apostles" and "deceitful workmen," "transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. And no wonder; for Satan himself transformeth himself into an angel of light." 2 Cor. 11:13-14. Some such "false apostles," "who say they are apostles, and are not," were tried by the Ephesian church and found to be liars. There has doubtless been a succession, such as it is, of these "false apostles," but they all lack the Bible proofs of their apostleship. What Pope has ever been able to furnish the *signs of his apostleship*, "in signs and wonders and mighty deeds." 2 Cor. 12:12. If *feeding the sheep* and lambs of Christ (John 21:15-17) made Peter a Pope, then there were a plurality of Popes, for the elders were exhorted by Peter to "feed the flock of God which is among you, taking care of it not by constraint but willingly, according to God." 1 Peter 5:2. Also, Paul said, "take heed to yourself and to the whole flock over which the Holy Ghost has placed you bishops to rule the church of God which he has purchased with his own blood." Acts 20:28. It is rendered better by King James where it says: "To feed the church of God." The same word used in the original in directing Peter to feed the sheep and lambs, *poimaino*, is used in directing the elders, bishops, or pastors to feed the flock of God. If feeding the sheep of God made Peter a Pope, then feeding the flock of God by the

elders, as directed by Peter and Paul, made a plurality of Popes. According to this argument of the *Progress*, there were a plurality of Popes in the Ephesian church. We will tell the real founder of the Roman Church later in the discussion. The word of Christ as contained in the New Testament is the perfect rule of faith. The commission (Matt. 28: 19-20,) teaches this. It is his infallible word, delivered to inspired men, who committed it to writing, which forms the New Testament. Where in the Scriptures is the church made the rule of faith? The Scriptures of the Old Testament were given of God prior to the ministry of Christ on earth. But the New Testament was given by Jesus Christ, through holy men inspired for that very work. (c) If the simplest phrase is liable to a hundred interpretations, how does any Romanist know that he has the real interpretations of the Pope? The Pope speaks in Latin, shut up in the Vatican. His word is translated by fallible men, it is interpreted by fallible men, who are liable to put a hundred different meanings upon the Pope's words. No Romanist in America knows that he has the real doctrine of the Pope's last Encyclical. Thus Romanists are left in hopeless ignorance of the real sentiments of the Pope. There is no need of uninspired "tradition." The true test of "the Apostle's doctrine" can be easily applied. The people were required to study, understand, and exercise their judgment concerning the Scriptures. The living ministry are not to teach uninspired traditions, but they are required to "*preach the Word.*"

3. The quibble of the *Progress* concerning the authenticity of the Bible is sufficiently answered in our last. We cannot quit the discussion of the Roman Church claims to discuss the Canon of Scripture, which has already been admitted by the *Progress*. As shown in our last, the *Progress* in the third affirmative said: "The Protestant appeals to the Bible. The

Catholic appeals to the *same Bible*, plus tradition." Also, to take away all excuse, we are quoting largely from the Roman Catholic translation, called the Douay Bible, which the *Progress* admits is *inspired* and *infallible*. This Douay translation we get from Rome. While the inspired original Scriptures came from God, through holy men, who wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

4. (a) As the head cannot be separate from the body, then when any one Pope was an incarnate demon, the Church receiving its life from him was an apostate and wicked Church. When Formosus, that perjured murderer, was head, then according to the *Progress*, the body was corrupt. When Sergius III., "clasped in the lewd embraces of a notorious prostitute," was head, then according to the *Progress*, the Church was totally corrupt. When John XI., the devilish, corrupt, bastard son of Pope Sergius III., was in the chair as head, according to the *Progress*, the Church was totally corrupt. When Stephen VI., that hyena Pope, was head of the Church, according to the *Progress*, the Church was no better than its head. This logic of the *Progress* marks the Roman Church as the great apostacy of revelation. (b) Exactly. The interpretation of the constitution is not the constitution. So, the interpretation of the *Bible rule* is not *the rule* itself. Interpreters make mistakes, but *the rule is infallible*. (c) As the simplest phrase of the Pope is liable to a hundred interpretations, no Romanist is positive that he has either a correct translation or interpretation of Leo XIII.'s last Encyclical.

5. (a) History gives abundant proofs that unscriptural traditions began to prevail immediately after the apostolic age. In fact, Paul says: "For the mystery of iniquity already worketh; only that he who now holdeth, do hold, until he be taken out of the way." 2 Thes. 2:7. "The mystery of iniquity," which culminated into the papal heirarchy in after centuries,

had begun its deadly work before the death of Paul. The command comes from the *infallible* Word of God, to "call none your father upon earth. For one is your father who is in heaven." Matt. 23:9. This does not conflict with the Scriptures that regulate the obedience of children to their fathers after the flesh. But it does positively forbid the disciples of Christ to have a human ecclesiastical father, or head, in the sense of a *ruler*. We repeat again:

"*But be you not called Rabbi, for one is your master, and all you are brethren. And call none your father upon earth: for one is your father, who is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your master, Christ. He that is greatest among you shall be your servant.*" Matt. 23:8-11, Rhem. Test.

Will the *Progress* answer what does Christ mean when he says, "CALL NONE YOUR FATHER UPON EARTH?" This is a deadly blow to the popedom. (b) Exactly so. Christ and Paul taught and commanded the Lord's Supper in both the bread and wine. But the Roman Church teaches, in direct opposition to the command of Christ, that communion in one kind is enough! The Roman Church being anti-Scriptural, is anti-Christian. Also it teaches that every fragment of either species contains a whole entire Savior, flesh and blood, soul and divinity. Therefore it worships a multitude of Gods, in the Eucharist. (c) It is not true. Christ did not teach that baptism was essential to salvation. Under his personal ministry, when Christ pardoned sins, he in no case made baptism a condition. When he pardoned the penitent woman (Luke 7:50) he said, "Thy faith hath made thee safe, go in peace." No baptism here as a condition. When he pardoned the man sick with the palsy, baptism was not a condition. See Matt. 9:2 and Mark 2:5. In his interview with Nicodemus, Jesus said, "That whosoever believeth in him, may not perish, but may have life everlasting. For God so loved the world, as to give his only begotten Son; that whosoever believeth in him,

may not perish, but may have life everlasting." John 3:15, 16. Every true believer in Christ has eternal life, and is therefore pardoned. John 3:5, has no reference to baptism. It teaches regeneration or the birth of the Spirit. "That which is born of the flesh, is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." If baptism is here referred to, then water is the mother of Christians, which is absurd and false. (d) The Roman Church does teach that unbaptized infants are lost, for lack of baptism. Speaking of infants, the Catechism of the Council of Trent, page 123, says: "Unless they are regenerated through the grace of baptism, be their parents Christians or infidels, they are born to eternal misery and everlasting destruction." The Roman Church, in the face of the word of God, and contrary to common sense, and in opposition to the character of God himself, teaches that all unbaptized infants, however young, are doomed "to eternal misery and everlasting destruction." Though baptism is the duty of every Christian believer, there is no command to baptize unconscious infants. Infants dying before the age of accountability, are saved through the atoning blood of Jesus Christ. Baptismal salvation is the "mother heresy" which brought forth popery with its fearful train of evils.

6. While the mystery of the Trinity is above the reach of finite reason, it is not contrary to common sense, and the testimony of our physical senses. "It is impossible for God to lie" and just as impossible for Jesus, in his physical body of flesh and blood, to be in different localities at the same time. When Christ was bodily on the cross he was not bodily in heaven, or any other place on earth. If the body of Jesus Christ is physically omnipresent, his body would be as much in every cranny and grain of sand on earth as on the papal altar. If this furnishes the authority to worship the bread, upon the same principle, why not worship every grain of sand

and everything under heaven? This miserable polytheism marks the Roman Church as an idolator. If the literal body (of flesh and blood) of Jesus can exist whole and entire in a million different places at the same time, then the bodies of all the saints, which are to be "fashioned like unto his glorious body" may also exist in a million different places at the same time! The Rheimish Testament reads: "Who will reform the body of our lowness, made like to the body of his glory, according to the operation whereby also he is able to subdue all things unto himself." Phil. 3:21. According to the *Progress*, as the physical, literal body of Christ can exist whole and entire in different places at the same time, and the bodies of the saints are to be like "his glorious body," then the bodies of the saints may exist in different places at the same time! This is not only absurd, but foolish. Such is the doctrine of the Roman Church.

It was not the created universe, to which we referred, but "it requires a *whole universe of space* to contain the omnipresent God." By this we meant that it requires *infinite space* to contain the infinite God, who cannot be contained in "the heavens of heavens," much less in the temple of Solomon. We have not attempted to define the mode of existence of the infinite God, but we do know that there are not a multitude of whole, entire, separate gods, one in every grain of sand.

As our fifth negative argument, we proved that the Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because of her unscriptural sacrament of baptism. She teaches that all the unbaptized, including infants, "are born to eternal misery and everlasting destruction." The leading Roman theologian, St. Alphonsus Ligouri, in his *Mission Book*, p. 266, on baptism, has the following:

"Q. What is Baptism? A. Baptism is the Sacrament of Regeneration, in which man is born again to eternal life, by washing of water and the Word of God. Q. What are the effects of Bap-

tism? A. The principle effects of Baptism are, 1st, The pardon of sin, whether original or actual; 2nd, The infusion of sanctifying graces into the soul; and 3rd, The indelible impress of the Christian character. Q. Is Baptism necessary to our salvation? A. Yes, it is necessary, and for all men.

The doctrine which makes baptism a condition of regeneration and salvation, places salvation in the hands of the administrator. When the jailer cried out: "Masters, what must I do that I may be saved?" they said, "believe in the Lord Jesus; and thou shalt be saved and thy house." Acts 16:30, 31. But the Roman Church would say, you cannot be saved without baptism. You cannot be saved without joining "Holy Mother Church." While baptism and church membership are Christian privileges, as well as duties, they are not made conditions to salvation. To baptize a child of the devil to make him a child of God, is just as absurd as to put a goat in a sheepfold to make a sheep of him. In his sermon at the house of Cornelius, Peter said: "To him all the prophets give testimony that by his name all receive remission of sins who believe in him." Acts 10:43. The plan of salvation devised by infinite wisdom is adapted to every condition of human necessity. "Therefore it is of faith, that according to grace the promise might be firm to all the seed, not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all." Rom. 4:16. "For by grace you are saved through faith, and not of yourselves, it is the gift of God. Not of works, that no man may glory." Eph. 2:6-9. But in the face of God's revelation the Roman Church teaches salvation by baptism—by works of righteousness. The plan of salvation is so free that it is accessible to the penitent dying sinner upon the cross, where baptism or church membership is impossible. This plan will reach to the wrecked seaman drifting upon the bosom of the briny deep, so that he may repent of his sins and accept Christ by grace, through faith, and his

soul may go from a watery death to the home of the saved. The plan of salvation is so grand and glorious that it may be accepted by the dying soldier, bleeding on the battle field, though there is no preacher, priest or any one else to render him assistance. The Roman Church, which places itself, the ordinance of baptism, or the priest, between the penitent soul and Christ, is not the true church of God. Also, this doctrine of baptismal salvation, by which the unregenerate sinner is introduced into the Church, fills the Church with a carnal membership. Those who are baptized in order to *regeneration* are still *unregenerate*. This fundamental practice of the Roman Church is directly opposed to the Scriptures. Peter says: "Be you also as *living stones* built up, a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." 1 Peter 2:5. The materials for the house of God, the church, must be "living stones," previously prepared and then put into the building. But the Roman Church, in direct violation of the law of God, puts unregenerate sinners (dead stones) into the building to prepare them. No master workman would take the rough stones as torn out of the quarry to put in a temple, under the delusion that the act of putting the stones into the building would prepare them for the building! Concerning the temple of Solomon it is said: "And the house when it was in building, was built of stones hewed and made ready; so that there was neither hammer nor ax nor any tool of iron heard in the house when it was in building." 3 Kings 6:7. In like manner, the spiritual stones, from the quarry of nature, must be *made ready* before they are put into the spiritual building, the Church. This introduction of unregenerate materials into the Church of Rome is the fundamental reason why the large mass of Romanists are destitute of spirituality.

OUR CONTROVERSY.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD.

CHURCH PROGRESS' ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE.

(July 18, 1891.)

Vital questions unanswered by the *Baptist*.

WHERE IS THE SCRIPTURE TO SHOW THAT THE CHURCH WILL NOT REJECT THE NOTE OF INFALLIBILITY?

WHERE IS THE SCRIPTURE TO SHOW THAT THE CLAIM OF INFALLIBILITY IS UNSCRIPTURAL?

WHERE IS THAT SUCCESSIVE LINE OF INFALLIBLE, IMPECCABLE, INSPIRED, MIRACLE-WORKING MEN, WHO HAVE ALWAYS TAUGHT GOD'S WORD INFALLIBLY?

WHERE ARE THESE INFALLIBLE, INSPIRED, MIRACLE-WORKING TEACHERS TO-DAY? WHERE IS THAT VISIBLE BODY NOW, AND WHERE HAS IT BEEN DURING THESE NINETEEN HUNDRED YEARS?

WHERE ARE THOSE INFALLIBLE PROOFS IN THE SHAPE OF MIRACLES?

WHERE IS THAT INFALLIBLE RULE OF FAITH WHICH HAS GIVEN THE LIGHT OF THE GOSPEL THROUGH ALL AGES TO THE PRESENT?

WHERE IS THAT TRUE SUCCESSION OF INFALLIBLE TEACHERS AND DISCIPLES OUTSIDE OF AND INDEPENDENT OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH?

BY WHAT AUTHORITY DOES THE BAPTIST ASSERT THAT THE THINGS WHICH ST. PETER SAYS MANY WREST TO THEIR OWN DESTRUCTION, ARE NOT ESSENTIAL TO SALVATION?

HOW DOES THE BAPTIST DETERMINE WHAT IS AND WHAT IS NOT ESSENTIAL TO SALVATION?

BY WHOM, WHEN AND WHERE WAS THE PRESENT CANON OF REVELATION, AS ACCEPTED BY BAPTISTS AND PROTESTANTS, ACCEPTED AND ESTABLISHED BEFORE THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH EXISTED?

WHERE DID YOU GET YOUR SUNDAY?

DID NOT CHRIST GIVE US A PERFECT RULE OF FAITH?

DID CHRIST GIVE US THE BIBLE?

WHERE DID YOU GET YOUR BIBLE?

1. "We did not argue that none but impeccable men can teach the truth," declares the *Baptist*. What then becomes of the *Baptist's* argument against the infallibility of the Popes, because some of them were sinners? If it does not require impeccable men to teach truth without error, then peccable men can teach infallibly. In other words peccability (liability to sin) does not preclude infallibility or freedom from error in teaching. A peccable man, therefore, occupying the chair of St. Peter, can teach the truth, just as the peccable St. Peter did. Hence a bad Pope does not mean a false teacher. Christ promised that the gates of hell should not prevail against His Church, that He himself would be with its teaching to the end of time. In spite, therefore, of the weaknesses and the sins of men His truth was to be taught without fail. Therefore the divine promise of the infallibility cannot be brought to naught by the sins of men, and as the just man falls seven times a day, how would Christ's doctrine be taught at all if the sins of men (and no man is not a sinner) nullified the divine promise? It is clear then that infallibility (freedom from error in teaching the truth delivered by Christ) is not the same as impeccability or freedom from the liability to sin. Hence infallibility is not impeccability. Nor does an *uninspired* Pope mean a fallible Pope. An inspired teacher is of

course infallible, but an infallible teacher need not be inspired. St. John was inspired in writing his gospel; but he who teaches that gospel without possibility of error is infallible, though not inspired. We never claimed inspiration for the Popes. So the *Baptist's* ruse of shifting the argument to the question of inspiration has no point. It will now be easily seen how futile has been the *Baptist's* attempt to controvert our argument for infallibility on the ground that there were bad Popes, Christ's Church cannot teach false doctrine in spite of the wickedness of men. It must be infallible. Infallibility is an essential mark of that Church. No Church even so much as claims that mark except the Catholic Church. In fact all others repudiate it, and thus by denying an essential and necessary note of the Church founded by Christ, reject a necessary element of Christianity. Plainly then none of those Churches, lacking what Christ has declared to be essential to His Church, can be the Church founded by Him. But as Christ did establish a Church with the promise of its unending power to teach His truth always, the Catholic Church alone by the very fact that it alone claims this gift of infallibility, is shown to be His Church. To reject infallibility is to reject Christianity. To alone claim infallibility, on the strength of the divine promise, is to demonstrate the validity of that claim. We need not revert now to the *Baptist's* futile declamation about the monstrous iniquities of bad Popes. Out of a long line of 258 Popes during eighteen centuries to be able to say that only six can be accused of being immoral is a glorious record, and even the *evidence* against these six is dubious. This is a sufficient rebuttal of the *Baptist's* attempt to defile the fair name of the papacy.

2. In demonstrating the Apostolic succession there is no necessity of tracing a separate and distinct succession from *each* Apostle. All that is necessary is to trace succession from

the chief Apostle, St. Peter. The Church is a society, one of whose essential principles is Unity, and the source of that Unity lies in her visible head. To establish succession from St. Peter the chief of the Apostles, the Universal pastor, is sufficient to establish Apostolic succession, and, what is more, demonstrates the Unity of the Church, another essential mark which the Catholic Church alone possesses. As the *Baptist* admits "that God has had a succession of witnesses * * * * who kept the ordinances as they were delivered" and as we affirm that that succession is in the Catholic Church and have pointed it out from St. Peter to Leo XIII., as any one may see who knows the history of the Christian era, will the *Baptist* point out that succession outside of the Catholic Church? We will not stop to confute the *Baptist's* statements that "Rome contradicts herself a thousand times." When the *Baptist* attempts to prove it we will consider it. The *Baptist* promises to tell "the real founder of the Roman Church later in the discussion." We prophesy that the *Baptist* won't, excepting of course Christ Himself. The *Baptist* will forget all about this promise.

3. "Where in the Scriptures is the Church made the rule of faith?" asks the *Baptist*. Wherever Christ commanded the *Apostolic* body to teach the truths He had taught them, and wherever He commands that the faithful hear that body, as if they hear Him. These texts we have quoted often before. We will not waste space in reiterating them. We ask in turn where in the Scriptures are the Scriptures themselves made the rule of faith? Matthew 28: 19-20 states nothing of the sort. The commission given there is to the *Apostolic body*: "Going therefore teach Ye (the Apostles) all nations, etc." This text establishes the teaching authority of the *Apostolic body*, i. e. the Church. It proves the very contrary of that which the *Baptist* asserts:

4. "But the New Testament was given by Jesus Christ, through holy men inspired for that very work." In support of this astounding assertion, let the *Baptist* give us the Scripture for it. Christ never uttered one word about the New Testament, never mentioned it as the rule of faith, and what is most pertinent, never commissioned His Apostles to commit one iota of His doctrine to writing. We challenge the *Baptist* to the proof. But He did commission His Apostles *to teach and preach* His doctrine, and He promised that the *Apostolic body* should never teach falsely.

5. "We cannot quit the discussion of the Roman Church claims to discuss the canon of Scripture" evasively declares the *Baptist*. It means it dare not. But the discussion does hinge upon that very point, for the question resolves itself into this, what is the rule of faith? We hold that the rule of faith is a living body of teachers divinely commissioned by our Lord Himself to teach what He taught. This is the position of the Catholic Church. The *Baptist* holds that the Bible alone is the rule of faith. We have shown that the Bible, a book hard to understand and liable to many contradictory interpretations, which many, St. Peter tells us, will wrest to their own destruction, cannot be the rule of faith. We have asked the *Baptist* where Protestants get their Bible. From the Catholic Church is the answer, and the *Baptist* cannot refute the answer. *What it claims to be its sole rule of faith it has accepted on the authority of the Catholic Church.* The *Baptist* does not face the issue, and ignominiously seeks to escape under the illogical plea that it is discussing the claims of the Roman Church and not the Canonicity of the Bible! Does it not see that the determination of the Canonicity of the Bible will settle the whole question? Yes, it does but it is afraid to meet this issue. But we intend to force this issue, for in this lies the solution of the question in debate. It is the critical

point. The honest seeker after truth will probe the issue before him to the bottom. When the *Baptist* entered this discussion it professed the sole motive of seeking the truth. Why does it so studiously and persistently avoid the cardinal point in dispute, whose solution will present the truth as it is in reality. If the *Baptist* is sincere, let it show its honesty. Furthermore we deny that Protestants possess the Bible pure and intact. They have corrupted the sacred books which they have received from the Church. The collection of books called *the Bible* by Catholics and Protestants, is of course the same book, but in the hands of Protestants its text has become corrupted and pervert. The Protestant versions are full of errata, and they have mutilated it to such an extent as to leave out even whole books. It is this mutilated and corrupted text they make their rule of faith! What is more they leave its interpretation in the hands of everybody, the unlearned and the unstable, thus making not even the vitiated text the rule, but the private meaning that each reader, whether learned or not, may put upon it. The result has been that Protestantism is split up into hundreds of sects interpreting the Bible differently, yet each claiming that it alone has the right meaning. Such a method actually destroys the rule of faith. It does not even leave the semblance of a rule, for a text interpreted a hundred different ways is not a rule, but rather a bone of contention amongst quarreling sectaries. The *Baptist* gains nothing by quoting from the Rheimish edition of the Bible authorized by the Church. To do this is to admit the very point it is seeking to controvert for the Bible, so quoted, has value only as *authorized by the Church*, and so to quote is to appeal to the authority of the Catholic Church. "Interpreters make mistakes but the rule is infallible," the *Baptist* admits. Then the Bible needs an interpreter. That is the Catholic position. As the Bible is liable to misinter-

pretation, plainly it requires as its interpreter one who will infallibly explain its many difficulties and obscurities, etc. Therefore the Bible cannot be the sole rule of faith, since its true meaning can be made known only by an authorized interpreter.

5. History no doubt does give abundant proof of unscriptural traditions in the past and does yet in the present. Heresies prevailed even in the time of the Apostles. They flourish to-day, and Protestantism is only one heresy out of many.

When Christ used the words "call none your father upon earth," he meant plainly enough that no one was to be called father in the sense in which we use the word as applied to God; in the sense for instance, in which we use it, when we say: "Our Father, who art in heaven." This of course, as is plain enough, does not restrict the use of the word to its other inferior significations. When we speak of God as father it is in a supreme sense, as when we apply the term creator to Him. But we are therefore not restricted to that sole use of the term.

6. Whatsoever the Church established by Christ taught, this Christ himself taught. Christ's Church teaches that Baptism is necessary for salvation, therefore he taught the same, for that Church can only teach what He commanded; no more no less. We have seen that the Catholic Church alone possesses those marks, which Christ's Church possesses. Until the *Baptist* has shown the contrary, the discussion of a special doctrine, like the necessity of Baptism, is not within the scope of the argument. When the fundamental principles are determined then we may proceed to the consideration of special matters flowing from them. We are considering the marks of the Church, these primary notes or elements which constitute it in its essence. When these are determined

special doctrines follow naturally and easily. Having discovered the true Church by these fundamental characteristics. We accept all doctrine from her with absolute certainty. If she teaches the necessity of Baptism then that must be a true doctrine. It is not sufficient for the *Baptist* to merely assert that the text from St. John III. 3-5., has no reference to Baptism. It must prove that it has not, "Unless a man be born again of WATER and the Holy Ghost he shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." Will the *Baptist* explain Christ's use of the word *water* here? He makes a regeneration by water necessary for salvation. If He does not refer to Baptism, to what then? The texts cited by the *Baptist* by no means go to show that faith without Baptism saved the persons in question. How does the *Baptist* know that these subjects of our Lord's miraculous ministrations were not already baptised, for Christ himself had been baptised, and many thousands besides by St. John the Precursor. "Thy faith hath made thee safe," does not necessarily preclude Baptism. No more do the words? "whosoever believeth in Him, may not perish, etc.," for that belief in Him includes the acceptance of all that He proposed to our faith, and the necessity of Baptism for salvation is one of those necessary doctrines He requires us to accept on His word. The *Baptist* does not understand the Council of Trent. The words quoted refer to the unbaptized in general. All unbaptized persons are lost, *i. e.*, they shall never see the face of God in beatific vision. But that all are condemned to the torments of hell is another question. On the contrary the Church teaches, that even unbaptized adults, who have led meritorious life, though not suffered to enter the kingdom of heaven, will enjoy a *natural* felicity in the next life. Although they do not see God face to face, as the saints do, they are not condemned to hell. Unbaptized infants are placed in the same class. The *Baptist*

distorts the words of the Council of Trent from their true meaning.

7. The miserable cavil of the *Baptist* over the miraculous presence of our Lord in the Sacramental species grows more and more absurd. Once for all we answer, *it is not contrary to reason for a body to be present in two different places at the same time.* We challenge the *Baptist* to show that it is. Let the *Baptist* show how in the essence of the matter it is impossible for the same body to be in two different places. We know whereof we speak, and we know the futility of the *Baptist's* position. We throw out a similar difficulty for the *Baptist's* consideration. Our Lord after the resurrection entered *through closed doors* into the midst of the assembled disciples (John xx. 19.) How could His body have penetrated the walls or doors of the room in which the disciples were gathered? In the language of the *Baptist* is it not against common sense to suppose that one body can occupy the same place at the same time with the other? Will the *Baptist* explain the difficulty? Infinite space is sheer nonsense. Space is not infinite but indefinite. There is no space except where there is matter. There is no uncreated universe. Space is an adjunct of matter. God does not exist either in or out of space. He is absolutely independent of space or place. He is whole and entire wherever He is, and He is infinite wherever He is, and no place and no space can contain Him. As we cannot be in time, so He cannot be in space. We advise the *Baptist* to avoid these dangers of metaphysics. It is clearly on unfamiliar ground, and utters absurdities whenever it attempts to speak of these matters. We purposely led it into its difficulties in order to show the folly of its argument against the Eucharist.

THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

PROPOSITION: *Resolved that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*

CHURCH PROGRESS, Affirms.
AMERICAN BAPTIST, Denies.

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S ELEVENTH NEGATIVE.
(July 23, 1891.)

The question of infallibility, based on the perversion of our arguments, have been *sufficiently* answered in our former articles. Also, the questions concerning the authenticity of the Bible have been answered, as far as necessary for the present discussion. The *Church Progress* agreed to prove "that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God." It affirmed that

"There is not a dogma of the Catholic Church but what can be victoriously proved both by Scripture, by tradition, and by reason, and that all objections made by Protestants against her doctrines and practices can be answered and cleared up in the most lucid manner."

In its third affirmative, the *Progress* said: "The Protestant appeals to the Bible. The Catholic appeals to the same Bible, plus tradition"; thus admitting the *same* Bible as others, excepting the "tradition." In its fifth affirmative, the *Progress* said:

"The Catholic Church holds and teaches that the Bible is the inspired word of God and therefore true; and this written word of God is as true as his spoken word: that the written word is as infallible as his spoken word."

Thus the *Progress* has admitted the *canonicity* and *infallible* authority of the "*same Bible*," which we affirm contains the *sole rule* of faith and practice for the churches of Christ. Though

the Roman Douay Bible is an imperfect translation, but indorsed by the Roman Church, it is to them *infallible* authority. On the same principle that David used the sword of Goliath, on a certain occasion, we are using the Douay Bible. David was under no necessity or obligation to stop to explain to the giant, or anybody else, the process of making the sword. The *Progress* knows full well, that if it can draw us into the discussion of its numberless outside questions, that the Roman Church will escape from the terrible exposure of its anti-Christian doctrines and ordinances. We here notify the *Progress* to prepare itself for the conflict, as it cannot possibly draw us from the proposition agreed upon.

1. If the promise of Christ to be with his disciples in *teaching* proves the *infallibility* of the Pope as a teacher, it also proves the *infallibility* of every other *teacher* of the New Testament. This would make a multitude of *infallible Popes*! Speaking of the officers of the church, Paul says:

"And God indeed hath set some in the church; first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly doctors [thirdly teachers]; after that miracles, then the graces of healings, helps, governments, kinds of tongues, interpretations of speeches." 1 Cor. 12:28.

According to this, God did not set the Pope in the church at all. The first officers of the church were apostles; the second class were prophets, and the third class were "doctors," *rather teachers*. According to this argument of the *Progress*, these teachers must have been *infallible* Popes, making a plurality of Popes independent of the apostles!! Also in the letter to the Hebrews it is said: "Whereas for the time ye ought to be masters [*didaskaloi*—teachers], etc. This passage shows that all the Hebrew disciples, who were only then babes in Christ, should have become *teachers*; and according to the *Progress*, they should have all been Popes! Also, according to this argument, we must have women Popes. Paul says:

"The aged women, in like manner, in holy attire, not false accusers, not given to much wine; *teaching well*;" or "teachers of good things." Tit. 2:3. According to the argument of the *Progress*, these "aged women" were *Popes*. This may possibly be the excuse for the papal controversy concerning the woman Pope, Joan, who came to grief in such an unfortunate way, and has been left out of the succession of the Popes. She certainly had as much right to the popedom as Sergius III. or John XI. In the Roman Catholic theological work called "Evidences of Religion," by Louis Jouin, and endorsed by Cardinal McClosky, page 288, Priest Jouin says:

"There is no need of refuting the fable of Pope Joan, for this has long since been exploded by a number of learned Protestant writers. * * * But, even had it been true, it could not have broken the chain of succession. The fable states that the woman was mistaken by all for a man of great learning and piety; and hence, during the two years and a half that she is said to have been thought to be Pope, the Holy See would simply have been vacant, and the Pope chosen after her would have been the lawful successor of St. Peter."

The special point in quoting this is to show that, according to Roman theologians, the Church might exist for two years and a half without a Pope, and consequently destitute of an *infallible teacher*! If the Church could exist without a Pope for two years and a half, why could it not exist all the time without a Pope? As to Pope Joan, some Roman Catholic writers of ability admit the truth of this woman in the chair, while others reject and repudiate the rule of this female Pope. We have already proved that the *infallibility* of Christ the head, the *infallibility* of his rule of faith, and the infallibility of the Holy Spirit, the Guide, is a mark of the true church. The false infallibility is that which is claimed for the Pope of Rome, which is no better than that which was claimed for Joseph Smith, the founder of the Mormon Church. Instead of only six very bad and immoral Popes, Roman writers number some eleven, and others thirty of these monsters of iniquity who disgraced the papal

chair. In fact, every Pope who has claimed infallibility, and the power to pardon sins and grant indulgences, is a blasphemer and extremely wicked. These very claims for the Popes, of the attributes that belong to Christ and God alone, mark the Roman Church as the false Church. 2 Thes. 2:5.

2. Scriptural unity is not in the Pope but in Christ. Paul says: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female. For you are all *one in Christ Jesus*." Gal. 3:28. The *Progress*, contrary to the infallible Word of God, makes the *unity in the Pope*. But the Bible says: **FOR YOU ARE ALL ONE IN CHRIST JESUS.** We have shown from approved Roman historians that the popedom has been utterly broken by the fact of so many false and unlawful Popes in the chair.

3. We showed above, under number one, that there was a class of official teachers, besides the apostles, which according to the *Progress* would make a plurality of Popes. Also, that the disciples, both men and women, should be *teachers* in the Church of Christ. Thus, according to the argument of the *Progress*, making every teacher a Pope, would make all the members in the church popes, both men and women! Such is the intolerable nonsense of the papal claims.

4. Nothing was to be taught under the New Testament—new covenant—except what was *commanded* by Christ, "teaching them to observe all things *whatsoever I have commanded you*." Matt. 28:20. The very commission to teach all the commands of Christ, includes the commission to write His commands, because writing the Word of Christ is as much divine teaching as speaking that Word. Therefore, the New Testament was given by Jesus Christ, through holy men inspired for that work. Speaking of the gospel by John, he says:

"But these are written that you may believe that Jesus is Christ the Son of God: and that believing you may have life in his name." John 20:31.

The same is true of the other gospels. They were *written under the commission of Christ*, which required them to teach all things which he had commanded. Therefore the gospels were written by the authority of Christ, in order that men might believe in Him, and believing have life. Therefore the statement of the *Progress* is untrue that says that Christ never "commissioned his Apostles to commit one iota of his doctrine to writing!" If the New Testament was written without the authority of Christ then it is a wicked book and should not have been written. Also John was commissioned by Christ to write the book of Revelation. The glorified Christ said unto him: "What thou seest write in a book: and send to the seven churches which are in Asia." Rev. 1:11. "Write therefore the things which thou hast seen, and which are, and which must be done hereafter." Rev. 1:19. This (passage) proves that the statement of the *Progress* is untrue. Christ "commissioned His apostles to commit one iota of his doctrine to writing." The New Testament was written and confirmed by the authority of Jesus Christ, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. This New Testament was accepted by the churches, centuries before the Roman hierarchy existed. This will be further treated as we advance. The *Progress* admits that, "The collection of books called the Bible by Catholics and Protestants, is of course, the same book, but in the hands of the Protestants its text has become corrupted and pervert." As the same original inspired Bible, the Old and New Testaments, is admitted on all hands by Baptists, Protestants and Catholics, then its canonicity does not necessarily enter into this discussion. The corruption of this original Bible has been done by Romanists as will be shown later.

5. We quote the Rheimish Testament in this controversy, because it is admitted to be infallible by the *Church Progress* itself. The Roman Church, which contradicts the Rheimish

Testament in more than a hundred places, is according to its own rule, a false church. The command to "call none your father upon earth" in the sense of an infallible Lord to pardon sins and grant indulgences, is directly condemned by the Roman Church. Devout Romanists not only call the Pope "Holy Father" but "Lord" and "Sovereign Pontiff" presiding "over the Universal Church, the father and Governor of all the faithful, of Bishops, also, and of all other prelates, be their station, rank, or power what they may." Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 222. All the priests are called fathers and even Gods, in this ecclesiastical sense, with power to pardon sins.

6. The true church does not teach that baptism is a condition of salvation. The Roman Church which teaches this doctrine is not the true church. It is absurd to say that "born of water," John 3:5, means baptism. Baptism is called a burial which is very different from a birth. Sufficient proofs were introduced in our last. The interpretation of the *Progress* that makes baptism a birth and a condition of regeneration contradicts the teachings of the Savior. It is a false interpretation, because it makes the Savior contradict himself in his interview with Nicodemus. John 3:15, 16. It is puerile to guess that those whom Christ pardoned in his personal ministry, had previously been baptized. We did not misrepresent the Romish doctrine which teaches that unbaptized infants are lost; for "be their parents Christians or infidels, they are born to eternal misery and everlasting destruction." Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 123. This is the common teaching of the Roman Church, that all infants, even unborn infants, are lost unless baptized! This absurd and unscriptural doctrine marks the Roman Church as the false church.

7. But it is contradictory to both Scripture and reason to

contend that the body of Christ, whole and entire, flesh, blood and bones, can be in a thousand different places at the same time. When Christ was bodily on the cross, he was not bodily in a thousand other places at the same time. Since he has bodily ascended to heaven, to remain until his second coming, he is not bodily on earth, either on the Roman altar or anywhere else. The miraculous entrance of Christ into the room, in Jerusalem, the doors being shut, is not a parallel case. Whether he miraculously opened the door or roof in a moment and came in is not said. It does not say that "his body penetrated the walls or doors of the room." One thing is certain, his body was not in two different places at the same time. God, who is a Spirit and omnipresent, fills infinite space, whether we have sense enough to grasp the idea or not. How does the *Progress* know that there is no space where there is no matter? The *Progress* claimed that God existed whole and entire in every cranny and grain of sand; but now it says that "God does not exist either in or out of space!" We will leave the reader to decide who is afflicted with "sheer nonsense." Of course, the truth is absurd and nonsensical to the *Progress*, which is not allowed to think religiously, except as directed by the Pope.

SIXTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Catholic Church is not the true church of God because of its unscriptural sacrament of confirmation.*"

Cardinal Gibbons says:

"Confirmation is a sacrament in which, through the imposition of the Bishop's hands, unction and prayer, baptized persons receive the Holy Ghost, that they may steadfastly profess their faith and lead upright lives." Faith of Our Fathers, p. 320.

The baptism and unction of the Holy Spirit were very different from the Roman Chrism, made from the oil of olives with balm of Gilead, and consecrated by the Bishop on "Maundy Thursday!" This confirmation sacrament is re-

garded so sacred that it can only be administered by a Bishop or priest, appointed by the Pope himself. The Romanist Deharbe, in his Catechism, p. 255, asks:

"Why does the Bishop, after he has annointed him, give him a slight blow on the cheek? To remind him that, being now strengthened, he ought to be prepared to suffer patiently any kind of humiliation for the name of Jesus."

The Roman theologian, Perry, in his Instructions, p. 279, of confirmation, says: "This Sacrament gives us the *plenitude* of the Holy Spirit, who adorns and enriches our souls with those interior graces, with which he sanctified and strengthened the Apostles on the day of Pentecost." Thus Romanists teach that this confirmation, by the application of olive oil, confers the baptism of the Holy Ghost. If so, it ought to confer *inspiration* and the *gift of tongues*. As this sacrament of Rome does not produce apostolic fruits it is a deception and delusion. This pretended sacrament of confirmation is wholly unscriptural—contrary to Scripture. Therefore it is one mark that labels the Roman Church as the false church. We have shown that the Roman Catholic Church is not the church of God, 1st. Because of its church salvation; 2d. Because of its false claims to infallibility; 3d. Because it rejects the Bible standard of authority and rule of faith; 4th. Because of its idolatrous sacrament of the mass; 5th. Because of its unscriptural sacrament of baptism; 6th. It is not the true church of God, because of its unscriptural sacrament of confirmation.

SEVENTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because of her unscriptural sacrament of marriage.* While the Roman Church boasts herself as being the special guardian of the sanctity of marriage, it has done more to break down and destroy the Bible institution of marriage than any other sect, professing to be religious. In its twenty-fourth session, the Council of Trent decreed that matrimony is "one of the seven sacraments" of

the Church. And in Cannon III., it sets aside the degrees of "consanguinity and affinity" contained in Leviticus, as hindering matrimony, and makes other impediments. It affirms that the Church can dispense with some of these degrees, establish others, and dissolve the marriage relation. Cannon IV. says: "If anyone saith that the Church cannot establish impediments dissolving marriage; or that she has erred in establishing them; let him be anathema." Decrees of the Council of Trent, by Waterworth, p. 194. Such is the unscriptural and horrible doctrine of the Church of Rome, concerning marriage. While teaching that "the bond of matrimony cannot be dissolved on account of adultery of one of the married parties," she claims the impious authority of dissolving marriage between persons who are living in Scriptural wedlock. She claims the authority to dissolve the obligations of marriage when "one of the parties" makes "profession of religion!" This abominable doctrine of *dissolving* and declaring marriages null and void, teaches that all civil marriages, even of Christians, are null and void; and in this country, those who have not been married by the authority of the Romish Church, are "living in concubinage in the guise of legitimate marriage." While completely setting aside the virtuous marriage relation, the Roman Church binds an innocent party, contrary to the New Testament, in marriage to a base adulterer or adulteress for life. And yet the Roman Church claims to be the guardian of the sanctity of marriage!!!

Also, the Roman Church is denounced by its own Testament. This Roman Rheimish Testament says: "It behooveth therefore a bishop to be blameless, *the husband of one wife*, sober, prudent, and of good behavior, chaste, given to hospitality, a teacher." "One that ruleth well his own house, having *his children in subjection* with all chastity." 1 Tim. 3: 2-4. But the Roman Church, in contradiction to its own New Testament, which it admits to be "the inspired word of

God," forbids a bishop or priest to have a wife at all. God teaches "a bishop to be *the husband of one wife.*" But in defiance of God's word, the Roman Church *forbids a bishop to marry.* Therefore the Roman Church cannot possibly be the true church of God.

Here, according to the *Progress* itself, the "infallible" "inspired Word of God" teaches a bishop to be the husband of one wife, but the Roman Church *forbids him to marry.* Therefore, the Roman Church, which contradicts the Word of God, *is a false church.*

OUR CONTROVERSY.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD.

CHURCH PROGRESS' TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE.

(August 1, 1891.)

Vital questions unanswered by the *Baptist*.

WHERE IS THE SCRIPTURE TO SHOW THAT THE CHURCH WILL NOT REJECT THE NOTE OF INFALLIBILITY?

WHERE IS THE SCRIPTURE TO SHOW THAT THE CLAIM OF INFALLIBILITY IS UNSCRIPTURAL?

WHERE IS THAT SUCCESSIVE LINE OF INFALLIBLE, IMPECCABLE, INSPIRED, MIRACLE-WORKING MEN, WHO HAVE ALWAYS TAUGHT GOD'S WORD INFALLIBLY?

WHERE ARE THESE INFALLIBLE, INSPIRED, MIRACLE-WORKING TEACHERS TO-DAY? WHERE IS THAT VISIBLE BODY NOW, AND WHERE HAS IT BEEN DURING THESE NINETEEN HUNDRED YEARS?

WHERE ARE THOSE INFALLIBLE PROOFS IN THE SHAPE OF MIRACLES?

WHERE IS THAT INFALLIBLE RULE OF FAITH WHICH HAS GIVEN THE LIGHT OF THE GOSPEL THROUGH ALL AGES TO THE PRESENT?

WHERE IS THAT TRUE SUCCESSION OF INFALLIBLE TEACHERS AND DISCIPLES OUTSIDE OF AND INDEPENDENT OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH?

BY WHAT AUTHORITY DOES THE BAPTIST ASSERT THAT THE THINGS WHICH ST. PETER SAYS MANY WREST TO THEIR OWN DESTRUCTION, ARE NOT ESSENTIAL TO SALVATION?

HOW DOES THE BAPTIST DETERMINE WHAT IS AND WHAT IS NOT ESSENTIAL TO SALVATION?

BY WHOM WHEN AND WHERE WAS THE PRESENT CANON OF REVELATION, AS ACCEPTED BY BAPTISTS AND PROTESTANTS, ACCEPTED AND ESTABLISHED BEFORE THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH EXISTED.

WHERE DID YOU GET YOUR SUNDAY?

DID NOT CHRIST GIVE US A PERFECT RULE OF FAITH?

DID CHRIST GIVE US THE BIBLE?

WHERE DID YOU GET YOUR BIBLE?

The *Baptist* has not answered a single question as regards the authenticity of the *Bible*. *That authenticity is in dispute*. The canonicity of the Bible means the authoritative and unerring establishment of its truth as a part of the revealed word of God. This the *Baptist* utterly fails to do, and runs ignominiously away from the most vital issue in the controversy. The determination of this single question will settle the entire controversy. Here is an easy and short road whereby to come to a definite and satisfactory conclusion. Here is an easy and effective way to destroy at one fell swoop all the claims of the Catholic Church. Here is a way to certain victory. Why does the *Baptist* avoid the combat on this one issue, so simple and so effective? It has several times with evident unction compared itself to David, and his use of the sword of Goliath. Now here is Goliath's sword ready to hand for the editor of the *Baptist*. Why does he not use it against his adversary? The effective use of that sword would take off the head of this imaginary Goliath at a stroke. Here is victory in his hands and he actually refuses to seize it! Why? Because the *Baptist* is a sham David. It dare not attempt to handle the one weapon which would determine the issue conclusively. It is afraid to attempt a proof of the canonicity of the Bible. To attempt this means certain defeat for the *Bap-*

tist and it runs away from it with persistent cowardice, kicking a cloud of dust at the same time to obscure and hide the real issue. It affirms that we have admitted the canonicity and infallibility of the Bible. True; but it conspicuously avoids the discussion of the ground upon which we admitted this. Our grounds are not its grounds at all. We admit the canonicity of the Bible *because the Catholic Church has declared that canonicity*. It is on the *authority* of the Church that we accept the Bible as portion of the revealed word of God. We believe that the Bible is infallible, because, accepted in the authority of the Church as God's word, it must be true. In the proper use of the word, *infallible* can't be applied to the *Bible* at all. *Infallibility* in its strict sense should be applied only to a living teacher, and has reference to the teaching faculty in so far as it is free from liability to teach without error. The Bible is *true*, not infallible in the proper use of the term. It contains no untruth. But when we consider the interpretation of its true meaning, then only is the word *infallible* properly applicable to it. The indisputable truth of the Sacred books is one thing; its true interpretation quite another. We hold that the Bible is canonical and true because the Catholic Church so teaches, for she alone has the authority to so teach. On what authority does the *Baptist* hold the canonicity of what it calls the Bible? Why does it not answer our very simple question. Where did you get your Bible? There will be ample opportunity to discuss special dogmas after the *Baptist* has satisfactorily answered this question.

The Pope is the successor of the chief Apostle St. Peter. He is therefore included amongst Apostles set first and foremost in the Church; Chief Apostle, therefore, head of the Apostolic body, therefore chief officer and chief teacher; presiding and hence deciding officer. Of course there are many teachers in the Church, all teaching infallibly when they teach

what Christ commanded the Church to teach, and they know what Christ commanded the Church to teach by going to the authorized teachers, whose faith Christ promised should not fail and whom He designated *to confirm his brethren in the faith*. This is St. Peter and his successors as head of the undying apostolic body.

3. Well, suppose for two years and a half there were no Pope. It does not follow that the church is without an infallible guide, especially if there were no question of a definition of faith in that time. An œcumenical council could determine a question of faith. Nor would the Church cease to exist during such interim, any more than our government would if there were no president for a short time. But the objection is as puerile as the Pope Joan figment.

4. Of course we are all one in Christ Jesus. This does not in the least conflict with the visible unity of the Church around the vice-regent of Christ on earth. The Apostles after Christ's ascent were united and were *one* apostolic body in virtue of their head, St. Peter, who was appointed by Christ to preside over the rest and confirm them in their faith. Christ himself established this bond of unity in the Church by his power and authority. Therefore are we "all one in Christ Jesus."

5. The *Baptist* is running a pretty course! To *teach* means to *write*, does it? How does the *Baptist* make that out? "Go ye and *teach* all nations," said our Lord. How does this sound with the *Baptist's* substitution: "Go ye and *write* to all nations." We do not deny that writing may be an *accessory* to teaching. But the commission to teach does not include the commission to write, for then *every* *Apostle* was in duty bound, *to write as well as to teach*. But they did nothing of the sort: they (the Apostles) established the faith by *teaching* and *preaching*; only a few of them wrote anything, nor did they write everything commissioned them to teach. But we go to

our Lord Himself. *If to teach includes to write why did not our Lord Himself write?* He not only taught, but He showed His Apostles *how* to teach, and he never wrote a word. He not only gave us the rule of faith in what He taught, but He gave us the perfect *method* of teaching. His way was to teach by word of mouth and not to write. Therefore the commission to teach did not include the commission to write. The *Baptist* argument that *to teach* includes *to write* is an inference. On its own principle, by what right does the *Baptist* infer a doctrine from the Scripture? That is the Catholic not the *Baptist* way. Where is Scripture, *chapter and verse* for the statement that Christ commissioned the Apostles *to write* the gospels? St. John 20:31 does not say that Christ *commissioned* John to write His gospel. St. John wrote His gospel sixty-three years after Christ's ascension, and he wrote it at the *solicitation* of his brethren and not by *commission* of Christ. If he had been commissioned to write he would have done it long before as a part of his *imperative duty*. So would all the other Apostles. What St. John was commanded to write in the mystical vision of the Apocalypse has no reference to the divine commission to teach given by our Lord on earth. Moreover the whole entire book is a mystical prophecy given in a special supernatural manner long after the deposit of faith had been confided to the Apostolic keeping and after the Church had long been completely established. It is not a command *to teach the faith by writing*. "Write what thou seest," that is, the thing you *see* in this vision *describe* in writing. There is no question here of teaching a doctrine but of simply describing things *seen*.

6. The *Baptist* has not explained the passage from John 3:5 "Unless a man be born of WATER, etc." It does not suffice to say simply "It is absurd to say that 'born of water' means baptism." We want the *Baptist* to show the absurdi-

ty. To evade the issue in this puerile fashion is not to reason. Either advance an argument or drop the question. We have already shown that the Church does not teach the damnation of unbaptized infants and have shown the *Baptist's* perverted application of the citation from the Council of Trent. Let the *Baptist* be honest at least, even if it be not logical.

7. Just as we thought it would, the *Baptist* shirks the real issue in its foolish objection to the doctrine of the real presence. That question is, can the same body be present in two different places? The reiterated assertion that this is against common-sense remains to be proved. If it is so plainly against common-sense why does the *Baptist* not show it? If it were possible to laugh in print the type would grow hilarious over the *Baptist's* futile and clumsy attempt to explain away the difficulty we propounded to it in the miraculous presence of Christ in the room at Jerusalem. The sacred writer expressly tells us that our Lord entered the presence of the Apostles through *closed* doors. The *Baptist* says He might have miraculously *opened the door or roof*. Where is the miracle in opening the door or roof even? Why should the sacred writer have mentioned the *closed* doors, save unless to show that the Divine Body did not enter in their presence save in a miraculous way and this to show the supernatural powers that His Body possessed over matter. If the glorified Body did not come *through* the walls but through an open door or roof why did the sacred writer particularly mention that the room was closed tight? Let us not waste any more time over trifling evasions. We know there is no space where there is no matter, just as we know that there is no "wet" where there is no water (or liquid). Space is an attribute of matter. It is nothing else than the co-existing series of bodily extension. When there are no bodies there is no extension; and where no

extension, no space. God is a pure spirit; therefore has no body; so He has no extension, and therefore can neither be in or out of space.

8. The *Baptist's* declarations in regard to the Sacrament of Confirmation are not worth answering. There is no question whether Confirmation is a true Sacrament or not. The question is where is the true Church? First ascertain which is the true Church, and you will find the true Sacraments. It is easy enough to say this is not a true sacrament; and therefore the Church so teaching is not the true Church. But how do you know that this or that is not a true sacrament? It is unscriptural, you say, so then we come back to the fundamental question. What is the sole rule of Faith? Now this is the very question the *Baptist* is perpetually evading. Why not then go to the root of the matter at once? Every argument the *Baptist* advances is based on the same ground, viz; that the *Bible* is the sole rule of faith. This is the real question in issue, and not baptism, or confirmation, or matrimony. Solve the question of the rule of faith and you have disposed of all the rest. Answer the question, Where did you get your Bible? You see it is the *canonicity* of the Bible that is in dispute.

9. The Church does not teach that a true marriage can be dissolved; she does declare and establish impediments that make a *so-called* marriage null and void. Impediments are obstacles which prevent a free and valid contract or impede the reception of the Sacramental grace. These she authoritatively establishes. But a valid and lawful marriage she declares indissoluble. She does not teach that those married without her authority are living in concubinage. She recognizes the *natural* contract, accepts it, and refuses to sanction divorce even in two savages. The *Baptist* misrepresents and mistakes our doctrine. We are surprised at the dishonesty displayed by our opponent. It is shameful and inexcusable.

THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

PROPOSITION: *Resolved that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*

CHURCH PROGRESS, Affirms.
AMERICAN BAPTIST, Denies.

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S TWELFTH NEGATIVE.

(August 6, 1891.)

The *Progress* persistently ignores the proposition which it solemnly engaged to prove "both by Scripture, by tradition and by reason." Realizing that the Roman Church is condemned by Scripture and reason, the *Progress* is making desperate efforts to draw us into the discussion of other questions. We *have answered* in our former argument that batch of questions, so far as necessary in the discussion of the present proposition. Though already answered, we answer those questions again; thus: 1st. Matt. 28:19-20, and all other Scripture which teaches the infallibility of Christ, his inspired word and the Holy Spirit. 2nd. The Scripture which condemns the false infallibility of the Pope, is found in 2 Thes. 2:3-4. 3d. This is a false statement of our position, for which there is no excuse. See 5th and 7th negatives as found in AMERICAN BAPTIST, May 2, and June 11. We stated that the *infallibility* was in Christ and his word, instead of in the Pope. 4th. We did not teach that uninspired men were *infallible*, but that Christ has had witnesses for the truth through all the ages. 5th. Those miracles are recorded in the New Testament. 6th. That infallible rule is contained in the Word of God, the Bible. 7th. The succession of those true witnesses is pointed out in the prophecies of the Old and New Testaments. 8th. By the authority of the New Testa-

ment which defines plainly the terms of salvation. 9th. By the word of Christ in the New Testament which says: "Who-soever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life." 10th. The Old Testament Scriptures were given of God to the Jews, and was settled and accepted long before the coming of Christ. The New Testament Scriptures were read in the churches and accepted centuries before the Roman Hierarchy existed. 11th. Our Sunday was received and observed by the churches centuries before the existence of popery. 12th. Christ gave the perfect rule of faith which is contained in the New Testament. 13th. The Old Testament Scriptures were given from God and every word established before the coming of Christ. Christ gave the New Testament which was committed to writing by his authority. 14th. The Old Testament was given through holy men of God, who wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, and committed to the Jews for safe keeping. The New Testament came through the authority of Christ and was accepted by the churches before the rise of popery.

"The collection of books called the Bible by Catholics and Protestants, is of course the same book," but in the hands of Roman Catholics, its text has become corrupted and perverted. The present Roman Catholic Bible, as now used, was not established as canonical, until the year 1546, in the fourth session of the Council of Trent, in which "the old Latin Vulgate edition," then in use, was made the standard of authority. This imperfect edition of Jerome's translation, was given authority above that of the original Hebrew and Greek, inspired Scriptures. In 1590 Pope Sixtus V. published an *infallible* (?) edition of the Vulgate "which he ordered to be used in all discussions, public and private, to be received as true, lawful, authentic and unquestioned." But, alas! in 1592, Pope Clement VIII. issued another *infallible* (?) edition of the Vulgate Bible, making 2,000

changes, differing from the Sixtus Bible. Here we have *infallibility* against *infallibility*! Besides this, the Council of Trent added the spurious books known as the apocrypha to their Bible. These books called the apocrypha are not found in the Hebrew Bible of the Jews, though "the words of God were committed to them." Rom. 3:2. They have never been regarded as authentic by the Jews. These apocryphal books are not mentioned by Josephus or Philo of the first century. These apocryphal books were not regarded as inspired Scriptures during the first centuries of the Christian era. On April 8th, 1546, 53 persons, 5 cardinals and 48 Bishops, introduced the apocryphal books into the canon of Scriptures for the Latin sect. The Church of Rome which has thus allowed the corruption of the Word of God, cannot possibly be his Church. But the perverted Douay Bible, with all its imperfections, contains enough truth to condemn the Roman Catholic Church as the *false Church*. With this sword, as "David," we have already beheaded every real argument which has been set forth by the *Church Progress*. Therefore, it has retreated from its proposition, and is cowardly trying to hide itself behind irrelevant questions. In its fifth affirmative the *Progress* declared that the Catholic Church teaches that the Bible is the inspired Word of God, "true" and "infallible," but now it goes back on itself, saying, "in the proper use of the word, infallible cannot be applied to the Bible at all." This is a direct and positive contradiction. If the *Progress* spoke the truth in the former passage it spoke falsely in the latter. It is utterly confused.

2. We have shown that the true church claims infallibility alone in Christ her head, in her rule of faith the Word, and in the Holy Spirit, the Guide. Our argument remains unanswered which proved that if one of the apostles was a pope, then all the apostles were popes, and, still more, all the church members were under obligation to become popes!

3rd. Though modern Romanists are disposed to deny the rule of Popess Joan, yet the most reliable Roman Catholic historian, Lewis Cormenin, in his History of the Popes, arrays overwhelming testimony to the fact that a woman under the name of John VIII. ruled in the papal chair over two years, until that frightful tragedy, while marching at the head of a procession in Rome, caused the glory of her popedom to go down in darkness.

4th. In the Bible, Peter is nowhere called the head of the church. Christ is "head over all things to the church."

5th. It is a misrepresentation. We said that the commission to teach all the commands of Christ, includes writing his commands, because writing them is a part of divine teaching. We gave the testimony of John who said, of his Gospel, "These things are written that you may believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and that believing you might have life through his name." The gospels were written for the salvation of men. Also, John was directly commanded by Christ to "write in a book" and send to the seven churches of Asia. Paul directed his Epistles to be read in the churches at Colosse and Laodicea. Col. 4:16. Also, Paul said: "I charge you by the Lord that these epistles be read to all the holy brethren." 1 Thes. 5:27. The reading of the writings of the New Testament in the churches was of the Lord. Again Paul says: "And if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and do not keep company with him, that he may be ashamed." 2 Thes. 3:14. Obedience to the inspired writings of the New Testament was enjoined of God, through the inspired writers, on pain of exclusion. The inspired writings were certainly included in the command to *teach all nations*. Christ baptized through his disciples as agents. He gave the New Testament

in like manner through his inspired agents. Therefore it is not an inference but a command.

6. It is certain that John 3:5 does not mean baptism as a condition of regeneration, because this would make the Savior contradict himself in the same interview, when he says: "Whosoever believeth in him, may not perish, but may have everlasting life." We did not misrepresent the Catechism of the Council of Trent. It is the *Progress* that misrepresents that Council and the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church. Speaking of infants, the Catechism of the Council of Trent says that "UNLESS THEY ARE REGENERATED THROUGH THE GRACE OF BAPTISM, BE THEIR PARENTS CHRISTIANS OR INFIDELS, THEY ARE BORN TO ETERNAL MISERY AND EVERLASTING DESTRUCTION." Cat. of the Council of Trent, p. 123. The Roman Church teaches that unbaptized infants "*are born to eternal misery and everlasting destruction.*"

7th. We showed that the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation is opposed to Scripture, reason, and even common sense. The *Progress* cannot meet our arguments, and is trying "to laugh in print."! But from its own ugly insinuations, the *Progress* is not in a laughing mood. The *Progress* falsely quotes its own Testament. It says: "The sacred writers expressly tell us that the Lord entered the presence of the apostles through closed doors."

There is not one word said about going through closed doors. The doctrine of the Eucharist, which has 10,000 bodily Saviors, whole and entire, one in every particle of bread and every particle of wine, is utterly untrue, absurd, contrary to reason, and against the plainest dictates of common sense. Such a doctrine destroys the unity of the Godhead and teaches the most degraded polytheism. The Catechism of the Council of Trent teaches that when Jesus, in the Eucharist is bodily taken into the stomach "it is not like bread and wine changed

into our substance; but in some measure, charges us into its own nature," etc. Cat. of the Council of Trent, p. 165. Will the *Progress* tell what becomes of the Eucharist Christ when taken into the stomach of an infidel? What becomes of Christ bodily, in such a stomach? How long does he retain his godship? What becomes of him? Such a doctrine is degrading to Christ and his religion. The nonsense of the *Progress* which says that God can "neither be in or out of space," is hardly worth notice. In a former article the *Progress* said, God is entire in every cranny and grain of sand. Now it says God is *neither in or out of space!* We hope the *Progress* is not going deranged,

8. When we prove that the Roman Catholic Church has unscriptural and false ordinances, we prove that she is not the true church of God, because the true churches keep the ordinances as they were delivered unto them. 1 Cor. 11:2.

9. The Church of Rome does teach that she has authority to dissolve the marriage relation. The Catechism of the Council of Trent, in its twenty-fourth session on the sacrament of matrimony, Canons III. and IV., says: "IF ANYONE SAITH THAT THOSE DEGREES ONLY OF CONSANGUINITY AND AFFINITY, WHICH ARE SET DOWN IN LEVITICUS, CAN HINDER MATRIMONY FROM BEING CONTRACTED, AND DISSOLVE IT WHEN CONTRACTED; AND THAT THE CHURCH CANNOT DISPENSE IN SOME OF THOSE DEGREES, OR ESTABLISH THAT OTHERS MAY HINDER AND DISSOLVE IT; LET HIM BE ANATHEMA. IF ANYONE SAITH THAT THE CHURCH COULD NOT ESTABLISH IMPEDIMENTS DISSOLVING MARRIAGE OR THAT SHE HAS ERRED IN ESTABLISHING THEM, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA." This positively teaches that the degrees of consanguinity and affinity in Leviticus may be dispensed with, and others established, and marriages dissolved.

The celebrated Roman Catholic theologian, Liguori, in his Mission Book, on the marriage sacrament has the following:

The Holy Church has, from the earliest ages, annexed certain conditions to the matrimonial contract, which are called impediments. These are of two kinds. 1. The Annuling Impediments, or those which make it impossible to contract any real marriage at all; and, 2. The Prohibitory Impediments, which do not take away the power to contract a valid marriage, but only make it unlawful and sinful.

1. THE ANNULING IMPEDIMENTS:—A marriage contracted, notwithstanding an impediment of this kind, is null and void from the beginning, that is to say, no marriage at all in the sight of God. No law of the land can make such an alliance good. Both parties to it live together in crime, and under the anger of God, if they are aware of the impediment; and if they did not know of it in the beginning, they are bound to separate immediately when they discover it. Sometimes, indeed, the impediment may be dispensed with by the Church, but in that case they are bound to abstain from all use of marriage until the dispensation is obtained and a valid marriage contracted.

5. DIFFERENCE OF RELIGION^{**} is an impediment which makes marriage null and void between a baptized person and one who was never baptized.

6. VOWS:—All persons who have made solemn vows of chastity, by entering into some religious order, are incapable of contracting marriage; and so are all orders of the clergy, beginning with sub-deacons and upwards. Mission Book, p. 328.

This quotation shows that the statement of the *Progress* is utterly without foundation, which says that the Church of Rome does not teach that those married without her authority are living in concubinage. We ask the *Church Progress* to withdraw its charge of "dishonesty," as the charge is untrue and in direct violation of the agreement to treat each other with respect. The *Progress* ought to be careful how it contradicts the doctrine of its own Church. It may lay itself liable to *anathema*.

EIGHTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because of her unscriptural sacrament of Extreme Unction.* It is called Extreme Unction because it is "the sacrament of the dying," or to prepare them for dying. Its matter or element, as defined by the Council of Trent, "consists of oil of olives, consecrated by episcopal

hands." In its administration the priest says: "By this Holy Unction, and through his great mercy, may God indulge thee whatever sins thou hast committed by sight, smell, touch, etc., etc." Cat. of the Council of Trent, p. 207. "The Sacred Unction is to be applied not to the entire body, but to the organs of sense only—to the eyes, the organs of sight, to the ears of hearing, to the nostrils of smelling, to the mouth of taste and speech, to the hands of touch." Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 209. On the same page, "As in corporal disease, although it effects the entire body, yet the cure is applied to that part only which is the seat of the disease, so in spiritual malady, this Sacrament is applied not to the entire body, but to those members which are properly the organs of sense, and also to the loins, which are, as it were, the seat of concupiscence, and to the feet, by which we move from one place to another." Thus Rome follows the poor soul through life with her superstitions, and as he enters the spirit world deceives him with the delusion, that in the Extreme Unction his sins are forgiven, he is granted indulgence, and prepared for glory. He thus dies under this fearful delusion.

NINTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God because of her unscriptural sacrament of Orders.* By this is meant the Orders of the ministry, which, like the sacraments, are seven. "Their number, according to the uniform and universal doctrine of the Catholic Church, is seven, Porter, Reader, Exorcist, Acolyte, Sub-deacon, Deacon and Priest." Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 216. The authority given to these Orders is wholly unscriptural and unreasonable, Bishops, Arch-bishops, Cardinals and Popes, are only regarded as priests exalted to a still higher dignity. But priests themselves are regarded as occupying the place and authority of Jesus Christ on earth. We quote the Catechism of the Council of Trent as follows.

"Priests and bishops are, as it were, the interpreters and heralds of God, commissioned in his name to teach mankind the law of God, and the precepts of a Christian life—they are the representatives of God upon earth. Impossible, therefore, to conceive a more exalted dignity, or functions more sacred. Justly, therefore are they called not only angels, but gods, holding, as they do, the place and power and authority of God upon earth. But the priesthood, at all times an elevated office, transcends in the New Law all others in dignity. The power of consecrating and offering the body and blood of our Lord and of remitting sin, with which the priesthood of the New Law is invested, is such as cannot be comprehended by the human mind, still less is it equalled by or assimilated to, anything on earth." p. 212.

According to this blâsphemy, the priests are "NOT ONLY ANGELS, BUT GODS, HOLDING, AS THEY DO, THE PLACE AND POWER AND AUTHORITY OF GOD UPON EARTH." !!! This blasphemy doubtless far exceeds any blasphemy ever perpetrated by the prince of devils. Satan does transform himself into an "angel of light," but these priests have transformed themselves into gods and Christs, claiming the power of God and Christ!

Such is the fearful doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. It is not the true church of Christ because of its *unholy* Orders.

The New Testament ministry are only servants of the churches, "For we preach not ourselves, but Jesus Christ our Lord; and ourselves your servants through Jesus." 2 Cor 4:5.

OUR CONTROVERSY.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD.

CHURCH PROGRESS' THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE.

(August 15, 1891.)

1. Here is the way the *Baptist* answers our questions: 1. It cites Matt. 28:19-20, to show that the Church will not reject the note of infallibility. Therefore the Church is infallible. In controversy May 9th, the *Baptist* said: "Negative argument, 2. The Roman Catholic Church is not the true Church of God because of its *unscriptural* claim to infallibility. Now it quotes *scripture* to prove that the Church must be infallible. 2. The text 2 Thesis. 2, 3, 4, has nothing to do with the question. We asked for a scriptural text to support the *Baptist* statement that *the claim of infallibility is unscriptural*. It can't give it. 3. This is the logical statement of the *Baptist's* position. It argued that infallibility includes impeccability and inspiration. Popes not inspired and impeccable; ergo not infallible. But Christ's doctrine cannot be taught with error. Ergo teachers of that doctrine infallible, impeccable, inspired. The *Baptist* admits the necessity of succession. Therefore, denying that this infallible, impeccable, inspired line exists in the Catholic Church, we ask the *Baptist* to point it out elsewhere. 4. A plain evasion. We ask you to point out these witnesses *through all the ages*. 5. *Baptist* argued that Popes did not work miracles. Ergo not apostolic successors. Ergo miracles require a proof of apostolic succession. The church that can't show miracle proofs is not scriptural is *Baptist's* im-

plied premise. Ergo we ask the *Baptist* to point out miracle-working Church. 6. This is exactly what you can't prove. The Apostolic Church had no Bible. You see the question does hinge on the Bible as the sole rule of faith. 7. If that succession is pointed out in the prophesies of old and new Testament, no doubt the *Baptist* will find it perfectly easy to trace for the past nineteen hundred years. This is what we ask it to do. 8. Give us the chapter and text of this authority. On the contrary we read: "In which (St. Paul's epistles) are certain things hard to understand, which the unlearned and the unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, to their own destruction." Clearly the *Baptist* and Scripture don't agree? But the question is what is the *meaning* of that Word.

How does the *Baptist* determine that meaning? 9. It has just cited Scripture to show that, that meaning is hard to understand, and as the Protestant Bishop Walton says: "The Word of God does not consist in mere letters, whether written or printed, but in the true sense of it." 10. We didn't ask when the Old Testament was given. The other portion of your answer is false. You cannot prove it. We have been challenging you to that proof right along. You shirk it every time. 11. Not true. Prove it. Show Scripture for the observance of Sunday, if you can. It is *unscriptural*. Yet you religiously keep it. 12 and 13. Christ did not give the New Testament. Ergo it is not the perfect rule. Christ did not command His Apostles to *write* His doctrine, nor did He command the faithful to learn it by *reading* it. He commanded His Apostles to *teach*, and the faithful to *hear*. 14. The same old answer. Prove the Churches accepted the New Testament before "rise of Popery."

2. We have insisted all along that the real question at issue is the determination of the rule of faith. We have shown clearly enough that the solution of the question: Is the Bible

the sole rule of faith? would end all dispute. But the *Baptist* purposely flees every attempt to bring it squarely up to the real issue, and pretends that we are seeking to draw it away from the true point of dispute. Let us summarize briefly the *Baptist's* arguments up to date, and we shall see by its own words that the real issue is the question, whether or not the Bible is the sole rule of faith. May 9, the *Baptist*: "Negative argument 2. The Roman Catholic Church is not the true Church of God, because of its UNSCRIPTURAL claim to infallibility."

May 16, the *Baptist* argued: "Negative argument 3. The Roman Catholic Church is not the true Church of God because it rejects the BIBLE STANDARD of authority and rule of government for her own traditions." May 23, *Baptist* repeats "Negative argument 3." May 30, *Baptist* again repeats, "Negative argument 3." June 13, *Baptist* argues: "Negative argument 4. The Roman Catholic Church is not the true Church of God, because of her idolatrous sacrament of the Eucharist, or Mass." Declaring the doctrine of the real presence to be *contrary to Scripture*.

June 27, the *Baptist* argues: "Negative argument 5. The Roman Catholic Church is not the true Church of God because of her UNSCRIPTURAL Sacrament of Baptism."

August 1, *Baptist* argues: "Negative argument 6. The Roman Catholic Church is not the true Church of God, because of its UNSCRIPTURAL Sacrament of Confirmation."

Again the same date: "Negative argument 7. The Roman Catholic Church is not the true Church of God because of her UNSCRIPTURAL Sacrament of Marriage."

This week it argues: "Negative argument 8. The Roman Catholic Church is not the true Church of God because of her UNSCRIPTURAL Sacrament of Extreme Unction."

Here we see every argument of the *Baptist* is based upon

the alleged ground that certain particular doctrines, taught by the Catholic Church, are *unscriptural*. It will also have been noted that the *Baptist* is perpetually quoting some Scriptural text (according of course to its own interpretation) in its endeavors to show that this or that teaching of the Catholic Church is not Christ's teaching. Plainly then the issue does hinge upon the solution of the question: Is the Bible the sole rule of faith? The *Baptist* constantly appeals to *its meaning* of the Scripture as the infallible measure and standard of doctrine. Will it not then expedite the entire controversy to determine whether the Bible alone is the sole measure and standard of doctrine and whether the *Baptist's* interpretations of its text are its true and authoritative sense? The *Baptist* declares it is looking for the truth. Why not take the shortest road to the desired goal? IF THE BIBLE BE THE SOLE RULE OF FAITH, THEN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS NOT THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD. Here is the issue squarely and plainly put. Let the *Baptist* demonstrate that the Bible alone is the sole rule of faith, and it will vanquish us ignominiously. But if the Bible is shown not to be the sole rule of faith, then the Protestant is not the true Church of God. With the determination of this *one issue* is involved every other; all special doctrines, such as Baptism, Confirmation, Real Presence, Matrimony, Extreme Unction, Confession, etc., etc., are of only secondary importance to this point. We can argue with the *Baptist* till doomsday about special doctrines, and quote Scripture as often as, and more effectively, than it does to substantiate every one of these doctrines. To what avail as long as the *Baptist* lays it down as its fundamental principle that *the meaning it reads into the letter of a certain book* is authoritative doctrine, the measure and standard of faith? For we must remember, that it is not the Book itself that measures the truth, but the *Baptist* that measures the Book. To what

avail, in the second place, when the *Baptist* can give no intelligible account of the origin of the Book by which it imagines it completely measures God's revelation, can give us no history of its compilation or its authenticity, and has no security against corruptions in its text or authority for accepting it as God's word at all? Clearly enough then it is the canonicity of the Bible which is involved; clearly enough the determination of that canonicity will settle the dispute definitively. Yet the *Baptist*, so anxious for the truth (?) avoids the *open sesame* of the entire problem.

3. Curiously enough here is the *Baptist* accusing the Council of Trent of adding apocryphal books to the Bible. Now how in the world does the *Baptist*, or any Protestant, determine which books are or are not apocryphal? When the *Baptist* makes a historical statement, let it prove it. Let it show authority for the "two thousand mistakes" in the Bible published by Sixtus V. What is meant by *mistakes* here? Where is the authority for the fable of Pope Joan? Read Baring Gould, a Protestant minister, on the Pope Joan fable in his "Curious Myths of the Middle Ages." He will enlighten the *Baptist*, and teach it a lesson on its easy credulousness. What reliable Catholic historians admits the "Popedom of Pope Joan?" What in the world does the *Baptist* expect to gain by such barren, unsubstantiated assertions? Does the *Baptist* suppose it subserves the cause of truth by making statements of this character? When its readers find that it has asserted, in the supposed interest of truth, what it cannot prove, and what respectable historians have shown to be false, it becomes discredited in their eyes.

4. Because St. John says: "these things are written that you may believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, etc.," it does not follow that only the "things written" are to be believed, that the "things written" are all that Jesus Christ

taught and did, or that the "things written" are the sole rule of faith. These "things written" are to be believed on the *authority of St. John* as the 24. verse of the last chapter of his gospel itself tells us: "This is that disciple who giveth testimony of these things and hath written these things; and we know that his testimony is true." These "things written" are to be believed because St. John is authority for their truth. Nor were the "written things" all, so the 25, verse of the same chapter tells us expressly: "But there are also many other things which Jesus did; which if they were written every one, the world itself, I think, would not be able to contain the books that should be written." Because St. Paul charged "that these epistles be read to all the holy brethren," it does not follow that all he taught was contained in the epistles or that the holy brethren learned the truth only by reading his epistles. The word of God is both written and unwritten. In Scripture the unwritten word is called "The Word of God spoken" (Acts iv. 31)—"The Word of Faith preached" (Romans x. 8)—"The Gospel heard and preached" (Colossians i. 23)—"The Word of God, received, heard, believed" (1 Thes. ii. 13)—"The Word of Christ heard" (Romans x. 17). St. Peter says: "But the word of the Lord endureth forever, and this is the word that hath been preached unto you" (1 ep. 1-25). This unwritten word handed down by word of mouth is Tradition, and St. Paul tells us how this Tradition is to be handed down when he says: "For I DELIVERED unto you first of all, which I also RECEIVED" (1 Corinth. xv. 3). Writing to St. Timothy he says: "The things which thou hast HEARD of me by many witnesses, the same COMMEND to faithful men, who shall be fit to TEACH also" (1 Timothy ii. 2). In the Old Testament we have the same doctrine of Tradition in the prophecy of Isaias, in which passage promise is also given of the unfailing guardianship

(infallibility) of the truth: "This is my covenant with them: My spirit that is in thee, and my words that I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, henceforth and forever." (Lix. 21). So also does our Lord promise: "And I will ask the Father, and He shall give you another Paraclete (or Comforter) that he may abide with you forever, the spirit of truth. . . . But when He, the spirit of truth is come, He will teach you all truth" (xiv. 16, 17, and xvi. 13). Hence says St. Irenaeus, who lived so close to the apostolic age: "For where the Church is, there is the spirit of God, and where the spirit of God is, there is the Church and all grace, and the spirit of truth." (Against Heresies, vol. iii. c. xxiv.) St. Paul tells us "Faith cometh by HEARING" (Romans x. 17) and therefore by the Word of God PREACHED. Hence the same apostle says; "And how shall they HEAR without a PREACHER? And how shall they preach unless they be sent?" (Romans x. 14, 15). Again says St. Paul in his second epistle to the Thessalonians (ii. 14), "Brethren, STAND FAST AND HOLD THE TRADITIONS, which you have learnt, whether by word or by our epistle." St. John writing in his old age says: "We are of God. He that knoweth God HEARETH US. He that is not of God, HEARETH US NOT. By this we know the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error" (1 John iv. 6). St. Irenaeus thus challenges the heretics of his time: "We challenge them to that TRADITION, which is from the Apostles, which is preserved in the churches by the succession of Presbyters" (Against Heresies, book iii. chap. ii). Origen says: "We are not to believe otherwise than as the Churches of God have by succession transmitted to us" (Book iii. Commentary on St. Matthew). St. Chrysostom lays it down as an axiom: "It is a Tradition (of the Church): seek nothing further" (Com. on passage 1. Thes. ii. 14, book xi. Homily 4).

Clearly then the written is not the sole word of God. Clearly then the Bible, the written word, cannot be the sole rule of faith.

5. Chap. xx. verse 19, St. John's Gospel reads: "Now when it was late that same day, the first of the week, AS THE DOORS WERE SHUT, where the disciples were gathered together for fear of the Jews, Jesus came and stood in the midst, and said to them: "Peace be to you." Did we falsely quote our own Testament about the *closed doors*?

6. The Canon of Council of Trent on Matrimony quoted by *Baptist*, and the extract from St. Alphonsus Liguori say nothing more than we said last week. Marriage contracted in spite of impediments established by the Church are null and void. There is nothing in *these extracts* to show that a *valid and a lawful marriage can be dissolved*, nor to show that those contracting marriage without her authority *are living in concubinage*. This is a forced and illogical inference of the *Baptist's*. All that is here said is that there are certain impediments, which dissolve marriage, *i. e.* make it null and void. These impediments the Church can establish, but this does not say that a valid and lawful marriage can be dissolved, nor yet does it conclude, that those validly married outside of the Church for instance as Protestants or other heretics, are living in concubinage or that they can be divorced.

Want of space crowds out other points in answer to *Baptist*. These we will return to next issue of controversy.

THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

PROPOSITION: *Resolved that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*

CHURCH PROGRESS, Affirms.
AMERICAN BAPTIST, Denies.

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S THIRTEENTH NEGATIVE.

(August 20, 1891.) —

1st. The infallibility of Christ, his Word, and of the Holy Spirit, is Scriptural, while the infallibility of the Pope is not only unscriptural but *anti-scriptural*. The Bible description of the witnesses of Jesus, through all the ages, will be discussed when we come to the origin of the Roman Catholic Church. It is utterly absurd for uninspired men to claim infallibility without being able to establish that claim by miracles. The statement of the *Progress* is not true, that "the Apostolic Church had no Bible!"

Will the *Progress* please tell, when and where the Roman Catholic Church established the canonicity of her present Bible? Will it dare tell? Will the *Progress* tell when and where the Roman Catholic Church established Sunday as an "unscriptural" observance? The Christian Sabbath (Sunday) was established by the example of Christ and the Apostles, and was accepted by the churches centuries before the existence of the Roman Church; but this is not the proposition for discussion. It has already been proved that the New Testament was written by the authority of Christ.

2nd. The *Progress* affirms "that the real question at issue is the determination of the rule of faith!" This is not the proposition for discussion, neither would its decision settle the

question. Even if it could be proved (which it cannot) that unwritten tradition is of equal authority with the inspired Bible, then the question would arise as to what party possessed the true tradition. The *Progress* knows this. The proposition for discussion, solemnly agreed upon, is this: "*Resolved, that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*" This is the proposition which the *Progress* so much dreads, and utterly refuses to debate. We repeat, that as the *Progress* agrees with us concerning the infallibility and authority of the Bible, which we both accept as inspired, there is no necessity whatever, in this discussion, of introducing the question of the divine authenticity of the Scriptures.

In its third affirmative, the *Progress* said: "The Protestant appeals to the Bible. The Catholic appeals to the same Bible, plus tradition," thus admitting the *same* Bible as others, excepting the "tradition." In its fifth affirmative, the *Progress* said:

"The Catholic Church holds and teaches that the Bible is the inspired word of God and therefore true; and this written word of God is as true as his spoken word: that the written word is as infallible as his spoken word."

Thus the *Progress* has admitted the *canonicity* and *infallible* authority of the "*same Bible*," which we affirm contains the *sole rule* of faith and practice for the churches of Christ.

In its eleventh affirmative the *Progress* further admits that "*the collection of books called the Bible by Catholics and Protestants, is of course the same book, but in the hands of Protestants its text has become corrupt and pervert.*" Every one with a grain of common sense can see that there is no necessity of discussing a point which is already admitted by the *Progress*. We have forced the *Progress* to an unconditional surrender of the Bible. The *Progress* admits that: "IF THE BIBLE BE THE SOLE RULE OF FAITH, THEN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS NOT THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD. Here is the issue

squarely and plainly put. Let the *Baptist* demonstrate that the Bible alone is the sole rule of faith, and it will vanquish us ignominiously."

This is a candid confession extorted from the *Progress*, under fire, that the Bible gives no support to the Roman Catholic Church. It is utterly condemned even by its own Bible. The Bible and the Roman Catholic Church are irreconcilable enemies. "If the Bible is the sole rule of faith, then the Catholic Church is not the true Church of God." The *Progress* boldly started to prove its Church claims by "the Bible"; but now it has surrendered the "Bible" citadel to us, and fled into the dismal swamp of human traditions! But it cannot escape in this way. Were we to grant that "the rule of faith" is contained in both the *inspired, infallible* Bible and in unwritten tradition, then we could prove that the *Roman Catholic Church is not the true Church of God because she is destitute of the true tradition*. On this supposition, the *true tradition* must harmonize with the *infallible* Bible. But the traditions of the Roman Church contradict the Bible; therefore that Church is not the true church, because of her false traditions. The infallible Bible says a bishop *must* be "the husband of one wife"; but the Roman tradition says he shall not have a wife at all. The infallible Bible says that "marriage [is] honorable in all." (Heb. 13:4); but Roman tradition says *marriage is not honorable in all*. Therefore the Roman Church, whose traditions contradict the infallible Bible, is an *anti-Bible* and false church.

3rd. Prior to the Council of Trent, Baptists, Romanists and Protestants appealed to the "same Bible," as "the inspired Word of God," and of *infallible* authority. But the Council of Trent, in 1546, adopted seven apocryphal, spurious books as of equal authority with the inspired Word of God. See Decrees of Trent, by Waterworth, pp. 18, 19.

These bogus books are Tóbias, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch and 1st and 2nd Maccabees. These apocryphal books are to be received, and venerated with "equal affection and piety" as the inspired books of the Bible; and if any one receive not as sacred and canonical, the said books entire, with all their parts, etc., "let him be anathema." These seven books, which formed no part of the Hebrew Bible, which were not received by the Jews, which were not endorsed by Christ or the Apostles, and which were not regarded as the Word of God by the apostolic churches, were added by the Trent Fathers, in 1546, to the Vulgate Bible. Prior to this time, no one was under obligation to receive and believe these books. But now they must be received and believed by every Romanist on pain of damnation.

There is not a reasonable doubt of the occupation of the Papal chair by Popess Joan, as John VIII., in the ninth century. Du Pin, a Roman historian, speaking of Charles the Bald, being crowned by Pope John VIII., in a note, says:

"This Pope, according to Platina's reckoning, which is accounted the truest, is John IX., for Pope John VIII. is Pope Joan, of which the Roman Church is so much ashamed, that they have blotted her out of the Catalogue of their Popes, for though they allow their Popes too many women, yet they will not endure to hear of a woman to be a Pope." Du Pin's Ecclesiastical History, vol. 6, p. 45.

Louis Marie De Cormenin, a Roman Catholic, in his History of the Popes, furnishes overwhelming proofs of the reality and identity of the "Popess Joan." See pp. 225 to 231. Cormenin cites the Roman historian "Marianus Scotus" as proving the identity of Popess Joan. It is said the emperor, Louis II. received the imperial crown from the hands of Joan. Cormenin says: "Thus, according to the most authentic and unexceptionable testimony, it is demonstrated that the Popess Joan existed in the ninth century; that a woman has occupied

the chair of St. Peter; been the vicar of Christ on earth, and proclaimed sovereign pontiff of Rome!!!” p. 227.

In A. D. 1033, Theophylactus was elevated to the pontifical chair, under the name of Benedict IX., at the age of *twelve years*. Of this baby boy Pope Cormanin says: “The Pope Theophylactus became daily more odious to the Romans, until finally, after twelve years of rapine, murders, rapes and robberies, the people drove him from the holy city.” p. 330. Does the *Progress* claim that this murderer, robber Pope was infallible?

4th. All the sayings and doing of Christ necessary to our salvation and edification are contained in the New Testament. Isaiah 59: 21 only teaches that the gospel preaching was to continue forever. This does not antagonize the truth that this covenant or testament was to be written. This gospel has been recorded by divine inspiration in the New Testament as shown heretofore. The other passages cited by the *Progress* for oral preaching are in perfect harmony with the position that the New Testament gospel was committed to writing. The “traditions,” “whether by word or by epistle,” 2 Thess. 2:14, were inspired traditions which were dictated by the Holy Spirit. These inspired writers were able to speak with tongues and work miracles in confirmation of their teaching. This gives no sanction, however, to the teachings of uninspired, wicked men.

5th. But the *Progress* did wrongly quote its own Testament by saying: “The sacred writers expressly tell us that the Lord entered the presence of the apostles through closed doors.” Now it quotes John 20: 19, which only refers to the fact that the doors were shut, and “Jesus came and stood in the midst.” Not one word was said about “coming through closed doors.”

6th. We did state correctly the Canon of Trent, concerning

marriage. The fourth Canon says: “*If anyone saith that the Church could not establish impediments dissolving marriage; or that she has erred in establishing them; let him be anathema.*” Here the Church of Rome claims the authority to dissolve marriage, and establish impediments which God hath not established. Also, we showed that, according to Liguori, “DIFFERENCE OF RELIGION is an impediment which makes marriage null and void between a baptized person and one who was never baptized.” Mission Book, p. 328. This horrible doctrine of Rome concerning marriage has become a dreadful fountain of corruption and immorality. In his *Vaticanism: An Answer to Reproofs and Replies*, Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M. P., page 20, says:

“I have before me the Eposition with the text, of the Encyclica, and Syllabus, published at Cologne, in 1874 with the approval of authority, (*mit oberkirchlicher Approbation*). In p. 45 it is distinctly taught that with marriage the state has nothing to do; that it may safely rely upon the Church, that civil marriage, in the eyes of the Church, is only concubinage; and that the State, by the use of worldly compulsion, prevents the two concubinary parties from repenting and abandoning their guilty relation to one another. Exactly the same is the doctrine of the Pope himself, in his speeches published at Rome, where civil marriage is declared to be, for Christians, nothing more than a mere concubinage, and a filthy concubinage (*sozzo concubinato*). These extraordinary declarations are not due to the fondness of the Pontiff for speaking *impromptu*. In his letter of September 19, 1852, to King Victor Emmanuel, he declares that matrimony carrying the Sacraments is alone lawful for Christians, and that a law of civil marriage, which goes to divide them, for practical purposes, constitute a concubinage in the guise of a legitimate marriage. So, that, in truth, in all countries within the scope of these denunciations, the parties to a civil marriage are declared to be living in illicit connection, which they are called upon to renounce. This call is addressed to them separately as well as jointly, the wife being summoned to leave the husband, and the husband to abandon his wife; and after this pretended repentance from a state of sin, unless the law of the land and fear of consequences prevail a new connection, under the name of a marriage, may be formed with the sanction of the Church of Rome. I know not by what infatuation it is that adversaries have compelled me thus to develop a state of facts created by the highest authorities of the Roman

Church, which I shall now not shrink from calling horrible and revolting in itself, dangerous to the morals of society, the structure of the family, and the peace of life."

Mr. Gladstone is not an enemy to Romanists. He has spent much of his life and remarkable talent in defending Romanists against the English law of proscription. After thorough examination of all the facts, Mr. Gladstone pronounces the Romish doctrine of dissolving marriage "*horrible and revolting in itself, dangerous to the morals of society, the structure of the family and the peace of life.*" Surely the Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God because of her horrible "sacrament of marriage." The unholy doctrine of the Roman Church concerning marriage has borne its bitter and sad fruits in purely Roman countries. The Catechism of Trent, p. 235, says: "Without the presence of the Parish-priest or of some other priest commissioned by him or by the ordinary, and that of two or three witnesses, there can be no marriage." This settles the question positively. According to this horrible doctrine of Rome, all Protestants and others, who think they are married, are living in abomination, because they were not married by a Roman priest!

The *Progress* has utterly failed to reply to our eighth negative argument against the Roman *anti-scriptural* ordinance of Extreme Unction.

Our ninth negative argument showed that the Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God because of *anti-scriptural* "Sacrament of Orders." We showed that the Catechism of Trent claimed that priests "justly, therefore, are they called not only angels, but gods, holding as they do, the place and power and authority of God on earth." p. 212. Again the Catechism of Trent says:

"The power with which the Christian priesthood is clothed, is a heavenly power, raised above that of angels: it has its source not in the Levitical priesthood, but in Christ the Lord, who was a priest not according to Aaron, but according to the order of Mel-

chisedec. He it is who, endowed with supreme authority to grant pardon and grace, has bequeathed this power to his Church, a power limited, however, in its extent, and attached to the Sacraments." Cat. of Council of Trent, p. 215.

This is the claim for the priesthood of heavenly power above angels, equal to the Melchisedec priesthood of Christ. This pretended Sacrament of Orders, confers an eternal priesthood.

DeHarbe, in his Catechism of the Catholic Religion, endorsed by Cardinals Wiseman and McCloskey, on p. 299, has the following:

"Can a priest be deprived of his ordination? No, he can as little be deprived of Ordination as of Baptism, because it imprints an indelible character upon the soul.

A Priest, therefore, or Bishop cannot be deprived of the power which he has received in his Ordination or Consecration to change bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, and to offer up the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, to administer Confirmation, Extreme Unction and Holy Order; but the power of remitting sins by Sacramental Absolution can be taken from him, because the valid administration of the Sacrament of Penance is also dependent on *Jurisdiction.*"

Thus a fallen, drunken and devilish priest, revelling in all the crimes of infamy, still retains his priestly power to change bread into the body and blood of Jesus, etc. ! If he was so disposed, he could change, at one ceremony, all the bread in St. Louis into as many whole and entire Christs as there are particles of bread!! Also, this drunken, polluted priest may administer the sacrament of Confirmation, Extreme Unction, and Holy Order!

TENTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because of her anti-scriptural sacrament of Penance, or Confession.* The Council of Trent in its fourteenth session says: "And this sacrament of Penance is, for those who have fallen after baptism necessary unto salvation; as baptism itself is for those who have not as yet been regenerated." Waterworth 94. The Catechism of the Council of Trent, page 180, says:

"To calm this our solicitude, the Redeemer instituted the Sacrament of Penance, in which we cherish a well founded hope, that our sins are forgiven us by the absolution of the priest, and the faith which we justly have in the efficacy of the Sacraments, has much influence in tranquilizing the troubled conscience and giving peace to the soul. The voice of the priest, who is legitimately constituted a minister for the remission of sins, is to be heard as that of Christ himself, who said to the lame man; 'Son, be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee.'"

In the Confessional, or Penance, *the voice of the priest is to be heard as that of Christ himself!* This secret confessional to the priest "god" is *anti-scriptural*. The Church of Rome, which has established such a polluting tribunal; is not the true church of God.

"Unlike the authority given to the priests of the Old Law, to declare the leper cleansed of his leprosy, the power with which the priests of the New Law are invested, is not simply to declare that sins are forgiven, but, as the ministers of God, really to absolve from sin; a power which God himself, the author and source of grace and justification, exercises through their ministry." Catechism of Council of Trent, p. 182.

This blasphemy affirms that the priest absolves from sin by the power which God himself exercises through him.

Language is too poor to fully express the impious blasphemy of this daring assertion. In the secret confessional box, lying prostrate at the feet of the priest, the penitent venerates the priest as Jesus Christ himself, "as his legitimate judge" discharging the functions of Jesus Christ!!! No wonder the priest has absolute control over the soul and body of the superstitious penitent. On page 183 the Catechism further states: "There is no sin, however grievous, no crime however enormous or however frequently repeated which Penance does not remit." This is a flat contradiction of Christ himself who says: "But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost shall never have forgiveness, but shall be guilty of an everlasting sin." Mirk 3:29. Matthew records: "He that shall speak against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him neither in this world, nor in the world to come." Matt.

12:32. The Church of Rome which teaches directly contrary to Jesus Christ himself, cannot possibly be the true church of God.

OUR CONTROVERSY.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD.

CHURCH PROGRESS' FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE.

(August 29, 1891.)

Questions evaded, but not answered by the *Baptist*.

WHERE IS THE SCRIPTURE TO SHOW THAT THE CLAIM OF INFALLIBILITY IS UNSCRIPTURAL ?

WHERE IS THAT SUCCESSIVE LINE OF INFALLIBLE, IMPECCABLE, INSPIRED, MIRACLE-WORKING MEN, WHO HAVE ALWAYS TAUGHT GOD'S WORD INFALLIBLY ?

WHERE ARE THESE INFALLIBLE, INSPIRED, MIRACLE-WORKING TEACHERS TO-DAY ? WHERE IS THAT VISIBLE BODY NOW, AND WHERE HAS IT BEEN DURING THESE NINETEEN HUNDRED YEARS ?

WHERE ARE THOSE INFALLIBLE PROOFS IN THE SHAPE OF MIRACLES ?

WHERE IS THAT INFALLIBLE RULE OF FAITH WHICH HAS GIVEN THE LIGHT OF THE GOSPEL THROUGH ALL AGES TO THE PRESENT ?

WHERE IS THAT TRUE SUCCESSION OF INFALLIBLE TEACHERS AND DISCIPLES OUTSIDE OF AND INDEPENDENT OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH ?

BY WHAT AUTHORITY DOES THE BAPTIST ASSERT THAT THE THINGS WHICH ST. PETER SAYS MANY WREST TO THEIR OWN DESTRUCTION, ARE NOT ESSENTIAL TO SALVATION ?

HOW DOES THE BAPTIST DETERMINE WHAT IS AND WHAT IS NOT ESSENTIAL TO SALVATION ?

BY WHOM WHEN AND WHERE WAS THE PRESENT CANON OF REVELATION, AS ACCEPTED BY BAPTISTS AND PROTESTANTS, ACCEPTED AND ESTABLISHED BEFORE THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH EXISTED.

WHERE DID YOU GET YOUR SUNDAY ?

DID NOT CHRIST GIVE US A PERFECT RULE OF FAITH ?

DID CHRIST GIVE US THE BIBLE ?

WHERE DID YOU GET YOUR BIBLE ?

1. A lack of space in our last answer crowded out our reply in rebuttal of the *Baptist's* argument relative to the Sacrament of Holy Orders. We were surprised to see the *Baptist* accusing the Council of Trent of blasphemy in applying the language of Scripture itself to the priesthood. "Justly, therefore, are they called not only angels, but gods, holding, as they do, the place and power and authority of God upon earth." How did it happen that the *Baptist* failed to see the references in the text to the foot-notes on page 212 of the Catechism of the Council of Trent ? These foot-notes referred to Mal. ii. 7. "For the lips of the priest shall keep knowledge, and they shall seek the law at his mouth, because he is the Angel of the Lord of Hosts." And again to Psalms lxxxi. 6, "I have said: you are gods, and all of you sons of the Most High." If the Council blasphemes, so does Holy Writ. Of course the term *gods*, thus used by the Council and Scripture, means gods in the sense of one *divinely* commissioned and empowered with God's authority. Our Lord Himself granted His Apostles, and in them their successors, the priestly authority: "All power is given to me in heaven and earth: Going, therefore, teach ye all nations, baptizing them, etc." Math. xxviii. 18, 19, 20. Again: "He that despiseth you, despiseth Me. And he that despiseth me, despiseth Him

that sent me." Luke 10, 16. "Behold; I have given you power to tread upon serpents and scorpions, and upon all the power of the enemy; and nothing shall hurt you." Ibid. 19. "But the Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, He will teach you all things, and bring all things to your mind, whatsoever I shall have said to you." St. John xiv. 26. See same xiv. 16. "But when He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will teach you all truth, etc." St. John xvi. 13. "He said therefore to them again: Peace be to you: *As the Father hath sent me, I also send you.* When He had said this, He breathed on them; and He said to them: Receive ye the Holy Ghost; Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain they are retained." St. John xx. 21, 22, 23. "And He gave some Apostles, and some prophets, and other evangelists, and other some pastors and doctors, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." Eph. iv. 11, 12. "Remember your prelates, who have spoken the word of God to you; whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation." Hebrew xiii. 7. "Obey your prelates, and be subject to them." Ibid. 17. Thus does Scripture itself confirm the power and authority of the priesthood, representing God on earth.

2. As the *Baptist* reiterates the Pope Joan fable, as authentic history, we will explode the silly bubble for it. Appleton's American Encyclopedia calls her, "a fictitious female personage, who was long supposed to have succeeded Leo IV." and concludes its article in these words: "It (the Pope Joan fable) was completely disproved by David Blondel, a Protestant writer, in his "*Familier eclaircissement de la question si une femme a ete assise au siege papal entre Leon IV. et Benoit III.*" (Amsterdam 1649): and it is now generally admitted that no such person as Pope Joan ever existed." Pro-

testant historians of any note now reject the fable, amongst them Neander, Gieseler, and even Kurtz. "Perhaps the earliest writer," says Baring-Gould, a Protestant clergyman, "to mention Pope Joan is Marianus Scotus, who in his chronicle inserts the following passage: "A. D. 854, Lotharii 14, Joanna, a woman, succeeded Leo, and reigned two years five months and four days." Now Marianus Scotus lived over two hundred years after the supposed Pope Joan. No writer contemporary to the supposed Joan mentions her, and for over two centuries she is not heard of. Suppose we should state on our own bare authority, without it ever having been mentioned before, that Martin Luther was a woman! What weight would our statement have? So much for the historical value of Marianus Scotus and Monsieur de Cormenin as well, whose authority in things historical is about as good as the *Baptist's*, not to mention the Jansenist Du Pin. The first writer to give the particulars and details of that fictitious papal parade, in which the *Baptist* seems so to delight, is Martin Polonus, some four hundred and twenty years after the supposed reign of the fabulous Pope! But to the question of fact, leaving authority (?) aside. Leo IV. died on the 17th of July, and Benedict the III. was consecrated on the 1st of Sept., in the same year, so that it is impossible to insert between their pontificates a reign of two years, five months, and four days. What havoc the advocates of the Pope Joan myth make with chronology in trying to crowd two years and more into a short month and a half! This is a fair sample of the blindness of those who rake and scrape together all the possible filth in reach to fling at the Holy See. We hope the *Baptist* out of self-respect will drop this irrelevant method of controverting. Or is this its way of escaping the real behind the cloud of dust it kicks up over a false issue? For those who wish to gather fuller information upon this untenable myth we recommend the essay on

anti-Christ and Pope Joan in "Curious Myths of the Middle Ages," by S. Baring-Gould, M. A., a Protestant clergyman.

3. Really the *Baptist* wastes time and space in citing Mr. Gladstone against us. "Vaticanism" was a bitter polemic written against Catholics, distorting and misrepresenting the truth in exactly the same way as the *Baptist* does. The *Baptist* might with just about as much weight cite its own words as authority upon this subject. Cardinals Newman and Manning both effectually answered Gladstone. Did or did not the *Baptist* know this? The passage quoted from "Vaticanism" is based upon a gross misrepresentation of the subject in hand the "Matrimonial propositions" condemned by Pius IX. (1.) "The Sacrament of Marriage is nothing but what is accessory to the contract and separable therefrom and the Sacrament itself lies in the nuptial benediction alone." (2.) "By virtue of a merely civil contract true marriage can exist between Christians, and it is false either that the contract of marriage between Christians is always a sacrament, or that there is no contract if the sacrament be excluded." The doctrine which underlies the condemnation of the above propositions is simply this; that marriage is a sacrament conferring grace; like other sacraments it requires on the part of these administering (who are in this instance the contracting parties) the intention to do so: if they deliberately intend not to do so, and so exclude it, it is not conferred, and that the parties themselves are those who administer this sacrament, which depends therefore, on their intention, not on the nuptial benediction. The marriage contract is instituted by God; the state has nothing to do with it, except to secure and protect it by law. If a Christian man and woman choose to enter into an agreement to live together as man and wife by virtue of a *civil* contract, excluding in their doing so the intention of administering or receiving or of having anything to do with the Sac-

rament of Marriage, that contract has all the force that the State can give to it and no more. But our Lord has said that marriage is more than a civil contract "What God has joined together let no man put asunder". Therefore a merely civil contract between Christians, who deliberately refuse to bind themselves by the tie of the Christian sacrament, is in itself dissoluble, and is in its own nature a mere partnership dependent upon their wills and by the choice and intention of the parties a mere "concubinage". It would be absurd to suppose that the sacramental tie could exist when it was deliberately intended that it should not exist. Now Mr. Gladstone distorted these two condemned propositions into the following (13): "That marriage is not in its essence a sacrament." Quite a different thing from the proposition really condemned, *i. e.*, that the sacrament of marriage is only an accessory to the contract and separable from it, and only in the nuptial bond. (14.) "And that marriage not sacramenally contracted (*si sacramentum excludatur*) has a binding force." The propositions in question (not Mr. Gladstone's distortion of them) were condemned in order to uphold the sanctity and indissolubility of marriage. It is curious indeed to see the *Baptist* cite Mr. Gladstone waging an ignorant war upon the Church for condemning doctrines which would degrade Christian marriage to the level of a mere civil contract, and so make it, in its own nature, a partnership dissoluble at the will of the State, and subject to the caprice of the contracting parties. Witness our divorce scandals under the disastrous teaching that marriage is a mere civil partnership, and witness the conduct of the Catholic Church with regard to civil marriages or to the marriage of heretics in Catholic countries, and you will be furnished one of the most beautiful proofs of her faithfulness to her high commission for the benefit of Christian society, no greater mischief to which can possibly be imagined than the

reduction of marriage to that level to which it has always sunk when its sacred character has not been upheld. Now we want proofs, where and when "this horrible doctrine of Rome concerning marriage has become a dreadful fountain of corruption and immorality." This is a slander or true. Now prove that it is not a slander.

4. To the "tenth negative argument that the Sacrament of Penance is unscriptural we answer: "And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed in heaven" (Matt. 16, 19). "Amen I say to you, whatsoever you shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven" (Ibid. 18, 18). "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained" (John 20, 23). "And were baptized by Him in the Jordan confessing their sins" (Matt. 3, 6). "And many of them that believed came confessing and declaring their deeds" (Acts 19, 18). "Confess, therefore, your sins one to another" (St. James 5, 16).

5. In the same breath the *Baptist* denies and admits that the determination of the rule of faith is the real question at issue. First it avers that "this is not the proposition for discussion," and then a few lines below affirms in rebuttal to our hypothesis—"If the Bible be the sole rule of faith, then the Catholic Church is not the true Church of God"—that it has vanquished us by showing that the Catholic Church is not the true Church because, according to the *Baptist's* notion, it fails to agree with the Bible. If then the Catholic Church is false, because it conflicts with the Bible rule or standard, is that not to assume that the Bible alone is the sole rule of faith, and to establish that point is it not to utterly disprove the Catholic

claim? By its own method of argument the *Baptist* does admit that the question at issue is the determination of the rule of faith. The true religion is the rule of faith, the true Church is the rule of faith. Determine then what is the true rule of faith, and you have determined the true Church. This is the issue which the *Baptist* dare not face, and the issue to which it pretends we are irrelevantly dragging it. Here is a sure and easy way to victory, if it can establish this one point. Why not face it squarely? This is what its readers logically expect, and to run away from it is to admit to them that the *Baptist* cannot successfully meet it.

6. (a) Yes, we admit the canonicity and infallible authority of the Bible as interpreted by the Church, because the Catholic Church has canonized and authorized it. But why do you admit its canonicity and authority? That's the one question pertinent to the discussion. (b) How can you, who hold the Bible to be the *sole* rule of faith, prove "that the Catholic Church is destitute of the true tradition?" This is flat contradiction; ergo, nonsense. (c) Celibacy of the clergy is a disciplinary regulation, not a doctrine. Celibacy does not therefore conflict with Scripture. Does the *Baptist* affirm to say that this text means that a Bishop *must* marry? Because a man *chooses* not to marry is it dishonorable? (d) The Council of Hippo A. D. 393 first determined the Canonical books of Scripture, and among them the very books, which the *Baptist* falsely asserts were for the first time added by the Council of Trent. (e) How does the *Baptist* know Sunday was established by Christ and the Apostles? The Bible does not say so. (f) How does the *Baptist* determine apocryphal books of the Bible? (g) A bad Pope could not teach false doctrine for Christ promised the gates of hell should not prevail against His Church. (h) It is not we who have surrendered the Bible, but you who can't show title to its posses-

sion. (k) Answer the texts we brought forward last time to show that TRADITION was a proper and essential method of teaching amongst the Apostles. There were Traditions not written, and these St. Paul bids the brethren hold to; written word therefore not the sole rule. Answer our texts. A general denial does not answer. Prove your point.

THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

PROPOSITION: *Resolved that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*

CHURCH PROGRESS, Affirms.
AMERICAN BAPTIST, Denies.

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S FOURTEENTH NEGATIVE.
(September 3, 1891.)

Those questions have been answered.

1st. We knew full well that the Council of Trent, like the *Progress*, frequently refers to the Holy Scriptures, not as *the* Guide, but to wrest their meaning. In the temptation, Satan quoted the Scriptures in order to overthrow Christ. False teachers do the same. God's ministers are sometimes called messengers (*anggeloi*—angels), because they are *sent* of God. The term "gods" was applied to the Jewish political judges as the term "lords" is applied to certain civil officers in England. They were termed "gods" because they were divinely commissioned judges of the political commonwealth of Israel. These "gods" were civil "lords." The law says: "Thou shall not revile the gods, nor curse the ruler of thy people." Ex. 22:28. These political rulers, called gods, were to execute justice by defending the "poor and fatherless" and punishing the oppressors. But there are no such judges or officers in the New Testament churches. While ministers are messengers, they are not "gods" in the Old Testament sense of being judges. The term "prelate," Heb. 13:7, in the Rheimish Testament, is a false translation. A prelate has jurisdiction, by virtue of his office, not only over the membership, but over other ministers. There is no such an office known to the New

Testament. *Heegoumenos*, Heb. 13:7, cannot properly be translated *prelate*. In its connection, it properly means a leader, to take the lead, as a teacher. These New Testament rulers were elders but not "prelates." They ruled by teaching and example. A local church possesses the only ecclesiastical authority on earth. The ministers are officially servants of the churches. 2 Cor. 4:5. A local church, composed of men and women, has authority superior to a minister.

It is not true that the priests have all the power of Christ. Matt. 28:18; and because those who despise an apostle, also despise Christ, does not prove that the apostles were gods. Luke 10:16. Whatever is done to one of Christ's little ones, who are believers, is done to Christ himself. Matt. 25:40-45. This does not make a Christ of every little believer with power of absolution.

If the Popess Joan is a fable, it was gotten up and vouched for by Roman Catholic historians. The reign of Joan was much better than the average popes until her misfortune, while marching at the head of the procession of cardinals in Rome. The Romanist Cormenin refers to the manuscripts of different authors which "Marianus Scotus" left in the Abbey Fulda, dating back more than a hundred years prior to the time he wrote. Of course it was to the interest of Pope Benedict III. and his successors to suppress, as far as possible, the facts concerning the Popess Joan.

It is impossible for Joan to have been as bad as a long line of corrupt Roman Popes. The Roman historian, Joseph Reeve (of the eleventh century), says:

"Simony and incontinence had struck deep root among the clergy of England, Italy, Germany and France. The evil began under those unworthy Popes, who so shamefully disgraced the tiara by their immoral conduct in the tenth century; the scandal spread, and had now continued so long that the inferior clergy pleaded custom for their irregularities. Many even of the bishops were equally unfaithful to their vow, and with greater guilt. Hence

the corrupt laity being under no apprehension of reproof from men as deeply immersed in vice as they, gave free scope to their passions." History of the Church, p. 315.

3rd. Not so. Mr. Gladstone has proved himself one of the greatest friends that Romanists have ever had, outside of their own communion. The reader will re-examine Mr. Gladstone's criticism in the AMERICAN BAPTIST of August 20th. Every intelligent reader knows that Hon. W. E. Gladstone, formerly prime minister of England, was not "waging an ignorant war upon the Church of Rome." This charge is incorrect as well as extremely rash. The *Church Progress*, contrary to its own authorities has valid sacramental marriage, to depend alone on the private intentions of the contracting parties without the recognition of Church or state! According to this "horrible" position persons may secretly occupy the relation of husband and wife, without the knowledge of any except themselves!! But on the contrary, the Council of Trent says: "WITHOUT THE PRESENCE OF THE PARISH-PRIEST, OR OF SOME OTHER PRIEST COMMISSIONED BY HIM OR BY THE ORDINARY, AND THAT OF TWO OR THREE WITNESSES, THERE CAN BE NO MARRIAGE." Cat. p. 235. In the light of the canon law, the *Progress* has become heretical by sanctioning the monstrous position that persons may live together without any public recognition or marriage whatever. The Church of Rome which claims authority to dissolve marriage, as shown in our last, and that all marriages not sanctioned by herself are null and void, is not the true church of God. The theology of Rome teaches that "difference of religion is an impediment which makes marriage null and void between a baptized person and one who was never baptized." Liguori's Mission Book, p. 328. According to this doctrine, all non-Romanists, including Baptists and Protestants, who think themselves married, are living in "filthy concubinage." The Papal doctrine concerning mar-

riage is far worse than the abominable civil laws of divorce which tend to the corruption of society. The Roman law of divorce and nullification of marriage has proved a dreadful fountain of corruption in purely Papal countries. The facts will be established under another argument. The Scriptures recognize only one crime which dissolves the marriage relation. Jesus says: "And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery." Matt. 19:9. It appears from this that the crime of fornication or adultery constitutes a cause for which one may put away the guilty companion and marry another. But the Church of Rome, contrary to the will of Christ, binds an innocent person for life, to a vile prostitute.

4th. It was shown that the key power, Matt. 16:19 and 18:18, was not confined to Peter or the twelve apostles, but belonged to the church. See our third negative argument, May 14. The authority to forgive sins, John 20:23, is evidently parallel in teaching with Matt. 18:18, which simply confers authority to transact church business. The Savior said, "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained?" 1st. If this passage teaches that sinful men, ministry or priesthood, are to pardon sins in the sense of saving souls, then it is the only passage in the Scriptures which teaches this doctrine. 2nd. If this passage puts the salvation of sinners, in the sense of pardon, into the hands of the ministry, it contradicts the whole tenor of Bible teaching. For it is taught throughout the New Testament that every true heart believer is already saved, and has eternal life. See Luke 7:50; John 5:24; John 3:15,16. 3rd. If this passage teaches that the apostles and their successors had power to pardon and save souls, it is a remarkable

fact that they did not understand this passage. They never in a single instance pronounced *absolution* or pardon upon a penitent soul. They pointed the inquirer to Christ alone. At the house of Cornelius, in his sermon, Peter says: "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth on him shall receive remission of sins." Acts 10:43. When the jailor cried out, "Sirs what must I do to be saved?" Paul and Silas replied, "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and though shalt be saved." But the Romish priests directly contradict the teaching and practice of the apostles, and usurp the place of Jesus Christ himself, and profess to pardon sinners. The priest is required to say: "I absolve thee from thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." When did Peter or Paul, or any other apostle, pronounce such *absolution* or pardon upon any one? The apostles were not alone when the Savior uttered the remarkable language of John 20:23. The same events are recorded in the 24th chapter of Luke. After meeting the risen Savior the women "returned from the sepulcher and told all these things to the eleven and to all the rest." Luke 24:9. Here "all the rest" shows that there was a company of disciples associated together, more than the apostles. Added to these were "Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and the other women that were with them." Verse 10. "Also two of the disciples went that same day to a village called Emmaus." Verse 13. And after the Savior was made known to them "they rose up that same hour, and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together and them that were with them." Verse 33. These two disciples that went to Emmaus were not apostles.

"And as they thus spake, Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and said unto them peace be unto you. But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit.

And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." Luke 24:36-39.

This passage is evidently parallel with John 20:19-23.

From these Scriptures then it appears, beyond successful contradiction, that the words of the 23rd verse, "Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain: they are retained," was spoken to *the disciples*, the eleven and "*all the rest*"—the eleven "*and they that were with them*," which was the church of the Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore, these remarkable passages were not spoken to the eleven apostles, alone, or to the eleven as ministers of Jesus Christ. It was spoken to *the disciples*, the eleven with a number of brethren and sisters present. Even if this power to bind and loose, to remit and retain sins had been given to the apostles as such, then there would be no foundation for the Romish argument for the remission of sins by the priesthood. For if it was given to the apostles as apostles, it was confined to the apostolic office, and it ceased with the death of the last apostle. The important question now arises, What did the Savior mean when he said to the church (the disciples associated together in church capacity) "whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained?"

Some able Biblical critics and expositors interpret this passage as referring to the authority given to the church of Christ to preach the Gospel of salvation to the world. Thus God's people are instruments in the salvation of men. James says: "Let him know that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death and shall hide a multitude of sins." Jas. 5:20. But it is evident that this authority of *binding* and *loosing*, *retaining* and *remitting sins*, has reference to the authority given to the church to receive

or expel members, and do whatever a church of Christ is authorized by the New Testament to do. The church at Corinth was instructed by Paul to expel the incestuous man, thus: "In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ. To deliver such a one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." 1 Cor. 5:4, 5. Here the church exercised the key power of *binding on earth*. Also in the same chapter Paul says: "For what have I to do to judge them also that are without? Do not ye judge them that are within? But them that are without God judgeth. Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person." 1 Cor. 5:11-13. Here the church, with the authority of binding and loosing, were to "judge them that are within," and put "away from among yourselves that wicked person." This binding and loosing on earth, when scripturally done, is sanctioned in heaven. Again in the exercise of this key power of *remitting* and *retaining sins*, Paul instructs this same church to forgive the sorrowing penitent offender. He says:

Sufficient to such a man is this punishment, which was inflicted of many. So that contrariwise ye ought rather to forgive him, and comfort him, lest perhaps such a one should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow. Wherefore I beseech you that ye would confirm your love toward him. For to this end also did I write, that I might know the proof of you, whether ye be obedient in all things. To whom ye forgive anything, I forgive also, for if I forgave anything to whom I forgave it, for your sakes forgive I it in the person of Christ. 2 Cor. 2:6-10.

Here the church was to forgive sins, so far as those sins were against herself. "*To whom ye (the church) forgive anything, I forgive also.*" No apostle or minister of Christ in the apostolic age, ever, in even one instance, pretended to pardon sins committed against God. No one dared to usurp the power which belonged to God alone, to pardon and save

souls. This fact itself is sufficient to condemn the Romish claim of priestly absolution and pardon.

5th. The *Church Progress* having admitted the same inspired Bible as infallibly true, it is not necessary in this discussion to waste time discussing a point which is admitted on both sides to be true and infallible. This the *Progress* knows full well, but it dreads the Church question. After the present controversy shall have closed, if the *Progress* is anxious to debate the question of the Holy Scriptures, we will then give it an opportunity, provided it will affirm that *the Baptists, Protestants and all other religious denominations, are dependent upon the Roman Catholic Church for the Holy Scriptures called the Bible.* Notwithstanding its surrender of the Scriptures in its last, in this it quoted and misapplied them.

6th. In its opening affirmative, the *Progress* proposed to prove its proposition by the Bible, but it has been forced to confess that "IF THE BIBLE BE THE SOLE RULE OF FAITH, THEN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS NOT THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD. Here is the issue squarely and plainly put. Let the *Baptist* demonstrate that the Bible alone is the sole rule of faith, and it will vanquish us ignominiously." This amounts to the confession that the Bible gives no support whatever to the Roman Catholic Church. Every quotation from the Scriptures to sustain the Roman Church is a perversion. If unwritten tradition is a part of God's word and rule of faith, then it must harmonize with the inspired infallible Bible. Paul says: "It behooveth, therefore, a bishop to be blameless, and the husband of one wife * * * having his children in subjection with all chastity." 1 Tim. 3:2-4. From this it appears that the normal condition of a bishop is to have a wife and children, and that "marriage," as the apostle says, "is honorable in all." But the Roman Church by her anti-Bible tradition says that

marriage is not honorable in a bishop; also by "forbidding to marry" she teaches the "doctrines of devils." 1 Tim. 4:1-3. Though it is not the province of the church to force a pastor to marry, yet to forbid marriage is a mark of anti-Christ. The other questions have been already answered. Our *tenth negative argument* affirms that the Roman Church is not the true church of God, because of her *anti-scriptural* Confessional. While the Bible teaches the public confession of sins to God, and to those against whom we have sinned, it gives no sanction to the doctrine of the Confessional of Rome.

The Trent Catechism says:

"The penitent must also submit himself to the judgment of the priest, who is the vicegerent of God, to enable him to award a punishment proportioned to his guilt; and, hence, are clearly understood the nature and necessity of confession and satisfaction." p. 184.

In the secret confessional the subdued penitent must "submit himself to the judgment of the priest, who is the *vicegerent* of God," "to award a punishment proportioned to his guilt!" Here the priest is both supreme judge as Christ himself, and executioner to award punishment to soul or body, or both, as he may judge fit. In this tribunal or confession, a sinner must tell the priest all his sins. The Catechism, p. 190, says:

"Justly, then, do the Holy Fathers proclaim, that by the keys of the Church, the gate of heaven is thrown open; a truth which the decree of the Council of Florence, declaring that the effect of penance is absolution from sin, renders it imperative on all, unhesitatingly to believe. * * * On the same principle must it prove most salutary to those, whose minds are agitated by the consciousness of guilt, to make known the diseases and wounds of their souls to the priest, as the vicegerent of Jesus Christ, bound to eternal secrecy by every law human and divine."

Thus in the secrecy of the confessional, every one, whether man or woman, must plainly tell the priest every sin which may have been committed in thought, word or deed!! In this way the priest comes into possession of all the corruptions and

scandals of his parish. His ear and mind is made to become a sewer for the moral filth of the city or community. This *anti-scriptural* and abominable confessional opens the flood gates of moral pollution which inundates every community where Rome has entire control. The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God because of her anti-scriptural sacrament of Penance.

OUR CONTROVERSY.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD.

CHURCH PROGRESS' FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE.

(Sept. 5, 1891.)

Questions evaded, but not answered by the *Baptist*.

WHERE IS THE SCRIPTURE TO SHOW THAT THE CLAIM OF INFALLIBILITY IS UNSCRIPTURAL ?

WHERE IS THAT SUCCESSIVE LINE OF INFALLIBLE, IMPECCABLE, INSPIRED, MIRACLE-WORKING MEN, WHO HAVE ALWAYS TAUGHT GOD'S WORD INFALLIBLY ?

WHERE ARE THESE INFALLIBLE, INSPIRED, MIRACLE-WORKING TEACHERS TO-DAY ? WHERE IS THAT VISIBLE BODY NOW, AND WHERE HAS IT BEEN DURING THESE NINETEEN HUNDRED YEARS ?

WHERE ARE THOSE INFALLIBLE PROOFS IN THE SHAPE OF MIRACLES ?

WHERE IS THAT INFALLIBLE RULE OF FAITH WHICH HAS GIVEN THE LIGHT OF THE GOSPEL THROUGH ALL AGES TO THE PRESENT ?

WHERE IS THAT TRUE SUCCESSION OF INFALLIBLE TEACHERS AND DISCIPLES OUTSIDE OF AND INDEPENDENT OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH ?

BY WHAT AUTHORITY DOES THE BAPTIST ASSERT THAT THE THINGS WHICH ST. PETER SAYS MANY WREST TO THEIR OWN DESTRUCTION, ARE NOT ESSENTIAL TO SALVATION ?

HOW DOES THE BAPTIST DETERMINE WHAT IS AND WHAT IS NOT ESSENTIAL TO SALVATION ?

BY WHOM WHEN AND WHERE WAS THE PRESENT CANON OF REVELATION, AS ACCEPTED BY BAPTISTS AND PROTESTANTS, ACCEPTED AND ESTABLISHED BEFORE THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH EXISTED.

WHERE DID YOU GET YOUR SUNDAY?

DID NOT CHRIST GIVE US A PERFECT RULE OF FAITH?

DID CHRIST GIVE US THE BIBLE?

WHERE DID YOU GET YOUR BIBLE?

1. If the Bible is the sole rule of faith, then the Catholic Church is not the true Church of God. Such is the proposition the *Baptist* refuses to face. We will now take it upon ourselves to demonstrate its converse. If the Bible is *not* the sole rule of faith, then the Catholic Church is the true Church of God. We shall prove that the Bible cannot be the sole rule of faith. As an introduction of our argument we quote the following words of Prof. Thayer (a Protestant) of Harvard College, in relation to the recent discussion over Dr. Briggs and the Bible:

"The primitive Christians for generations were destitute of our collection of Bible records. These records came into existence gradually as the wisdom of the authors and the varying needs of the scattered bodies of believers dictated. More than a century elapsed before a collection of writings was framed together into a body of religious literature. There are evidences in the Bible itself that letters to the Thessalonians, Philippians and Corinthians from Paul's pen have been lost. Even the words and works of the Lord Himself have come down to us greatly abridged. Are the books that have been preserved inspired, and those that are lost not inspired? Such facts as these show that the Church produced the Bible and not the Bible the Church. They teach also that there is no historical warrant for setting this book up as the infallible and final appeal in all matters of belief and life. But the intrinsic characteristics of the Bible make still more evident the error of the view that the Scriptures are the only sort of divine authority."

The words of Prof. Thayer are all the more significant coming from a Protestant source; for his admission is really an abandonment of the Protestant position. But let us come to

some points made by Prof. Thayer. The primitive Christians were destitute of our collection of Bible records. If the Bible be the sole rule of faith it must have been so from the beginning. Our Lord could not have established two rules one of which would exclude the other. As it is clear that the primitive Christians did not have the Bible, on the supposition that the Bible alone is the rule of faith, then they had no rule of faith; they were deprived of the word of God; the preaching of the Apostles and the Disciples was in vain, for there could have been no rule or measure of the truth of the doctrine they preached and taught. Without the Written Word, on this theory, how were the primitive Christians to know that Paul and Peter and John and Matthew and Mark and Luke and Barnabas and James and the numerous other disciples, who were engaged in spreading the gospel, were preaching the true Word? They possessed no Bible, wherewith to measure the faith of their preachers. This was not the condition for one generation only; it remained the case for many generations. On this supposition then the primitive Christians could not have the word of God at all, or else the rule of faith in those primitive times was something other than the Bible. Is it not plainly absurd to say *that* the primitive Christians had no rule of faith? Is it not absurd to say that must be the rule of faith which plainly was an impossibility in the primitive Church? What then must have been the rule of faith in those early times? Nothing other than the Authority of the Apostolic body divinely commissioned to preach and teach the Word to all nations and all peoples, and with whom our Lord promised to be for all time and to whom he promised the spirit of all truth, in order that they might not fail in teaching His Word. This Apostolic Body, perpetuated throughout all time is His Church. It was the rule of faith in the beginning why should it not be now? It was the rule of faith

in the primitive Church, why not now? By whom or what could it be superseded? On whose authority was the primitive rule of faith disestablished? The rule of faith A. D. 100 must be the rule of faith A. D. 1900. The rule of faith A. D. 100 was the Church divinely authorized to teach the word of God. Therefore the rule of faith in the year 1900 must be the same Church divinely authorized to teach that same Word. The Bible or the written word did not then exist, and could not therefore have been the rule of faith. Hence it cannot now be the sole rule of faith; therefore the Catholic Church is the true Church of God.

2. (a.) The *Baptist* labors hard but in vain. The scriptural term *gods* is applied to both priests and judges, for the Jewish priests were also judges. But grant that it is only applied to judges, where is the blasphemy in calling priests *gods* and none in calling judges *gods*? Now as the council of Trent manifestly quoted scripture and so intended, plainly it used the term in the scriptural sense. If judges are to be called *gods* because divinely commissioned, how much more those divinely commissioned by Jesus Christ? Again if the Jewish priesthood were worthy of being called angels, viz., divine messengers, how much more the Christian priesthood of Christ, Who sent his priesthood as His Father sent Him. It is curious to see the *Baptist* declaring that the council of Trent *perverts* Scripture. (b) Where did the *Baptist* learn that *prelates* is a false translation of Hebrews xiii. 7? Here is an instance of the very thing in the Bible which the *Baptist* avers is not in it. Singular fatuity, to deny what is immediately under its eyes? Not only here but elsewhere is there mention of an hierarchy in the Bible. "And God indeed hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, second Prophets, third Doctors. . . ." 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29. Again "and He gave some Apostles, and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and other some pastors

and doctors." Here is an order of jurisdiction, some having authority and jurisdiction over others. (c) As Christ did not give to "little ones" power of absolution, no one denies or despises Him in denying them the power of absolution. But He did give such power to his apostles and their successors. (d) We have disposed of the Joan myth. We are satisfied to leave it to the honest reader to judge of its value and of the *Baptist's* insistence on it after such clear disproof. We leave the *Baptist* to its nauseating methods of stirring up filth to sling at the Church of Christ. It resorts to the old confusion of infallibility with impeccability. (e) As Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet "Vaticanism" is evidence of an ignorant war waged on Catholicity we are willing to leave the matter in the hands of the *intelligent* reader. The CHURCH PROGRESS did not say that the valid sacramental marriage depended *alone* on the private intention of the contracting parties. What the CHURCH PROGRESS did say, and what the Church teaches is, that *without* that private intention there is no sacramental marriage. This was said in contradistinction to those who tried to make out that the sacrament consisted in the nuptial blessing alone. It would be well for the *Baptist* to understand what we did say before attempting to answer us. Between an unbaptized person and a baptized person there is of course no sacramental marriage; for the Church teaches that Baptism is the sacramental gate to the Church, and there can be no reception of another subsequent sacrament without first having received Baptism. But this does not mean to say that the Church would allow people to be divorced, even if they had not been baptized, who had entered upon the marriage state in good faith and with the intention of Christian marriage. Let two Protestants who have entered the marital relation unbaptized and have become Catholics, try to get the sanction of the Church to a divorce. We warrant you that

they will find themselves bound as fast as if they had always been Catholics. We are constrained to tell the *Baptist* that its reiterated assertion that the Catholic doctrine of marriage has been a dreadful fountain of corruption either in Catholic or Protestant countries is a slander. Either it is bound to prove its words or in common decency retract them. (f) Even for adultery there can be no such thing as absolute divorce, i. e., the right to marry another. Our Lord's words mean that a man may separate from his wife for adultery, but He does not therefore give him the right to marry another. If this were not the true rendering of this text why should the other, who marries the adulterous wife, commit adultery by so doing, unless, though put away or separated, the adulterous wife is still bound to her husband. She may be separated "from bed and board" but never *a vincule*, that is, the indissoluble bond of marriage can not be severed. Therefore the Scripture recognizes no crime which dissolves the marriage relation. (g) Matt. xviii. 18, and John xx: 23 are more than parallel in teaching. One is a fuller and more specific declaration than the other, and the *Baptist* commits the absurd blunder of minimizing the fuller and completer meaning by endeavoring to restrict it to the lesser instead of explaining the vaguer by the completer text. The words are plain and explicit: "Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them; whose sins you shall retain they are retained." You cannot escape this plain teaching of our Lord by paralleling them with Matt. 18:18, and then pervert the passage in Matthew to mean simply the conferring of authority to transact church business. Where did the *Baptist* learn that this passage of Matthew simply conferred authority to transact church business? The evasion is nothing short of the ridiculous. Think of treating our Lord's most solemn declarations in this trivial, absurd style. "Amen, I say to you: whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound in heaven; and

whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed in heaven." And this solemn declaration and commission, the *Baptist* asserts, means that the "Church business you transact, such as, for instance, choosing the site of a church, or determining upon the style of architecture, or its size, or the material, whether of wood or brick or stone, these and other like things, as you shall bind them on earth shall be bound in heaven, and as you loose them on earth they shall be loosed in heaven." Spare us from the folly! And how can church business be *bound* and *loosed*? Nor is this the only passage in Scripture teaching the power of absolution. We quoted many for you last week. See our argument 4 of last week. Nor does this passage contradict the whole tenor of the Bible, for it is taught throughout the Bible that every true believer is saved by believing what Jesus Christ taught, and by hearing the Church teach what Christ commanded it to teach. He who will not hear the Church is to be treated as a heathen and a publican. It would be a *remarkable fact* if the Apostles did *not* understand this passage to give them the power of absolving sinners. Acts xix. 18 shows that they did so believe and so practiced, as also does St. James v. 16, and Matt. iii. 6, all of which we quoted last week. (g) Our Lord did confer the power of absolution or of forgiving sins upon his *disciples*. We don't deny that in the least. Nor were there any women present at the time. Luke 24, 10, warrants no such inference. Verse 10 narrates a different event from that of verses 36 to 39. But even if the women were present it is no reason to believe that the power of absolution was also conferred on them. The *Baptist* contradicts itself when it states that the power was also given to the disciples and the rest and then in the same breath declares it was given only to the apostles and confined to the apostolic office. Here is not only a contradiction but a further absurdity. If the power of forgiving sins

was to die with the apostles, as the *Baptist* asserts, then was the Church to die with them. If the apostolic office ceased at their death then the preaching of the Gospel was to die with them. But against this we have the divine promise that Christ would be with the *apostolic body*, teaching even to the end of time. Therefore is the apostolic body to exist to the end of time and therefore the power to teach the Gospel and to forgive sins, to bind and loose, retain and remit, was to continue forever in the perpetual apostolic body. To say that the power of binding and loosing was simply the power to receive or expel members is on a par with, and contradicts, the *Baptist's* assertion that Matt. 18, 18, simply conferred the authority to transact church business. Besides, this does not explain John 20, 23, where, in plainest terms, the power to *forgive* sins is conferred.

But the *Baptist* goes still further into the depths of absurdity. It has just argued that this text of John 20:23 meant the same thing as Matthew 18:18, viz: simply conferred the authority to transact Church business. It then tells us that Matt. 18:18 means more than this, viz., the power to receive or expel members, and now it goes still further and declares that it means that *the Church has power to forgive sins*. "Here the Church was to forgive sins, so far as those sins were against herself," are the *Baptist's* words. But did not the *Baptist* just say that the texts John 20:23 and Matt. 18:18 gave merely the power to transact Church business. Which meaning will the *Baptist* stick to? Again how can the Church forgive sins except through its proper and authorized officers, and how will the Church know what sins to forgive unless the sin be confessed to it. Let us pause. The confusion of the *Baptist* is overwhelming. We will return to the subject again next week with more space at our command.

THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

PROPOSITION: *Resolved that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*

CHURCH PROGRESS, Affirms.
AMERICAN BAPTIST, Denies.

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S FIFTEENTH NEGATIVE.

(September 10, 1891.)

Our readers know that we *have answered* that batch of questions. Any one of them which bears in the least upon the proposition, will receive further attention as we advance in the negative. If the *Church Progress* believes what it affirms, it will be willing to discuss the question concerning Rome's proprietorship and friendship for the Bible. 1st. We have already proved that the Bible contains the sole rule of faith. See BAPTIST of May 21, 28, and June 4. Therefore, as the Bible contains the *sole rule* of faith the Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God. The *Progress* has completely surrendered the Bible. We repeat:

In its third affirmative, the *Progress* said: "The Protestant appeals to the Bible. The Catholic appeals to the same Bible, plus tradition"; thus admitting the *same* Bible as others, excepting the "tradition." In its fifth affirmative, the *Progress* said:

"The Catholic Church holds and teaches that the Bible is the inspired word of God and therefore true: and this written word of God is as true as his spoken word: that the written word is as infallible as his spoken word."

Thus the *Progress* has admitted the *canonicity* and infallible authority of the "*same Bible*," which we protest contains the *sole rule* of faith and practice for the churches of Christ.

In its eleventh affirmative the *Progress* further admits that "the collection of books called the Bible by Catholics and Protestants, is of course the same book, but in the hands of Protestants its text has become corrupted and perverted." Every one with a grain of common sense can see that there is no necessity of discussing a point which is already admitted by the *Progress*. We have forced the *Progress*, to an unconditional surrender of the Bible. The *Progress* admits that: "IF THE BIBLE BE THE SOLE RULE OF FAITH, THEN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS NOT THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD. Here is the issue squarely and plainly put. Let the *Baptist* demonstrate that the Bible alone is the sole rule of faith, and it will vanquish us ignominiously."

This is a candid confession extorted from the *Progress*, under fire, that the Bible gives no support to the Roman Catholic Church. It is utterly condemned even by its own Bible. The Bible and the Roman Catholic Church are irreconcilable enemies. "If the Bible is the sole rule of faith, then the Catholic Church is not the true Church of God." The *Progress* boldly started to prove its Church claims by "the Bible;" but now it has surrendered the "Bible" citadel to us, and fled into the dismal swamp of human traditions: The quotation from Prof. Thayer is of no more authority than the *Progress* itself. However, it proves nothing in favor of the Roman Catholic Church. Prior to the collection of the New Testament writings into one book, the inspired speakers and writers were able to confirm the authority of the word delivered through them by the gift of tongues and other miracles. As the Roman Church cannot produce such proofs for her traditions they must be regarded as false. The disciples in the time of the apostles were enjoined to "continue in the same rule"—"walk by the same rule." This gospel rule of faith, which at the first was delivered orally, being confirmed by signs

and wonders, was committed to writing during the lifetime of the apostles. The New Testament Word of God was of as much binding authority in manuscript form in separate books, as since it has been collected into one book. The collection into one book, gives no authority to the New Testament writings which they did not have before. These writings were completed with the revelation to John. Any addition or subtraction involves the curse of God. The Lord says:

"For I testify to every one that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book: If any man shall add to these things, God shall add unto him the plagues written in this book. And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from these things that are written in this book." Rev. 22:18-19.

In the year A. D. 100, the entire New Testament rule of faith had been written and was contained in the inspired books of the New Testament, and of course was the sole rule of faith for the churches of Christ, which is the rule to-day. This Bible rule did exist then. The pretended argument of the *Progress* is illogical, absurd and even silly. It stands thus: A certain woman claims heirship to the large estate of a prince, but admits that her claim is not contained in the written will of the deceased. She affirms without proof that the written will is not the sole will of the deceased. She affirms that because the prince said many things not contained in the will that it is reasonable to suppose that the written document is not the sole will. Then she boldly affirms that the written document is not the sole will of the king, therefore, she must of necessity be the heir to the estate! This silly stuff the *Progress* calls argument! If the question of the church was to be settled, not by the Bible but by tradition, then the controversy would turn upon what was true tradition. Even on this supposition the Roman Catholic Church cannot be the true church of God,

because her traditions antagonize the inspired, infallible authoritative Word of God.

2nd. The Old Testament priests, who were political judges, were called "gods" or lords, not because they occupied the place, power and authority of God, but because they were God's messengers of justice to punish the wicked and vindicate the deserving. The priesthood under the law was only a type of the priesthood of Christ who offered, himself as the only real sacrifice for sins. There are no New Testament *priest gods*, with authority to judge, punish or absolve from sin. The "christian priesthood" is composed of God's children who are church members, who are "a kingly priesthood, a holy nation." 1 Peter 2:5. The New Testament furnishes no authority for calling the gospel ministers, as a separate class, priests. Christ is the only official Priest of the new dispensation. Instead of the apostles, prophets and teachers forming an hierarchy over the churches, they were only servants. Paul says: "For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus our Lord, and ourselves your servants through Jesus." 2 Cor. 4:5. In every case of discipline, it was the local church, composed of men and women, that acted. They received members, tried members, and excluded the unworthy. It was the church at Corinth that *forgave* the penitent transgressor. The power of absolution, in the sense of regeneration or the pardon of sins against God, was never committed to men or angels. The claim of such power is horrid blasphemy. The Savior was charged with blasphemy by the Scribes, because he said to the sick man "thy sins are forgiven thee". Matt. 9:2. If he had not been Divine, the real God, this language would have been blasphemy. None but God, according to the inspired Word, ever pronounced absolution in the sense of *the pardon* of sins against God. Peter was instructed to "forgive" his brother who might trespass against him "until seventy times seven

times." Matt. 18:21, 22. Every one who prays acceptably must "forgive men their offences". Matt. 6:14, 15. But because Peter was to forgive the brother who trespassed against him, and all Christians must "forgive men their offences," to wrest these Scriptures into priestly absolution is abominable. Any one may forgive a sin or trespass as far as it is against himself. The church has authority, as shown in our last, to forgive sins as far as those sins are against her, but this authority to absolve from sins against God, in the sense of saving souls, is blasphemy in the highest degree. We realize that it is nauseating to the *Progress* to be told of the filthiness of those Popes for whom it claims infallibility. According to the admission of Roman Catholic historians, scores of the Popes were fornicators, adulterers, seducers, murderers and blasphemers. The claim of infallibility for these incarnate fiends, called Popes, is utterly absurd and abhorrent to common sense, as well as the Scriptures. The infallible Word of God was not given to corrupt and wicked men, "but the holy men of God spoke, inspired by the Holy Ghost." 2 Peter 1:21. It is contrary to God's character and plan to commit his infallible Word to thieves, adulterers and murderers. The filth of which the *Progress* complains is the exceeding filthiness of the Romān Babylon which is described in Revelation as "the hold of every unclean spirit, and the hold of every unclean and hateful bird." Rev. 18:2.

3rd. If the *Progress* did not teach that persons with the "intention to do so" may unite and live together as husband and wife, without the church sacrament or recognition from the State, there is no sense in what it did teach. See last BAPTIST. Our allegations and arguments still hold against the Roman anti-scriptural sacrament of marriage. According to the doctrine of that Church there can be no marriage without the presence of the priest or other Roman official. According

to this all Protestants, unless married by the priests, are living in shame. Also, according to the proofs already introduced, no marriage can exist between a baptized and unbaptized person. See Mission Book, page 328. The *Progress* says: "But this does not mean to say that the Church would allow people to be divorced, even if they have not been baptized, who had entered upon the married state in good faith and with the intention of Christian marriage." But, according to the Church of Rome, they are not married at all, and of course could not be divorced. According to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, Protestants are living in concubinage, unmarried, unless they have been married by a priest.

"In 1870 Wm. Grant was married to Mary Reilly by a Protestant minister. Though Mr. Grant was not baptized, his marriage was supposed to have been made lawful by his baptism in 1878 and his subsequent living with her. The case was the first tried before Bishop McMahan of Hartford, who decided that his marriage was valid. The case was then appealed to Archbishop Williams of Boston, who reversed the decision of the Hartford court on "the grounds that there was no proof of Mr. Grant's baptism previous to 1870, and that the mere living with Mary Reilly after baptism did not make the marriage valid. He therefore concluded that the first marriage was always null and hence the second, properly contracted, is the only valid one in the eyes of the Catholic Church." *Western Watchman* of May 28, 1887.

Thus the marriage of a Romanist with an unbaptized person by a Protestant minister is declared null and void and the Church gives her sanction to the adulterous marriage of Mr. Grant with another woman while his lawful wife is living. Such is the corruption of the Roman doctrine of marriage. According to this abominable doctrine any person married by a Protestant may leave his wife, join the Roman Church and be married to another woman with the full sanction of that Church. The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God because of her anti-scriptural, horrible sacrament of marriage.

4th. The *Progress* has totally perverted our position and arguments concerning John 20:23. We neither said nor thought that Matt. 18:18 had reference to building church houses, etc. That quotation put in our mouth is a pure and unmitigated fabrication. We distinctly said "that this authority of binding and loosing, retaining and remitting sins, has reference to the authority given to the church, to receive or expel members and to do whatever a church of Christ is authorized by the New Testament to do." This is the transaction of church business. The *Progress* should apologize for its gross misrepresentation. Of course the one guilty of trespass must hear the church or be treated as an heathen. But the church is neither the Pope, Bishop or Priest, but the local congregation of men and women, which has authority to bind and loose. See 1 Cor. 5:5 and 2 Cor. 3:6-10. Let the reader turn to the last week's issue and read again our exposition of John 20:23. Is it a misrepresentation. We did not say that this power of binding and loosing "was given only to the apostles and confined to the apostolic office." We stated that if this power had been given alone to the apostles, as such, it would have ceased at the death of the last apostle. We were only showing the utter absurdity of the Roman argument. The promise of perpetuity was to the church not to the so-called "apostolic body." Matt. 16:18. It is the *Progress* that is overwhelmed with confusion.

The Roman Church has grossly wrested and perverted the command of Christ to repent into their "do penance"! Gospel repentance does not require the punishment of the body for the sin of the soul. The Council of Trent says: "And this sacrament of penance is, for those who have fallen after baptism, necessary unto salvation; as baptism itself is for those who have not as yet been regenerated." Decrees, p. 94. We have already shown that in the Roman sacrament of penance,

the priest is to be regarded as Jesus Christ himself, the supreme judge and executioner, to deal out punishment to the guilty. Alone with the priest the penitent is to tell all the wounds of his soul to this "vicegerent of Jesus Christ, bound to eternal secrecy." Thus the wife or daughter, alone with the priest, must answer, on pain of damnation, the most vulgar and obscene questions which can be conceived. Thus thousands have been polluted and led to ruin. The Council of Trent says: "It also teaches that even priests, who are in mortal sin, exercise, through the virtue of the Holy Ghost, which was bestowed in ordination, the office of forgiving sins, as the ministers of Christ; and that their sentiment is erroneous who contend that this power exists not in bad priests." Decrees, p. 100. Thus the doctrine of the Church of Rome is that the most devilish, drunken, treacherous priest that ever existed may hear confessions and grant absolution from sins! The Garden of the Soul is a Manual of Devotion by the late Bishop England and endorsed by the late Bishop Hughes. It was published for common use by Roman Catholics. Among the questions propounded by the priest in the secret confessional to men, women and children, who have reached accountability, we have: "Have you been guilty of fornication, or adultery, or incest, or any sin against nature, either with a person of the same sex, or with any other creature? How often? Or have you designed or attempted any such sin, or sought to induce others to it? How often?" Garden of the Soul, p. 213. The questions which follow these are still more degrading, if possible. Modesty is put to blush. Such questions, and even more polluting, are asked by the priest alone in the confessional of young ladies and girls who are not more than twelve or fourteen years of age. Such is the horrible rottenness and filth of the confessional of Rome. We only mention these abominations to arouse Romanists and others to the necessity

of abolishing this anti-scriptural confessional. The Romanist Deharbe, in his Catechism, which is endorsed by Cardinals Wiseman and McCloskey, on page 277 has the following: "10. But could we not also receive forgiveness of our sins by confessing them to God alone?

By no means; or else the full power which Christ gave to the priests, of retaining or remitting them according to their judgment, would indeed be vain and useless." According to this horrible blasphemy God himself has no power upon earth to forgive sins. This power has been committed to the priests, and even the most corrupt priest has power to pardon sins, while God himself cannot! The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God because of her anti-scriptural and polluting sacrament of oricular confession and penance.

OUR CONTROVERSY.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD.

CHURCH PROGRESS' SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE.
(September 12, 1891.)

WHERE DID YOU GET YOUR SUNDAY?
DID NOT CHRIST GIVE US A PERFECT RULE OF FAITH?
DID CHRIST GIVE US THE BIBLE?
WHERE DID YOU GET YOUR BIBLE?

2. Nowhere do the Holy Scriptures themselves put forth any claim to be the sole rule of faith. But in numerous passages do we find the Scriptures testifying to the Church as the rule and authority in matters of faith. It is evident then, according to Holy Scripture itself, that the written word is not the sole rule of faith, but that Word, written or unwritten, as taught and preached by the Apostolic Body, which is the teaching Church, is the rule and guide of faith. On the authority of the Church we read: Matt. xvi. 18. "And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Matt. xviii. 17: "And if he will not hear them, tell the Church. And if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican." Matt. xxviii. 18-20: "And Jesus coming spoke to them saying: All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. Going therefore teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold I am with you all days, even to

the consummation of the world." Mark xvi. 15: "And He said to them: Go ye into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature." Luke x. 16: "He that heareth you heareth me; and he that despiseth you despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth Him that sent me." John xiv. 16-18: "And I will ask the Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete, that He may abide with you forever, the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not nor knoweth Him; but you shall know Him, because He shall abide with you, and shall be in you. I will not leave you orphans; I will come to you."

John xvi. 13: "But when He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will teach you all truth. For He shall not speak of Himself; but what things soever He shall hear, He shall speak, and the things that are to come, He will show you." All these texts are the solemn declarations of our Lord Himself constituting the divine authority of His Church in the Apostolic Body and their successors. In these words He commissions them and AUTHORIZES them to teach the Word, and with equal solemnity promises them that He Himself will abide with them to the end of the world, and that the Spirit of all truth in them shall instruct them in all truth and that they shall never teach error. He clearly and emphatically places His own divine authority in *them*, with equal emphasis and solemnity promises them the Spirit of truth both to instruct them and to preserve them from error. He thus makes them (the Apostolic Body) the authorized guide and rule of faith. They are its custodians and its interpreters. In the commission to teach all nations, He necessarily implies that all nations are bound in obedience to hear the authority He constitutes to teach them, and moreover He explicitly declares that those who obstinately refuse to hear the Church are as heathens and publicans to be cast out. He also as solemnly asseverates that the gates of hell (the gates

of error) shall never prevail against His Church. Here then we have Scripture giving authority in emphatic terms, and commanding all to listen to and obey that authorized guide of the faith. That this authority and guidance was so understood and exercised by the Apostolic Church we have the following texts from Scripture to confirm. Acts xv. 28:41: "For it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay no farther burden upon you than these necessary things. And he (Paul) went through Syria and Cilicia confirming the churches; commanding them to keep the precepts of the Apostles and ancients." See also ib. xvi. 4. Acts xx. 28. "Take heed to yourselves and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops to rule the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood." 1 Cor. xii. 28:29. "And God indeed hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, secondly Prophets, thirdly Doctors; are all Apostles? are all Prophets? all Doctors?" Ephes. iv. ii-14. "And He gave some Apostles and some prophets and other some evangelists and other some pastors and doctors; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ until we all meet in the unity of the faith, and of knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the age of the fullness of Christ; that henceforth we be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about by every wind of doctrine by the wickedness of men, by cunning craftiness by which they lie in wait to deceive." 1 Tim. iii. 14-15: "These things I write to thee, hoping I shall come to thee shortly. But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth." Heb. xiii. 7, 17: "Remember your prelates who have spoken the Word of God to you: whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation. Obey your prelates, and be subject

to them. For they watch as being to render an account to your souls." 1 John iv. 1, 6. "Dearly beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits if they be of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world. We are of God. He that knowest God heareth us. He that is not of God, heareth us not. By this we know the spirit of truth and the spirit of error." In these words of the Apostles themselves, recounted in Scripture, we see how the Apostles understood the Word of our Lord in making them the guide and authority in matters of faith. It is the Apostles and Prophets and Doctors and prelates who are the teachers and expounders of the Word; in them resides the authority, and the Holy Spirit, teaching them all truth abides with them. And St. John expressly tells us that the test between the spirit of truth and the spirit of error for the faithful lies in *hearing* the Word of God from the Apostolic body, divinely sent to teach that Word.

It is very patent then, from Scripture itself, that the written word is not the sole rule of faith, and that the guide and authority in matters of faith is the Apostolic body, teaching and expounding the word in the truth of the Holy Spirit, which had been promised them. Furthermore we learn from Holy Scripture itself, that there is an unwritten as well as a written Word of God. This unwritten Word is spoken of as follows in Scripture; the word of God *spoken* (Acts iv. 31). The Word of Faith *preached* (Romans x. 8). The Gospel *heard* and *preached* (Colossians i. 23). The Word of God *received, heard, believed* (1. Thes. ii. 13). The Word of Christ *heard* (Rom. x. 27.) St. Peter says, 1. Ep. i. 25: "But the Word of the Lord endureth forever, and this is the *Word* which hath been *preached* to you." This unwritten Word is what is called Tradition. Speaking of this unwritten Word or Tradition St. Paul says, "For I have DE-

LIVERED unto you first of all, which I also RECEIVED" (i. Cor. xv. 31). And again writing to St. Timothy, he says: "The things which thou hast HEARD of me by many witnesses, the same command to faithful men, who shall be fit to TEACH others also." It is very clear then that the written Word itself not only declares that the teaching authority, and therefore the guide and interpreter of faith, resides in the Apostolic Body, but also testifies to the existence of an unwritten Word which resides in the Apostolic Body, whose expounder and interpreter that body also is. The unwritten Word is the Tradition which St. Paul bids the brethren stand in and holdfast to (2 Thess. ii. 14). It is patent then that the Bible, which is the written Word, cannot be the sole rule of faith. Therefore the Catholic Church is the true Church of God.

(a) The *Baptist's* "proofs" that the Bible contains the sole rule of faith, May 21, 28 and June 4, consist of a series of italicised assertions "that the Catholic Church is not the true Church because she rejects the Bible standard of authority," in which gratuitous assumption neither the assertion is proved nor the reason given for it. (b) Yes, we admit the truth of the Bible and give a reason; you admit the Bible but *without a reason*. You do not, therefore, give a reason for the faith that is in you, as St. Paul says. The discussion of the canonicity of the Bible is a discussion of that reason, which you shirk from attempting. Hence the *common sense* of discussing this very necessary point. To say that the Bible is not the sole rule of faith is not to surrender it, nor does it give the least color to the violent assumption that, therefore, the Bible gives no support to the Catholic Church. Because the Bible does not contain every truth of revelation and because it contains certain truths in an incomplete form, there is no warrant for the conclusion that therefore it gives no support to such truths as may not be contained in it or are imperfectly in it, or that

there are not some revealed truths which are not explicitly expressed in, nor can, and should be, logically inferred from it. The Catholic Church declares that the Bible does contain true revelation, but not the whole of revelation, and she alone has authority to declare the authenticity of that part of revelation which the Bible does contain. Her authoritative seal upon such part of revelation, as is contained in the Bible, alone establishes its canonicity. The *Baptist* denies that authority and therefore the canonicity of the Bible. Here is the reason it is afraid to discuss this point. Prof. Thayer was not quoted as *authority*. But he is a striking evidence of the entire lack of authority in Protestantism; for his *opinion* is as good as any Protestant's on the principle "that every humble Christian may go to the Bible and find in it the guide of faith for himself," a principle repeatedly asserted by the *Baptist*. (c) The admission that the gospel was originally delivered orally, with its cognate points, we will take up next week little to the *Baptist's* delectation we promise. (d) The *Baptist's* illustration of a certain woman claiming heirship is absurdly infelicitous. The Bible is not in the least analogous to a will, nor does the Catholic Church claim to inherit an estate from the dead apostles; she is the APOSTOLIC BODY WITH WHOM CHRIST PROMISED TO ABIDE UNTO THE CONSUMMATION OF THE WORLD. SHE IS A PERPETUAL LIVING WITNESS TO HIM FOREVER. (e) So those sent by Christ as His Father sent Him are not priests; so there is no priesthood required, in the new dispensation, to teach all truth to all nations, to minister unto the faithful, etc.; and so the priesthood of the old law is more excellent in dignity than the priesthood of the new? We will leave the *Baptist* to its depreciation of the Christian dispensation. A hierarchy may indeed be servants of the faithful. The Pope styles himself "the servant of the servants of God," and yet he has supreme jurisdiction. (f) "Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins

you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; whose sins ye shall retain they are retained." This is Christ's grant of the *power of absolution*. The *Baptist's* charge of Blasphemy is but a repetition of the charge of the Scribe's. "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those that trespass against us," is the meaning of the instruction to Peter, a very different thing from forgiving and *retaining* sin. One text means not to bear malice against those who offend or injure us, incumbent upon every one; and here there is no formal grant to *retain* sins. The other text gives the power to *forgive and retain*, not against one injuring us in the sense of cherishing no malice, which would be absurd with this text, but to bind or loose the sinner with the power and authority of Jesus Christ, who clearly and distinctly and formally and solemnly delegates that power with the gift of the Holy Spirit. (g) The *Baptist* did say, "The authority to forgive sins, John 20:23, is evidently parallel in teaching with Matt. 18:18, which *simply confers authority to transact church business*." After thus minimizing this text, the *Baptist* contradicted itself in attempting to explain away its true meaning. We leave it to its own inextricable confusion. We clearly indicated the hypothetical character of the *Baptist's* argument relative to John 20:23, and then showed its absurdity. The Apostolic Body is the teaching Church. Therefore the promise of infallible teaching and all other powers were given to it. (h) Of course the priest forgives sins as the viceregent of Christ and by the power delegated to him by Christ. How else could he forgive sins? Not by his own power surely? The priest asks no such questions as the *Baptist* quotes from the Garden of the Soul. The *Baptist* has ludicrously mistaken a *private examination of conscience*, printed in this prayer book for the use of the penitent in order to bring to mind the sins he is about to confess. Its fatuous attempt to besmirch the sacred tribunal of penance, instituted by our Lord Himself, recoils upon

its own head. The abominations are all in its own imagination. The argument that God Himself cannot forgive sins on earth because Our Lord established a tribunal of penance is too absurd for consideration. (i) The *Baptist* declaiming last week against the Sacrament of Marriage said: "According to this horrible position persons may occupy the relation of husband and wife without the knowledge of any one except themselves!!!" This week it declares, "According to the doctrine of that Church, there can be no marriage without the presence of the priest or other Roman official." Will the *Baptist* stick to one distortion or the other? neither is the truth. A marriage lawfully contracted is indissoluble. A marriage not lawfully contracted is no marriage. A lawful marriage in the Christian sense is one where the parties intend to fulfill all the required conditions, and so intend to enter upon Christian marriage, be they Protestants or Catholics. Where the parties intend not to enter upon Christian marriage, and intend to make a mere civil contract, a civil partnership, there is no lawful and Christian marriage.

When the contract is merely civil, and intentionally so, it is dissoluble by the civil power. A Catholic marrying an unbaptized person knowingly, refuses sacramental and lawful marriage, and in that very fact intends not to make a lawful and Christian marriage. That is the sum and substance of the Catholic doctrine. In order to safe-guard and protect the sanctity of marriage, which Christ made a Christian institution, the Church declares that the civil power has no right to marry, and the propositions, about which Mr. Gladstone made such a fuss and so grossly misunderstood, declared a doctrine contrary to the doctrine of the Church and were condemned in consequence. The full fact of the case of Wm. Grant and Mary Reilly cited by the *Baptist* are not known to us, nor evidently are they known to the *Baptist*; we cannot therefore

pass upon it any more than the *Baptist* without knowing these facts. PROVE YOUR POINT THAT CATHOLIC MARRIAGE HAS BEEN A FOUNTAIN OF CORRUPTION IN CATHOLIC OR PROTESTANT COUNTRIES OR STAND CONVICTED OF WILFUL SLANDER.

THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

PROPOSITION: *Resolved that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*

CHURCH PROGRESS, Affirms.
AMERICAN BAPTIST, Denies.

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S SIXTEENTH NEGATIVE.

(September 17, 1891.)

The Christian Sabbath was established by the example of Christ and his apostles centuries before the Church of Rome was born. Christ gave the perfect rule of faith in the New Testament. Christ as God gave the Old Testament, through holy men, by the Holy Spirit, and the New Testament Scriptures were also given by Jesus Christ, through inspired men of God. Therefore we have the Bible from Jesus Christ. 1st. The Progress has admitted "the same Bible" with us, as the inspired Word of God and infallible, but confesses that "if the Bible be the sole rule of faith then the Catholic Church is not the true Church of God." With this confession, there is no necessity under the Church proposition of discussing the history of the Bible. According to these confessions, the Bible gives no support to the Roman Catholic Church. If traditions should be admitted, then they must harmonize with the inspired infallible Word. The Roman traditions contradict this infallible Word. Therefore the Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God.

2nd. In its former affirmatives the Progress labored earnestly to prove that the Pope was the *only infallible teacher* in the Church, but now in its confusion, it tries to establish the

"Apostolic Body"—"the teaching Church"—as the infallible authority!! The *Progress* says:

"The written Word is not the sole rule of faith, but that Word, written or unwritten, as taught and preached by the Apostolic Body, which is the teaching Church, is the rule and guide of faith." "All these texts are the solemn declarations of our Lord Himself, constituting the divine authority of His Church, in the Apostolic Body and their successors." "He thus makes them (the Apostolic Body) the authorized guide and rule of faith." So "that they shall never teach error." "It is the apostles and prophets and doctors and prelates, who are the teachers and expounders of the Word; in them resides the authority, and the Holy Spirit, teaching them all truth, abides with them!"!

To establish the infallibility and divine authority of this apostolic body as the teaching Church, the *Progress* quotes Matt. 16:18, 18:17, 28:18-20, etc., the very same Scriptures which it has quoted to prove that the Pope of Rome was the only infallible teacher! See the *Progress's* third and fifth affirmatives. If these Scriptures prove that the *Pope alone* is the infallible teacher of the Church, then they cannot possibly prove that this so-called "Apostolic Body" or "teaching Church," are also infallible teachers. Will the *Progress* tell in which case it has wrested and perverted the Scriptures? Speaking of the gift of infallibility, in its third affirmative, the *Progress* said: "We proceed to show scripturally that the gift we speak of resides in the head of the Church, the Pope of Rome." But now it has found this *same gift* in the "teaching Church" of more than 10,000 infallible teachers.

In its sixth affirmative the *Progress* said:

"When the Pope speaks in this wise it is the Church speaking. When I speak by my mouth, it is not merely my mouth speaking, it is the man speaking. The faculty of speech may reside in the organ of speech, yet it is the man who speaks. The gift or faculty of infallibility resides in the head of the Church, yet it is the Church who speaks." See AMERICAN BAPTIST, June 4th.

According to the *Progress*, heretofore the infallibility belonged alone to the Pope, but now it has made an argument

from the same Scriptures to prove that there are thousands of infallible teachers, who cannot possibly err in doctrine! Has the *Progress* gone back on the infallibility of the Pope? Is it not liable to his anathema for heresy?

3rd. As already shown the inspired Gospel was committed to writing before the death of the last apostle. This same Gospel of the kingdom was to be preached orally to the end of the world, having the written New Testament as its standard. The bare statement of the *Progress* that the written word cannot be the sole rule of faith, and therefore the Catholic Church is the true Church of God, is supremely nonsensical. If tradition was admitted as equal authority with the Word, then it would be easy to prove that the Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God because her traditions antagonize the infallible written Word. We are *reasoning* concerning the faith and practice of Rome instead of wasting time on outside issues. The Old Testament Bible is called a will or testament—*diatheke*. 2 Cor. 3:14. Like the present Romanists, the Israelites "until this present day, the self same veil, in the reading of the old testament, remaineth not taken away (because in Christ it is made void.)" 2 Cor. 3:14. The Greek word for testament means a *will*, as well as covenant. The Old Testament writings contained God's *written will*. The New Testament writings are the *written will* and testament of Jesus Christ. That impudent woman who claims the estate of the prince on an unwritten traditional will is a false claimant. Jesus Christ is the only High Priest of the New Testament, who has passed within the veil, to make intercession for us.

4th. The reader is referred to our former articles for the exposition of John 20:23. The priest who pretends to forgive sins as the vicegerent of Jesus Christ, is a blasphemer. The priest does ask such foul questions as the BAPTIST quoted from the Garden of the Soul. This examination of the conscience

is such as is made by the priest in the deep secret of the confessional, where he propounds the vilest and most vulgar questions to men, women and young girls, that Satan himself could invent. The questions in the Garden of the Soul, an endorsed Roman Catholic work, are not private questions propounded by the penitent to himself. The answers to such foul questions are to be made to the priest in the secret place of the confessional. The penitent "kneeling down at the side of your Ghostly Father" must tell in the ear of the priest all of his or her sins of thought or deed. The confessional is so intolerably filthy, that to tell what transpires between the priest and the penitent would abolish the confessional at once. No decent father, husband or brother, if he knew the foul and polluting conversation which passes between his daughter, wife or sister, and the priest, would tolerate such desecration and pollution of the family relation for a day.

The Decrees of the Council of Trent require a penitent to declare "specifically and one by one," every sin "even though these sins be most hidden and committed only against the two last precepts of the decalogue." "All mortal sins, even though of thought" must be confessed to the priest god. Alone in secrecy, the priest must thus know every sin with all the circumstantial details, or "it cannot be that they can estimate rightly the grievousness of the crimes, and impose on the penitents the punishment which ought to be inflicted on account of them." Decrees pp. 97 and 98. The Council of Lateran decreed that every Romanist must make confession at least once a year, though they are encouraged to go to confession very often. As an example of the corrupt fruits of the confessional, we refer to a case which was reported in the *London Standard* in 1886, of three children who had their mother go to confession, preparatory for heaven, and then burned her to death to get her property, after which they con-

fessed their crime to the priest and got absolution. The criminals were convicted and punished for their horrible crime, by the civil court. The question arose "if a priest would be justified in allowing an innocent man to be convicted after he had heard the confession of the real criminal." The answer was given by the *Western Watchman*, from which we clip as follows:

"A priest who would be guilty of revealing what is communicated to him in the Sacrament of Penance becomes an object of universal horror, and the Church has but one penalty for him; detrusion in a prison for life. It may be true or it may not, that the sacramental seal was never violated; one thing is certain, there was never yet a conviction under the law.

The theory of the Church is that the secrets of the confessional are not confided to a man, but to Christ himself who is represented by the priest. St. Peter told Ananias and Sapphira that they had not lied to man but to God. The priest is the ear of God to hear and the arm of God to smite or spare the offending Christian. A priest would not betray his penitent to save ten thousand lives. A husband must not inform on his wife or a mother against her child; for much greater reason may a priest not expose the crime of the poor wretch who tremblingly confesses at his feet." *Western Watchman*, December 25, 1886."

Thus the priest, who really becomes accessory to the crime by pretending to pardon the guilty wretches, would not tell who the guilty party is *to save 10,000 innocent lives!!!* These children believing the Roman doctrine of absolution, doubtless concluded that their mother would be better off in heaven, and after absolution, they would send her forward and get her money, and immediately get absolution from the priest and be as innocent as if they had never sinned. Had it not been for the doctrine of the confessional these children would not have had the temptation to commit this horrible crime.

5th. In its 14th affirmative the *Progress* took the position that the administrators of marriage were the "contracting parties" themselves "and that the parties themselves are those

who administer this sacrament, which depends therefore, on their intention, not on the nuptial benediction." In our reply we said. "The *Church Progress* contrary to its own authority has valid sacramental marriage to depend alone on the private intention of the contracting parties without the recognition of church or state! According to this 'horrible' position, persons may secretly occupy the relation of husband and wife without the knowledge of any except themselves!!! But, on the contrary the Council of Trent says: 'Without the presence of the parish-priest, or some other priest commissioned by him or by the ordinary, and that of two or three witnesses, there can be no marriage.'" Catechism 235. The *Progress* knows full well that the only contradiction in this is its own contradiction of the doctrine of the Church of Rome. The Romish Church positively teaches that all marriages except such as are performed by Roman officials, are null and void, and that even marriages performed by a priest, between a Romanist and unbaptized person, are null and void. The case of Wm. Grant is only an example where Rome put in practice her horrible doctrine of dissolving marriage. She put her seal of approbation upon his adulterous marriage with another woman while he had another wife. For proof of the corrupting tendency of the Romish doctrine of dissolving marriage we refer the *Progress* to the state of morals in such Romish countries as Italy, Mexico and Brazil. 6th. The *Progress* says: "The argument that God himself cannot forgive sins on earth because Our Lord established a tribunal of penance is too absurd for consideration." But it is the doctrine of the Roman Church all the same. We repeat:

The Romanist Deharbe, in his Catechism, which is endorsed by Cardinals Wiseman and McCloskey, on page 277 has the following: "10. But could we not also receive forgiveness of our sins by confessing them to God alone? By no means; or else the full power which Christ gave to the priests, of retaining or remitting them

according to their judgment, would indeed be vain and useless." According to this horrible blasphemy, God himself has no power upon earth to forgive sins. This power has been committed to the priests, and even the most corrupt priest has power to pardon sins, while God himself cannot. The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God because of her anti-scriptural and polluting sacrament of oricular confession and penance.

Once more, concerning the Popess Joan, it is not surprising that a strenuous effort was made to expunge her from history. Cormenin says:

"It is equally impossible to admit, that a man of the character of Marianus Scotus would have filled his chronicles with an adventure so singular, if it had not been true. Still, admitting that he was capable of such an imposture, is it probable that the popes who then governed the church, would have kept silence on this impiety? Gregory the Ninth, the proudest of the pontiffs, the most impassioned in his pretensions for the infallibility of the Holy See, would he have suffered a monk to dishonor the court of Rome with so much insolence? Would Victor the Third, Urban the Second, Pascal the Second, contemporaries of Marianus, have suffered this outrage with impunity? Finally, would the ecclesiastic writers of his age, and especially the celebrated Alberic of Monte Cassino, so devoted to the popes, have failed to rise up against such an infamy?" p. 226.

While a goodly number of Roman Catholic historians assert confidently the history of Popess Joan, the silence of others who were ashamed of her, proves nothing. The catalogues and dates of the reigns of the popes, as given by Romanists, differ from each other. Names and dates have doubtless been inserted to suit the necessities.

ELEVENTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God because of her unscriptural hierarchy.*

The Scriptures quoted by the *Progress* to prove that Bishops, rather pastors, had authority to rule the church, are misunderstood and therefore perverted. The same is true of its use of Hebrews 13:7, 17. The pastors are to rule by teaching the Scriptures and by example only. No elder, pastor or evangelist has the slightest ecclesiastical authority over the church.

The seven orders of ecclesiastics above the membership mark the Church of Rome as the false Church. Acts 15:22, in the same chapter referred to by the *Progress* it is said: "Then it pleased the apostles and ancients with the church, to choose men of their own company, and to send to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas, namely Judas, who was surnamed Barsabas, and Silas, chief men among the brethren." It was the whole Jerusalem church, composed of men and women, that sent them to Antioch to settle the difficulty about circumcision. The seven deacons were not appointed by Peter, or all the apostles together, but after the question was laid before the church, then "the saying was liked by all the multitude. And they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, and Phillip, and Phochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicholas a proselyte of Antioch." Acts 6:5. The whole church, men and women, choose these men to the office of deacons. Even in the election of the apostle to fill the place vacated by Judas, the church, numbering one hundred and twenty, men and women, "gave forth their lots." "And the lot fell upon Matthias and he was numbered with the eleven apostles." Acts 1:26. It was the whole church that excluded or restored members, as already seen 1 Cor. 5:4-7; 2 Cor. 2:6-7. Also, in the case of the brother committing trespass, it must be told to the church, which is the local church, composed of men and women. See Matt. 18:15-18. The local church is the only ecclesiastical authority on earth. An hierarchy over the churches is usurpation and rebellion against the government of Christ. "But Jesus calling them, saith unto them, you know that they who seem to rule over the Gentiles, lord it over them; and their princes have power over them. But it is not so among you: but whosoever will be greater, shall be your minister. And whosoever will be first among

you, shall be the servant of all." Mark 10:42-44. Also, see Luke 22:25, 26: The *only* ruling of pastors and elders in the churches of Christ is by *teaching* and *example*. "The Lord said, who (thinkest thou), is this faithful and wise steward, whom his lord setteth over his family to give them their measure of wheat in due season?" or rather "to give them their portion of meat in due season?" Luke 12:42. The elders had no judicial authority over the churches. They were to *rule* by *teaching* the word of God. Peter said: "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock." 1 Peter 5:1-3.

The Rheimish translation grossly perverts this passage where it says: "Neither as lording it over the clergy, but being made a pattern of the flock from the heart." The term "clergy" is a pure forgery. The word *kleeron* cannot be translated *clergy*. The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God because it is a despotic hierarchy.

OUR CONTROVERSY.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD.

CHURCH PROGRESS' SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE.

(September 19, 1891.)

(a) The *Baptist* declares that Sunday was established by the EXAMPLE of Christ and the Apostles. But this is not even mentioned in the Bible. Hence Sunday is not a Scriptural institution. Therefore, according to the *Baptist's* logic, the observance of that day is anti-scriptural! Again as Sunday is not a scriptural ordinance, where did the *Baptist* find out that it was established by Christ and the Apostles? By TRADITION of course, that is, oral teaching handed down from generation to generation. Hence tradition is accepted by the *Baptist* as a guide in religious ordinances. The Bible therefore is not the standard or rule. (b) If the New Testament was given by Christ, there should be clear indubitable evidence in the New Testament that it was so given. But there is not a particle of evidence that it was. On the contrary Christ taught orally altogether, He never wrote a line. Search the gospel from end to end and there is not a line to show that Christ taught otherwise than orally, but on the contrary there are many texts to show that He commanded the Apostles to teach and preach the gospel by word of mouth as He Himself taught it. He says He sends them as His Father sent Him. We quoted many texts last week to show that the teaching of the gospel to the world was to be carried on as Christ had taught it, *i. e., orally*. These texts invincibly proved that the written word

was not intended by Christ and the apostles to be the sole rule of faith. (c) As the Pope is the head of the Apostolic Body, he speaking as the head of that Body and in virtue of his headship, is an infallible teacher. When he thus speaks it is the Apostolic body which speaks. Therefore no contradiction in saying that the Pope is the sole infallible teacher and that the Apostolic body is also an infallible teacher. *The Apostolic Body always speaks in the unity of its head.* Ergo the non-sense of the *Baptist's* objection on this point. (d) The *Baptist* uses the word *Testament* or *Will* equivocally. Testament as applied to the Bible does not mean a written instrument devising property to heirs. This is the meaning the *Baptist* would put on it. As applied to the Scriptures it means simply that this written Word is an expression of God's will or purpose in the divine economy, or as in the Old Testament a covenant or agreement with the Patriarchs. Furthermore, granting for argument's sake that the New Testament is Jesus Christ's written will in the *Baptist's* sense, where is the evidence in the document itself that Christ devised it? Again, under the same foolish superstition, how does the *Baptist* reconcile the many express statements of that document, that the Church is the sole rule and guide in matters of faith, with its unfounded assumption that the supposed devise or written will is the sole rule or standard? (e) The abomination lies not in confessing sins but in *committing* them. Among these is bearing false witness against your neighbor. Repentance and confession are meritorious. Christ established the tribunal of penance and gave His priesthood power to absolve the contrite sinner. His words were "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whose sins ye shall forgive, they are forgiven them, whose sins you shall retain they are retained." The *fillth* of the confessional is all in the *Baptist's* imagination. To prove the character of the confessional let the editor of the *Baptist* go to confession to a

Catholic priest, or let any of the *Baptist's* readers go. Let us parallel the case of the three children whom the *Baptist* says killed their mother *because* they believed in the Sacrament of Penance. John Jones believes that God forgives sins. "I will commit theft, murder and adultery," reasons John Jones, "because God will forgive me." So John Jones commits theft, murder and adultery, falls on his knees and asks God's forgiveness. *Therefore* he committed these sins *because* God would forgive him. (f) The contracting parties do administer the Sacrament of Marriage. In this is the *essence* of marriage. Where the Council of Trent has been declared there must be present priest and witnesses, as an indispensable condition to contract. Where is the contradiction? The sacramental contract is the *act* of the parties marrying. The Church *witnesses* to that sacramental contract through her accredited officer. But non-Catholic parties contracting marriage in good faith with the intention of entering on Christian marriage, are just as *essentially* married in the eyes of the Church, and their *union* just as indissoluble. The *essence* of marriage does not consist in the presence of witnesses, ecclesiastical or lay, but in the sacramental contract. For Catholics, to whom the decrees of the Council of Trent apply, the marriage is not valid except in the presence of the prescribed witnesses, but it is none the less *binding*. Catholics marrying without complying with the conditions prescribed by Trent are just as much married, that is the indissoluble union of man and wife is contracted, though they commit sins by neglecting the conditions imposed by the Council. The attempt on the part of the *Baptist* to confuse the Catholic teaching on this point and to besmirch the sacramental institution with foul insinuations is as disgraceful as it is false. The *Baptist* stands convicted of wilful slander, as it has not proved that marriage in Catholic countries has been a fountain of corruption. We want to know what it means by

referring us to Italy, Mexico and Brazil. Italy, Mexico and Brazil are more moral than Sweden, Denmark, Norway and Scotland, the most Protestant countries in the world, especially in all that relates to marriage. (g) As God has ordained that, through the tribunal of penance He will forgive sin it is our duty to comply with His command and follow the way He has pointed out. We have proved that God has so commanded. The *Baptist* may quarrel with the divine ordinance as much as it pleases. But God's ways are not to be questioned. As He clearly ordained that way, it is blasphemous to dispute that divine command. (h) Cormenin is no historical authority. He was a politician. The work which the *Baptist* quotes from is not mentioned among his writings in the British Encyclopaedia. He was, moreover, Jansenistic, as DuPin was. Nor is Marinus Scotus any *authority* on the point. He lived two hundred years after the supposed Pope Joan. The *Baptist's* return to the Pope Joan myth shows the weakness of the cause that has to prop itself on a flagrant falsehood, clearly and forever disproved by even Protestants. (i) A Church without a hierarchy is a mob. A hierarchy means simply ecclesiastical rulers. Most Protestant bodies have a hierarchy. You might as well talk about a government without properly constituted rulers as any ecclesiastical society without them. That there were such ecclesiastical rulers in the Apostolic Church we have quoted texts to show from the Bible itself. These the *Baptist* has purposely ignored. The texts from Acts, quoted by the *Baptist* to show there was no ecclesiastical jurisdiction or rule in the Apostolic Church, in the light of their context prove the opposite. The seven deacons *chosen* or *selected* by the Hebrews were *appointed* by the Apostles. The *Baptist* evidently forgot to quote verse 3 of the same chapter of Acts. Here it is: "Therefore, brethren (say the twelve Apostles) look ye among you seven men of good reputation, full of the Holy

Ghost and wisdom, whom we may *appoint* over this business." The multitude of disciples simply pointed out or selected men whom they could recommend as suitable for the business; the Apostolic body did the *appointing* and on its own authority. Again, Acts 1, 26 requires a context. Here it is: "And they appointed two, Joseph called Barsabas, who was surnamed Justus, and Mathias." The choice by lots was simply a method of determining between the two *appointed* by the Apostles. Nor were the women included in the selecting, for St. Peter, addressing those assembled, opens his discourse on the matter saying, "*Men, Brethren.*" That women had no part in Church administration or jurisdiction we learn clearly from St. Paul. 1 Cor. 34, 35. "Let women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted to them to speak, but to be subject as the law saith. But if they would learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home. For it is a shame for a woman to speak in the church." The women therefore had nothing to do with the matter. It is not therefore the whole local church, men and women, who administer church matters. And why cannot *kleeron* be translated *clergy*, pray? The *Baptist* fails to show *why*. It is not the Catholic but the Protestant translation which is grossly perverted. In order to use the word *heritage* the Protestant translators are forced to pervert the verb governing *kleeron*. St. Peter used the words *katakuriuontes kleeron*, lording it (domineering) over the clergy. Or course to lord it, or domineer over, a *heritage* is sheer nonsense. So our Protestant friends, in order to escape the true meaning of *kleeron*, pervert not only that word but the verb that governs it. But even granting the Protestant perversion, the existence of a hierarchy is not in the least affected by the text. St. Peter could instruct the ancients (seniors or bishops) who had charge of the flocks, not to tyrannize, or domineer, over their flocks, and to be models to them, without in the least denying their judicial authority, nay,

that authority is pre-supposed in the very fact that St. Peter beseeches them not to use their position for the purpose of lording it. If the ancients or bishops had no such authority St. Peter's words are meaningless.

1. We have seen that the Bible was not the rule of faith in Apostolic times, and that therefore it cannot be the rule of faith now. The rule Christ established *then* is the rule existing *now*. To deny this is to deny Christ. That the gospel rule of faith was delivered orally at first, the *Baptist* admitted last week: "The gospel rule of faith, which *at first was delivered orally*" were its words. The *Baptist* has also admitted that the disciples in the time of the Apostles were enjoined "to continue in the same rule—walk by the same rule which had been established." That rule was by its own admission oral. Therefore are we also enjoined to continue, to walk by that same rule. That rule, as we have seen is the Word of God as delivered to and by the Apostolic Body. We have also seen that the Bible itself nowhere makes claim to be the sole rule of faith, but on the contrary in many places declares that the Apostolic Body is the guide in such matters. This testimony of Holy Writ itself the *Baptist* has failed to answer. We have therefore, seen, both from the Apostolic rule and from the Bible itself, that the Written Word cannot be the sole rule of faith. Therefore the Catholic Church, which is the only Church that continues in and walks by that Apostolic rule, is alone the true Church of God.

2. It is true that the several *parts* of the New Testament had been written by the year 100; but what we know as the Bible, that is, *all* these different parts collected into one book and authoritatively known as inspired writings did not exist, and did not exist for nearly three centuries. The *Baptist* asserts that the collection of the different parts of the New Testament into one book gives no authority to the New Testa-

ment writings which they did not have before. On the other hand it declares: "Any addition or subtraction from it involves the curse of God." On its showing, therefore, it is that very collection or unification into one book that does give the New Testament its authority, for its integrity depends upon that collection into one book, which alone contains the whole World of God. It requires ALL the parts of the Bible taken together to constitute the *Baptist's* sole and whole rule of faith. Any addition or subtraction, in its own words, involves the curse of God. Now in the year 100 these parts were not collected or united in one volume, and the Christians of these ages were necessarily obliged to depend upon the oral or traditional teaching of the Apostles and disciples and their successors. The different parts of the Bible were written at different times and for diverse purposes. The gospel of St. John was not written until the year 96, when he was nearly a hundred years old, and long after he had spread the gospel and established Churches through Asia Minor. He then wrote his gospel only at the earnest solicitation of some Asiatic Bishops, in order to confute the errors of Cerinthus and Ebion who had denied the divinity of Christ. St. Paul's epistles were addressed to particular Churches or even to individuals, and so were the epistles of other Apostles. Some Churches in those days possessed only separate parts of what we call the Bible. Some had one part, another another and some none. Therefore according to the *Baptist's* reasoning they did not possess the rule of faith. Before the gospel of St. John was written, in the year 96, all the parts of the Bible had not been separately written. Now does the *Baptist* mean to say that Christians before the year 96 had no rule of faith? Does the *Baptist* mean to argue that the rule of faith was changed upon the completion of St. John's gospel? If so, by whom and on what authority was the rule, established by Christ, abrogated and

another put in its place? Clearly then the early Christians did not have the Bible. Therefore the Bible could not have been the Apostolic rule of faith, and so cannot be the rule of faith to-day. Christ, our Lord, did not deliver the Word in writing to the Apostles, but delivered orally every jot and tittle of the Word of God. Hence St. Paul says: "For I *delivered* unto you first of all, which I also *received*." (1. Corinth xv. 3.) That which St. Paul tells us he thus received and delivered is the Word of God spoken, which the Apostle elsewhere calls "Tradition." Brethren stand fast and hold the *Traditions*, which you have learnt, whether by word (that is by my preaching) or by our epistle (that is by my inspired writing.)

3. If it has been intended that the written Word was to be the sole rule of faith, then it was the peremptory duty of every Apostle to commit that word to writing, and to admonish and instruct the faithful, that in the written Word was the whole rule and the sole rule. Now only two Apostles wrote a gospel, St. Matthew and St. John; the latter at the close of his life, as we have seen, and only when persuaded to do so by some Asiatic Bishops, St. Mark and St. Luke were simply disciples. Only five Apostles wrote epistles, St. Paul, St. Peter, St. James the Less, St. John, and St. Jude. In all these writings we have not a single passage to show that the Written Word was the whole and sole rule of faith, but, as we have seen, on the contrary many passages to show that it was not.

THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

PROPOSITION: *Resolved that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*

CHURCH PROGRESS, Affirms.
AMERICAN BAPTIST, Denies.

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S SEVENTEENTH NEGATIVE.

(September 24, 1891.)

1st. If the *Progress* believes that Baptists, with all other denominations, are dependent on the Roman Catholic Church for the Bible and Christian Sabbath it will so affirm in another discussion. But, having admitted, "the same Bible" with us as the inspired infallible Word of God, this proposition does not require the discussion of Bible authenticity. Admitting, (which is not true) that the written Word and unwritten tradition is the rule of faith, then all traditions which do not harmonize with the infallible written Word are false. The Roman traditions antagonize the infallible written Word of God; therefore, they are false, and that Church is anti-christian. Examples: Jesus Christ is the sole head of his church. "He hath subjected all things under his feet and hath made him Head over all the church," etc. Eph. 1:22; Col. 1:18; Eph. 5:23. But Roman tradition makes the Pope "head over all the Church", for which there is not even a semblance of Bible truth. Therefore, the Roman Church, whose traditions antagonize the infallible Word of God, is a false Church. The infallible Word of God enjoins a bishop—pastor—to "be the husband of one wife," 1 Tim. 3:2, but the Romish tradition forbids him to have "one wife." Therefore, the Roman Church, whose traditions contradict the infallible Word of God

is a false Church. The infallible word of God affirms that "marriage is honorable in all," Heb. 13:4, but the Romish tradition says that marriage *is not honorable in all*. Therefore the Roman Church, whose traditions contradict the infallible Word of God is a false Church.

2nd. The arguments of the *Progress* do positively contradict themselves. It used certain Scriptures to prove that "the Pope is the sole infallible teacher" and then contradicts this by affirming that "the apostolic body" (including bishops and priests) constitute "the divine authority," "the authorized guide and rule of faith," "so that they shall never teach error." See BAPTIST Sept. 17th. This makes all officials of the Church, infallible teachers. If the *Progress* teaches the truth when it claims infallibility alone for the Pope, it teaches falsely when it claims infallibility for all the priesthood. The Church, whose doctrine thus contradicts itself, is certainly a false Church.

3rd. The inspired infallible New Testament is the last will of Christ. The church is made the executive and administrator of this will, which holy men were inspired to commit to writing. Just before his death, the Savior said: "And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; That ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Luke 22:29-30. The Romish Testament has "*dispose to you*," instead of "appoint to you a kingdom." The member that is guilty of trespass must "hear the church" as the citizen must hear the court. But the statute law is the supreme standard of authority by which the court is to be governed in the administration of justice. So, the New Testament contains the supreme standard of authority by which the church is to be governed as the executive in the kingdom. An hierarchy with ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the churches is

wholly anti-scriptural. The establishment of the Pope over the churches amounts to usurpation, rebellion and treason. Also diocesan bishops and prelates, with authority over the inferior ministry and the churches, partake of the same character. Of course the inspired apostles, moved by the Holy Ghost, taught the churches their duty as executive in the kingdom. The very fact that the church was to look out "seven men of good report" for the deaconship, is proof positive, that even the apostles themselves did not usurp the authority to ordain deacons without their first having been chosen, elected, by the church. Also, the *Progress* has perverted Acts 1:23. "They appointed two," refers to the appointment by the church, (composed of one hundred and twenty,) of the two candidates who had the qualifications described in Peter's address. The antecedent of "they" is not the apostles, as stated by the *Progress*. It was the church that appointed or nominated the two candidates and after prayer gave forth their votes; and Matthias was elected to the apostleship. He was not appointed by Pope (?) Peter nor elected by the apostles. He was elected by the church, composed of one hundred and twenty, a part of whom were women. Acts 1:14, 15. Of course the women, so far as preaching and debating questions in the church meetings are concerned, are "to keep silence in the church;" but this does not prohibit them from obeying Christ by casting their votes in all matters of church business. The Greek word *kleron* (1st Pet. 5:3) does not mean clergy because *kleros* does not mean clergy in the sacred Scriptures and is never so applied. To translate it clergy is as base a fraud as any other forgery committed by the Church of Rome. The term heritage or possession, in this connection, is a correct translation. It means the same as the Lord's flock which is his heritage. The Roman bishops and priests are guilty of "lording it over the flock," when they

claim to judge and punish their members, contrary to the Scriptures. Of this passage, under the head of *Cleric*, the Catholic Dictionary, says:

"But 'dominantes in cleris' (*katakurienontes toon kleroon*) cannot have the meaning given to it in the Donay version. This is shown both by the connection, and by the fact that the word is in the plural. Estius calls attention to each of these points and interprets the passage as a prohibition forbidding the 'ancients' to domineer over the 'lots,' or congregations placed under their care. The word 'cleris' is parallel and equivalent to the 'gregis' or 'flock' which occurs in the latter part of the verse." p. 190.

Thus the Roman Catholic Dictionary has honesty enough to condemn this flagrant forgery of the Roman Church, by which it attempts to establish its usurped hierarchy over the flock. No such hierarchy as the Roman Church is mentioned in the New Testament, nor in the first and second centuries. The tendency toward an hierarchy began to develop about the middle of the third century and was established as the foundation for popery in 312. While ministers in the churches have equal privileges with other members, officially they are servants of the churches. 2 Cor. 4:5. The *Progress* has willfully failed to notice the Scriptures introduced proving this position. The whole arrangement of the Roman Seven Orders of the ministry is anti-scriptural and anti-christian. Paul says: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bound nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus." Gal. 3:28. In the gospel ministry, the bishop, (*episcopos*,) and elder, (*presbuteros*,) are the same officer. When Paul sent from Miletus to Ephesus he "called the ancients of the church," rather elders of the church, Acts 20:17, after which he addressed them as bishops, saying: "Take heed to yourselves and to the whole flock wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops, to rule the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." Acts 20:28. *presbuteros*—elders—in the 17th, are called *episcopous*—bishops—in the 28th verse, show-

ing that elders and bishops are the same ministerial officers. Evangelists were elders who traveled in missionary work. The ministerial officers in the New Testament churches, were elders and deacons. Some of these elders—*episcopoi*—were pastors; while others were evangelists. Deacons were not necessarily pastors or evangelists, but had charge of the temporal affairs of the church. However, some deacons advanced to pastoral, or evangelistic work. Phillip, the deacon, became an evangelist. The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of Christ because of her anti-scriptural hierarchy.

4th. The so-called sacrament of penance or confessional is an anti-scriptural abomination for which there is no authority in Scripture or reason. The apostle James writing to the Hebrew Christians, says: "Confess therefore your sins one to another; and pray one for another, that you may be saved. For the continual prayer of a just man availeth much." James 5:16. Here is the same authority for the pastor to confess to the laymen as for the laymen to confess to the pastor. When we sin against a brother it is our duty to confess to that brother as far as we have injured him, and that brother may forgive us such sin. But the Bible teaches the confession of all sins to God himself with a view to his forgiveness. The secrets of the confessional are even more abominable than charged in our former negative. The case of John Jones committing "theft, murder and adultery," with a view of being forgiven for these sins, is not parallel to the confessional to the priest. Such a wretch has no assurance that these crimes will be forgiven, because there is a sin which cannot be forgiven in this, nor the world to come, as already shown by the Scriptures. Also it is useless to pray for some sinners who have gone beyond the reach of mercy. See 1 John 5:16. But the Roman doctrine of the confessional teaches that all sins, however flagrant, and often repeated, can be forgiven by the priest

god. This confessional, with ceremonial repentance and absolution, is the deep dark fountain of pollution and crime which marks the Roman Church as anti-Christian.

To show the outrageous abominations of the confessional, we quote from the Catechism of the Council of Trent as follows:

"Has anyone imbrued his hands in the blood of his fellow man? He must state whether his victim was a layman or an ecclesiastic. Has he had criminal intercourse with any one? He must state whether the female was married or unmarried, a relative or a person consecrated to God by vow. These are circumstances which alter the species of the sins: the first is called simple fornication; the second adultery; the third incest; and the fourth sacrilege." p. 194. "But as all are anxious that their sins should be buried in eternal secrecy, the faithful are to be admonished that there is no reason whatever to apprehend that what is made known in confession will ever be revealed by any priest, or that by it the penitent can, at any time, be brought into danger or difficulty of any sort. All laws, human and divine, guard the inviolability of the seal of confession, and against its sacrilegious infraction the Church denounces her heaviest chastisements. 'Let the priest,' says the great Council of Lateran, 'take especial care, neither by word nor sign, nor by any other means whatever, to betray, in the least degree, the sacred trust confided to him by the sinner.'" p. 197. "Still more pernicious is the conduct of those who, yielding to a foolish bashfulness, cannot induce themselves to confess their sins. Such persons are to be encouraged by exhortation, and to be reminded that there is no reason whatever why they should yield to such false delicacy; that to no one can it appear surprising if persons fall into sin, the common malady of the human race, and the natural appendage of human infirmity." p. 198.

These quotations from the Catechism of Trent contain what is regarded as infallible authority for the abominations of the confessional. The devout Romanist, believing that the priest holds supreme power to forgive the crimes of "murder," "fornication," "adultery" and "incest," having the fear of future torment thus removed, will commit these and other crimes, believing by the sacrament of penance that, in a few minutes, he can become as innocent as an angel. The priest is to inform the penitent that eternal secrecy will be observed, so that no father, mother, husband, wife, son or daughter, or

other relative or friend, will ever know the nature of the foul communications which take place between the priest and the penitent in the confessional. Once more; the priest is to reprove the pernicious "conduct of those who, yielding to a foolish bashfulness, cannot induce themselves to confess their sins." Such modest persons are to be "encouraged by exhortation" not to "yield to such false delicacy," and that sin is only the "common malady of the human race, and the natural appendage of human infirmity"!!! Thus all modesty is crushed out of the soul and conscience of the penitent, who is made to believe that sin is a small matter, and to enter into the most filthy conversations with the priest, alone in the confessional is a religious duty.

5th. The theology of the Roman Church concerning the confessional is infamous beyond power of language to describe. Peter Dens' Theology, used as standard in Roman Catholic seminaries and colleges, is published in seven volumes. We quote several passages from this standard Roman theologian. In answer to the question:

"Can a case be given in which it is lawful to break the sacramental seal?" The answer is given: "It cannot, although the *life or safety* of a man depended thereon, or *even the destruction of the state*; nor can the Supreme Pontiff give dispensation in this; so that on that account *this secret of the seal is more binding than the obligation of an oath, a vow, a natural secret, etc., and that by the positive will of God.*" Dens Theology, vol. 6, p. 228.

A more fiendish doctrine can hardly be conceived of. The priest *may know*, by sacramental confession, that a plot has been concocted to destroy the state or even commonwealth, in which fifty millions of the human family are to be slaughtered, and, yet he does not dare to reveal the hellish plot to save the nation! In this case the priest is in league with the criminals. We quote again:

"What answer, then, ought a confessor to give when questioned concerning a truth which he knows from sacramental confession

only? Answer: "*He ought to answer that he does not know it, and if it is necessary, to confirm the same with an oath.*" (Dens, vol 6, p. 228.

Here Roman theology teaches a priest to tell a *deliberate lie and swear to it!!!* Thus the Roman Church teaches the most infamous perjury, as a religious duty!!! But how do they whip the devil around the stump, to get out of this difficulty? Again we quote:

Objector: "It is in no case lawful to tell a lie, but that confessor would be guilty of a lie, because he knows the truth; therefore, etc." Answer: "I deny the minor [*i. e.*, that the confessor would be guilty of a lie]; because such a confessor is *questioned as a man, and answers as a man; but now he does not know that truth as a man, though he knows it as a God.*" Dens Theology, vol. 6, 228.

Thus the Roman theology teaches a priest to tell a lie and swear to it, when it tells him that it is not a lie, because in the confessional he is not a man, but a God!!! we advise the priests to read Rev. 21:8, "that all liars" shall have their part in the "pool burning with fire and brimstone, which is the second death." Again we quote from Peter Dens:

Q. What if it should be asked of a confessor whether he knows it through sacramental confession? A. "In this case he ought to give no answer (so Steyart and Silvius), but the question should be rejected as impious; or he could even say, *absolutely*, not relatively to the question, *I know nothing*, because the word *I restricts to his human knowledge.*"!!! Dens vol. 6, p. 228.

When the direct question is put to the priest by the court, as a sworn witness on the stand, whether he knows certain facts through sacramental confession, he is taught to answer on oath *absolutely* "*I know nothing*", though he knows positively that it is telling a deliberate falsehood. In the above quotations, translated from the Latin of Dens Theology, the italics are ours. The Church of Rome which gives her sanction and endorsement to such fiendish Theology, rather demonology, cannot possibly be the church of God. Will the *Progress* dare to quote Scripture in support of such frightful abominations? Are the Roman priests proper persons to educate our Amer-

ican youth? Ought the Congress of the United States vote the people's money to have such fiendish principles taught the rising generation?

TWELFTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God because of her idolatrous worship of Mary, saints, images and relics.* Idolatry, is the worship of any, except the true God. The Lord of hosts forbids to worship "other gods," or bowing down to images.

Archbishop Kenrick, of St. Louis, prepared a book called "Formulary of Prayers" for the use of a certain order of Sisters from which we quote from page 211, as follows:

"Seventh Joyful Mystery. After her glorious death, the blessed Virgin was carried into heaven, where she was proclaimed Queen of the universe, the mother and advocate of sinners."

Thus Mary is "proclaimed Queen of the Universe"!! This is blasphemy and treason against God. Surely the Romish Church, which endorses such "abominations," cannot be the church of Christ. On page 214 of the same book, the "Sisters of St. Joseph" are taught to pray thus:

"O refuge of the miserable and hope of the world do not reject my humble prayer, but be merciful, hear and generously grant my petition. Amen."

This exalts Mary to be the "refuge of the miserable and hope of the world!" But Jesus Christ is the "refuge" and hope of the Christian. Heb. 6:18, 19. The celebrated Roman Theologian Liguori, in his Mission Book, p. 160 says:

"O Queen of the universe, the most bountiful sovereign, thou art the great advocate of sinners, the sure port of those who have suffered shipwreck, the resource of the world, the ransom of captives, the solace of the weak, the comfort of the afflicted, the refuge and salvation of every creature. O! full of grace! enlighten my understanding, and loosen my tongue, that I may recount thy praises and sing to thee that angelical salutation which thou dost so justly merit. Hail! thou who art the peace, the joy the consolation of the whole world! Hail! Paradise of delight, the sure asylum of all who are in danger, the source of grace, the mediatrix between God and man!"

Mary is made the "Queen of the universe," "Bountiful Sovereign," "the great advocate of sinners," "the resource of the world," "the ransom of captives," "the refuge and salvation of every creature," "the source of grace," and "the mediatrix between God and man."!!! But the Word of God presents Jesus Christ as the "only name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:12.

In addition to the gross idolatry of the mass in worshipping wafer gods innumerable, the Roman Church has established the worship of Mary as the "Queen of heaven," "mediatrix between God and man" and "the salvation of every creature." Such is the gross and besotted idolatry of the Church of Rome. The Church of Rome is not the true church of God because of her idolatry.

OUR CONTROVERSY.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD.

CHURCH PROGRESS' EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE.

(September 26, 1891.)

1. We have seen that the rule of faith in Apostolic times was not the Bible; that the Bible itself never makes claim to be the sole rule of faith; that the Bible did not exist in the first century of Christianity; that the Word preached in the mouth of the Apostolic Body was the primitive rule, and therefore must be the present rule; that if the written Word had been intended to be the sole rule, all the Apostles should have written that rule, but that they did not; and therefore, the Catholic Church, which alone possesses that Apostolic rule, is the true Church of God. All this the *Baptist* has ignored, because it can't answer. These are positive arguments we have advanced to prove the truth of the Catholic Church. The *Baptist* has no excuse to evade them. Its silence is evidence of its acquiescence in their force. We continue our argument on this line.

2. In the first two centuries of the Christian world there were many spurious gospels written and circulated. Among these one by St. Barnaby, himself an Apostle. Now who was to determine for the faithful what were or what were not inspired writings? Who could determine this point? Who, indeed but those who had the authority to determine what were or were not inspired writings, the Apostolic Body, which was by no means to die, with the Twelve, for our Lord had promised to be with them, the Apostolic Body, until the consummation

of the world. Now the determination of what are or are not inspired writings is nothing more or less than establishing the canon of the Bible. To determine amongst many written documents which are truly the inspired Word of God, and to do this with authority, in itself stamps the authority, so determining, as the guide of faith, and not the document so determined. Hence the rule of faith is not the written word. As the Catholic Church alone continues in and walks by the Apostolic rule of faith, the Word of God delivered to the faithful by the Apostolic Body, the Catholic Church alone is the true Church of God.

3. If the Bible had been intended to be the sole rule of faith, not only should we expect to find this expressly stated in the Bible itself, in order that there could be no possible dispute about the question, but in addition the Bible itself should be so clear and explicit in every point that there could be no possibility of mistaking its meaning. But is this the case? Not in the least. The *Baptist* itself is a witness to the difficulties found upon every page of the sacred volume. It has constantly found it necessary to explain the very texts it quotes. Witness its abortive attempts to explain the meaning of the texts Matt. 18:18 and John 20:23 on the forgiveness of sins. But according to its own axiom every humble soul can go to the Bible and find the truth without any difficulty. The *Baptist*, as we have, has several times appealed to the *Greek text* to elucidate the meaning of the English text. Surely not every humble soul can do this. A man who knows no Greek cannot *verify* the English translation. How then can every humble soul know that God's Word has been properly translated, and that what he reads in the English version is the true Word of God? That the Greek has been differently translated, and this on vital points, is evident in the discrepancies between the Catholic and the Protestant versions. Now how is every

humble soul, who may not know Greek, to compare these translations with the Greek? Furthermore, the original manuscripts are no longer in existence. What guaranty then is there for every humble soul, who refuses the offices of an authorized interpreter, to know whether the version of the Bible, which he possesses, is a faithful rendition of the original or not? What guaranty has he that the text, he has received, is not corrupt and vitiated and interpolated, going through the hands of numerous translators, as it has done, through the long centuries of the Church's existence? Certainly a book, subject to all these difficulties and changes and corruptions and abuses in the hands of fallible men, a book whose original even does not exist, could not have been intended as the sole rule of faith. What is more, that book itself specifically declares that its meaning is hard to understand, and that the unlearned and the unstable wrest that meaning to their own destruction; "In which are things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, to their own destruction." 2 Pet. iii. 16. Surely it is clean against reason and common sense to suppose that such a book is the sole rule of faith to which every humble soul can go and *infallibly* find the truth. Men, in their every day life, refuse to be governed by such an absurd principle. Even in the interpretation of our civil statutes, the authority of an established tribunal is necessary. The citizen is not permitted to interpret the statutes as he pleases, but must abide by the decision of the judicial tribunals, with whom it is a difficult science to decide the meaning of even statutes enacted by the present legislature. If such be the case in the ordinary affairs of life, so much more so is it necessary to have an authorized interpreter in spiritual and doctrinal matters, which in proportion to their spiritual excellence and value are difficult to be understood.

(a) The Catholic Church teaches that Jesus Christ is the sole head of the Church, and that the Pope is His vice-regent on earth. The Bible does not *enjoin* (by which the *Baptist* means *command*) a Bishop to be the husband of one wife *i. e.* to have a wife at all. We have asked it to prove this but it has not attempted it. The obvious meaning of the *Baptist's* use of this text is that the Bible forbids the celibacy of the clergy. Now it does nothing of the sort. Firstly the celibacy of the clergy is not a doctrine but a *disciplinary measure*. Secondly the Bible does inculcate celibacy. In his first epistle to the Corinthians, after stating that marriage is good, St. Paul says, "But I speak this by indulgence, not by commandment. For I would that all men were as myself (unmarried); but every one hath his proper gift from God; one after this manner, and another after that. But I say to the unmarried and to the widows, it is good for them if they so continue even as I." (1 Cor. vii. 6, 7, 8). And again he says: "Now concerning virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord, but I give counsel as having obtained mercy of the Lord, to be faithful. I think therefore that this is good for the present necessity, that it is good for a man to be so." (Ibid. 25, 26). And yet again; "But I would have you to be without solicitude. He that is without a wife is solicitous for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please God. But he that is with a wife is solicitous for the things of the world, how he may please his wife, and he is divided. And the unmarried woman and the virgin thinketh on the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and spirit. But she that is married thinketh on the things of the world, how she may please her husband." (Ibid. 32, 33, 34). This is the Catholic *counsel* of celibacy. It is a voluntary acceptance of the virginal state, that those, who have devoted themselves to the service of the altar, may the better serve God free from the solicitude of the

world. It is also in honor of our Lord and a consecration of virginity to Him. Who also chose to live in a state of celibacy while on earth.

(b) We proved the infallibility of the Catholic Church. That Church is one in the unity of her head. She teaches in that unity, and speaks in that unity. Therefore is the Pope infallible teacher and infallible mouthpiece of that one church. Therefore no division in faith or teaching in the infallible Catholic Church.

(c) The *Baptist* does not prove the Bible to be the will of Christ; nor does it prove that the Bible is a supreme standard of authority. Statute law is not the supreme standard; the Legislature makes that law and abrogates it at will. Therefore no analogy here. The *Baptist* gives no *proof* that ecclesiastical jurisdiction is anti-scriptural. "They appointed two" does not refer to the appointment by the Church, *i. e.* men and women, but by the Apostles as we showed last week. The case of the seven deacons likewise.

(d) The opinion of the editors of the Catholic Dictionary on the meaning of *kleroon* is worth just what it stands for. We do not agree with them, but with the Douay version. The word *cleris* is not equivalent to the word *gregis* or *flock* in the latter half of the verse, for *cleris* does not mean *gregis* and *kleroon* does not mean *poimniou*. St. Peter would never have used two different words in the same sentence to mean the same thing. But even granting the Catholic Dictionary's opinion, our argument is not in the least affected. We argue against the Protestant version "As being lords over God's heritage" which the Greek text under no possible construction can mean. We did not introduce this text, and we showed that even admitting the Protestant version this was no proof, as the *Baptist* alleged, that there was no ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the Apostolic Church, for St. Peter could not have

admonished the Ancients to *domineer*, unless by virtue of their office they had jurisdiction over the "clergy" or the "flock" or the "heritage." But why did the *Baptist* not continue quoting the Catholic Dictionary on this point? We will do it for it.

"While however the name (technical name) is wanting in the New Testament, the thing intended by the name is there. The very fact that the epistles of St. Paul mention bishops who "are to rule the Church of God" and prelates "whom the faithful are to obey," and to whom they are "to be subject" is proof conclusive that the distinction between clergy and laity was fully recognized by the Apostles."

(e) The labors of the *Baptist* to prove that *episkopos* and *presbuteros* mean the same thing go for nothing. Whether or not *episkopos* and *presbuteros* are one and the same ecclesiastical officer, they are to rule the Church of God, and ecclesiastical rulers constitute a hierarchy. (f) St. James' words do not mean to confess to laymen, but to the priests whom in verse 14 of the same chapter he tells the faithful to call in. What would be the sense of confessing to laymen who had no power of absolution?

But even if this were the meaning of St. James, Protestants don't confess their sins to one another, and therefore don't fulfill the Scripture. Ergo they are anti-scriptural. The sin that will never be forgiven is final impenitence. Therefore no confession for one who refuses to repent. The *Baptist* talks nonsense when it uses such language about the confessional as "deep, dark fountain of pollution and crime." This only excites laughter and contempt amongst Catholics who know the true character of confession. Of course the secrets of the confessional cannot be betrayed. That is common sense. The civil law is possessed of just this common sense when it exempts doctors and lawyers from divulging the professional

secrets of their clients and patients. The *Baptist* is utterly ignorant of the nature of the Sacrament of Penance. No Catholic believes that he can commit sin, and simply confess it to be forgiven, any more than John Jones commits sin because he believes that God will forgive him. Such an argument is simply nonsense. No Catholic who goes to confession intends to commit *further* sin. The act of confession means not only repentance for sins already committed but a *firm purpose* not to commit sin again. Without such dispositions there can be no repentance and no absolution. As there is no earthly power which has the right to know the secrets of the confessional, and as the confessor is bound, as his highest and most sacred duty, not to betray those secrets, so no power on earth has the right or authority to extort those secrets from him by oath or otherwise. Therefore to retain those secrets even under the imposition of an oath which by the nature of the case being unlawful cannot bind him, is the first and most sacred duty of the confessor. To betray those secrets would be to violate the most sacred of all trusts, and make him a traitor to God and his fellow man. As therefore no power has a right to such information, it is the bounden duty of the confessor under all circumstances, even at the forfeit of his own life, not to give it. There is only *one* obligation in such a case for a confessor and that is not to betray the secrets of the tribunal of penance, and this obligation is supreme; therefore no other obligation can hold against it; just as the first obligation of the early Christians, not to sacrifice to the statue of the emperor, was paramount to all others, and for which they suffered death: It is evident that the *Baptist* is extremely weak when it has to resort to such foolish abuse in place of argument. It is simply seeking to throw dirt in the eyes of its readers. But it forgets that intelligent people can see through the shallow subterfuge. The more it abuses and the more emphatic its

vituperations the weaker it grows in the eyes of the honest and sincere. (g) Idolatry is rendering that honor to creatures which is *due* to God *alone*. The honor given by the Catholic Church to the Blessed Mother of Our Lord Jesus Christ and to His friends, the Saints, in no way conflicts with the divine honor paid to God; on the contrary they are honored because they are reflections of God's glory and manifestations of his grace amongst men. The Mother of our Lord is only honored because she is His mother. As He honored her by choosing her amongst all women for the great and immense dignity of becoming His mother, of giving to Him the human frame in which he became incarnate for our redemption, surely it is becoming in those whom He has redeemed to honor her also for His sake. If He worked a miracle (changing water into wine) at her request before His time had come, it is but proper and natural to ask her to intercede with Him, Whom she loves as no other mother has ever loved her son and whom He loves as no other son ever loved his mother. Any other belief or practice is against the tenderest ties of nature and does violence to human affections. Surely He was a model Son and she a model mother, and if an angel from heaven could address her "Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee," surely we may use the same words with the same veneration; and if St. Elizabeth could say to her "Blessed art thou amongst women and blessed is the fruit of thy womb," surely it is proper and natural for us to do the same. He would be an unnatural son who would not be pleased to see His mother honored for His sake. The Church honors the saints also *because* they reflect the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ. They have no merit save in His Infinite Worth; they are worthy of honor only because they reflect Him. Our Lord Jesus Christ is the Center whence all merit and glory comes and the circumference to which all goes. The veneration of His blessed mother and His saints comes

from Him and goes to Him. This is the sole meaning of the Catholic devotion and practice. To deny this and not honor the Blessed mother and the saints for His sake is to deny Him in part and refuse Him a portion of that glory which is truly His. For His mother is blessed and His saints are holy, and therefore worthy of our veneration only in and through and by Him.

THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

PROPOSITION: *Resolved that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*

CHURCH PROGRESS, Affirms.
AMERICAN BAPTIST, Denies.

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S EIGHTEENTH NEGATIVE.

(October 1, 1891.)

1st. In the days of the apostles the rule of faith was in the New Testament which was committed to writing through inspired men, before the close of the first century. The "Apostolic Body" was not the rule of faith, but the inspired word of Christ. If unwritten tradition was allowable (which it is not) then the Roman Church is utterly condemned and anathematized, because her traditions contradict the inspired infallible Bible rule. After the Old Testament word of God was committed to writing in the Scriptures, no Old Testament teacher was allowed to appeal to tradition as authority. Since the New Testament Word has been committed to writing, no New Testament teacher is allowed to appeal to unwritten tradition as standard authority. Such license would open the flood gate for the admission of all the heresies of men and devils. If there is difficulty in understanding the simple teachings of Jesus Christ in his word, then there is tenfold more difficulty in understanding the teachings of the Pope (even if he were infallible), because he speaks *ex-cathedra* in Latin, and all the Cardinals, Bishops and priests who translate and convey these teachings to the masses, are fallible. According to the theory of Rome, it would require an infallible teacher to be within easy access of every child of God. If the *Progress* should ac-

cept the challenge to discuss the proprietorship of the Roman Church over the Holy Scriptures, we will show that that Church has been the avowed enemy of the Bible, and has really instigated the murder of thousands, because of their attachment to Bible truths.

2nd. It is untrue. The Roman Church does not teach that "Jesus is the sole head of the Church." She teaches that the Pope of Rome is the sole head of the church of God on earth. We have a Roman Catholic publication called "Sketches of the Life and Times of Pius Ninth Pontiff and King," by Rev. Nazareno Graziani, D. D. On page 15 the author speaks of Pius as "Sovereign Pontiff, head of the Church of Jesus Christ." The tradition which teaches that the Pope is the supreme head of the church of Christ, is an anti-scriptural tradition and amounts to treason. Concerning the decree of infallibility, on page 201, the same writer says that "the Vicar of Christ being the visible bridegroom of the Church would be of an inferior condition to that of his bride which enjoys infallibility!" This blasphemous doctrine makes the Pope the bridegroom of the Church. The whole question of the infallibility and supremacy of the Pope is anti-scriptural and blasphemous. In every New Testament example of church discipline the business was transacted by the whole church.

3rd. The *Progress* admits that the celibacy of the clergy is not a Bible doctrine. It is simply a disciplinary measure of the Church. This *disciplinary* arrangement which forbids the ministers and various other religious orders to marry, marks the Roman Church as teaching the "doctrines of devils." The inspired infallible Word of God says: "It behooveth therefore a bishop to be blameless, the husband of one wife," "having his children in subjection with all chastity." 1 Tim. 3:2-4. Also, "now the Spirit manifestly saith, that in the last times

some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to spirits of error, and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy, and having their conscience seared. Forbidding to marry, to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving by the faithful, and by them that know the truth." 1 Tim. 4 1-3. The Roman Church is guilty of a departure "from the faith, giving heed to spirits of error, and doctrines of devils," "forbidding to marry, to abstain from meats," etc. Thus the Roman *tradition* of forbidding to marry and *commanding* to abstain from meats is branded by the infallible Word of God as "the doctrines of devils." Therefore the Roman Catholic Church which teaches "the doctrines of devils" is not the true church of God. Of course, under some circumstances, it was no sin to remain unmarried; and especially in view of the desolations which were about to come upon the Jews. But, *forbidding to marry is anti-Christian and devilish.*

4th. The *Progress* has not even given one Word of Scripture proving that there was a Pope at all, let alone proving his infallibility. Jesus Christ is the only infallible head of the church.

5th. We give the editor of the Catholic Dictionary credit for telling the truth concerning *kleeroon* against the fraud of the Roman Douay version. In 1 Peter 5:3, elders or pastors were simply to rule by preaching the truth and by their example. No pastor or elder had any ecclesiastical jurisdiction over any other minister, or local church. The local churches are the only executives in the organic kingdom of Christ on earth.

6th. It is not true. Baptists and Protestants do confess their sins one to another. When one child of God sins against another, and he is made conscious of it, he confesses that sin to the brother whom he has wronged. As seen in our last,

the Roman Theology teaches the priest to utter a deliberate falsehood and then swear to it. This the *Progress* admits by failing to make an effort to refute our allegations. If the Theology of Rome requires a priest to commit the crime of *perjury* for the good of the Church, what must be the infamous instructions of such perjured priests to the laity? In fact, in the deep, dark confessional the wife or daughter must have greater intimacy with the priest-god than with her husband or mother! Though the husband and wife are "one flesh," yet the priest must know all the secrets of the wife which she dare not tell her own husband! It is made the duty of the priest to demand of the wife or daughter an answer to the most filthy questions that blackguard vulgarity can invent!! If this is denied by the *Progress* we will furnish the texts proving this allegation. To cap the climax of blasphemy, these priests in the confessional are called gods, though many are drunken perjured wretches. As an example of the *godship* of the priesthood of Rome, we refer to the "inside history of the diocese of St. Joseph," Mo., as given by Bishop John J. Hogan. A petition was presented to Bishop Hogan, of Kansas City, from the members of the St. Joseph Cathedral for the removal of Father Ignatius, a German priest, and that another priest be put in his place. In answer to this petition, Bishop John J. Hogan wrote a private letter to Mr. Lysaght, the leading petitioner, explaining his difficulty in getting good priests. Though marked *private*, this letter was allowed by Bishop Hogan to be seen by the petitioners. In 1887, a suit was pending against the priest, A. M. J. Hynes, of Pierce City Mo., in which Bishop Hogan was concerned. The attorney of Mr. Hynes, by some means, got possession of this letter, and read it as evidence in court, the Bishop admitting its genuineness. It was then published in the *Kansas City Times*,

and in the *Missouri Republican* of June 20th, 1887. In this letter to Mr. Lysaght Bishop John J. Hogan says:

"I did not know then as now what by bitter experience I know but too well, that priests ordained for and belonging to a diocese do not leave it but through compulsion or expulsion, especially when the change is from a rich diocese to a poor diocese. Such expelled priests are a happy riddance to bishops they have grieved and parishes they have scandalized, but they are a withering curse to bishops and parishes compelled to have their services."

"In their charity for erring priests," says Bishop Hogan, Bishops that expel them always give them "written recommendation" an "honorable mention," hoping that they will do better!! But, as a rule, they failed to improve. Of these, Bishop Hogan, in his letter exclaims:

"But, alas! human nature is very weak, and when temptations come again they are yielded to, and thus it is that in trying to pardon and lift up erring men, we have only to get them into deeper disgrace and give them opportunity to disgrace themselves more and more, and to carry and spread disgrace from diocese to diocese and from parish to parish. In this way priests are known to go from Ireland to England, and thence to Australia, through the United States from one diocese to another, pardoned by one bishop, exhorted by another, to no purpose, but to spread quarrels, contentions and scandals through the Church of our blessed Redeemer."

Thus Bishop John J. Hogan gives the "inside history" of these *priest gods* (?) who are taught in Roman theology to tell a lie and swear to it. As examples of the many bad priests in his diocese, Bishop Hogan gives the names, dates, and places of twenty-two which, he says, are "*only a few*" that might be mentioned. Since 1869, the Bishop says: "I cannot give you a history of each individual case of misfortune and of crime. The recital would be too long and often too shameful in detail. I mention the names and dates of a few!" If these *twenty-two* were "*only a few*" in the one diocese of St. Joseph, the good priests must have been like angels' visits. Among these Bishop Hogan mentions the names of Rev. Mitchael Hailey, of Brookfield mission, constantly drunk; once made an assaults on a

female;" "1869 received into diocese of St. Joseph, Rev. P. McGinnis (Breckinridge mission) constantly drunk;" "1869 received into diocese of St. Joseph, Francis O'Reilly, student recommended by priests of St. Louis." "After ordination had charge of Plattsburg mission. Was constantly drunk." "1869 received to diocese of St. Joseph, Rev. George Turk from the diocese of St. Louis. Got charge of Conception mission. Was constantly drunk." Bishop Hogan concludes his list of twenty-two, "only a few" of the bad priests, and says:

"The constant shameful public and sacrilegious drunkenness of the last three mentioned priests who were by my side at the cathedral determined me to wipe them and their kind out of my jurisdiction. Herbert, after repeated drunkenness, went into a spree for a week in my house; was in the house, broke out in the night, got into a house of disreputable women in his drunkenness and was thrown out into the street, picked up drunk, recognized and taken into a house and made sober, and put into a carriage and taken to my house. That evening Galvin and Kiley were told by me to prepare for the proper celebration of the feast of the patronage of St. Joseph for Easter Sunday. On Saturday night they staid up all night, drinking, carousing and shouting. Kiley fell down, blackened and almost broke his face in falling. Of course the two sacrilegious priests said mass the next day, and Kiley went into the pulpit and preached, with his blackened and bruised face, to the people in the cathedral. This was on the feast of the patron of the diocese and of the universal Church."

What will the *Progress* say for the *infallibility* and *godship* of these drunken and licentious priests? To these drunken "brute beasts" women, old and young, married and single, alone, in the secret confessional, are compelled on pain of damnation to answer the most vulgar and polluting questions which Satan himself could invent! However grossly insulted and injured, in the confessional, no woman dare tell a friend of the outrageous conduct! All that occurs in the confessional must remain a part of the "inside history" of the Roman Church, and her "ghostly" priesthood!! Before we confess to such a priest we must know that he has confessed, in the deepest repent-

ance, his sins committed in the secret confessional, to almighty God, and give evidence of his conversion by repudiating Romanism and the Pope, and following Jesus Christ. It is well known that the Roman penance is a ceremonial affair, and the so-called absolution of the priest does not change the affections of the penitent so as to hate sin. Every sin so committed and absolved only prepares him the more for similar and greater crimes. But when God *regenerates* and *absolves* from sin, he plants in the heart of the penitent an intense hatred for sin. "Whoever is born of God committeth not sin; for his seed abideth in him, and he cannot sin because he is born of God." 1 John 3:9. But the priestly absolution, while it may sooth the conscience and remove the fear of punishment, does not eradicate the love of sin. While believing, as he does, that the priest has absolute power, as God himself, to forgive all sorts of sins, he has a powerful temptation to commit the most fiendish crimes. The Catechism of the Council of Trent, page 183, says: "There is no sin, however grievous or however frequently committed which penance does not remit." Thus a drunken priest in the confessional becomes a God and can pardon the most fiendish murderer that ever dyed his hands in the blood of his fellow men! We repeat, the confessional of the Roman Church is the dark fountain from which all sorts of crimes and abominations flow. Will the *Progress* dare to find a solitary passage of Scripture, or even one word, that supports such an horrible tribunal! The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because of her horrible, filthy, blasphemous and degrading sacrament of penance.

Our twelfth negative argument affirms that the Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God because of her anti-scriptural idolatrous worship of Mary, saints and images. The Roman Catholic theologian, Liguori, in his Mission

Book, page 169 calls Mary "Queen of all the heavenly hosts." In the Litany, on page 186 he calls Mary "the Mother of our Creator!" On page 162 Liguori prays: "Do not leave me until thou seest me safe in heaven, occupied in blessing thee, and singing thy mercies throughout eternity. Amen." In this Mary is exalted, and God is ruled out of the worship of Heaven. Again, on page 161 Liguori says:

"Most holy and immaculate Virgin, my Mother Mary, it is to thee, the Mother of my God, the queen of the world, the advocate, the hope, and the refuge of sinners, that I have recourse to-day, I, who am the most miserable of all. I render thee my humble homage, O great Queen, and I thank thee for all the graces which thou hast bestowed upon me until now, particularly for having delivered me from hell, which I have so often deserved."

This makes Mary *the Savior!* On page 167 he says: "So then, most pure and virgin queen, thou who art rich in power, and rich in compassion. Thou art both able and desirous to save us all." According to this, Mary is the Savior of all! On page 188 we have this prayer:

"Remember, O most merciful Virgin Mary, that it is unheard of, that anyone flying to thee for protection, imploring thy help, or seeking thy intercession, was ever forsaken. Animated by this unerring confidence, I hasten to thee, Virgin of Virgins; I fly to thee, O sweet mother; a wretched sinner, I prostrate myself groaning at thy feet; despise not my prayer, O Mother of the divine Word, but graciously hear and grant the same. Amen."

Such is the degrading idolatry of the Church of Rome which makes Mary the mediatrix and Savior of sinners. On page 346 of the Mission book Liguori teaches that every head of a family should "pray every day before the crucifix," and on page 379, Liguori says: "Encourage the dying person to look often on the crucifix and kiss it. Let an image, too, of the blessed Virgin Mary be placed before his eyes that he may have recourse to her." Thus the unfortunate slave of Rome, having been kidnapped and deceived in infancy by the sacreligious ceremony of infant baptismal salvation, is continued in

superstition through life and deluded and cheated out of his soul by image worship in his dying moments. Such is the horrible idolatry of the Roman Catholic Church. Romanists are also taught to pray to souls suffering in purgatory. See Liguori's Mission Book, p. 209. "St. Catherine of Bologna, when she wished to obtain any grace, had recourse to the souls in purgatory, and her prayers were heard immediately." Also the Roman Catholic Church is filled with the worship of saints and images. Surely the Roman Catholic Church, which is guilty of the grossest idolatry in worshiping wafer-gods, Mary, saints, and images, cannot be the true church of God. Also, the establishment of "lent," holy days, and saints' days, helps to mark the Roman Church as the false Church. To the Galatians, who had been bewitched by false teachers, Paul says: "You observe days and months, and times, and years, I am afraid of you lest perhaps I have labored in vain among you." Gal. 4:10, 11. The Galatian churches were being injured by false teachers. Again the apostle says: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of a festival day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbaths: Which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is Christ's. Let no man seduce you, willing in humility, and religion of angels, walking in the things which he has not seen, in vain puffed up by the sense of his flesh." Col. 2:16-18. But the Roman Church and Pope do judge in meats and drinks and in respect to holy days and Sabbaths. Also they teach the worship of saints and images, which God has forbidden. Therefore the Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God.

THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

PROPOSITION: *Resolved that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*

CHURCH PROGRESS, Affirms.
AMERICAN BAPTIST, Denies.

CHURCH PROGRESS' NINETEENTH AFFIRMATIVE—MINUS, *having ignominiously retreated.*
(October 8, 1891.)

In its thirteenth affirmative the *Progress* acknowledged that "if the Bible be the sole rule of faith then the Catholic Church is not the true church of God." "Let the BAPTIST demonstrate that the Bible alone is the sole rule of faith and it will have vanquished us ignominiously." That the *Progress* has been defeated and "ignominiously" vanquished is shown as follows:

THE LETTER OF SURRENDER.

St. Louis, September 29th, 1891.

MR. D. B. RAY,
ED. AMERICAN BAPTIST—

DEAR SIR: Your 6th of this week's controversy so patently violates the 5th article of agreement regulating the controversy that we are compelled to protest against it. Either you must cut it out entirely or we will no longer continue the controversy. We cannot let our columns be used as the vehicle of such filthy matter, which is plainly against the terms of our agreement as well as against ordinary decency. We did not enter upon this controversy, nor did we suppose you would, for the purpose of spreading scandal and defaming religion in general. Had this been our intention we would long before this have raked up every scandal connected with the Protestant clergy in the country, which, as you are well aware, are numerous. We would also have raked up the scandalous and disgraceful history of John of Leyden and the early Baptists. But we did not, and do not now, propose to lend ourselves to this sort of disgraceful scandal-monging. It is neither argument nor decency. To cherish the iniquity of bad men lends

neither force nor weight to an argument, and the Baptists as much as any other sect of Protestants need to cover up its record. A history of the doings of the Baptists of Munster would be neither delectable nor edifying. Unless, therefore you will cut out the objectionable matter, and refrain from such dirt slinging in the future, we will decline to controvert any further. An immediate answer will oblige,

Yours truly,
CONDE B. PALLER,
Editor *Church Progress*.

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S LETTER IN REPLY.

St. Louis, Mo. September 29, 1891.

Church Progress, City.

DEAR SIR: Yours of this date considered. I have not violated the "agreement." I have made no disrespectful reference to the *Church Progress* or any of its editorial staff. The part of my argument complained of gave a sad sample of the immorality of many of the priesthood of the Roman Church to whom the membership are required to confess their sins, as unto God. We gave this example to show that the Roman Church bears bad fruit and must be known by the same. The 4th article of agreement says: "That due courtesy and respect becoming religious journals shall be strictly observed by each paper towards its opponent." We have rigidly observed this rule towards the *Church Progress*, though the *Progress* has, on more than one occasion, grossly violated this agreement. The "filthy matter," which is complained of is the testimony of Roman Catholic theologians and writers concerning the doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome and her priests. Your reference to Baptist history is uncalled for and the statement untrue.

In our invitation, to the discussion, which was accepted by the *Church Progress*, we said: "In the negative we expect to show that the Roman Catholic Church is a huge political despotism, which has cursed the world for centuries past. Will Rome risk the light of investigation?" To this the *Progress* said: "We accept Mr. Ray's challenge" saying, "We tender our assistance to Mr. Ray of the AMERICAN BAPTIST to investigate the 'Church of Rome.' We believe that Mr. Ray is afraid of cold print. His reply to our acceptance of his challenge will put his good faith to the test. We shall rejoice at the opportunity of showing his Baptist readers what the Church of Rome really is. Will the gentleman pick up our gauntlet?"

In the light of these facts, we hope that the *Progress* will reconsider the matter of retreat, and continue to discuss to the end, unless it is prepared to make an unconditional surrender of the Roman Catholic Church to be the true church of God.

Also, your letter came too late for any changes in my reply. It had already gone to the press rooms.

Very respectfully,

D. B. RAY,
Editor AMERICAN BAPTIST.

The agreement of the *Church Progress and Catholic World* to enter into a discussion of the claims of the Roman Catholic Church with the AMERICAN BAPTIST, was a genuine surprise all around. Many predicted that the *Progress* would find some excuse to retreat before the opening of the conflict; and, since the Controversy has been going on, many have asserted that the Roman authorities would not allow the exposure of the rottenness of their theology and hierarchy before their own people. The *ignominious* defeat and retreat of the *Church Progress* is proof, positive, that the Church of Rome cannot endure the light of truth. More than two years ago, Priest Enright, endorsed by Bishop John J. Hogan, of Kansas City, was lecturing in Northwest Missouri, in support of the Roman Catholic Church and challenging Protestants and Baptists for discussion. His challenge was accepted for the editor of the AMERICAN BAPTIST, and the time agreed upon for the discussion to take place at Maryville, Mo. When the editor of the AMERICAN BAPTIST appeared on the field, ready for the oral discussion, Priest Enright failed to put in an appearance. The Roman authorities doubtless feared the light of investigation.

March 2, 1891, it was reported that a few ministers, and other citizens of St. Louis, met socially in the study of one of the churches and actually said some things in opposition to Papal rule in St. Louis. The *St. Louis Republic* and *Globe-Democrat* made a sensation out of this social meeting in which the editor of the AMERICAN BAPTIST was prominently criticised. At the close of an editorial explanation bearing date of March 12, 1891, we added the following:

"However, as we have been challenged in the past to the discussion of the claims of the Roman Catholic Church, and the representative, endorsed by Bishop Hogan to meet us, backed out, we renew the *invitation* for the Roman Catholic authorities to furnish a man whom they will endorse as able to sustain the claims of the Papacy. We repeat the proposition, as accepted and endorsed by Priest Enright, who was approved to defend Romanism. The proposition reads: '*Resolved, That the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*' As Priest Enright backed out from the discussion at Maryville, Mo., we now invite the Catholic authorities in this city to appoint some representative to support this proposition in a public, friendly discussion. In the negative, we expect to show that the ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IS A HUGE POLITICAL DESPOTISM, which has cursed the world for centuries past. Will Rome risk the light of investigation?"

To which the *Church Progress* replied:

WE ACCEPT.

The AMERICAN BAPTIST, edited by D. B. Ray, gave birth to the following in its issue last week:

"As we have been challenged in the past to the discussion of the claims of the Roman Catholic Church, and the representative endorsed by Bishop Hogan to meet us backed out, we renew the *invitation* for the Roman Catholic authorities to furnish a man whom they will endorse as able to sustain the claims of the Papacy. We repeat the proposition as accepted and endorsed by Priest Enright, who was approved to defend Romanism. The proposition reads: '*Resolved, That the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*' As Priest Enright backed out from the discussion at Maryville, Mo., we now invite the Catholic authorities in this city to appoint some representative to support this proposition in a public, friendly discussion. In the negative we expect to show that the ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IS A HUGE POLITICAL DESPOTISM, which has cursed the world for centuries past. Will Rome risk the light of investigation?"

We accept Mr. Ray's challenge to a public discussion of the proposition he proposes, in the columns of the AMERICAN BAPTIST and the *Church Progress*, under the following condition: *That both journals shall publish verbatim the arguments of its opponent.* If Mr. Ray is in good faith, this is his opportunity. We are quite willing to risk the light of investigation. All we ask is the acceptance of the above condition.—*Church Progress and Catholic World*, March 21, 1891.

The AMERICAN BAPTIST in its issue of March 26, replied:

The readers of the AMERICAN BAPTIST will remember the back-out and retreat of the Roman Catholics from the Maryville discussion. They made the challenge, fixed the place, and demanded

that we should fix the time. But they failed to come at the time. It was our firm conviction that the leaders were conscious that the Roman Catholic Church could not afford to endure the light of investigation. And since the *Church Progress* has signified its willingness to enter the discussion, prominent men, not Baptists, expressed their conviction that the Catholic authorities will yet find some pretext to avoid the discussion. Another vaunting editorial squib, in the same issue of the *Church Progress*, reads thus:

"We tender out assistance to Mr. Ray of the *American Baptist* to investigate the 'Church of Rome.' We believe that Mr. Ray is afraid of cold print. His reply to our acceptance of his challenge will put his good faith to the test. We shall rejoice at the opportunity of showing his Baptist readers what the Church of Rome really is. Will the gentlemen pick up our gauntlet?"

We cheerfully pick up the gauntlet as we are not "afraid of cold print." It may warm up a little before the controversy closes. We rejoice in the opportunity to lay before our readers the claims of the Roman Catholic Church in a dignified controversy with the representative of the ablest Romanists in the West. Such a controversy between a Roman Catholic and a Baptist has never occurred. It will be something new under the sun. We also rejoice at the prospect of laying before a host of Roman Catholic readers the contrast between Roman Catholicism and true Christianity. The points of preliminary agreements have been mutually accepted as follows:

"*First.* The *Church Progress* and AMERICAN BAPTIST mutually agreed that the discussion shall last at least six months provided either party desires it.

"*Second.* That an equal amount of space with the same size type be occupied by the above named papers with the arguments, amounting to two and a half or three columns each, of the AMERICAN BAPTIST space, each week.

"*Third.* That both journals shall publish verbatim the arguments of its opponent to the amount of space above agreed upon.

"*Fourth.* That due courtesy and respect becoming religious journals shall be strictly observed by each paper toward its opponent.

"We mutually for the AMERICAN BAPTIST and *Church Progress* agree to be governed by the above articles in the forthcoming discussion.

"The discussion to open April 25, 1891.

"D. B. RAY,
"Editor of *American Baptist*.
"CONDE B. PALLEN,
"Editor of *Church Progress*."

The *Church Progress and Catholic World* is the leading Roman Catholic paper in the West. It is published by the Catholic Publishing Company of St. Louis. The names of the directors of the Publishing Company are as follows:

Very Rev. P. P. Brady, president; Very Rev. H. Muehlsiepen, vice president; Conde B. Pallen, Secretary; Rev. C. Kuhlman, treasurer, of the *Church Progress*.

We publish its endorsement as follows:

Published with the approbation of Most Rev. P. A. Feehan, Archbishop of Chicago; Rt. Rev. P. J. Baltus, Bishop of Alton; Rt. Rev. L. M. Fink, O. S. B., Bishop of Leavenworth; Rt. Rev. J. J. Hogan, Bishop of Kansas City and St. Joseph; Rt. Rev. J. Janssen, Bishop of Belleville; Rt. Rev. J. Rademacher, Bishop of Nashville; Rt. Rev. K. C. Flasch, Bishop of La Crosse; Most Rev. F. X. Katzer, Archbishop of Milwaukee, and Rt. Rev. J. J. Hennessy, Bishop of Wichita.

Vicar General Brady, of St. Louis, is president of the board of directors. This paper has the endorsement of the Archbishop of Chicago, the Bishop of Alton, the Bishop of Leavenworth, the Bishop of Kansas City, the Bishop of Belleville, the Bishop of Nashville, the Bishop of La Crosse, the Archbishop of Milwaukee and the Bishop of Wichita. The *Church Progress* has the sanction of nine Archbishops and Bishops beside Vicar General Brady and a host of priests. The utterances of the *Church Progress and Catholic World* ought to be as nearly infallible as anything in the Church of Rome.

REMARKS.

1st. The *Church Progress* accepted our invitation for the discussion saying: "We accept Mr. Ray's challenge to a public discussion of the proposition he proposes, in the columns of the AMERICAN BAPTIST and *Church Progress*, under the following condition: That both journals shall publish verbatim the arguments of its opponent. If Mr. Ray is in good faith, this is his opportunity. We are quite willing the risk the light of investigation. All we ask is the acceptance of the above condition."—*Church Progress and Catholic World*, March 21, 1891.

2nd. The rules of agreement were suggested by the AMERICAN BAPTIST and adopted by the *Progress*, the fourth of which says: "That due courtesy and respect becoming religious journals shall be strictly observed by each paper towards its opponent." This has been adhered to strictly by the AMERICAN BAPTIST, though the *Progress* has more than once violated it.

3rd. The rules did not require the AMERICAN BAPTIST to refrain from exposing the Roman Catholic Church. In the challenge, accepted by the *Progress*, we distinctly said: "In the negative we expect to show that the ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IS A HUGE POLITICAL DESPOTISM which has cursed the world for centuries past."

We were just reaching this point in the controversy when the *Progress* "ignominiously" fled from the field. But the exposure will be made all the same, though the *Progress* is not "willing to risk the light of investigation."

4th. The *Church Progress* vauntingly said: "We believe that Mr. Ray is afraid of cold print. His reply to our acceptance will put his good faith to the test. We shall rejoice at the opportunity of showing his Baptist readers what the Church of Rome really is. Will the gentleman pick up our gauntlet?" We cheerfully picked up the gauntlet and for *eighteen* installments the Papal Controversy has attracted the attention of teeming thousands of American readers, until, (having previously surrendered the Bible citadel and fled into the swamp of tradition), the *Church Progress* has at last closed its columns against the *rays* of light and retreated into its den of darkness. It evidently realizes that ignorance is the mother of Papal devotion. *Who now is "afraid of cold print?"*

5th. The pretended excuse of the *Progress* for its ignominious backout was doubtless invented to cover the retreat. Had we yielded to the demand of the *Progress* to cut out our argument entirely, it might have gone further and demanded of us to make no argument at all. The "spreading scandal" complained of, was only the exposure of the scandalous practices and doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church as acknowledged by Roman Catholic authorities.

6th. As the *Church Progress* has forfeited its word and "ignominiously" retreated from the field of Controversy, we

now invite the Roman Catholic authorities of the United States to appoint some other representative to come to the support of this proposition while we "show that the Roman Catholic Church is a huge political depotism which has cursed the world for centuries past." The political character of the Roman Church must be exposed during the present investigation.

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S NINETEENTH NEGATIVE.

The charge of the *C. P.* that we had introduced "filthy matter" and were "dirt slinging" against the Roman Catholic Church is wholly without foundation. The "filthy matter" and ecclesiastical "dirt" is inherent and constitutional with the Roman Church. Our only offence in the matter has been that of uncovering a little of the "filthy matter" and "dirt" of that enormous system of ecclesiastical abominations. We were only performing a necessary, though painful duty, in exposing the "filthy matter" and "dirt" of the Roman Church, to induce Romanists to escape from Babylon, and keep others out of the deadly pitfalls of ecclesiastical "filthiness" in which millions have sunk to shame and everlasting ruin. The false claims of the Church of Rome must be exposed on the same principle that it would be necessary to expose the dangers of a city advertized for a great health resort, but beneath whose beautiful streets and gilded mansions there are innumerable pits and vaults filled with "filthy matter" from which is continually exhaled deadly miasmas as fatal as the far-famed Upas tree. Thousands are being decoyed into this city with the idea of securing health and perpetual life, but are only lured to breathe the deadly atmosphere and finally drop into the vaults of death. It would be the imperative duty of every philanthropist to expose the false claim of such a city of death and the hypocrisy of its rulers, who are reveling in luxury from the riches obtained from the property of the slain. The one who tears the

gilded covers from these pits of "filthy matter" and warns the people to avoid the deadly miasma of this city is certainly the benefactor of mankind.

The Roman Catholic Church is that great city of abominations. She is described in the book of Revelation as follows:

"And there came one of the seven angels which had the seven vials, and talked with me, saying unto me, come hither; I will shew unto thee the judgment of the great whore that sitteth upon many waters; With whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication, and the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication. So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness; and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet color, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication. And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH. And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus;" Rev. 17:1-6.

The scarlet colored beast is evidently the political Roman empire which supported the Roman Catholic Church. Her fornications with the kings of the earth is the union of church and state. "Purple and scarlet" are Papal colors and describe the Roman Catholic Church as the bloody, persecuting woman; and being "decked with gold," etc., indicates the untold wealth of the Roman Church. The "abominations" contained in the golden cup refers to the abominable, blasphemous doctrines of the Church. Her being drunk with the blood of the saints and martyrs of Jesus, points to the more than fifty millions of saints slaughtered by the instigation of the Roman Church. Surely Rome is the great city of death.

THIRTEENTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true Church of God because of her anti-scriptural purgatory.*

Liguori, the Romish theologian, in his "Mission Book," page 256, describing purgatory, says:

"Q. What is Purgatory? A. Purgatory is a place where some souls suffer for a while on account of those sins which they have not expiated during this life. Q. What souls are they which go to Purgatory? A. The souls of those who die in the grace of God, but are nevertheless still soiled by venial sins, or who have not done during their life sufficient penance for their sins. Q. How may these poor souls in purgatory be aided by us? A. They may be aided, 1. By prayer. 2. By the holy Sacrifice of the Mass. 3. By other good works done for their sake. 4. By indulgences."

There is no Bible authority for the Romish purgatory. It was the invention of Satan to keep the people in his service. As the priests must be paid liberally for the masses to relieve these suffering souls in purgatory, this is the most powerful means known to the Romish Church to extort money from her stupid children. What parent, child, brother or sister would not pay out his last dollar to deliver his loved ones from the flames of purgatory, which are said to be as fearful as hell itself? We have a small book entitled "The Mirror of Souls," written in French. It claims to be an "exposition of the different states of the soul in relation to God, for the use of such as sincerely desire their salvation or that of others." It was printed by "Perissi Bros., printers to his Holiness the Pope and his Eminence Cardinal Archbishop, Lyon and Paris, 1853." The work contains a number of pictures describing the devil possessing the souls of men. On page 67 is an explanation of the picture which describes lost souls in the fires of purgatory, and also describes the use of purgatory in the following language:

"What you behold is not even a shadow of purgatory, of the pains which the souls endure which are condemned thereto. The fire which tortures them is the same, says St. Thomas, as that of hell; the time they have to stay there is in proportion to their faults; it may peradventure be a thousand years, says Bourdalove, (this is evident) because the Church grants indulgences for (even) such duration. Do you see how they struggle to rise upward to go to rejoice with God, and to escape the glowing heat? But they are repulsed and retained until they have satisfied the terrible justice of God, or until you, upon earth, have paid for them by

your alms, your prayers and your communion, in general by the holy Sacrifice (*i. e.*, the Mass) and your indulgences. Their guardian will then come to draw them out and lead them to heaven where they will report the services which you have rendered them." *

Such is the frightful picture drawn by the Romish writers to frighten the ignorant, and induce them to pay large sums of money for the delivery of the souls of their loved ones from the horrible tortures of purgatory. The Scriptures clearly teach that the righteous dead go immediately to heaven, the place of happiness. Jesus said to the converted thief, "Verily; I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." According to Romish teaching, the thief went that day to the horrible flames of purgatory. Paul says, "We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord." 1 Cor. 5:8. The righteous dead who are "absent from the body," are not in the tortures of purgatory, but are "present with the Lord." John says: "And I heard a voice from heaven, saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; and their works do follow them." Rev. 14:13. But Roman Catholics, instead of resting from their labors, must go to the awful torments of purgatory. All the saints who die in the Lord are "at rest from their labors." The Romish doctrine of purgatory is false. When the wicked die, they go directly to hell, from whence there is no deliverance. Read the 16th chapter of Luke. There is a great gulf fixed between the righteous and the wicked dead: none can pass from the place of torment to the place of happiness. Romish writers pervert the Scriptures to sustain their unscriptural purgatory. One passage perverted reads as follows:

"According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a

* See Appendix G.

wise master-builder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man's work shall be made manifest; for the day shall declare it because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved yet so as by fire."

This passage has no reference to the false doctrine of purifying souls by fire. If any one builds upon the foundation improper materials, described as wood, hay and stubble, such materials will be destroyed—burned up. The wood, hay and stubble cannot be purified by fire, so as to become gold, silver or precious stones. Doubtless purgatory was invented for the benefit of the priesthood to secure money under false pretense.

It is claimed that the Virgin Mary appeared to Simon Stock General of the Carmelites, and gave him a scapular and promised that all who wear this scapular will escape eternal burning. Also, it is claimed that Mary appeared to Pope John XXII., and promised to go down to purgatory every Saturday afternoon to bring out those who wear the scapular. Though some Romanists regard this part of the bull of Pope John as a forgery, yet all Romanists attribute great virtue to the use of the scapular, which is only a piece of cloth worn upon the shoulders before and behind. One other passage is grossly perverted by Romanists to establish their horrible purgatory, which is a great money-making machine for popery. Peter says:

"For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water." 1 Pet. 3:18-20.

This somewhat difficult passage cannot possibly teach the Roman doctrine of purgatory. Referring to the wicked destroyed by the flood, with the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, Paul says "they were reserved until the day of judgment to be punished." 2 Peter, 2d chap. The same class Jude describes as set forth "for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." Jude, 7th. Surely the Savior did not go and preach, while his body was in the grave to those lost souls in "eternal fire." If he was preaching to lost souls in purgatory, why did not the Savior send some preachers besides himself to those regions of sorrow to preach the gospel? Though Popes, Cardinals, and all the best Catholics that die are supposed to go to purgatory, no gospel is ever sent to them. Evidently the true meaning of the above-named Scripture is that the same Holy Spirit that quickened and raised the body of Christ from the tomb, was the Spirit that preached to the antediluvians through Noah, the preacher of righteousness. The terms "spirits" is sometimes used like souls to mean persons. They were in the prison-house of sin during the preaching of Noah. All sinners are in this prison. The mission of Christ is "to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house." Isaiah 42:7. This preaching to the spirits, or persons, then in the prison-house of sin, but now the prison-house of torment, was performed when "once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah." All true gospel preaching is attended by the Holy Spirit—the same Spirit that raised Christ from the dead. Surely the Roman Catholic Church which has so grossly wrested and perverted the Scriptures, as to make a horrible purgatory for the people of God. is not the true church of God. Purgatory is a confidence scheme by which ecclesiastical tricksters secure money under false pretense. It is one of the

most heaven daring systems of robbery ever perpetrated upon God's earth. The priests devour widow's houses under the pretext of relieving their relatives from purgatory, and for a pretense, make long prayers.

Instead of indulging in "filthy matter" as charged by the *Progress*, in this discussion we have refrained from mentioning the most abominable practices of the Roman Church. In fact we could not faithfully publish in English the infamous vulgarity of the doctrines and priesthood of the Church of Rome without becoming liable to prosecution for the circulation of obscene literature. The Rev. Charles Chiniquy was a priest in the Roman Church for twenty-five years, during which time he heard the confessions of two hundred priests, all of whom except nineteen, confessed their base and criminal relations with women. According to this estimate nine-tenths of all the Roman priests are base, licentious libertines. And yet these drunken bloated "brute beasts" are the "gods" of Rome. Their foul practices must not be exposed because it is "filthy matter" !!!

The testimony of "Father Hyacinthe," as given by "Father Chiniquy" declares that "ninety-nine out of every hundred of them, [the priests] live in sin with the females they have destroyed. And not only the common priests are, for the greater part, sunk in that bottomless pit of secret or public infamy, but the bishops and popes, with the cardinals, are no better." *The Priest, Woman and Confessional*, p. 280.

Charles Chiniquy, who was so long a Roman priest, says:

"Go to Italy, and there Roman Catholics themselves will show you the two beautiful daughters whom the last Pope, Pius IX., had from two of his mistresses. They will tell you, too, the names of five other mistresses—three of them nuns—he had when a priest and a bishop; some of them are still living. Inquire from those who have personally known Pope Gregory XVI., the predecessor of Pius IX., and after they have given you the history of his mistresses, one of whom was the wife of his barber, they will tell you

that he was one of the greatest drunkards in Italy! Who has not heard of the bastard whom Cardinal Antonelli had from Countess Lambertini? Has not the suit of that illegitimate child of the great cardinal secretary filled Italy and the whole world with shame and disgust? However, nobody can be surprised that the priests, the bishops, and the popes of Rome are sunk into such a bottomless abyss of infamy, when we remember that they are nothing else than the successors of the priests of Bacchus and Jupiter. For not only have they inherited their powers, but they have even kept their very robes and mantles on their shoulders, and their caps on their heads. Like the priests of Bacchus, the priests of the Pope are bound never to marry, by the impious and godless laws of celibacy. For everyone knows that the priests of Bacchus were, as the priests of Rome, celibates. But, like the priests of the Pope, the priests of Bacchus, to console themselves for the restraints of celibacy, had invented auricular confession. Through the secret confidences of the confessional, the priests of the old idols, as well as those of the newly-invented wafer gods, knew who were strong and weak among their fair penitents, and under the veil 'of the sacred mysteries,' during the night celebration of their diabolical mysteries, they knew to whom they should address themselves, and made their vows of celibacy an easy yoke."—*Priest, Woman and Confessional*, pp. 287, 288.

The dark confessional of the Church of Rome is so unspeakably infamous that language is inadequate to describe its *horrible "filthiness."* The Roman Catholic Church, which has invented such a polluting institution is not the true church of God, but the "Mystery, Babylon" of Revelation.

THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

PROPOSITION: *Resolved that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*

CHURCH PROGRESS, Affirms.
AMERICAN BAPTIST, Denies.

CHURCH PROGRESS' TWENTIETH AFFIRMATIVE—MINUS, *having "ignominiously" retreated.*
(October 15, 1891.)

In the *Progress* of Oct. 3, which should have contained its twentieth affirmative it makes its editorial

SURRENDER.

We publish from the *Church Progress* of Oct. 3, its pitiful excuse for its cowardly surrender.

THE END OF OUR CONTROVERSY.

Under the compulsion of self respect and in the name of common decency, we have determined to discontinue our controversy with the AMERICAN BAPTIST. In its last installment, the BAPTIST so grossly outrages all sense of decency, that we were forced to protest against the polluting matter in which it indulged, both as a violation of the fifth article of the agreement, by which the controversy was regulated, and as an offense against common decency. We protested against the matter in question, and requested the BAPTIST to cut it out, or we would cease controverting. This the BAPTIST refused to do. We have therefore declined to controvert any further. The editor of the BAPTIST, of course, claims that he has not violated the agreement, on the ground that the fifth article of agreement calls for due respect and courtesy *only* towards the editors of the respective papers. This is, of course a mere subterfuge and evasion. Due respect and courtesy becoming religious journals necessarily requires common decency both in the matter and manner of argument. Against this the BAPTIST has more than once sinned, and descended to the level of a common scandal monger, shaming in its vile insinuations and statements the columns of a police gazette. This feature became so

gross this week that we have come to the conclusion that the BAPTIST has purposely resorted to this method of escaping the pressure of our argument, and of compelling us out of self respect to break off the controversy. It will, of course, claim that, as we have declined further argument, the victory remains with it. We are quite willing to let the matter rest where it stands. When we entered upon the controversy, we did not propose, nor do we now propose, to dispute within the precincts of a house of shame with its brazen inmates, nor do we intend to let the BAPTIST drag the issue over a threshold forbidden to respectable people. Such surroundings may be congenial to the BAPTIST'S imagination, filled as we have seen it to be, with all sorts of polluting images. We not only willingly but with all speed retire from such a field, and leave it to the triumphant viciousness of an antagonist who prefers the sewers to the streets.

1st. We feel sorry for the staff of the *Church Progress* who are thus compelled to retire from the light of investigation. It well knows that the lack of "common decency" lies in the theology of Rome, and in her corrupt line of popes and priests. The matter complained of, is the deliberate testimony of Bishop John J. Hogan, showing that the priesthood of St. Joseph diocese, were totally corrupt and lacking in common decency. It was introduced to prove that the Roman Catholic Church is not the true church. The majority of her priesthood are totally corrupt. We strictly observed due respect and courtesy towards the *Church Progress*. While, according to the testimony of converted Catholics, nine-tenths of of the priesthood are grossly immoral and licentious, we have regarded the editors of the *Church Progress* as belonging to the better class, and have so treated them.

2nd. The charge is utterly untrue and slanderous that the AMERICAN BAPTIST has "descended to the level" of the common scandal-monger." If we were to publish in plain English the vile questions and instructions which priests are required, by Roman theology, to communicate in the confessional, we would be arrested at once, and our paper suppressed, for the publication and circulation of obscene literature. But if it is an offense to publish the questions propounded by the priest

to women of all classes and ages in the secret confessional, then what ought to be done with such priests for their intolerable vulgarity towards women alone in the confessional? Again we repeat: We challenge the *Church Progress* and Catholic authorities to an investigation. We are prepared to show from the approved theology of Peter Dens, Alphonsus Liguori, and Archbishop Kendrick, that priests are required, under the pretext that they are gods in the confessional, to propound to wives, mothers and daughters, questions of such intolerable vulgarity as to shame "common decency," as well as the "vile insinuations and statements [of] the columns of the *Police Gazette*." Will the *Progress* dare to deny that the Roman Catholic confessional is the most indecent, degrading and scandalous institution, so far as language and instruction are concerned, known to the world. These facts, in a modest way, should be known by the common people so that they may shun the confessional as they would a pest house of death. The Roman confessional is certainly a "house of shame" with its brazen inmates in the shape of priest-gods. While it is not at all congenial, yet polluting carcasses must be pointed out and removed from the city to protect the health of the inhabitants. Under a keen feeling of the shame of defeat, the *Church Progress*, "not only willingly but with all speed retires"—retreats—leaving the AMERICAN BAPTIST triumphant over the champions of the Roman Church whose "visciousness" cannot be fully exposed to the light of day without filling the astonished people with horror.

It is a sad fact that the theology of the Church of Rome allows the utterance of falsehood for the benefit of the Church. The *Church Progress* has deliberately and wilfully forfeited its word by its retreat from the discussion. The *Church Progress* said:

"We accept Mr. Ray's challenge to a public discussion of the proposition he proposes, in the columns of the AMERICAN BAPTIST and the *Church Progress*, under the following condition: *That both journals shall publish verbatim the arguments of its opponent.* If Mr. Ray is in good faith, this is his opportunity. We are quite willing to risk the light of investigation. All we ask is the acceptance of the above condition."

"We tender our assistance to Mr Ray of the AMERICAN BAPTIST to investigate the 'Church of Rome.' We believe that Mr. Ray is afraid of cold print. His reply to our acceptance of his challenge will put his good faith to the test. We shall rejoice at the opportunity of showing his Baptist readers what the Church of Rome really is. Will the gentleman pick up our gauntlet?"—*Church Progress and Catholic World, March 21st, 1891.*

What respect can the *Progress* have for its own word, when it deliberately and wilfully violates its own engagements? Can it expect a priest, drunk or sober, to forgive its sins? While Rome numbers six deadly sins, one of which is sloth, it does not include lying or stealing as deadly sins. Is this why the *Church Progress* so readily forfeits its own word? The *Progress* said: "All we ask is the acceptance of the above condition." That condition was accepted and strictly adhered to by the AMERICAN BAPTIST; but the *Progress* got afraid of "cold print" and refuses to "risk the light of investigation." Is it right and honest to tell people that the Roman Church is the true church of God, when it cannot bear the light of truth? We hope the *Progress* will repent of its sins, make confession, and open its columns for the conclusion of the discussion. We will be as easy on the Roman Church as the nature of the case will allow; but it must be remembered that desperate diseases demand heroic treatment.

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S TWENTIETH NEGATIVE.

As shown in our last, the Roman Church is not the true church of God, because of her horrible purgatory by which she robs her superstitious children of their property, under the pretext of delivering souls from suffering. In fact, masses for the dead become a great source of traffic, and are sold at stip-

ulated prices, to the votaries of Rome. The Church which has committed such a forgery is not the true church of God.

FOURTEENTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true Church of God because of her Society of Jesuits.* The Society of Jesus, falsely so-called, known as Jesuits, was organized under the leadership of Ignatius Loyola, a Spanish priest. After long preparation, he and six companions, met in an underground temple of the church of Montmartre, France, August 5, 1534, and organized the famous society known as the "Company of Jesus," or *Jesuits*. In 1539 Pope Paul III. gave the sanction of his infallibility to the Jesuits. It is acknowledged that this remarkable society was organized in order to oppose the Reformation under Luther and others. The Jesuit Society is regarded as the militia of the Church of Rome. Every Jesuit is a sworn soldier, to support the Pope in his temporal as well as spiritual power. We quote several extracts from a Roman Catholic work, called "Jesuits," by Paul Feval, as translated by T. F. Galwey, and published by John Murphy, Baltimore. The writer, translator and publisher were all Roman Catholics. As determined soldiers of the Church, the Jesuits may assume different characters to accomplish their purposes. Paul Feval says: "At Carthage, in South America, the Jesuits performed other wonders of charity. Just as they had become Pariahs in India to convert the Pariahs, and Brahmins to convert Brahmins, the blessed Peter Claver became a negro, and more than a negro, the 'slave of the negroes,' in order to raise these miserable victims of European avarice to the sentiment of religion." p. 162. They have assumed various garbs and professions by which to deceive the people as to their real objects. The Jesuits have ever been the bulwark of kings and despots where those kings could be used to further the plans of the Pope. Paul Feval claims that the Jesuits "for two centuries had been

the bulwark of royalty." p. 227. It is admitted by historians that the Jesuits have fomented discord, commotions, and wars which have desolated the nations for centuries. During the time of their power and success, they became so outrageously wicked and fiendish in their character that they were expelled from the various countries (even Roman Catholic countries) at different times and under different circumstances. They were expelled from France. Paul Feval says:

"On the 6th of August, 1762, the parliament having decided this great case in one vacation, and having neglected or almost neglected the foundation of the case, gave a judgment which, by its very length is proved to have been prepared in advance, and which declared: The Society called the Company of Jesus, inadmissible in any polished state as being contrary to natural law, subversive of all authority, spiritual and temporal, and tending, under the specious veil of a religious institute, to introduce into the Church and into states, not an order which really and only inspires to evangelical perfection, but a political body whose essence is a continual activity in order to obtain, by all sorts of ways, direct and indirect, secret and public, at first an absolute independence and then the usurpation of all authority." *Jesuits*, p. 302.

Also, the Jesuits were charged by the French parliament with:

"Simony, blasphemy, sacrilege, magic, witchcraft, astrology, irreligion of all kinds, idolatry and superstition, immodesty, theft, parricide, homicide, suicide and regicide."—*Jesuits*, p. 303.

Feval quotes the decree of the parliament of France against the Jesuits, from which we quote. Among other crimes the French parliament accused the Jesuits with:

"Teaching men to live as beasts, and Christians to live as Pagans; offending chaste ears; nourishing concupiscence and leading to temptation and to the greatest sins; eluding the divine law by false sales, simulated societies and other artifices and frauds of that class; palliating usury; leading judges to prevarication; apt to foment diabolical artifices; troubling the peace of families; adding the art of deceit to the iniquity of theft; shaking the fidelity of domestics; opening the way to the violation of all laws, whether civil, ecclesiastical or apostolic; offensive to sovereigns and to government, and making the life of man depend on vain reasonings and systems; excusing revenge and homicide; approving of cruelty and of personal revenge; contrary to the second commandment of charity, and stiling even in parents and children all feel-

ings of humanity; execrable, contrary to filial love, opening the road to avarice and to cruelty; tending to produce homicides and unheard-of parricides; openly opposed to the Decalogue; protecting massacres; threatening magistrates and human society with certain loss; contrary to the maxims of the Gospel, to the examples of Jesus Christ, to the teachings of the Apostles, to the opinions of the Fathers, to the decisions of the Church, to the certainty of life and honor of princes, their ministers, and their magistrates, to the repose of families, to the good order of civil society; seditious, contrary to natural law, to positive law, and to the law of nations; smoothing the way to fanaticism and to horrible carnage; disturbing the society of men; creating an ever-present danger to the life of kings; doctrines, whose poison is so fearful and so well attested by their sacreligious effects that they cannot be viewed without horror." pp. 305 and 306.

Notwithstanding that the members of the French parliament were reared in the Roman Catholic Church, yet the doctrines and practices of the Jesuits were so superlatively devilish and ruinous to all society, social and political, that they were compelled to expel them from the government as an unbearable nuisance. Surely, the Roman Catholic Church which now tolerates that Society, holding the same principles, cannot be the true church of God, but the anti-Christian Church. The intolerable crimes of this so-called "Company of Jesus" became so unbearable, that from time to time, they were expelled from the various countries of Europe, until at last, Pope Clement XIV., under fearful pressure of the civil power, abolished the horrible Society of the Jesuits in 1773. "They had been expelled from England, 1604; Venice in 1606; Portugal in 1759; France, 1762; Spain and Sicily in 1767; and now they were totally suppressed and abolished by Pope Clement XIV., in 1773." But this horrible Society was revived and established by Pope Pious VII., in 1814. The Society now has the full sanction of the Roman Catholic Church which amounts to the endorsement of all its horrible crimes. Of this Society the historian, Mosheim, says.

"In the sphere of morals, the Jesuits made still more dreadful and atrocious inroads than in that of religion. In affirming, that

they have perverted and corrupted almost every branch and precept of morality, we should not express sufficiently the pernicious tendency of their maxims. Were we to go still farther, and maintain that they have sapped and destroyed its very foundations, we should maintain no more than what innumerable writers of the Romish Church abundantly testify, and what many of the most illustrious communities of that Church publicly lament. Those who bring this dreadful charge against the sons of Loyola, have taken abundant precautions to vindicate themselves from the reproach of calumny. They have published several maxims inconsistent with all regard for virtue, and even decency, which they have drawn from the moral writings of that order, and more especially, from the numerous productions of its casuists. Mosh. p. 559. Maclains translation.

This testimony of Mosheim is but the testimony of history concerning this flagitious Society, blasphemously called the "Company of Jesus." We have before us a book called the Secret Instructions of the Jesuits, printed verbatim from the London copy of 1725, issued from Princeton, N. J., in 1831, to which is added an appendix. We quote from page 94:

"The Jesuits were implicated in the assassination of Henry III., of France—planned the Spanish Armada—often contrived the death of Elizabeth of England—invented the gunpowder plot—instigated the murder of Henry IV., of France—impelled the revocation of the edict of Nantz—ruined James II.—and in short, were commingled with all the atrocities and miseries which desolated Europe during nearly two-hundred years. So atrocious, extensive, and continual were their crimes, that they were expelled, either partially or generally, from all the different countries of Europe, at various intervals, prior to the abolition of the order in 1773—THIRTY NINE TIMES—a fact unparalleled in the history of any other body of men ever known in the world. This is the seal of reprobation stamped upon Jesuitism." p. 94.

Surely the Roman Catholic Church, which gives its sanction to this atrocious Jesuit Society, is not the true church of God. The appendix to the Secret Instructions of the Jesuits quotes George Bronswell, the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, in 1558, less than twenty years after Jesuitism started, as saying:

"There is a fraternity, which has lately arisen, called the Jesuits, who will seduce many. Who, acting for the most part like the Scribes and Pharisees, will strive to overturn the truth: they will go [far and] near to accomplish their object for they transform

themselves into various shapes; among pagans, they will be pagans; among atheists, atheists; Jews among Jews; and reformers among reformers,—for the sole purpose of discovering your intentions, your hearts and your desires. These persons are spread over the whole earth; they will be admitted into the council of princes, which will however be no wiser for their introduction; they will infatuate them so far as to induce them to reveal the greatest secrets of their heart; they will be in no way aware of them. This will be the consequence of their advisers neglecting to observe the laws of God and of his gospel, and conniving at the sins of princes. Notwithstanding, God will, in the end, in order to avenge his law, cut off this Society, even by those who have most supported and employed it, so that at last they will become odious to all nations." *Appendix, p. 140.*

These bitter fruits of Jesuitism grew naturally from the fundamental principles of that Society. These principles of the Society of the Jesuits are wholly subversive of the principles of law and justice. In 1879, the Chamber of Deputies of France discussed the law of "Liberty of Superior Education," in which the Jesuits were prohibited from teaching. Senator Paul Bert took an active part against the Jesuits as teachers, and exposed their principles as being so corrupt as to be dangerous to the rising generation. The Jesuits called in question his statements of their doctrine. In self-defense, Deputy Paul Bert wrote a very important book, called "Doctrines of the Jesuits," in which he gave numerous citations of the immoral teachings of the Jesuits, giving an analysis of the work of "Father Gury, S. J.," professor of moral theology of Romain. Gury is the leading Jesuit theologian. This very important work of M. Bert has been translated into English. Numerous quotations from Gury's Theology, show clearly that, under some circumstances, "murder, lying, stealing, and the like," are allowed by the Jesuits. Under the head of cases of conscience, the first case is given thus:

"Florine makes this confession: I have lied, but I did not believe I was sinning, because I was constrained by a very grave motive; it was to excuse my cousin, and save him from a severe chastisement. Ques. Can Florine be excused from sin, and is

her action commendable? Ans. She ought to be excused from the sin of lying, because of an invincible erroneous conscience. Moreover, she has acted well. What might be opposed to this decision is, that she might have had in view a formal evil; now that cause does not exist, because it is sufficient, in order to be meritorious, that the end in view should be good in principle; so that, in conscience, one should be convinced of its excellency. Do not say that an object materially bad is opposed to the divine will; because, though it is opposed to the primary divine will, it is not opposed to the secondary one, by which God orders or permits us to do something, in supposing our ignorance insuperable. God, indeed, by His consequent will, wants man to do what he feels uncontroably obliged to do." pp. 70-72.

Here deliberate lying is authorized by Jesuit theology. Surely the Roman Church which endorses such a Society is not the true church of God. Senator Bert, on page 242 of the Doctrines of the Jesuits, quotes Gury thus:

"Jacob has killed Marc, who was ruining his family by his luxury and habits of drunkenness. His confessor orders him to give a sum of money, as an indemnity, to Marc's family. Jacob answers that the death of Marc, instead of being a misfortune, is a profit to his family. His confessor insists; and as Jacob persistently refuses to obey, the confessor sends him away without giving him absolution. Ques.: Ought Jacob in reality to indemnify the family of Marc, whom he has killed? Should the confessor order him to give this compensation? Ans.: No; for Jacob has not caused any damage to the family, and he has even prevented it from being more ruined. Then the confessor, by reason of justice, could not order him to indemnify the family, threatening him with the refusal of absolution. He could only impose on him a penance, either of giving some money to the family, if it was in need, or of giving it as alms to the poor."

These are samples of the immoral and dangerous doctrines of the Jesuits. They allow the commission of almost all sorts of crimes in the interests of the Church. It is utterly absurd to suppose that the Church which endorses and encourages the Jesuits can possibly be the true church of God.

THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

PROPOSITION: *Resolved that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*

CHURCH PROGRESS, Affirms.
AMERICAN BAPTIST, Denies.

CHURCH PROGRESS' TWENTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE—MINUS, *having "ignominiously" retreated.*
(October 22, 1891.)

Like the man at the feast without the wedding garment, the *Church Progress* in its last issue is speechless concerning the discussion. Hoping to *provoke* the *Progress* to make an attempt to keep its word, we republish its vaunting acceptance of the discussion:

"We accept Mr. Ray's challenge to a public discussion of the proposition he proposes, in the columns of the AMERICAN BAPTIST and the *Church Progress*, under the following condition: *That both journals shall publish verbatim the argument of its opponent.* If Mr. Ray is in good faith, this is his opportunity. We are quite willing to risk the light of investigation. All we ask is the acceptance of the above condition."

"We tender our assistance to Mr. Ray of the AMERICAN BAPTIST to investigate the 'Church of Rome.' We believe that Mr. Ray is afraid of cold print. His reply to our acceptance of his challenge will put his good faith to the test. We shall rejoice at the opportunity of showing his Baptist readers what the Church of Rome really is. Will the gentleman pick up our gauntlet?"—*Church Progress and Catholic World*, March 21, 1891.

How are the mighty fallen! The *Church Progress* Company by their action confess before the world that the Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God. Surely it is high time for them to forsake that huge ecclesiastical Babylon, which cannot endure the light of investigation! The Church of Rome is described thus:

"And after these things I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power; and the earth was lightened with his glory. 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. 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, and the merchants of the earth are waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies. And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." Rev. 18:1-4.

The Roman Catholic Church loves darkness rather than light, because her deeds are evil.

"And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved. But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God." John 3:19-21.

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S TWENTY-FIRST NEGATIVE.

In our fourteenth negative argument, as seen in our last, we showed that the Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because of her so-called Society of Jesus. We have an edition of the Secret Instructions of the Jesuits containing the Latin and English, with an historical sketch by the Rev. W. C. Brownlee, D. D., published in Boston, Mass., 1888. Mr. Brownlee quotes from Brewster's *Edinburg Encyclopædia* as follows:

"Thus a peculiar energy was imparted to the operations of this most singular society. The Jesuits are a naked sword, whose hilt is at Rome, but its blade is everywhere, invisible until its stroke is felt." Secret Instructions of the Jesuits, p. 9.

It is charged, and generally believed, that Pope Clement XIV., who suppressed the Order of Jesuits, was soon afterward poisoned by their instigation. In his historical introduction, Mr. Brownlee says:

"The Secret Instructions formed a code of the laws of Jesuitism. They were not allowed to be made known even to many members

of a certain class of Jesuits. They had bold, daring, bad men to achieve desperate deeds, and take off their enemies by steel or bullet, or poisoned chalice. These knew something that others did not. They had also disguised agents, men in mask. These Jesuits knew something not imparted to others of the same order. They had shrewd, crafty, courteous and most polished men, who courted nobles, insinuated themselves into the favor of princes, kings and rich widows and young heirs and heiresses. These had their 'INSTRUCTIONS' from their general. They had fine scholars, decent, steady, serious, moral men. These were not at all let into the secret of Certain INSTRUCTIONS. They were sent out as traps to captivate the serious, the unsuspecting, the religious. These had it in charge to give a captivating representation of their Society of Jesus." p. 17.

The very name *Jesuit* has become a synonym for *cunning, craft, deception, fraud*, and all that is fiendish in false religion. We insert the Jesuit's oath, as follows:

I, A. B., now in the presence of Almighty God, the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Blessed Michael the Archangel, the Blessed St. John the Baptist, the Holy Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul and the saints and Sacred Hosts of Heaven, and to you my ghostly father, I do declare from my heart, without mental reservation that the Pope is Christ's Vicar General and is the true and only head of the universal Church throughout the earth, and that by virtue of the Keys of binding and loosing given to His Holiness by Jesus Christ *he hath power to depose Heretical Kings, Princes, States, Commonwealths, and Governments, all being illegal without his sacred confirmation, and that they may safely be destroyed.* Therefore, to the utmost of my power, I will defend this doctrine and his Holiness' rights and customs against all Usurpers of the Heretical or Protestant Authority whatsoever, especially against the now pretended Authority and Church in England and all Adherents, in regard that they be usurped and heretical, opposing the Sacred Mother Church of Rome.

I do renounce and disown any allegiance as due to any heretical King, Prince or State, named Protestant, or obedience to any of their *inferior Magistrates or Officers.*

I do further declare the doctrine of the Church of England, or Calvinists, Huguenots and other Protestants, to be damnable, and those to be damned who will not forsake the same. I do further declare that I will help, assist and advise all or any of His Holiness' agents, in any place wherever I shall be, and to do my utmost to extirpate the heretical Protestant doctrine, and to destroy all their pretended power, regal or otherwise. I do further promise and declare, that notwithstanding I am dispensed with to assume any religion heretical for the propagation of the Mother Church's interest to keep secret and private all her agent's coun-

sels as they entrust me, and not to divulge, directly or indirectly, by word, writing or circumstance whatsoever, but to execute all which shall be proposed, given in charge, or discovered unto me, by you my ghostly father, or by any one of this convent.

All which I, A. B., do swear by the Blessed Trinity, and blessed Sacrament which I am about to receive, to perform, on my part to keep inviolably; and do call on all the Heavenly and Glorious Host of Heaven to witness my real intentions to keep this my oath. In testimony whereof, I take this most Holy and Blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist, and witness the same further with my hand and seal in the face of this holy convent. Secret Instructions of Jesuits, p. 23.

According to this oath, Jesuits owe no civil obedience or allegiance to any government except that of the Pope, or those approved by him. A Jesuit swears that all governments, without the confirmation of the Pope, may "*safely be destroyed.*" Also, the Jesuits renounce any allegiance as due to heretical kings, princes, or states, with "their inferior magistrates or officers." Thus every Jesuit is a sworn enemy to every government, except that sanctioned by the Pope. Yet, the Roman Catholics in this country are clamoring for the education of the rising generation to be placed in the hands of these sworn enemies of our government. No Jesuit can possibly be a loyal citizen of the United States. Every Jesuit is a secret and sworn enemy of the government and waging war against its institutions with all the trickery known to Jesuitism. Surely the Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because of its endorsement of this diabolical Society.

The secret *Instructions* of the Jesuits, called the *Secreta Monita*, are so superlatively devilish and opposed to truth, morality and good government that many Romanists are disposed to deny their genuineness. But the proof is overwhelming. In an historical sketch of the Secret Instructions of the Jesuits, p. 21, Mr. Brownlee says:

"The first copy of 'The Secret Instructions' was discovered in the Jesuits' College at Paderborn, Westphalia; and a second copy in the city of Prague. In the preface to these is found the same

injunction as that above: 'If these Rules fall into the hands of strangers, they must be positively denied to be the Rules of the Society.' The discovery of the copy at Paderborn was in this wise, as appears from the preface to the English copy, published in 1658. When Christian, the Duke of Brunswick, took Paderborn, he seized upon the Jesuit College there, and gave their library, together with all their collections of manuscripts, to the Capuchins. In examining these they discovered 'The Secret Instructions' among the archives of the Rector. And they being, as were also the other monkish orders, no friends to the Jesuits, brought them before the public."

The testimony is clear that these Instructions contain the rules of action for that Society. As a sample of the degrading teachings of that Society, we quote from chapter 7 of the *Secreta Monita*, which is headed:

"How such widows are to be secured, and in what manner their effects are to be disposed of.

I. They are perpetually to be pressed to a perseverance, in their devotion and good works, in such manner, that no week pass in which they do not, of their own accord, lay somewhat apart out of their abundance for the honor of Christ, the blessed Virgin or their patron saint; and let them dispose of it in relief of the poor, or in beautifying of churches, till they are entirely stripped of their superfluous stores and unnecessary riches.

II. But if, besides their general acts of beneficence, they show a particular liberality to us, and continue in a course of such laudable works, let them be made partakers of all the merits of the society and favored with a special indulgence from the provincial, or even from the general, if their quality be such as may in some measure demand it:

III. If they have made a vow of chastity, let them according to our custom, renew it twice a year; and let the day whereon this is done be set apart for innocent recreations with the members of the society.

IV. Let them be frequently visited, and entertained in an agreeable manner, with spiritual stories; and also diverted with pleasant discourses, according to their particular humors and inclinations.

V. They must not be treated with too much severity, in confession, lest we make them morose and ill-tempered, unless their favor be so far engaged by others, that there is danger of not retaining it; and in this case, great discretion is to be used in forming a judgment of the natural inconsistency of women." *Secret Instructions of the Jesuits.* pp. 63, 65

Thus, it appears that the leading object of the Society of Jesuits is to secure the property of the rich. This is to be accomplished by systematic trickery and deception by which rich widows and daughters of wealthy persons are decoyed into the clutches of this greedy Society. The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God because of her fiendish army of Jesuits. As shown by the extracts given, some persons connected with the Jesuits, are kept in entire ignorance of the dark and ruinous character of these secret instructions.

FIFTEENTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God because of her bloody Inquisition.*

The overwhelming majority of Roman canonists hold and teach "that the Church can and ought to visit with fitting punishment the heretic and the revolter." After the union of Church and State up to the thirteenth century, it was the custom of the Roman Church to invoke the "secular arm" to punish heretics. In this century secular rulers were not as zealous in the persecution of heretics as the Roman Church desired. Therefore a new tribunal was necessary. Concerning the Inquisition the Catholic Dictionary says:

"The Church was as clear as ever upon the necessity of repressing heretics, but the weapon—secular sovereignty—which she had hitherto employed for the purpose, seemed to be breaking in her hands. The time was come when she was to forge a weapon of her own; to establish a tribunal the incorruptness and fidelity or which she could trust; which in the task of detecting and punishing those who misled their brethren should employ all the minor forms of penal repression, while still remitting to the secular arm the case of obstinate and incorrigible offenders. Thus arose the Inquisition. St. Dominic is said by some to have first proposed the erection of such a tribunal to Innocent III., and to have been appointed by him the first Inquisitor. Other writers trace the origin of the tribunal to a synod held at Toulouse by Gregory IX. in 1229, after the Albigensian crusade, which ordered that in every parish a priest and several respectable laymen should

be appointed to search out heretics and bring them before the bishops. The task of dealing with the culprits was difficult and invidious, and the bishops ere long made over their responsibility in the matter to the Dominican order." p. 446.

The Pope himself is president of "the congregation of Cardinals of the Holy Inquisition." The Inquisition was a court above or independent of the state, having jurisdiction over life and property in spite of the civil authorities. The Catholic Dictionary says:

"The duties and powers of inquisitors are minutely laid down in the canon law, it being always assumed that the civil power will favor, or can be compelled to favor, their proceedings. Thus it is laid down that they 'have power to constrain all magistrates, even secular magistrates, to cause the statutes against heretics to be observed,' and to require them to swear to do so; also that they can 'compel all magistrates and judges to execute their sentences, and these must obey on pain of excommunication;' also, that inquisitors in causes of heresy 'can use the secular arm,' and that 'all temporal rulers are bound to obey inquisitors in causes of faith.'" "The canon law also assumes that all bishops, being themselves inquisitors *ex vi termini* into the purity of the faith in their respective dioceses, will co-operate with the official inquisitors." "In France the Inquisition was established in pursuance of the decrees of the synod of Toulouse (1229) already referred to. Its tribunals were converted into state courts by Philip the Fair, who made use of them to condemn and ruin the Templars." The historian "Ranke calls the Inquisition a royal tribunal, furnished with spiritual weapons." The Roman Catholic Secretary of the Spanish Inquisition, Leorente, testifies "that during its existence of 330 years the Spanish Inquisition condemned 30,000 persons to death."

Thus, according to the testimony of the Roman Catholic Dictionary itself, the Inquisition, for the torture and murder of those who dared to differ from Rome, had the full sanction and endorsement of the Roman Church. The Pope himself is the chief Inquisitor, and "all temporal rulers are bound to obey the Inquisition." All Roman Catholic Bishops are, by their office, Inquisitors; and expected to co-operate with this bloody tribunal in hunting out and slaughtering the witnesses of Jesus. This fearful tribunal of the Inquisition, which has slaughtered hundreds of thousands of the saints of God, marks the Roman

Church as the bloody Babylon of Revelation. Of her, John says: "I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus: and when I saw her, I wondered with a great wonder." Rev. 17:6. R. V. The spirit of the Roman Church, as shown in her blood-thirsty Inquisition, is superlatively anti-Christian. When two of the disciples wished to call down fire on a village of the Samaritans, the Savior said: "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." Luke 9:55, 56. Instead of teaching this doctrine of bloody persecution, the Savior taught his disciples, "but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." Matt. 5:39. At the bar of Pilate, Jesus said: "My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence." John 18:36. On the cross the Savior said: "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do." Luke 23:34. When Peter smote off the young man's ear, the Savior restored it, and commanded Peter to "put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." Matthew 26:52. But in the face of all the teaching of the New Testament, the Pope, who claims to be the Vicar of Christ on earth, is supreme head of the tribunal of the Inquisition, which is the most fiendish and blood-thirsty tribunal which has ever polluted the Lord's earth. Surely the Roman Catholic Church cannot be the true church of God because of her tribunal of the Inquisition.

DuPin, a Roman Catholic historian, gives an account of the establishment of this tribunal in volume ninth of his ecclesiastical history, from which we quote concerning the events of the thirteenth century.

John Baussanees, Archbishop of Arles, held a provincial

Council in 1234, wherein he made twenty-four constitutions. Of this Council Du Pin says:

"In the third, he admonishes the bishops to make use of exhortations and even censures to oblige the officers of justice; and the lords to root out heretics out of their jurisdiction.

In the fourth it is ordered that every Sunday an ex-communication shall be published against heretics and their favorers.

The fifth imports that in each parish a priest and two other persons shall be settled as Inquisitors.

The sixth, that the heretics convicted [convicted] shall be condemned to perpetual punishment, and that those who will not recant shall be delivered up to the secular power.

In the eleventh, he orders that the bodies and bones of those who after death shall be discovered to have been heretics, shall be dug up again." *Du Pin, Vol. 9, 13 Century. pp. 109, 110.*

Six years before, 1228, the Inquisition is referred to by Du Pin, page 152, of his history of the thirteenth century:

"At last in the year 1228 Raymond, Count of Toulouse, was obliged to submit to King Lewis and the Pope, and to make a treaty with them upon what terms they pleased. It was begun at Meaux, and ended at Paris in the presence of Cardinal Romanus, the Pope's legate and of the lords of the land. The Count promised the legate and the king, that for the future he would be faithful to the Church and to the king of France; that he would extirpate the heretics and their favorers out of his territory; that he would set up the Inquisition in them; that he would pay a certain sum to those who should detect an heretic."

"About the Feast of Pentecost the king sent him" (Count Raymond) "into his own country, whither the legate accompanied him, and held a Council at Toulouse in the year 1229, wherein he set up the Inquisition, and made several orders for the extirpation of the heretics." p. 152.

"The Archbishop drew up the heads according to which the Count in the year 1233 made a very large declaration against the heretics, which he published at Toulouse on the 14th of February. This last blow put an end to the contest of the Albigenes, who were afterwards left to the Inquisitors, who totally destroyed the unhappy remainder of those heretics." Again, page 153.

"There have been already several instances of heretics condemned to fines, to banishments, to punishments, and even to death itself, but there had never yet been any war proclaimed against them, nor any crusade preached up for the extirpation of them. Innocent III. was the first that proclaimed such a war against the Albigenes and Waldenses, and against Raymond, Count of Toulouse, their protector. War might subdue the heads and reduce whole bodies of people, but it was not capable of alter-

ing the sentiments of particular persons, or of hindering them from teaching their doctrines secretly. Whereupon the Pope thought it advisable to set up a tribunal of such persons whose business should be to make inquiry after heretics, and to draw up their processes. For this purpose he made a choice of the Dominican and Franciscan Friars, who were newly established, to whom he gave commission to make an exact inquiry after heretics, and to draw up information against them: And from hence this tribunal was called THE INQUISITION. By degrees the authority of these Inquisitors increased, and whereas at the first they only drew up the process of heretics and solicited the ordinary judges to condemn them, they afterwards had the power granted them of trying the crime of heresy conjunctly with the bishops. The Emperor Frederick II. approved of this tribunal, took the Inquisitors into his protection, and attributed to the ecclesiastics the taking cognizance of the crime of heresy; leaving only to the secular judges the power of inflicting the punishment of death on those who were condemned. This tribunal of the Inquisition was at first set up at Toulouse, and in the other cities of Languedoc, where the heresy of the Albigenses and Waldenses had the deepest rooting. The Popes likewise set it up in Italy, from whence it passed a long time after into Spain; but it was banished from France, and could never be introduced into Germany."

Such was the origin of this Satanic tribunal blasphemously called the "Holy Inquisition." Though invented and planned by the pope and his emissaries, this terrible tribunal could not have accomplished its dreadful work of slaughter without the sanction and authority of the civil power. "The Emperor, Frederick II., approved of this tribunal and took the Inquisitors into his protection." Thus the Inquisition had the authority of the empire.

This Roman Catholic "Holy Inquisition" was the most diabolical and cruel tribunal ever established in the universe. Words are wholly inadequate to even faintly describe the fearful tortures of the Inquisition. Dowling, in his History of Romanism, has the following:

"The victims of the Inquisition were generally apprehended by the officers of the tribunal called familiars, who were dispersed in large numbers over Spain and other lands where the 'Holy office' was established. In the dead of the night, perhaps, a carriage drives up and a knock is heard at the door. An inquiry is made from the window, by some member of the family rising from his

bed, 'who is there?' The reply is the terrible words, 'The Holy Inquisition.' Perhaps the inquirer has an only child, a beloved and cherished daughter; and almost frozen with terror, he hears the words, 'Deliver up your daughter to the Holy Inquisition,' or it may be, deliver up your wife, your father, your brother, your son. No matter who is demanded, not a question must be asked. Not a murmur must escape his lips on pain of a like terrible fate with the destined victim. The trembling prisoner is led out, perhaps totally ignorant of his crime or accuser, and immured within those horrid walls, through which no sigh of agony or shriek of anguish can reach the ear of tender and sympathizing friends.

"The next day the family go into mourning; they bewail the lost one as dead; consigned not to a peaceful sepulchre, but to a living tomb; and strive to conceal even the tears which natural affection prompts, lest the next terrible summons should be for them. In the gloomy cell to which the victim is consigned, the most awful and mysterious silence must be preserved. Lest any of its internal secrets might be disclosed, no sounds were permitted to be heard throughout the dismal apartments of the Inquisition. The poor prisoner was not allowed to bewail his fate, or, in an audible voice, to offer up his prayers to Him who is the refuge of the oppressed; nay, even to cough was to be guilty of a crime, which was immediately punished. Limborch tells us of a poor afflicted victim who was, on one occasion, heard to cough; the jailor of the Inquisition immediately repaired to his cell and warned him to forbear, as the slightest noise was not tolerated in that house. The prisoner replied that it was not in his power to forbear; a second time they admonished him to desist; and when, again, the poor man, unable to refrain from coughing, had repeated the offense, they stripped him naked and cruelly beat him. This increased his cough for which they beat him so often, that at last he died through the pain and anguish of the stripes which he had received.

"The commonest modes of torture to force the victim to confess or to accuse themselves, were dislocation, by means of pulley, rope or weights; roasting the soles of the feet; and suffocation by water, with the torment of tightened ropes. These tortures were inflicted in a sad and gloomy apartment called the 'Hall of Torture,' generally situated far underground, in order that the shrieks of anguish generally forced from the miserable sufferers might not interrupt the death-like silence that reigned through the rest of the building." pp. 568, 569.

Such was for centuries the blood-curdling cruelty of the Roman Catholic Church, by which hosts of men and women were tortured to force them to accuse themselves of heresy. In violation of all principles of justice, the victim of the In-

quisition was not allowed to know who his accusers were. On bare suspicion he was tortured to force him to accuse himself of heresy.

SIXTEENTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because of her unparalleled blasphemy of the infallibility of the Pope.* The blasphemy of the Roman Church reached its climax in the promulgation of the dogma of infallibility in 1870. Prior to this date, no Romanist was required to believe the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope. But on the 18th day of July, 1870, Pope Pius IX. issued the decree of his own infallibility, thus fulfilling the prophecy of Paul concerning the "man of sin."

"Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming; even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they receive not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: that they all might be damned who believe not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." 2 Thes. 2:3-12.

The Pope claims to sit in the Church, or temple of God, claiming the attribute of God of *infallibility*, with the power of pardoning sins. We quote from the decree of infallibility as given in "The Vatican Decrees" by Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M. P., page 167, as follows:

"Therefore faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Savior, the exaltation of the Catholic religion and the salva-

tion of Christian people, the Sacred Council approving, we teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed. That the Roman Pontiff when he speaks *ex-cathedra*, that is, when in discharge of the office of pastor and doctor of all Christians by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the universal Church, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that his Church should be endowed for defining doctrines regarding faith or morals and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves and not from the consent of the Church. But if anyone—which may God avert—presume to contradict this our definition; let him be anathema.

Given at Rome in public Session solemnly held in the Vatican Basilica in the year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and seventy, on the eighteenth day of July, in the twenty-fifth year of our Pontificate." Vatican Decrees, pp. 167, 168.

Pius IX. declared himself infallible and this was for "the salvation of Christian people." If he spake *infallibly* concerning the dogma of infallibility then that which was necessary to salvation was not shown till 1870. Yet they say that Rome never changes!! Pope Pius vainly supposed that the establishment of of own infallibility would crush his foes and augment his own power.

"After extensive and careful preparations, the first (and perhaps the last) Vatican Council was solemnly opened amid the sound of innumerable bells and the cannon of St. Angelo, but under *frowning skies and a pouring rain*, on the festival of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, Dec. 8, 1869, in the Basilica of the Vatican. It reached its height at the fourth public session, July 18, 1870, when the decree of the Papal infallibility was proclaimed. After this it dragged on a sickly existence till Oct. 20, 1870, when it was adjourned till Nov. 11, 1870, but indefinitely postponed on account of the extraordinary change in the political situation of Europe. For on the second of September, the French Empire which had been the main support of the temporal power of the Pope, collapsed with the surrender of Napoleon III., at the old Huguenot stronghold of Sedan, to the Protestant King William of Prussia, and on the twentieth of September the Italian troops in the name of *King Victor Emanuel*, took possession of Rome, as the future capitol of united Italy. Whether the Council will ever be convened again to complete its vast labors, like the twice interrupted Council of Trent remains to be seen. But, in proclaiming the personal infallibility of the Pope, it made all future ecumenical councils unnecessary for the definition of

dogmas and the regulation of discipline, so that hereafter they will be expensive luxuries and empty ritualistic shows. The acts of the Vactican Council, as far as they go are irrevocable." Vatican Decrees, pp. 58, 59.

The doctrine of infallibility only plunged the papal throne deeper into the dire calamities which are surely coming upon that guilty power. We quote from Philip Schaff's "History of the Vatican Council," page 77 :

"The days of the two most important public sessions of the Vatican Council, namely, the first and the last, were the darkest and stormiest which Rome saw from December 8, 1869, to the 18th of July, 1870. The Episcopal votes and the papal proclamation of the new dogma were accompanied by flashes of lightning and claps of thunder from the skies, and so general was the darkness which spread over the church of St. Peter that the Pope could not read the decree of his own infallibility without the artificial light of a candle."

In the declaration of his own infallibility, the Pope reached the lowest depths of his iniquity and blasphemy. The Roman Church, which sanctions the dogma of the infallibility of the Pope, cannot possibly be the true church of God.

"And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet. For they are the spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty." Rev. 16:13, 24.

These demon frogs are symbols, doubtless, of the three most diabolical institutions connected with the Church of Rome.

1. The frog that came "out of the mouth of the dragon" is the tribunal of the Inquisition with its demon "*spirit*."
2. The frog that came "out of the mouth of the beast" is the Society of Jesuits, with its demon spirit of falsehood, fraud and crime.
3. The frog that came "out of the mouth of the false prophet" is the dogma of the infallibility of the Pope with its demon "*spirit*" of blasphemy and attempted usurpation of the throne of God. The tribunal of the Inquisition, though emanating from the spirit of Romanism, received its authority from the

Emperor Frederick II., who represented the dragon power. Therefore it came out of the mouth of the dragon. The Society of the Jesuits received their chief authority from the politico-ecclesiasticism of Rome, which is the beast. Therefore this second frog came out of the mouth of the beast. The dogma of the infallibility came from the Pope, and embraces also his claim to temporal power over all civil governments. Therefore this frog came out of the mouth of the false prophet, the Pope. These three infernal institutions—the "Holy Inquisition" (?), the "Company of Jesuits" (?), and Papal infallibility, are the three demon spirits that are to gather the nations to the great battle of Armageddon, in which the Church of Rome is to fall to rise no more. Surely the Roman Catholic Church cannot be the church of God. She is the habitation of such devils.

THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

PROPOSITION: *Resolved that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*

CHURCH PROGRESS, Affirms.
AMERICAN BAPTIST, Denies.

CHURCH PROGRESS' TWENTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE—MINUS,
having "ignominiously" retreated.
(October 29, 1891.)

In its vaunting acceptance of the Controversy, the *Church Progress* said: "If Mr. Ray is in good faith, this is his opportunity. We are quite willing to risk the light of investigation. All we ask is the acceptance of the above conditions." "That both journals shall publish verbatim the arguments of its opponent." But the *Progress* has deliberately and willfully forfeited its word. Is this because the theology of the Roman Church teaches a priest to utter a falsehood, and even swear to it? Again the *Progress* said: "We shall rejoice at the opportunity of showing his Baptist readers what the Church of Rome really is. Will the gentleman pick up our gauntlet?" But alas! the *Progress* has become frightened and refuses to tell our Baptist readers "what the Church of Rome really is." The *Progress* is "afraid of cold print." We learn that the *Progress* enrolled a large number of new subscribers on the promise of conducting the Controversy six months or more. But it has disappointed, and mistreated them by refusing to allow the discussion to be published in its columns. Such is the deception and treachery which is practiced under the sanction and endorsement of the Roman Catholic authorities.

Will not the *Progress* repent, make *confession*, and open its columns for the investigation of the Church of Rome?

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S TWENTY-SECOND NEGATIVE.

In our last, we showed that the dogma of infallibility carries with it the temporal, political supremacy of the Pope over all nations. It is the revival of the spirit of persecution, by the Church of Rome in the dark ages.

SEVENTEENTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT.—*The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God because she is a huge political despotism.* Referring to the Vatican decree of infallibility, Hon. William E. Gladstone, in his *Vaticanism*, lays down two propositions.

"I. That Rome had produced for active service those doctrines of former times, termed by me, 'rusty tools,' which she was fondly thought to have disused.

II. That the Pope now claims, with plenary authority, from every convert and member of his Church, that he 'shall place his loyalty and civil duty at the mercy of another;' that other being himself." p. 14.

This shows that all the claims to temporal power, made by the Popes in the past ages, is re-asserted in the decree of infallibility. On page 19, Gladstone quotes Schrader, the Jesuit, as follows: "In our view it is still useful that the Catholic religion should be maintained as the only state religion, to the exclusion of every other." Whenever possible, Romanists are ready and anxious for the establishment of the Roman Church as the State Church, with authority to punish all heretics who may oppose their State religion. The *Church Progress* has endorsed the most radical claims of Popery. We quote from its fourth of July issue as follows:

ULTRAMONTANE.

"We are ultramontane. We do not see how we could be anything else and be a consistent Catholic. It is true there is a bad odor in the nostrils of the world about the word ultramontane. An ultramontane means one who believes, for instance, in the

temporal power of the Pope. We are as ultramontane on this point as we can be. Indeed we know no point in Catholic doctrine or its cognates in which we are not ultramontane. One of these points is the school question. There can be no doubt of our ultramontaniam there.

In short, ultramontane really means to be as Catholic as the Pope. In our opinion unless one be as Catholic as that, he is not Catholic at all.

We write the above in answer to a communication complaining that the *Church Progress* is ultramontane. We are glad to be put on record. If our name were not *Church Progress*, we would like to change it to *The Ultramontane*. As the early Christians first received their name through the contempt of the pagans around them, so would we gladly receive the glorious title ultramontane through the contempt of the pagans around us.

We accept the compliment in the attempted rebuke. We have always been and always will be ultramontane. We haven't the least sympathy with liberalism or liberal Catholics as they like to be called. Liberalism is the pet devilry of the day, and we will form no alliance, direct or indirect, offensive or defensive, with the powers of the nether world.

Ultramontane is a harsh word in the ears of pagans."—*Church Progress and Catholic World*, July 4, 1891.

We give the *Progress* credit for its consistency, at least on one point, in endorsing ultramontaniam, which includes the temporal power of the Pope with all his usurped claims to temporal as well as spiritual authority over the nations. The *Progress* is "just as Catholic as the Pope" which means that it endorses all the usurpations of the Pope to temporal authority, which he has made in the past or may make in the future. The Vatican Decrees, in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance, by Cardinal Henry Edward Manning, is an effort to answer Mr. Gladstone's Vaticanism. From this very important work we quote to show the nature of the political despotism of the Church of Rome. On pages 50 and 51, Cardinal Manning says:

"The Divine Founder of the Christian Church said: 'To thee I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed also in heaven.' And again: 'All power is given to me in heaven and in earth.

Going therefore, teach all nations,' * * * 'teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.'

If these two commissions do not confer upon the Christian Church a supreme doctrinal authority, and a supreme judicial office, in respect to the moral law, over all nations, and over all persons, both governors and governed, I know what words could suffice to do so.

That authority and that office are directive and preceptive, so long as Princes and their laws are in conformity with the Christian law; and judicial, *ratione peccati*, by reason of sin, whenever they deviate from it."

On the ground of the keys, and that the Pope possesses all the authority of Jesus Christ "in heaven and in earth" he claims supreme doctrinal and judicial authority "over all nations, and over all persons, both governor and governed," with authority to decide when "Princes and their laws" are in harmony with the Christian law, and when they deviate from it. Thus, at the present time all the authority of Christ in heaven and in earth, political as well as religious, is claimed for that arch usurper of the Tiber. On page 53 of his Vatican Decrees, Cardinal Manning continues:

"If Christian Princes and their laws deviate from the law of God, the Church has authority from God to judge of that deviation, and by all its powers to enforce the correction of that departure from justice. I do not see how any man who believes in the Revelation of Christianity can dispute this assertion: and to such alone I am at present speaking.

Mr. Gladstone has quoted a passage from an 'Essay on Cæsarism and Ultramontaniam,' in which I have claimed for the Church a supremacy in spiritual things over the State, and have made this statement:

'Any power which is independent and can alone fix the limits of its own jurisdiction, and can thereby fix the limits of all other jurisdictions, is, *ipso facto*, supreme. But the Church of Jesus Christ, within the sphere of revelation—of faith and morals—is all this, or is nothing or worse than nothing, an imposture and an usurpation; that is, it is Christ or Antichrist.'

Here it is asserted that the Church (through the Pope) has authority not only to judge princes, but by all its power, to enforce its judgments upon civil rulers. Here it is also claimed that the Church is independent and can alone fix the

limits of its own jurisdiction, and is, *ipso facto*, supreme. "The Church of Jesus Christ, within the sphere of revelation—of faith and morals—is all this, or is nothing or worse than nothing, an imposture and an usurpation; that is, it is Christ or anti-Christ!"

We agree that the Church of Rome is a huge "imposture and an usurpation and anti-Christ." This huge political despotism, called the Roman Catholic Church, which claims political authority over all nations, cannot possibly be the true church of God, but is a huge political despotism. Cardinal Manning translates and republishes the celebrated Bull of Boniface VIII., issued in 1302, concerning his own temporal power. This Bull is called *Unam Sanctam*. We republish it entire as follows:

"We are bound to believe and to hold by the obligations of faith, one Holy Church, Catholic and also Apostolic; and this (Church) we firmly believe and in simplicity confess; out of which there is neither salvation nor remission of sins. As the Bridegroom declares in the Canticles, "One is my dove, my perfect one, she is the only one of her mother, the chosen of her that bore her;" who represents the one mystical Body, the Head of which is Christ; and the Head of Christ is God. In which (the one Church) there is one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism. For in the time of the Flood the ark of Noah was one, prefiguring the one Church, which was finished in one cubit, and had one governor and ruler, that is Noe; outside of which we read that all things subsisting upon the earth were destroyed. This also we venerate as one, as the Lord says in the Prophet 'Deliver, O God, my soul from the sword; my only one from the hand of the dog.'

'For he prayed for the soul, that is, for himself; for the head together with the body; by which Body he designated the one only Church, because of the unity of the Bridegroom, of the Faith, of the Sacraments, and of the charity of the Church. This is that coat of the Lord without seam, which was not rent but went by lots. Therefore of that one and only Church there is one body and one head, not two heads as of a monster; namely, Christ and Christ's Vicar, Peter and Peter's successor; for the Lord himself said to Peter. 'Feed my sheep.' Mine, he says generally; and not, in particular, these or those: by which he is known to have committed all to him. If, therefore, Greeks or others say that they were not committed to Peter and his successors, they

must necessarily confess that they are not sheep of Christ, for the Lord said (in the Gospel) by John, that there is 'One fold, and one only shepherd.' By the words of the Gospel we are instructed that in this his (that is Peter's) power there are two swords, the spiritual and the temporal. For when the Apostles say, 'Behold, here are two swords,' that is, in the Church the Lord did not say 'It is too much,' but 'it is enough.' Assuredly he who denies that the temporal sword is in the power of Peter, gives ill heed to the word of the Lord, saying, 'Put up again thy sword into its place.' Both, therefore, the spiritual sword and the material sword are in the power of the Church. But the latter (the material sword) is to be wielded on behalf of the Church, the former (the spiritual) is to be wielded by the Church; the one by the hand of the priest; the other by the hand of kings and soldiers, but at the suggestion and sufferance of the priest. The one sword ought to be subject to the other, and the temporal authority ought to be subject to the spiritual power. For whereas the apostle says, 'There is no power but from God: and those that are, are ordained of God;' they would not be ordained (or ordered) if one sword were not subject to the other, and as the inferior directed by the other to the highest end. For, according to the blessed Dionysius, it is the law of the Divine order that the lowest should be guided to the highest by those that are intermediate. Therefore, according to the order of the universe, all things are not in equal and immediate subordination; but the lowest things are set in order by things intermediate, and things inferior by things superior. We ought, therefore, as clearly to confess that the spiritual power, both in dignity and excellence, exceeds any earthly power, in proportion as spiritual things are better than things temporal. This we see clearly from the giving, and blessing, and sanctifying of tithes, from the reception of the power itself and from the government of the same things. For, as the truth bears witness, the spiritual power has to instruct, and judge the earthly power, if it be not good; and thus the prophecy of Jeremias is verified of the Church and the ecclesiastical power; "Lo, I have set thee this day over the nations and over kingdoms," etc. If, therefore, the earthly power deviates (from its end) it will be judged by the spiritual; but if a lesser spiritual power transgresses, it will be judged by its superior; but if the supreme (deviates), it can be judged, not by man, but by God alone, according to the words of the Apostle: "The spiritual man judges all things; he himself is judged by no one." This authority, though given to man and exercised through man, is not human, but rather Divine—given by the Divine voice of Peter, and confirmed to him and his successors in him whom Peter confessed, the Rock, for the Lord said to Peter: " whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."

"Whatsoever therefore resists this power that is so ordered by

God, resists the ordinance of God, unless as Manichaeus did, he feign to himself two principles, which we condemn as false and heretical; for, as Moses witnesses, "God created heaven and earth not in the beginnings, but in the beginning." Moreover, we declare, affirm, define and pronounce it to be necessary to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff." pp. 58-61.

Instead of one head, the Roman Church claims as head, Christ and the Pope, 'two heads, as of a monster.' But Christ is the *only head* of his Church. As Pope, Boniface VIII., delivered this bull *ex-cathedra*, therefore it must have the mark of infallibility. (?). The Pope claims authority over the two swords, the spiritual and temporal, as belonging to the Church. The temporal sword is to be wielded "by the hand of kings and soldiers, but at the suggestion and sufferance of the priest!" "The temporal authority ought to be subject to the spiritual power." "The spiritual power has to instruct and judge the earthly power, if it be not good, and thus the prophecy of Jeremias is verified of the Church and the ecclesiastical power: 'Lo I have set thee this day over the nations, and over kingdoms to root up, and pull down, and to waste, and to destroy, and to build and to plant.'" Jer. 1:10. Thus the Pope claims authority *over all nations and kingdoms, to root them up when he pleases, to pull them down when he thinks proper, to waste them according to his pleasure, to destroy them when he thinks best and to build them up and plant them according to his wisdom!* Such is the despotic claims of the Roman Catholic Church of this day. It is not simply the doctrine of the dark ages, but the doctrine of the present Pope, Leo XIII., and is bound to be the doctrine of all future Popes until the overthrow of their despotism. This famous *unan sanctum* Bull closes thus: "MOREOVER, WE DECLARE, AFFIRM, DEFINE AND PRONOUNCE IT TO BE NECESSARY TO SALVATION FOR EVERY HUMAN CREATURE TO BE SUBJECT TO THE ROMAN PONTIFF!!!" According to this infamous Bull,

every man, woman and child upon God's earth must be subject to the Pope, spiritually and politically, in order to salvation. Surely, the Roman Catholic Church which is a huge despotism, grasping for political power over the whole earth, cannot be the true church of God. This monstrous political despotism directly antagonizes Christ and his kingdom. "Though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich." 2 Cor. 8:9. When one was about to follow him, (doubtless for worldly motives) the Saviour said: "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head." Luke 9:58. Instead of claiming temporal power over all the kings like the Pope, Jesus, on earth, had no dwelling place, or even where to lay his head. The Pope, with an annual income of over twenty millions of dollars, with five hundred servants, men and women, in his Vatican palace, and one hundred soldiers as a body guard, cannot be the vicar of Christ in his poverty. When the young man appealed to the Master to speak to his brother to divide the inheritance with him, the Savior answered: "Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?" Luke 12:14. The Savior claimed no authority to judge concerning temporal matters. But the Pope claims to be judge and divider over the whole world, spiritual and temporal. Also, when he was demanded of the Pharisees when the kingdom of God should come, he answered and said: "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: Neither shall they say, Lo here, or, lo there, for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you," rather in the midst of you. Luke 17:21. Of course, the kingdom was not in the hearts of those Pharisees, but in their midst. It came not with outward show or observation; but the Roman Catholic Church, which comes with outward show and display of temporal power, is not the kingdom of Christ. At the bar of

Pilate, the Savior said: "My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my kingdom not from hence." John 18:36. The Roman Catholic Church is a kingdom of this world, claiming authority over all, therefore it is anti-Christian and false. The Saviour was so kind and tender-hearted that a bruised reed he would not break, nor quench the smoking flax. Isa. 42:3. "For the Son of man is come not to destroy men's lives, but to save them." Luke 9:36. For his murderers, on the cross, the Savior prayed: "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do." Luke 23:34. In direct rejection and rebellion against the doctrine of Christ and his apostles, the Roman Church is a huge political, despotic hierarchy asserting authority over all the nations of the earth. Should she succeed in her far-reaching, political schemes, every man, woman and child upon God's footstool will be bound in perfect and abject slavery, soul and body to the Pope of Rome. Hon. Wm. E. Gladstone in his *Vaticanism* on page 28 says:

"Had all antagonists been content to reply with the simple ingenuousness of Dr. Newman, it might have been unnecessary to resume this portion of the subject. I make no complaint of the Archbishop; for such a reply would have destroyed his case. Dr. Newman, struggling hard with the difficulties of his task, finds that the statement of Dr. Doyle requires (p. 12) 'some pious interpretation;' that in 1826 the clergy both of England and Ireland were trained in Gallican opinions (p. 13) and had modes of thinking 'foreign although to the minds of the entourage of the Holy See; that the British ministers ought to have applied to Rome (p. 14) to learn the civil duties of British subjects; and that 'no pledge from Catholics was of any value to which Rome was not a party.'

This declaration involves all, and more than all, that I had ventured reluctantly to impute. Statesmen of the future, recollect the words, and recollect from whom they came; from the man who by his genius, piety, and learning towers above all the eminences of the Anglo-Papal communion; who so declares a Romish organ, has been the mind and tongue to shape and express the English Catholic position in the many controversies which have arisen since 1845, and who has been roused from his repose on this occasion

only by the most fervid appeals to him as the man that could best teach his co-religionists how and what to think. The lesson received is this. Although pledges were given, although their validity was firmly and even passionately asserted, although the subject matter was one of civil allegiance, 'no pledge from Catholics was of any value to which Rome was not a party.'

Thus according to the learned Cardinal Newman, "NO PLEDGE FROM CATHOLICS WAS OF ANY VALUE TO WHICH ROME WAS NOT A PARTY." This is equivalent to the Jesuitical maxim that *no faith is to be kept with heretics*. The Roman Catholic Church allows its members to tell falsehoods and swear to them, in the name of religion. This is not simply the doctrine of Roman Catholics five hundred years ago, but it is the present doctrine of that hierarchy, which claims the right to educate the rising generation in her infamous principles of fraud and deception. In his *Vaticanism*, page 78, Mr. W. E. Gladstone says:

"I have now, at greater length than I could have wished, but I think with ample proof, justified the following assertions:

1. That the position of Roman Catholics has been altered by decrees of the Vatican or Papal Infallibility, and on obedience to the Pope.
2. That the extreme claims of the Middle Ages have been sanctioned, and have been revived without the warrant or excuse which might in those ages have been shown for them.
3. That the claims asserted for the Pope are such as to place civil allegiance at his mercy."

Perfect obedience to the Pope, as claimed in the middle ages, is claimed at the present time. The only reason why the Pope's authority is not enforced, as in the days of the Spanish Inquisition, is because he lacks the power. We have a very important Roman Catholic work by Louis Jouin, "priest of the Society of Jesus" and endorsed by John Cardinal McCloskey, Archbishop of New York, Oct 3, 1837. This is an able and theological work, stating the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church. On page 295 is the following:

"So that the body of the faithful do not participate in the government of the Church, but they are subject to it; their having

been incorporated into the Church by the sacrament of Baptism does not invest them with the powers of the priesthood, as Luther asserted; it makes them simply members of the Church, and gives them the right to participate in the spiritual blessings bestowed by Christ on his mystical body. It is not the faithful who make the Church; else, she would be only a human institution. Christ himself is her maker, and she communicates to those who join the privilege of membership. The government of the Church, therefore, is not democratic; it is not one in which the people delegate the ruling power to officials chosen by themselves and whose authority they may restrict at pleasure."

From this it appears that the "faithful" members of the Roman Church have no right whatever to participate in its government. They have the privilege of paying immense sums of money to support the priesthood in pomp and splendor, without the slightest representation in government. It is the oppression of taxation without representation. "The government of the Church, therefore, is not democratic" but despotic. The Pope rules with a rod of iron. We quote again from *Evidences of Religion*, endorsed by Cardinal McCloskey:

"Secondly, the Inquisition may be viewed as an ecclesiastico-political tribunal. When the Roman commonwealth became Christian, the emperors adopting into the code of laws, the canon law of the Church, looked upon heretics as disturbers of public order, and treated them accordingly. The Arian emperors applied these laws to harass and persecute Catholics; yet when, in 385, a Catholic emperor condemned heretics to death, this act excited the indignation of many bishops. When, after the disintegration of the Roman empire, true Christian states were founded, and the Catholic religion was considered by the nations as one of the fundamental laws of the State, heretics were held guilty, not only of a crime against God and the Church, but also of rebellion against the State, and of conspiracy against the constitution; the more so, because heresies of the West were not like the subtleties of the Greeks who dealt in abstract conceptions—they took a practical form and affected the body politic itself. No wonder, then, that the authorities of the State should punish such heretics as offenders in the civil order. But as the State cannot judge in religious matters, the tribunal to which these causes were deferred was, of necessity, a mixed court; the Church had to investigate and pronounce about the heresy; the secular judges applied the penalties inflicted by the State.

The spread of the Albigensian heresy led to the introduction of a special tribunal to check it and punish the guilty. The institu-

tion of the Inquisition, properly called, dates from the Council of Toulouse in 1229, and it soon was adopted in other countries; but, though it had to deal with turbulent heretics, who attacked Catholics wherever they could, destroyed churches and monasteries, murdered priests and religious, and committed other unheard of barbarities, even Protestant writers cannot find any tales of horror about the cruelties supposed to have been inflicted by inquisitors on convicted heretics." p. 306.

The Church claimed the right to condemn heretics, and turn them over to the secular arm for execution. But the Inquisition combined both the power of judging and executing. The charge that the Albigenses were guilty of attacking the Roman Catholics is not sustained by history. They resisted the crusading army of the Romanists to protect themselves and families from wholesale slaughter!

Also, on page 363, Jouin says:

"No law in any state, framed in opposition with her [the Church's] teaching, can be binding on the conscience of man; because such a law is opposed to the law of God, and we must obey God rather than man."

This is the claim of Jouin and Cardinal McCloskey, that no law of State, formed in opposition to the Roman Church, can be binding on man!! This is the claim for the Church of Rome, to nullify all State laws which are offensive to her. Again, on page 365 of *Evidences of Religion*, the theologian, Jouin, says:

"As the Church is a visible association, as she has to deal with men made up of body and soul, she must of necessity make use of material means. Hence it may happen that both Church and State have to legislate on the same subject. Oftentimes the limits of the respective jurisdictions are clearly indicated: for instance, in matrimony. As the matrimonial contract itself, its impediments, all cases arising therefore, they belong to the Church alone, because matrimony is a sacrament: but, as for the evil consequences of marriage, the laws of inheritance *ab intestato*, they belong to the jurisdiction of the civil authority. When, in doubtful cases, a collision of rights might arise, it is evident that, to preserve the union between both powers, the state must yield to the Church, since she is the higher power, and she alone is competent to determine the limits of her own jurisdiction."

This teaches that in case of collision between Church and State, the State must yield to the Church. Also, she alone has the right to determine the limits of her own jurisdiction. According to this, the State can make no laws which are binding, except as the Roman Catholic Church allows. Even in the present enlightened day, Romanists advocate the union of Church and State.

"Liberalism condemns this Christian view of union between Church and State, as if opposed to progress and modern civilization. Materialists, Pantheists and Rationalists scout the idea of a union between Church and State, because, denying as they do altogether, the supernatural order, they deem the Church a mere human institution, not based on objective truth, but the fanciful creation of a few enthusiasts." *Evidences of Religion*, p. 375.

Instead of advocating the "union of Church and State," Christ contended that his kingdom was not of this world. In his prayer (John 17:16) the Savior said that his disciples were not of the world. But the Roman Church is a worldly, political institution, which marks it as anti-Christ. Once more, the theologian, Jouin, says:

The Church after all does not need the protection of the temporal power; all that she requires is to be let alone. Wherever the Church is really separated from the State, as in the United States, she flourishes and spreads her influence more and more. Hence they applaud the efforts made now-a-days to uproot everywhere the last remnants of union between Church and State, in order that the Church may be entirely emancipated. They maintain that full liberty should be granted to all other religious denominations, even in countries altogether Catholic; for, say they, on what reasonable grounds can Catholics claim freedom in Protestant countries, if they themselves deny to Protestants the right of practicing their religion in Catholic states?

13. This theory, though very plausible in appearance, is devoid of truth. The condition of civil society may indeed be such that the Church will be satisfied if she be let alone, as may happen in countries where the majority of the citizens are non-Catholics, and she may no doubt flourish under these circumstances, provided the liberty granted by law be not merely nominal, but real; for the Church, being under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, may prosper even when exposed to the worst persecutions, as she prospered under the first three centuries of the Christian era. But it

is false that such a state of things is to be considered the normal condition of civil society with regard to the Church, and that therefore it should be introduced even in Catholic countries where the union between Church and State still exists. No state can be governed, unless its laws be based upon the principles of right and justice; and these can be fully known only through divine revelation, of which the Church is the divinely appointed guardian and interpreter. The State, therefore, must be subordinate to the Church, and accept from her the principles of divine law, that it may be enabled to frame its own laws in accordance with those of God. To assert that the State is entirely independent of the Church, is tantamount to holding that it is independent of God, and need not be subject to his law. pp. 377, 379.

According to Rome, the "normal condition of civil society, with regard to Church and State" requires "the union of Church and State." Also, it teaches that in Catholic countries, "liberty" should not be granted to all other denominations? Here is the old doctrine of intolerance and persecution in a work published in the United States and endorsed by the first cardinal of this country. It means that just as soon as the Roman Catholics gain the ascendancy, other denominations will be suppressed. The Roman Catholic Church is still breathing out threatenings and slaughter against those who dare to differ from her abominable doctrines. The closing paragraph of *The Evidences of Religion* endorsed by Cardinal McCloskey reads thus:

"The fundamental mistake of these liberal Catholics lies in supposing that falsehood has the same right to exist and spread this influence as truth. This is much akin to the Manichean heresy: for, if error and falsehood possessed the same rights as truth, the evil spirit, father of lies, would have the same right as God, author of truth, and consequently would be independent of, and equal to, him in power. Error must at times be tolerated by society; the Church herself has not the right to compel by force those who never joined her communion, to abandon their errors. Yet this is no warrant for saying that error has a right to exist. All right is derived from God, and he, the fountain-head of all truth, necessarily detests error and cannot approve it. The Church instituted by God to lead mankind to truth has the most undoubted right to proclaim it everywhere to all mankind, and no human power is privileged to impede her action. It is not only her right, but her duty, to shield her children from error, and use for this

purpose every means given her by God. On the contrary, error can never claim this right."

Thus it is taught that other denominations "must be at times tolerated" when the Romanists have not the power to root them out. In the last sentence it is claimed that it is the right and duty of the Church to bring to bear all the power at her command to shield her children from error. This means that she has a right to use the secular arm to punish heretics and protect Romanists. While, on the contrary, those in error can never claim the right of protection. Such are the blood thirsty principles of the Roman Catholic Church which has caused it to shed the blood of vast millions of the human family, for daring to differ from her base idolatry.

This universal temporal power over princes and kings was not simply the papal *doctrine*, but it was carried out in *practice* in all places and times where the Pope had the power.

The German Emperor, Otho, was excommunicated and deposed by Pope Innocent, of which the Catholic historian, Reeve, says :

"Excommunication had no effect upon a man who was obstinately wrong. The Pope then declared that he had forfeited his title to the imperial crown, and forbade his subjects to acknowledge him any longer for their sovereign. Otho immediately sunk into contempt, was neglected and abandoned by all the world. The princes of Germany elected in his stead Frederic, the young king of Sicily, son of the late emperor, Henry VI."—*History of the Church, p. 376.*

In like manner, Henry the IV., emperor of Germany, was excommunicated, deposed and required to do penance before the Pope's (Gregory VII.) palace at Canossa, three days and nights barefoot, in his night clothes, before he had the supreme privilege of kissing the Pope's toe and receiving his pardon. During this disgraceful penance, the Pope was revelling in luxury with his royal mistress, the Countess Matilda.

This was the exercise of the infallibility of the Popes in the time of the glory of their power. The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because it is a huge, political despotism, which has cursed the earth for centuries past.

THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

PROPOSITION: *Resolved that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*

CHURCH PROGRESS, Affirms.
AMERICAN BAPTIST, Denies.

CHURCH PROGRESS' TWENTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE—MINUS, having "ignominiously" retreated.

(November 5, 1891.)

By its action, the *Church Progress and Catholic World*, having the endorsement of seven bishops and two archbishops, confesses that the Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God. Its "ignominious" retreat from the discussion, after its boasting, amounts to the confession that the Roman Church cannot bear the light of investigation.

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S TWENTY-THIRD NEGATIVE.

Our seventeenth negative argument says that "THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IS NOT THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD, BECAUSE IT IS A HUGE POLITICAL DESPOTISM." The testimony is overwhelming that the Pope claims authority not only over spiritual matters, but over all the temporal kingdoms in the world. He claims that it is essential to salvation that every human being shall be subject to him, temporally as well as spiritually. In fact, the triple crown of the Pope indicates that he claims authority in heaven, earth and hell. Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, in his *Vaticanism*, concerning this universal claim of the Pope, on page 61, says:

"But the Triregno of the Pope, figured by the Tiara, touches heaven, earth, and the place of the departed. We now deal only with the earthly province. As against the local sway of the State,

the power of the Pope is ubiquitous; and the whole of it can be applied at any point within the dominion of any State, although the far larger part of it does not arise within its borders, but constitutes, in the strictest sense, a foreign force. The very first condition of State rule is thus vitally compromised.

"The power with which the State has thus to deal is one dwelling beyond its limits, and yet beyond the reach of its arm. All the subjects of the State are responsible to the State: they must obey, or they must take the consequences. But for the Pope there are no consequences: he is not responsible."

Should the Pope ever get supremacy over the nations, as he once had, he would set up kings, or depose them, according to the good pleasure of his will. He assumes authority in "heaven, earth and the place of the departed." Surely such an usurper of the authority of Christ, is anti-Christ. It is claimed by some that the Popes have not attempted to interfere with temporal governments during the past two hundred years. But this supposition is shown to be false by the facts of history. Mr. Gladstone, in his *Vaticanism*, pp. 63 and 64, of this subject has the following:

"1. In his Allocution of the 22d of January, 1855, Pious IX. declared to be absolutely null and void all acts of the government of Piedmont which he held to be in prejudice of the rights of Religion, the Church, and the Roman See, and particularly a law proposed for the suppression of the monastic orders as moral entities, that is to say as civil corporations.

2. On the 26th of July in the same year, Pious IX., sent forth another Allocution, in which he recited various acts of the Government of Spain, including the establishment of toleration for non-Roman worship, and the secularization of ecclesiastical property; and, by his own apostolic authority, he declared all the laws hereto relating to be abrogated, totally null, and of no effect.

3. On the 22d of June, 1862, in another Allocution, Pius IX. recited the provisions of an Austrian law of the previous December, which established freedom of opinion, of the press, of belief, of conscience, of education, and of religious profession, and which regulated matrimonial jurisdiction and other matters. The whole of these 'abominable' laws 'have been and shall be totally void, and without all force whatsoever.'"

Pius IX., predecessor of the present Pope, Leo XIII., exercised his pretended infallibility in nullifying the laws of the government of Spain, which tolerated the worship of Protest-

ants. Also, he nullified and set aside certain laws of Austria which "established the freedom of the press, of belief, of conscience, of education and of religious profession." This principle of liberty he denounced as abominable and totally void. Surely, the Roman Catholic Church, which assumes political power over the nations, in direct antagonism to the principles of Christianity, cannot be the church of Christ. On pages 67 and 68 in his *Vaticanism*, Mr. Gladstone describes the political despotism of Rome thus:

"We see before us the Pope, the Bishop, the priesthood and the people. The priests are absolute over the people; the Bishops over both; the Pope over all. Each inferior may appeal against his superior; but he appeals to a tribunal which is secret, which is irresponsible, which he has no share, direct or indirect, in constituting, and no means, however remote, of controlling; and which during all the long centuries of its existence, but especially during the latest of them, has had for its cardinal rule this—that all its judgments should be given in the sense most calculated to build up priestly power as against the people, episcopal power as against the priests, Papal power as against all three."

Thus the papal power has absolute control, spiritually and politically, over all loyal Roman Catholics, and claims supremacy and authority over all the civil governments of the earth. Are the citizens of the United States ready to bow the knee to this huge political despotism? Pope Paul III. condemned and excommunicated Henry VIII., King of England, on the ground of his authority directly from God himself. On the same assumed authority, Pius V. condemned Queen Elizabeth and absolved her subjects. On the death of bloody Mary, her sister Elizabeth, a Protestant, ascended the English throne. This was highly displeasing to his *Holiness Pope Paul IV.*, who made an unsuccessful effort to induce the Queen of England to bow to the Papal throne. And his successor, Pope Pius V. pronounced his woeful curse upon the Queen of England, in which he claimed that: "him alone he [God] made prince over all people and all kingdoms, to pluck up,

destroy, scatter, consume, plant and build, etc." This Pope, Pius V., prince over all people, pronounced his dreadful curse upon Elizabeth in the following style:

"For having by strong hand, inhibited the exercise of THE TRUE RELIGION, WHICH MARY THE LAWFUL QUEEN, OF FAMOUS MEMORY, HAD, BY THE HELP OF THIS SEE, RESTORED, after it had been formerly overthrown by King Henry VIII., a revolter therefrom, and following and embracing the errors of heretics, she hath removed the royal council, consisting of the English nobility, and filled it with obscure men, being heretics; hath oppressed the embracers of the Roman faith, hath placed impious preachers, ministers of iniquity, and abolished the sacrifice of the mass, prayers, fastings, distinction of meats, a single life, and the rites and ceremonies; hath commanded books to be read in the whole realm, containing manifest heresy, etc. * * * She hath not only condemned the godly requests and admonitions of princes, concerning her healing, and conversion, but also hath not so much as permitted the nuncios of this See to cross the seas into England, etc. * * * We do, therefore, out of the fullness of our Apostolic power, declare the aforesaid Elizabeth, being a *heretic* and a *favorer of heretics*, and her adherence in the matter aforesaid, to have incurred the sentence of anathema, and to be cut off from the unity of the body of Christ. And, moreover, we do declare her to be *deprived of her pretended title to the kingdom aforesaid*, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever; and also the nobility, subjects, and people of the said kingdom, and all others which have in any sort sworn unto her, to be *forever absolved from any such oath*, and all manner of duty, of dominion, allegiance, and obedience; as we also do, by the authority of these presents, *absolve them, and do deprive the said Elizabeth of her pretended title to the kingdom*, and all other things aforesaid. And we do command and interdict all and every one of the noblemen, subjects, people, and others aforesaid, *that they presume not to obey her*, of her admonitions, mandates and laws; and those who shall do the contrary, we do innodate with the like sentence of ANATHEMA." *Given at St. Peter's at Rome, in the year 1569, and the 5th of our pontificate.*" *Dowling's Hist. of Romanism, pp. 566, 567.*

Thus it appears that the lawful Queen of England was pronounced deposed and deprived of her kingdom, and her subjects absolved from their oaths of allegiance, on the ground that the Pope was "*Prince over all people and all kingdoms.*" He claimed the power, as head of the Catholic Church and Bishop of Rome, "*to pluck up, destroy,*" and "*scatter*" king-

doms. But Jesus Christ, whose Vicar he pretended to be, said before the bar of Pilate, "*My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my kingdom not from hence.*" Jno. 18:36.

Surely the Roman Catholic Church, which is a huge, tyrannical, cruel, blood-thirsty, political despotism, cannot be the true church of God.

Joseph Reeve, a Roman Catholic, speaking of Sixtus IV., in the sixteenth century, says:

"His successor, Innocent VIII., after a reign of eight years, made room for the infamous Cardinal Borgia, who reigned eleven years under the name of Alexander VI. To this Pope the two kings of Spain and Portugal, Ferdinand and Emanuel, applied for a grant to hold all lands they might discover and conquer in any part of the globe not yet explored. By such an application it is not to be presumed that those monarchs pretended to acknowledge a right in the sovereign Pontiff to dispose of earthly kingdoms. But they were apprehensive lest other Christian powers might claim a share of their discoveries, or wrest from them their new possessions, acquired with so much labor and expense. They knew the papal grant would be respected, and would give them a colored title, which would not be disputed. Alexander, in a pompous bull, authorized the two royal petitioners to hold all the territory which they might gain possession of in the new world, with a view to propagating the Christian religion among the savages, by the ministry of the Gospel." p. 449.

This Bull of Alexander VI. deeded to Ferdinand and Emanuel, the Kings of Spain and Portugal, all territory which might be discovered in their names, in the "new world." Thus America, including the United States, has been deeded by the Popes to the above named kings. Upon the same principle Pope Leo may deed the whole continent of America to any usurper who may consent to take possession, and hold it under the authority of the Pope. Pope Pius IX., who consummated the blasphemy of the Papal system by the establishment of the Immaculate Conception of Mary and her worship and his own infallibility as saving dogmas of the Church,

hurled his anathema against his enemies as though he were God.

When the "Piedmontese revolutionists" had attacked the "Papal kingdom," June, 1859, and taken possession of Boulogna, to encourage his soldiers and to intimidate his foes, Pope Pius uttered great swelling words as follows:

"I shall hurl thunderbolts of excommunication against thy enemies; I shall make my voice resound all over the world; I shall encourage thy and my spiritual children to persevere in good; I shall make hell itself tremble, and I hope, that the kingdom of the rebellion, being humbled, and the persecution crushed, to be able to sing, together with thee, hymns of victory, peace and triumph." *Sketches of Pope Pius, the Ninth, p. 137.*

But in spite of the Pope's thundering anathemas, his temporal power fell before the victorious troops of Emanuel. His temporal authority fell beneath the weight of his infallibility and blasphemy to rise no more. The greater the rage of the Pope publicly manifested the deeper will he sink in shame and infamy. It is amazing to witness the silly ignorance of apologists for Romanism who pretend that it is not now the desire and design of the Pope to gain political supremacy and control over the nations of the earth. The conflict between popery and civilization is irrepressible. The onward tread of civilization and human freedom must be stayed and turned back to the dark ages, or popery must be trampled in the dust by the forward march of the nations. As previously shown, every bishop and priest is sworn to support the temporal power of the Pope. As shown in our last, every Roman Jesuit is a sworn enemy to every government which has not the sanction of the blasphemous usurper at Rome. Not only so, but every loyal Roman Catholic who believes his creed is obliged to support the temporal, as well as spiritual power of the Pope. The creed of Pope Pius IV., which is the creed of the Roman Church, requires every Romanist to say:

"I acknowledge the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church for the mother, and mistress of all Churches, and I promise true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.

"I likewise undoubtingly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and General Councils and particularly by the Holy Council of Trent. And I condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies which the Church hath condemned, rejected and anathematized." Liguori's Mission Book, p. 275.

Thus the faithful Romanist regards the Roman Church as the "mother and mistress of all churches," and promises "true obedience to the Bishop of Rome," the Pope. True obedience to the "Bishop of Rome" requires him to obey the Pope *politically* as well as spiritually. Also, every Romanist must in particular believe and obey all the infallible decrees of the Pope, with "all other things delivered, defined and declared by the sacred Canons and General Councils, and particularly the Holy Council of Trent." Thus every loyal Romanist believes and advocates all the doctrines and canons of the Councils of the Church of Rome. Those canons have endorsed the monstrous claims of the Pope to political supremacy over the whole world. Therefore every Romanist is under solemn obligations to believe and hold the political supremacy of the Popes over all nations. DeHarbe's Catechism of the Catholic Religion, endorsed by Cardinals Wiseman and McCloskey, has the following:

"Are all Christians bound to submit to the decisions of the Pope?"

"Yes, as often as he decides as Head and Teacher of the whole Church in matters of faith and morals, the Pope is as infallible as the Church herself.

"Is the Pope infallible?"

"Yes; the General Council of the Vatican, in 1870, defined that the Pope is infallible when he teaches the Church *ex-cathedra*." p. 142.

According to Roman writers, faith and morals embrace political obedience to the Pope, as well as spiritual. DeHarbe

and Cardinals McCloskey and Wiseman teach positively that Christians are bound to yield obedience to the Pope who is regarded as infallible. Pope Nicholas III. became pontiff in 858 and reigned nine years. The Roman Catholic historian, Cormenin, in his History of the Popes, page 248, of this despot says:

"Gratian relates a decree, in which this abominable prelate makes himself equal with God himself. 'It is evident,' wrote Nicholas, 'that the Pope can neither be bound nor unbound by any earthly power nor even by that of the apostle if he should return upon earth since Constantine the Great has recognized that the pontiffs held the place of God upon earth, the divinity not being able to be judged by any living man. We are then infallible, and whatever may be our acts, we are not accountable for them but to ourselves' !!!

Speaking of the reigns of the Popes, Cormenin, page 248, says:

"Later, during the middle ages, thanks to the system of darkness of the Popes the degradation, misery and slavery of the people surpassed all that was most horrible in antiquity. Entire nations disappeared from the soil and were annihilated by iron, water, fire, in the name and by the will of the pontiffs of Rome; and in our own days, have we not seen the papacy make superhuman efforts to arrest the car of human civilization, unite itself with kings to eradicate liberty?"

Here is the confession of a Roman historian that the despotic rule of the papal system of darkness "surpassed all that was horrible in antiquity." "*Entire nations were blotted from the soil and were annihilated*" by the unspeakable cruelty of the Pontiff of Rome. It has been the policy of the Pope, and is until the present as far as possible, "to arrest the car of human civilization and unite itself with kings to eradicate liberty." Pope Adrian II. came to the pontifical throne in 867. He had a wife and beautiful daughter, who were finally murdered by Eleutherus, who sought in vain to marry the Pope's daughter. According to the Roman historian, Cormenin, Pope Adrian said:

"Know, bishops, lords and citizens, that whosoever among you shall oppose himself to the pretensions of Louis, whom we declare sovereign of Lorraine, shall be struck by the arms which God has placed in our hands for the defense of this prince." Cormenin, p. 255.

Charles having taken charge of the kingdom of Lorraine, Adrian addressed him thus:

"Impious king, we order thee to retire from the kingdom of Lorraine, and to surrender it to the Emperor Louis; if thou refusest submission to our will, we will ourself go into France to excommunicate thee and drive thee from thy wicked throne." Cormenin, p. 257.

These outrageous anathemas of the Pope Adrian II. are in perfect harmony with the doctrine of the present ruling Pope of Rome. He claims the same temporal authority over kings as did the Popes of the dark ages. In his arrogant despotism, the Pope has required emperors and kings in abject submission to kiss his feet. Recent Popes have not withdrawn one iota of their claims to temporal authority and the right to punish civil rulers for disobedience to them.

EIGHTEENTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God because it is totally destitute of Christian unity.* There may be unity of force, oppression and despotism without the unity of hearts. The unity of the Russian government under the Czar is the unity of authority and force. There is unity in the State prison which comes from constraint and not from choice. Also there is unity in the prison house of the lost, where love is a stranger. The so-called unity of the Roman Catholic Church, as far as there is any unity at all, is like the unity of a plantation of slaves under a cruel master. The Christian unity is the unity of love. Paul says:

"I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long suffering, forbearing one another in love; endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." Eph. 4:1-6.

This describes the unity of love. The worship of the New Testament is neither sponsorial nor by force. The Savior says: "If ye love me keep my commandments." John 14:15. The worshippers of Christ, being led by the Holy Spirit, voluntarily worship Christ in spirit and in truth. The government of Christ is the government of love. But the Roman Catholic government is the government of force and slavery. With all of her boasted unity, the Roman Catholic Church has produced more divisions than any other sect in Christendom. Robert J. Breckenridge, in his work called *Papism*, on page 211, quotes the Roman Catholic historian, Maimbourg, as saying, when speaking concerning the great schism of the West: It "Was the twenty-ninth which separated the Catholic communion and divided between different heads, the same church, to which by all laws, human and divine, there should have been but one, and that in one person."

According to this Roman authority, before the thirteenth century, the Roman Church was rent assunder by twenty-nine schisms. Also, speaking of the great schism of the West, Maimbourg continues:

"It was morally impossible to decide who were true popes and who anti-popes. In-so-much that even a universal council which had the infallible assistance of the Holy Spirit for everything which appertained to the faith, did not consider itself sufficiently enlightened to dissipate the darkness, and pronounce on the rights of the parties. And it finally judged, that to take a sure course in this uncertainty it was better to act by authority than by knowledge, and to exert its sovereign power in deposing the two pretended popes, that it might give to the Church, by a lawful and incontestable election, a head, in whom no one could contest the august quality, without manifest revolt."—He adds, "This furious schism extended all over christendom—without there being any visible heretics. For it is indubitable, that there were in the opposite parties, great men, celebrated juriconsults, most learned theologians, entire universities, and even saints, yea saints who had

revelations and wrought miracles! There were also on both sides the strongest presumptions and conjectures and the most plausible reasons."—After all this and much more like it, he proceeds to declare (p. 6.) "That the primacy of the pope had never been better established than during the schism of the Greeks; . . . and the unity of the Holy See, to which all the churches of Christendom ought to tend as lines to their common center, was never better preserved than during the great schism of the West."

During these frightful schisms Popes fought against Popes while contending for the chair of St. Peter and hundreds of thousands were slaughtered while fighting like fiends for their favorite Pope, against rival Popes. And yet, in the face of all these historic facts, the *Church Progress*, and others prate about the mark of unity of the Roman Catholic Church!!!

The Roman creed, established by Pope Pius IV., requires every member to say: "I acknowledge the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church for the mother and mistress of all Churches; and I promise true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ." Liguori's *Mission Book*, p. 275. This statement is untrue and absurd. The true churches of Christ existed centuries before the Roman Catholic Church was born. Also, true churches have existed in every age since the establishment of popery, independent of, and in spite of her authority down to the present. Instead of being the mother of the churches of Christ, the Roman Catholic Church is described, in symbol, as the Babylon of Revelation, thus:

"And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication: And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH. And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus: and when I saw her, I wondered with great admiration." Rev. 17:4-6.

According to the claims of the so-called infallible creed, the

Roman Church is the mother of all false churches. She declares the Roman Church "is the mother and mistress of all Churches." While this is not true of the New Testament churches, it amounts to the acknowledgement, in the so-called infallible creed itself, that the Roman Church is the mother of all false Churches, and consequently is the mother of all the false doctrines described as "abominations." As she is the great unlawful mother, she is denounced, and has printed on her brazen forehead the frightful inscription: "MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH." Even the Protestant denominations which separated from her in the sixteenth century and are so bitterly and continually anathematized by her, are, according to her own showing, her own unlawful children. Her creed says that she is *the mother and mistress of all churches*. Even if she tells the truth, she is responsible for all the heresies known to Christendom. Thus, according to her own showing, she has brought forth all the divisions and schisms of Protestantism, besides the twenty-nine sad divisions in which Popes made war with Popes, and Roman Catholic nations grappled with Roman Catholic nations in bitter and cruel wars which have desolated the earth for centuries. The Roman Church has produced all the abominations, in the shape of heresies, which have cursed Christendom. Therefore, the Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because she is wholly destitute of Christian unity.

Furthermore, the Roman Catholic Church is destitute of unity concerning the election of her Popes. According to the Roman historian, Maimbourg, as quoted by Breckenridge in his *Papism*, pp. 208 and 209, there have been many modes by which Popes have been made. This Roman historian records the different modes of making Popes: 1st. "Jesus Christ made the first Pope, in the person of Saint Peter"!

2nd. Maimbourgh contends that "the people and clergy jointly" elected the first successor of St. Peter. 3d. He asserts that "sometimes the clergy alone with the consent of the people" elected the Popes by plurality of votes, during the first five centuries. 4th. "Odoacer king of Heruli and of Italy made a law" forbidding an election of a Pope in the future "until the will of the prince should be made known concerning the subject who ought to be chosen." 5th. King Theodoric, an Arian prince, after murdering Pope John "tyrannically usurped the right to create the pope himself, and nominated Felix IV. to the pontificate." His example was followed by the Gothic kings in creating Popes. 6th. Justinian, and the emperors succeeding him, required the Popes to pay a fixed sum of silver before they could receive their confirmation. 7th. Though this tax on the Popes was remitted by Constantine Pogonatus, yet the "emperors always retained some authority in the election of Popes, who could not be elected without their consent and approbation." 8th. Lothaire I. and Louis II. declared by their imperial constitutions that the Church should be restored to full liberty so "that the election of the Popes should be free and canonical according to the ancient custom." 9th. "During the horrible disorders of the tenth century," the Holy See was reduced to such extreme desolation that the Counts of Tuscany with base women called "Roman grandees, oppressed anew the liberty of the church by creating and deposing Popes at their pleasure and according as they were more or less suitable instruments of their passions." 10th. "Otho the Great, and after him the two other Othos," though they delivered the Church from the tyranny of these monsters, "retained her themselves in a kind of slavery by subjecting to their authority the election of Popes." 11th. "The emperor, Saint Henry, Duke of Bavaria, restored her to full liberty, leaving this election to the clergy and people of

Rome." 12. Afterwards Henry IV. and his sons, with others, "usurped the power to choose or to make others elect, whom they would have for Pope; which by their abuse, caused horrible troubles in the Church, and in the end produced the war between the Popes and the emperors, on the subject of investitures." 13th. "After the church was divided for nearly a century by contending Popes, peace and liberty of election was restored by Innocent II." 14th. After the famous schism of Pierre de Leon had been suppressed by the labors of St. Bernard, "all the Cardinals reunited under the authority of Innocent, and strengthened by the principle clergy of Rome acquired so much authority that after his death they alone elected Pope Celestine II." 15th. At the death of Gregory XI. the clergy ceased to take any part in the election of the Pope and left this matter to the Cardinals alone. These Cardinals have since that time adopted different plans and made different majorities essential to the election of Popes. Thus it appears that more than fifteen different plans of electing Popes are recognized by the Roman Church. At present, no Pope can be lawfully elected except by Cardinals in solemn conclave, by two-thirds majority. But prior to the election of Celestine II. different plans of electing Popes prevailed in the Roman Church. Sometimes they were elected or rather appointed by the Roman emperors. At other times they were made Pope by the trickery of notorious and powerful harlots. At last, they are now elected to the popedom by a class of men that have no recognition in the Word of God. Even if the popedom was a New Testament institution, popes elected by those monsters of iniquity could not be the successors of St. Peter. For several hundred years past, Popes have been elected by Cardinals, a class of officials that are not even mentioned in the New Testament. How could a scriptural Pope, if popery had been lawful, be chosen by Cardinals, a class of men that

had no existence until long centuries after the apostolic age? The so-called infallible Popes, appointed in more than a dozen ways, and by the most infamous wretches and prostitutes that ever disgraced the earth, proves that the Roman Church is destitute of Scriptural unity in every sense of the word. *The Roman Catholic Church lacks the mark of unity in her head as well as her body.*

Once more: the Roman Catholic Church is wholly destitute of the "unity of the faith" required by the New Testament. She has advocated almost as many plans of salvation as she has had different modes of electing Popes. Prior to the Council of Trent, Romanists were not required to believe the dogmas of the creed established by Pius IV. Her fixed creed is younger than the various creeds of Protestantism. Prior to the confirmation of the decrees of the Council of Trent, in 1564, by Pius IV., a different plan of salvation was held by the Roman Church to the plan held since that time. Since the establishment of the creed of Pius IV., it is taught by the Roman Church that all who fail to believe all the dogmas of that creed are lost. According to Romanism, men were saved prior to the establishment of this creed upon the very same terms upon which they are now damned! And yet, they say, the faith of the Church is unchangeable! For three hundred years the Roman Church would send people to hell upon the same terms she sent them to heaven for ten centuries! But the Council of Trent failed to perfect the creed of the Roman Church. It was not until the 8th of December, 1854, in the presence of one hundred and seventy bishops, at the Vatican, in the Sistine Chapel, that Pope Pius IX., speaking *ex-cathedra*, declared the new dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary. The following is the blasphemous language of the new dogma:

"We declare, pronounce, and define, that the doctrine, which

holds that the Blessed Virgin Mary, at the first instant of her conception, by a singular privilege and grace of the Omnipotent God, in virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Savior of mankind, was preserved immaculate from the stain of original sin, has been revealed by God, and, therefore, should firmly and constantly be believed by all the faithful. Wherefore, if any shall dare—which God avert—to think otherwise than as it has been defined by us, let them know and understand that they are condemned by their own judgment, that they have suffered shipwreck of the faith, and have revolted from the unity of the Church; and besides, by their own act, they subject themselves to the penalties justly established, if what they think they should dare to signify by word, writing, or any other outward means." Sketches of Pius IX., p. 90.

On the establishment of this new idol worship, as a condition of salvation, Cardinals fell prostrate in the dust, the booming of cannons was heard and the chiming of innumerable bells and loud strains of music rang throughout the seven hills of Rome. Prior to the year 1854 Romanists could think what they pleased concerning the Conception of the Virgin Mary, without endangering their souls. But now, since the establishment of the new doctrine, if any shall dare "to think otherwise" "they are condemned" and "have suffered shipwreck of the faith and have revolted from the unity of the Church," and subject themselves to the punishment of damnation!!! Since the establishment of the worship of Mary as the goddess and "queen of heaven" all Romanists are required to believe the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception on pain of damnation. And yet they say the Roman Church never changes! At the conclusion of his bull of the Immaculate Conception, uttered *ex-cathedra*, and sent throughout the Roman Church, Pope Pius said: "If any should presume to assail it, let him know that he will incur the indignation of the Omnipotent God, and of his blessed apostles, Peter and Paul." Sketches of Pius IX., p. 119. Thus, Pope Pius IX. anathematizes all who oppose his foolish blasphemous dogma of the Conception, with "THE INDIGNATION OF THE OMNIPOTENT GOD, AND OF HIS BLESSED APOSTLES, PETER AND PAUL." Prior to the year 1854 no one

was required to believe the dogma of Immaculate Conception of Mary. But, after the declaration of the Pope, the 8th of December of that year, all who fail to believe that intolerable blasphemous nonsense are damned. Yet, they say, the Roman Church never changes! She has changed her plan of salvation from time to time. Once more, while some ignorant and superstitious people, during several centuries before, advocated the infallibility of the Pope when speaking *ex-cathedra* for the whole Church, yet no one was ever required to believe that dogma as a condition of salvation. In fact, leading bishops throughout the Church opposed the dogma as foolish, blasphemous and wicked. Yet, the time at last arrived on the eighteenth of July, eighteen hundred and seventy, in the Vatican Council at Rome, when the Pope, Pius IX., declared his own infallibility, and hurled his thunderbolts of anathema upon all who should dare oppose this silly dogma. Prior to the 18th day of July, 1870, no one upon the earth was required to believe in the infallibility of the Pope as a condition of salvation. But, since that day, all who refuse to believe that absurdity of absurdities, that foolery of all fooleries, that blasphemy of all blasphemies, are to be hurled down to damnation. Yet, they say, the Roman Catholic Church never changes! The present Pope, Leo XIII., any day or night, with or without a council, may proclaim the worship of the donkey on which the Savior rode to Jerusalem as a dogma of the Church, and all Romanists will be obliged to believe that foolish blasphemy on pain of damnation. No Roman Catholic can possibly foresee or ever guess what doctrine he may be obliged to believe even six months hence. In order to be equal to Pius IX., Leo XIII. may possibly proclaim the Immaculate Conception of Anna, the mother of Mary. This is altogether logical from the Roman position, for if Mary was conceived and born without the taint of sin, then all her ancestors back to grandmother

Eve must of necessity have been conceived and born without the taint of sin. In fact, it will become necessary for the Pope to declare the Immaculate Conception of all the ancestral mothers of Mary back to the creation. Then he may add all these Immaculate saints to their catalogue of gods and goddesses to complete the idolatry of Rome. Surely the Roman Catholic Church, which is so destitute of Bible unity, cannot possibly be the true church of God.

THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

PROPOSITION: *Resolved that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*

CHURCH PROGRESS, Affirms.
AMERICAN BAPTIST, Denies.

CHURCH PROGRESS' TWENTY-FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE—MINUS,
having "ignominiously" retreated.

(November 12, 1891.)

Before its *ignominious* retreat, the *Church Progress* in its boasting challenges, professed unconquerable bravery. But now the *Progress* plays the part of a truckling coward, in violation of its solemn engagement to discuss the Roman Church question for six months. That Romanism is an enemy to the institutions of every government which is not dominated by the Pope, is seen in the clipping from the *Church Progress* of Aug. 15th, 1891, as follows:

ANOTHER ULTRAMONTANE.

We are glad to welcome the *Catholic Review* to the ranks of the ultramontanes. It has come out boldly for the no compromise principle on the school question. It takes as its key-note Archbishop Hughes' motto voiced by Archbishop Ryan, "IT IS BETTER TO BE RIGHT AND WAIT THAN COMPROMISE ONE IOTA OF TRUTH." Speaking of the Poughkeepsie plan—a weak-kneed, compromise, principle-deserting plan—the *Review* says:

"But now, when looked at calmly and candidly, what is the meaning of this concession? What does it amount to? Does it not amount, in fact, to complete surrender of the principle of liberty of religious instruction? Guizot's declaration, so often quoted is undoubtedly correct. 'It is necessary that national education should be given and received in the midst of a religious atmosphere, and that religious impressions and religious observances should penetrate into all its parts. Religion is not a study or an exercise to be restricted to a certain place and a certain hour. It is a faith and a law which ought to be felt everywhere

and which after this manner alone can exercise all its beneficial influence upon our minds and our lives.'

A few lines further on the *Review* formally pledges itself to the ultramontane principle, no compromise, thus: "for our part we believe heartily in the principle of the illustrations Hughes as announced by Archbishop Ryan. 'It is better to be right and wait than to compromise one iota of truth.'"

Well said! Keep it up? This is the enduring principle which comes out triumphant in the end. This is the principle on which we have been fighting the school question from the beginning. This is the line on which we intend to fight it out to the end. It is a fight too, not a skirmish or a truce, but a fight with big guns, horse and foot, where to yield an inch is to invite defeat. We have been accused of impatience towards compromise. Impatience! Heavens! Who would not be impatient, right in the midst of a fight stubbornly, hotly, and bitterly contested, to see poltroons parrying with the enemy for terms of surrender! We are in battle, not in peace. With an enemy using every subterfuge, every stratagem, every device of war to destroy us, are we to talk of compromise? He who dallies is a dastard, he who doubts a coward!

REMARKS.

1st. The reader will remember that the ultramontane doctrine supports the temporal power of the Pope with all of his usurpations over kings and emperors. The *Progress* has thus conceded our allegation that the Roman Catholic Church is a huge political despotism. 2nd. In the extract from Guizot, as applied to the Roman religion, ultramontaniam claims that it is necessary that "national education should be given" alone by the Roman Catholic Church, and that "everywhere" in all countries. It is the intention of the Pope, with his clergy, to Romanize the United States and make the traditions and superstitions of Rome the national religion. Romanists are clamoring vociferously for more public funds to educate the rising generation in the idolatrous superstition of Roman Paganism. 3rd. A war has been declared against our public school system. Every loyal Romanist is a determined enemy to the institutions of the American government: He has no more business to hold office than if he lived in Italy. The

Progress says: "This is the principle on which we have been fighting the school question from the beginning." The *Progress* and all other ultramontane Romanists are fighting "stubbornly, hotly and bitterly" against our government education. The *Progress* says: "We are in battle, not in peace. With an enemy using every subterfuge, every stratagem, every device of war to destroy us, are we to talk of compromise? He who dallies is a dastard, he who doubts, a coward." The enemy against which Romanists are fighting so furiously is the American school system. Romanists hate the public schools as Satan hates the light. They know that when the people are educated independently of their superstitions, that they will never submit to the papal yoke. The above extract contains brave talk; but has not the *Progress* proved itself a "dastard" and a "coward" by its *ignominious* retreat from the Controversy? Like the owl and the bat, it seeks to hide its ugliness from the rays of truth. In the *Church Progress* of August 22, 1891, another editorial squib appears as follows:

"The glorious banner of ultramontaniam, which is Catholicism."—*Catholic Herald*.

Exactly where we stand. If we were to found a Catholic journal over again, we would glory in calling it "The Ultramontane." We suggest this name for the next Catholic paper coming into existence. It will be a guarantee of success.

"Ultramontaniam, which is Catholicism," includes all the abominations of popish usurpation in the dark ages of persecution, when tens of thousands of the "martyrs of Jesus" were burned at the stake and tortured in various ways because of their unyielding adherence to Christ and his ordinances. Thus the *Church Progress* glories in its shame by attempting to revive the dark age popery, which revelled in blood and persecution.

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S TWENTY-FOURTH NEGATIVE.

In our last we showed that the Roman Catholic Church is

not the true church of God because of her lack of Christian unity. She was torn asunder by more than thirty schisms, prior to the Reformation of the sixteenth century. It remains a question of controversy, since the great schism which became complete in the eleventh century, (1054) whether the Greek Catholic Church or the Roman Catholic Church has the better claim to priority. The Greek Catholic Church, numbering nearly one hundred millions, under the Patriarch of Constantinople, known as the Church of the East, claims to be the original Church, and regards the Roman Catholic Church as an apostacy from the true Church organization. But, on the other hand, the Roman Catholic Church, which finally separated from the Greek Church in the eleventh century, claims to be the original Church and anathematizes the great Greek hierarchy as an apostacy! It is evident that the Greek Church is, of the two great hierarchies, less corrupt than the Roman Church. It has already been seen that, according to its creed which claims infallibility, the Roman Catholic Church is the mother of all false churches. Every Romanist, as often as he repeats his creed, says: "I ACKNOWLEDGE THE HOLY CATHOLIC, APOSTOLIC ROMAN CHURCH, FOR THE MOTHER AND MISTRESS OF ALL CHURCHES." According to this, she is the mother of all false churches, however heretical, corrupt or blasphemous in their faith and practice! If she is the mother, as she claims to be, she is responsible for the existence of all her children. Therefore, when she charges that Protestantism is destitute of the scriptural marks of unity, she only accuses herself. For, according to her own claims, she is the mother of the Protestant churches. But on the other hand, Protestants plead their right to separation on the ground of the "voice from heaven," saying, "Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins and that ye receive not her plagues." Rev. 18:4. In spite of all the deep, dark heresy,

idolatry and infidelity of Romanism, some of God's people have been found in that "Babylon" of iniquity. God says: "come out of her my people." But, independant of the Roman Church, and the Protestant Churches which separated from her, God has had true witnesses and true churches through all the Christain centuries. This point will be established in our next. As an apology for the bloody persecutions waged by their own Church, Romanists charge that Protestants have also bitterly persecuted and put to death men and women for differing from them! ! But it must be remembered that all the persecutions waged by Protestants were only the fruits of Romanism which they inherited. According to her own profession, as mother and mistress of these churches, she is largely responsible for all the persecutions which Protestants have waged against others. While we do not excuse Protestants for any of their errors, we hold that they inherited the spirit of persecution from the Roman Catholic Church. On this subject, we quote from a book of sermons by Rev. Thos. Guthrie, D. D., of Edinburg, Scotland. The work was published in New York by Robert Carter & Bros., in 1870. In his sermon on "Justification" page of the book 212, Dr. Guthrie, this learned Presbyterian, of the Presbyterian Church, says:

"Three hundred years ago, our church, with an open Bible on her banner, and this motto, 'Search the Scriptures,' on its scroll, marched out from the gates of Rome. Did they come clean out of Babylon? Experience shows, that it is much easier to leave our mother country than drop our mother tongue. Across the seas which they sail, and to the lands which they settle on, the emigrants carry their prejudices, passions, and even superstitions. They people the glens and valleys of the new world with the fairies that dance on the green, and the specters that walk by night among the haunted ruins of the old country. So I fear that, on departing from the Church of Rome, we carried into our Protestantism—as was not unnatural—some of her ancient superstitions just as our fathers carried into their practice some of her intolerant principles. We cannot approve of their intolerance, yet it admits of an apology. They had been suckled by the wolf, and it

was no great wonder that, with the milk of the wolf, they should have imbibed something of her nature.

It is not the privilege and happiness of man to pass through his changes like the Savior. When Jesus rose, a conqueror from the the grave, he left the dead clothes behind him; but look at this apparition from which sisters and friends shrink back. Some scream with terror, and all afraid to touch him, they leave him to stand in the dark mouth of his grave till the word is given, 'Loose him, and let him go.' Lazarus comes forth alive, but he is bound hand and foot; he leaves the sepulchre, but with his grave clothes on. And prone, as we of Scotland are, to boast that our fathers, with Knox at their head came forth from Rome with less of her old superstition about them than most other churches, to what else than some lingering remains of popery can we ascribe the extreme anxiety which some parents show to have baptism administered to a dying child? Does this not look very like a rag of the old faith? It smells of the sepulchre.

* * * * *
But sympathize with those we cannot, who, when death has stamped his seal on an infant's brow, hurry off for a minister that he may baptize the dying. I cannot believe that there is any virtue in water to save its soul. I recoil with horror from the thought that a God of mercy would suspend its salvation on a mere outward ordinance. Is there not reason to suspect that at the root of this anxious and unnecessary haste, there lies some lurking feeling that baptism, if not essential, is at least serviceable to salvation, and has some connection, near or remote, with regeneration and the remission of sins?

Now, with all respect and due regard to the feelings of others, so far as they are conscientious, we cannot look upon such notions as else than the rags of an old superstition."

As the Protestant denominations "marched out from the gates of Rome" they did not come "clean out of Babylon" but retained some of her "ancient superstitions." Having "been suckled by the wolf" they "imbibed something of her nature." The persecuting spirit which pervaded the Protestant denominations, on their separation from the Church of Rome, was inherited from that mother of "abominations." We thank God for so many noble people of God among the various Protestant denominations. We hope and pray that they will throw aside every tradition and superstition of the old bloody Babylon and stand firmly for the whole truth as revealed in the New Testament. It is our heart's desire and prayer to God that all of

his children may put on the whole armor of God and wrestle "against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world," until the great Babylon shall be no more.

NINETEENTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true Church of God because of her lack of apostolicity.* The Roman Catholic Church did not have her origin from the ministry of Christ or his apostles. Neither Christ nor the apostles either held or taught even one of the eighteen marks of heresy and superstition peculiar to that Church, as already brought out and proved in this Controversy. These Roman Catholic peculiarities are neither found in the New Testament nor in the first centuries of the Christian era.

"A church of Christ is a congregation of baptized believers associated together in the doctrine and fellowship of the gospel." This church institution has the following marks of identity by which it may be known: 1. The true church has Jesus Christ *as the foundation.* 1 Cor. 3:11. 2. Its membership is composed of Christian believers, baptized in the "name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." Matt. 28:30. 3. The true church has Jesus Christ alone, for its *founder and head.* Matt. 16:18; Eph. 1:22. 4. The true church has the word of God alone, as found in the Bible, as its rule of faith and practice. See 4th, 5th and 6th Negatives for Bible proofs. 5. The Church of Christ continues steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, keeping the ordinances as they were delivered, and giving the pure gospel to the nations, through her living ministry. Acts 2:42; 1 Cor. 11:2; Matt. 24:14. The Roman Church, which is wholly destitute of these marks, cannot possibly be the true church of God.

Under the pressure of truth the *Church Progress* has surrendered the Bible. In its thirteenth negative argument the *Progress* said:

"IF THE BIBLE BE THE SOLE RULE OF FAITH, THEN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS NOT THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD. Here is the issue squarely and plainly put. Let the BAPTIST demonstrate that the Bible alone is the sole rule of faith, and it will vanquish us ignominiously."

As it has been proved that the Bible contains the sole rule of faith and practice for the churches of Christ, the *Church Progress* has been vanquished and forced to an ignominious retreat. The present Controversy shows conclusively that the Roman Catholic Church is destitute of apostolicity in doctrine, practice and government. We now come to answer the question of the *Church Progress*, which it propounded in its Tenth Affirmative, thus: "*We put the question to the BAPTIST. If Jesus Christ is not the founder of the Catholic Church, who is?*" While Jesus Christ is the founder and head of his own church, he is not the founder of such a despotism as the Roman Catholic Church. The literature of the world, whether sacred or profane, furnishes no evidence of the existence of such an institution as the Roman Church in the time of Christ on earth, or of his apostles. The bare affirmations of their writers that Christ was the founder of the Roman Church goes for nothing, in the absence of proof. As Satan is the father of lies, he is the father of all false religions. He is the prince of devils and the father of all counterfeiters and counterfeiters. When God established his worship on earth this great enemy established his counterfeit worship by perverting the worship of God. When God had his true prophets, in the old dispensation, Satan had his prophets of Baal. When Christ appointed and ordained apostles and ministers, Satan had his false apostles and false ministers. In the Christian dispensation, in order the better to deceive, the ministers of Satan hypocritically profess to be the ministers of Christ. Speaking of these Satanic apostles, Paul says:

"For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ.

And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light.

Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works." 2 Cor. 11:13-15.

When Jesus Christ had established his true church, and Satan failed to accomplish its overthrow, by introducing false ministers and by persecution, he finally founded and established the great anti-Christian Church, called Babylon. Therefore we are bold to say that his Satanic Majesty, the Prince of devils, and enemy of God and man, is the founder and ruling spirit of the Roman Catholic Church. Describing the rise and characteristics of this frightful system of error and fraud, Paul says:

"Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition;

Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.

Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things?

And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time.

For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way.

And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming:

Even him, whose coming is after the work of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders,

And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish: because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved.

And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie:

That they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." 2. Thess. 2:3-12.

This falling away was not the falling away of the church of Christ, but the falling away and departure of false members from the church. Of these John says:

"Little children it is the last time: as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time. They went out from us but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us; but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us." 1 John 2:18, 19.

These false members were antichrists. They did not carry the church into apostasy, but went out from the church. These false ministers and false members called antichrists, went out and organized false churches, which gradually grew into an hierarchy and finally became the Roman Catholic Church. "The mystery of iniquity," which afterwards produced popery, had begun its deadly work in the time of Paul. A part of this work was the attempt to engraft Judaism into Christianity. Some of these false teachers went down from Judea to Antioch and taught the brethren, and said: "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." Acts 15:1. We give the rise and establishment of the Roman Catholic Church as follows:

First. The "mystery of iniquity," which finally produced popery, began its work in the time of Paul, about A. D. 54. *Second.* Baptismal salvation, the mother heresy, which is the fundamental heresy of Romanism, was propagated by some as early as A. D. 150. *Third.* Infant baptism began in the third century as a result of baptismal salvation. *Fourth.* The supremacy of some pastors, called bishops, in the great city churches also began to be manifested about the close of the third century. *Fifth.* The true churches throughout the empire declared non-fellowship with the false churches and false members in the year 251. *Sixth.* The union of the false churches with the state occurred under Constantine the Great, A. D. 312. This was

the birth of the hierarchy which, centuries after, became the Roman Catholic Church. Seventh. The first general council of this hierarchy was called by Constantine and met at Nice, A. D. 325. Eighth. By the decree of the emperor, Phocas, Boniface III. was declared universal bishop over all churches in 606 A. D.

Thus, the Roman Catholic Church, with the Pope claiming universal authority over all Christians, was first established 606 years after Christ, by the instigation of Satan through the tyrant emperor, Phocas, who murdered his predecessor. The temporal power of the Pope was established A. D. 754, by the authority of Pepin, father of Charles the Great. Thus was established by Satanic wisdom, through wicked men, the great ecclesiastical hierarchy, known as the Roman Catholic Church. It was born and officially recognized A. D. 312. Constantine, the emperor and sponsor of this hierarchy, called the first general council, which met at Nice, A. D. 325. This hierarchy came to its maturity and became the Roman Catholic Church, with the Pope as its head, A. D. 606. The Pope obtained the reins of temporal power in 754, from which time the downward course to infamy and shame was still more rapid until the tenth century, when the papal chair was filled by the most bloodthirsty monsters of iniquity that ever disgraced the name of humanity. Finally the intolerable blasphemy and iniquity of the Roman Church came to its full under Pius IX., who established the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary in A. D. 1854, and his own infallibility in 1870. If it was proper for the Savior to designate those hypocritical Pharisees as the children of the devil, surely it is proper to call that frightful ecclesiastical hierarchy which has polluted the earth with fraud and slaughter, for so many centuries, the offspring of Satan. We answer the *Church Progress* that Satan, the Prince of the power of the air, the great Enemy of God and

man, was the founder of the Roman Catholic Church. The Pope is evidently that "man of sin," "the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." "Even him whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish." This is proof positive that popery was established by the working of Satan. The miracles of the Roman Church consist in "signs and lying wonders." It would be just as legitimate to call Satan, the Savior, as to call the Church of Rome the church of Christ. The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of Christ, because of her lack of apostolicity. It began as an hierarchy nearly three hundred years after the establishment of the church of Christ, and became the Roman Church nearly six hundred years too late to be the apostolic church. The true church of Christ began under his personal ministry, and has continued to the present time, independent of Rome. Jesus said: "Upon this rock I will build my church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Matt. 16:18. This institution built by Christ was not the Roman Catholic Church, as fully shown in the previous discussion. This will be further proved in our next.

THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

PROPOSITION: *Resolved that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*

CHURCH PROGRESS, Affirms.
AMERICAN BAPTIST, Denies.

CHURCH PROGRESS' TWENTY-FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE—MINUS, having "ignominiously" retreated.
(November 19, 1891.)

In its vaunting acceptance of the Controversy, the *Church Progress*, said: "If Mr. Ray is in good faith, this is his opportunity. We are quite willing to risk the light of investigation. All we ask is the acceptance of the above condition." "That both journals shall publish verbatim the arguments of its opponent." But the *Progress* has deliberately and willfully forfeited its word. Is this because the theology of the Roman Church teaches a priest to utter a falsehood, and even swear to it? Again the *Progress* said: "We shall rejoice at the opportunity of showing his Baptist readers what the Church of Rome really is. Will the gentleman pick up our gauntlet?" But alas! the *Progress* has become frightened and refuses to tell our Baptist readers "what the Church of Rome really is." The *Progress* is "afraid of cold print." We learn that the *Progress* enrolled a large number of new subscribers on the promise of conducting the Controversy six months or more. But it has disappointed, and mistreated them by refusing to allow the discussion to be published in its columns. Such is the deception and treachery which is practiced under the sanction and endorsement of the Roman Catholic authorities.

Will not the *Progress* repent, make *confession*, and open its columns for the investigation of the Church of Rome?

Notwithstanding the disgraceful and cowardly retreat of the *Church Progress*, from the discussion of the Roman Church question, that Roman sheet is pleading for the temporal power of the Pope, and making war upon public education. In its issue of Nov. 14th, the *Progress* has an editorial as follows:

THE TWO LEADING ISSUES.

It is growing plainer and plainer every day that the paramount question before the Catholic world is the Temporal power of the Pope. Recent events in Rome have revealed to the world the intolerable and harassing position of the Holy Father, subject to the surveillance and enmity of the Italian Government, as well as insecurity against insult and even open violence should the Italian Government imagine it to be to its interests to permit such an outrage, or rather if it find that it cannot restrain the sacrilegious hate of its secret and favorite partisans.

What is called the law of guarantee is merely the formulation of the Italian Government's decree of the imprisonment of the sovereign head of the Catholic Church. The Pope is either the subject of the King of Italy, or he is not. Plainly he is not, as by virtue of his exalted office and its universal rights and duties he cannot be. The law of guarantees can only be meant for a subject, and in face of the necessarily independent sovereignty of the Pope, becomes a farce and an insult.

The Catholic world is equally insulted, and Catholics the world over of every clime and every nationality are forced to witness the gross violation and the sacrilegious robbery of the Holy Father's rights by a usurping and infidel power with whom the bayonet is the mocking symbol of Justice. It therefore becomes the pressing duty of Catholics everywhere to raise their voices in vigorous and emphatic protest against the unjust usurpation of the rightful possessions of the sovereign head of the universal Church. It is their duty to throw the moral weight of their solemn and earnest declaration for the rights of the Holy See. We Catholics of the United States, who best understand the principles of liberty and their real guaranty, must not fail to raise our voice in open and emphatic protest against Italy's injustice and in hearty, sympathetic and unswearing attachment to the principle of the Temporal Power of the Popes. It is time for the Catholicity of the United States, following in the wake of the American hierarchy in the 3d Plenary Council of Baltimore, to boldly and loyally declare for the Temporal Power. The next Catholic Congress will be held in '93 at the time of the World's Fair in Chicago. No better opportunity

could present itself for Catholic America to declare to the civilized world its unswearing loyalty to the Sovereign Pontiff. The moral effect of such a declaration would reach to the end of the earth. If for this purpose only, it would be worth while convening the next Catholic Congress. This and the school question are the paramount issues for the Catholic laity to consider at their next Congress, and they must not be behind their Catholic brethren on the other side of the ocean in declaring their faith, especially in a land where freedom of speech is a birthright. We should be recreant to ourselves and our religion if we were to hesitate for an instant upon either.

It is true something was said upon both subjects at the Baltimore Congress, but it was practically tentative, a mere beginning, to lead up to greater things. The time is now ripe to speak out with all the ardor of loyal hearts and all the earnestness of free men.

Thus the *Church Progress* endorses the treason of Pope Leo XIII., in claiming to be a temporal king. He is a disloyal subject of King Humbert. Of course "the independent sovereignty of the Pope, becomes a farce and an insult" to the civilized world. If the Romanists of America have a right to make an effort for the establishment of the temporal power of the Pope in Italy, they have the same right to establish his temporal power in America. The Roman Catholics of America had better go slow in "the next Catholic congress" to be held in Chicago in 1893, at the World's Fair. No one who is loyal to the temporal power of the Pope, as taught by Romanists, can be a loyal citizen of the United States. If they declare their "unswearing" loyalty to the sovereign pontiff, then they must be set down as aliens and foreigners without real citizenship in this country. How can they have "unswearing loyalty" as long as they continue swearing? Also, if these aliens and foreigners know which side of their bread is buttered, they had better quit fighting our government school system. While waging war against our institutions, they are enemies to the government.

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S 25TH NEGATIVE.

Our nineteenth negative argument, as seen in our last,

showed the Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because of her lack of apostolicity. She originated centuries too late to be the true church. It must be remembered that the *Church Progress* has totally failed to give the definition of the true church. It assumed that the Roman Church was the true church, without giving a scriptural definition of what that church is. As shown in our first negative, the great politico-religious despotism, known as the Roman Church, is as different from the New Testament church as an elephant differs from a sheep and as an eagle differs from a dove.

It is proper here to define again the Greek word *Ekklesia*, which has been rendered church in the New Testament:

Ekklesia is the Greek word from which we have the imperfect translation *church*. Liddell and Scott, in their Greek Lexicon, define the word, "*Ekklesia*; an assembly of citizens summoned by the crier, the legislative assembly."

Dean Trench, in his Synonyms of the New Testament (page 17), says:

"*Ekklesia*, as all know, was the lawful assembly in a free Greek city of all those possessed of the rights of citizenship, for the transaction of public affairs. That they were *summoned* is expressed in the latter part of the word; that they were summoned *out of* the whole population, a select portion of it, including neither the populace, nor yet strangers, nor those who had forfeited their civic rights—this is expressed in the first. Both the *calling* and the *calling out*, are moments to be remembered, when the word is assumed into a higher Christian sense, for in them the chief part of its peculiar adaptation to its auguster uses lies."

Ed. Robinson, in his Lexicon of the New Testament, says: "*Ekklesia*, a convocation, assembly, congregation. In the literal sense a popular, or rather assembly, composed of persons legally summoned." All lexicographers and critics agree substantially in the above definition. The New Testament meaning of *Ekklesia*—Church—demands an assembly of believers, called out from the world. The word *Ekklesia* is composed of two Greek words—*Kalein*, to call, and *ek*, out of;

therefore the word *Ekklesia* literally means *the called out*. The word church is never, in the Scriptures, applied to an hierarchy, whether civil or religious, such as the Roman Catholic Church. Such a use is an abuse of the word church. *Ekklesia*, the Greek word from which we get the word church, is used in the New Testament one hundred and fifteen times, and is used in the singular to designate a local congregation, or the church institution, seventy-six times. It is used in the plural to designate local churches thirty-six times, and is used three times to designate a worldly assembly or mob. In Acts 19:32, referring to the mob, it is said "the assembly was confused," and in verse 39, "assembly," has the word *Ekklesia* in the Greek; and when the town clerk had thus spoken, "he dismissed the assembly"—*Ekklesia*, which was the unlawful assembly, which had been crying, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians."

It is abundantly evident from the testimony of Greek Lexicons, and the New Testament use, that the primary and literal meaning of the word *Ekklesia* is assembly. Describing the institution of Christ it simply means Christ's assembly, called out from the world to execute his laws. The New Testament speaks of "the churches of the Gentiles" (Rom. 16:4); "the churches of Christ" (Rom. 16:16); "So ordain I in all churches" (1 Cor. 7:17); "the churches of Galatia" (1 Cor. 16:1); "the churches of Asia" (1 Cor. 16:19), and "the churches of Macedonia" (2 Cor. 8:1).

We here give the literal definition of that New Testament church, thus:

A church of Christ is an assembly of baptized believers associated together in the doctrine and fellowship of the Gospel.

The phrase "kingdom of God," or "kingdom of heaven," is used in different senses. First: It is used to indicate God's general providence. "The Lord hath prepared his throne in

the heavens; and his kingdom ruleth over all." Ps. 103:9. Second: It is used to indicate God's political commonwealth of Israel, which is called "the kingdom of the Lord." 2 Chron. 13:8. The Jewish nation was God's political kingdom. Third: The kingdom of God is used in the Scriptures to indicate God's special providential care exercised over the Jews. Matt. 21:43. "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you." Fourth: The kingdom of God is used to indicate the heavenly state, where Christ is now enthroned. Paul says: "We must through much tribulation enter the kingdom of God." Fifth: The phrase "kingdom of God," is used in the Scriptures to describe God's organized spiritual commonwealth. This is the *new* kingdom of prophecy. Isa. 9:6, 7. "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed," etc. Dan. 2:44. This is the organized kingdom of Jesus Christ. "The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached."

"A church of Christ is an assembly of baptized believers joined together in the doctrine and fellowship of the gospel." The organic kingdom includes the sum total of all the Scriptural churches. This kingdom cannot be perpetuated without the churches, neither can the churches exist without the kingdom. Each church, as a component part of the kingdom, possesses authority to administer the laws and ordinances of the kingdom, in its community. The setting up of the kingdom includes the setting up of the church, and the setting up of the church includes the setting up of the organic kingdom. "The kingdom of Christ is the organic government over which he is sole Law-Giver and Ruler, and whose laws and ordinances are administered through his churches as executives." The term kingdom, applied to Christ's organic government, is always singular. There is but one King and one kingdom.

This organic kingdom of Christ was set up and established under his personal ministry. It began in its *preparation* under the ministry of John. The kingdom began in its *organic form* under the personal ministry of Christ. After spending the night in prayer, He ordained twelve to be with him. It was a complete model organization before the death of Christ on the cross. As illustrated in the building of Solomon's temple, the organic kingdom of Christ was set up, after which it was dedicated by prayer and the application of sacrificial blood. The prayer is recorded in the 17th chapter of John. The sacrificial blood, was the blood of Christ upon the cross. The spiritual temple, as the church institution, was endowed with the power from on high, inspired knowledge and the gift of tongues on the day of Pentecost. In addition to the primary literal meaning of "ekklesia" to signify a single local assembly, as an integral part of the organic kingdom of Christ, the term church is used by a common figure of speech to represent the *church institution*, which may apply to the whole extent of the organic kingdom of Christ. When used in this figurative sense the term church is not confined to any one local organization. It means the *church institution*, as where one is taken to represent a class. When we say the lion is the king of beasts we do not wish to convey the idea that there is one *universal lion* composed of all the lions in the lower universe! We simply mean to speak of the lion as a species of animals. In the Scripture, it is said, "the ox knoweth his owner." This does not mean one particular ox, neither does it mean a great *universal ox*, composed of all the oxen in the world! We speak of the "jury as the bulwark of English liberty." We do not mean by this to specify any one particular local jury in some district in England, neither do we mean to point out a *universal jury*, composed of all the juries of the world. We speak of the jury as a civil institution. In this sense the jury has existed for cen-

turies. In like manner we speak of the church as an institution. In this figurative sense, we do not confine the term to any one local church, neither do we mean to point out a huge ecclesiasticism composed of all the churches. In this sense the Savior used the term church, when he said: "Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Matt. 16:18. The Savior did not confine this prediction to the local assembly at Jerusalem. He referred to the *church institution* which should exist, in the shape of local churches, throughout all the coming ages. No one will dare to affirm that the word church in Matt. 16:18 is confined in its meaning to the local church at Jerusalem. It had reference to the *church institution* against which the gates of hell shall not prevail.

The strange and unnatural interpretation that would have this Scripture refer to an imaginary invisible church is too absurd to deserve serious attention, were it not that some eminent scholars have recently taken this position. If this passage has reference to the supposed invisible church, composed of all the redeemed of all ages, then it had already been *set up*, almost from the foundation of the world. From Abel forward the patriarchs and prophets were children of God, and according to this view, belonged to the invisible church! Then how could it have been set up and built under the ministry of Christ?

The literal meaning of the word *Ekklesia* (church) is a unit. It always and everywhere in the Scriptures, when literally describing Christ's organization, means *an assembly of baptized believers joined together in the doctrine and fellowship of the gospel*. It is but one. In like manner when the word *Ekklesia* is used by figure of speech, (where one is used to represent a class,) it has but one meaning: it means the *church institution*. "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in

one hope of your calling: One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all and in you all." Eph. 4:4-6. There is but one plan of church organization. There is but "one hope," though thousands enjoy that hope; there is but "one faith," though thousands possess that faith; there is but "one baptism," though thousands have received that baptism; and there is but "one body" or church institution, though the disciples in a thousand places have been organized on this one plan.

When the Savior said: "Upon this rock I will build my church," he did not say he would build a great ecclesiastical hierarchy or monarchy with a human head. He meant by this beautiful figure of speech to build his own church institution, of which he alone is head and ruler. In this sense the term church is used frequently in the New Testament. Paul says: "And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues." 1 Cor. 12:28. As in Matt. 16:18, the term church here, by figure of speech, is used to describe *the church institution*. Its meaning is not confined to one local church, neither does it mean a universal church composed of all the local churches consolidated into one. It simply means the *church institution*, of which Christ is the founder and head. Paul was writing to the church at Corinth. The twelve apostles did not hold their local membership in the Corinthian church, but at Jerusalem. Yet, as a *church institution*, the Lord set the apostles in the church first. In fact, they were the primary organic members. This is indicated in Revelation, where the church as "the bride, the Lamb's wife," in the marriage day, is brought to view by the symbol of the "Holy Jerusalem," descending from God out of heaven. "And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles of

the Lamb." Rev. 21:14. These twelve apostles were the organic foundation members of the church. After the Savior had prayed all night he ordained twelve to be with him. As already seen, this was the beginning of the church organization. As Christ was founder and head of the church institution so the apostles were the first members of the church institution and consequently, like Christ the founder, belonged to this institution for all time.

The churches being executive bodies in the organic kingdom of Christ, are essential to the perpetuity of that kingdom. The laws of the kingdom, being administered by the churches, the kingdom is perpetuated through the churches to whom the ordinances are committed for administration. It is almost self-evident that the organic kingdom of Christ can only be perpetuated through the churches, and the churches cannot exist without the organic kingdom of Christ.

Using the term church in its figurative sense, the kingdom and church are correlative. The kingdom cannot exist without the churches, neither can the churches exist without the kingdom. The terms of introduction into a church are the same as the terms of introduction into the kingdom. The laws and ordinances of a church are the same as the laws and ordinances of the kingdom.

There are, doubtless, thousands of children of God who have no membership in the organic kingdom and church of Christ. One must be a child of God, born of the Spirit, before he is qualified to enter the organic kingdom and church of Christ.

The doctrine of church salvation, so popular in these days, is anti-christian and ruinous. Jesus Christ is the only Savior. As heretofore, Christ now has the power on earth to forgive sins, in spite of the opposition of men and demons. No ordinance, institution, Pope or priest dare to be thrust between

the penitent soul and the loving Savior. As in the time of Christ on earth, he now extends the invitation: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls." Jesus Christ is the only "name given under heaven, among men whereby ye must be saved," "neither is there salvation in any other."

The prevailing teaching that the kingdom established by Christ while on earth, has become apostate and corrupt is without foundation in Scripture, and tends to infidelity. The teaching that the church of Christ has become subverted and perverted is unscriptural, unreasonable and fatal in the consequences.

The Roman Catholic Church was never the "true church of God;" it is a huge counterfeit anti-Christian despotism. It was conceived in sin, brought forth in iniquity, cradled in superstition, reared and nurtured by fraud, exalted to dominion by treachery and has scourged the world by fire and sword. This monstrous imposition must go down before the advancing light of the simple gospel of Christ, and finally be overthrown by his terrible judgments. It is just as absurd to call the Roman Catholic Church the "true church of God" as to call Satan an angel of light.

That the organic kingdom of Christ has been perpetuated till now, and will continue to the end of the world, is proved by the Scriptures.

1st. Referring to Christ and his organic kingdom, the prophet Isaiah says:

"For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be on his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, upon

his kingdom to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." Isaiah 9:6, 7.

The government of the organic kingdom rests upon Christ, the Prince of Peace, and of "the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end." This government established by Christ "*shall have no end.*" Christ, as the anti-type of David, is "to sit upon his throne and upon his kingdom to order and establish it with judgment and justice, from henceforth even forever and ever." This government upon the shoulder of Christ is to have no end, and is established with judgment and justice *even forever*. "The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." If that government should become unjust and corrupt, then the word of the Lord will have been forfeited. It is impossible for God to lie; therefore, the New Testament organic kingdom of Christ has been perpetuated and will continue to the end of the world.

2d. Speaking of the same government, Daniel the prophet says: "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms and it shall stand forever." This kingdom was set up during the personal ministry of Christ. He said: "The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." (Luke 16:16.) Mark the prophecies concerning the kingdom set up by Christ: "IT SHALL STAND FOREVER." It is impossible for the word of God to be more emphatic. The kingdom of Christ "SHALL NEVER BE DESTROYED," and "it shall not be left to other people," "it shall stand forever." If that kingdom has been subverted, perverted, or overthrown, then the word of God is false. It is impossible for God to lie. His word is firmer than the foundation of heaven and earth.

The work of the kingdom in destroying the political despotisms that bear rule over the earth is to be accomplished by weapons of warfare which are not carnal. The members of the kingdom of Christ are to put on the whole armor of God and fight valiantly with the sword of the Spirit against principalities and against powers and the rulers of the darkness of this world.

That same organic kingdom, through the churches, has broken and scattered to the four winds the kingly governments of the American continent. All the despotisms of Europe are tottering to their fall before the hosts of God's elect. These mighty empires, symbolized by the image in Nebuchadnezzar's dream, are to be totally overthrown and found no more at all in that glad day. When that day shall have arrived, popery, kingcraft and priestcraft, will have been abolished from the earth and mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the tops of the mountains and the nations shall flow into it. To doubt the perpetuity of the organic kingdom of Christ is to doubt the word of God; to oppose it, is to oppose revelation; to fight against it, is to fight against God.

As the perpetuity of the organic kingdom of Christ insures the perpetuity of the churches, then the doctrine of church succession is established. The Savior said: "And upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." The church institution was established by Christ, and whatever may be the meaning of the *gates of hades*, it includes all opposition to the church, whether it be political principalities, or powers, spiritual wickedness in high places, or the rulers of the darkness of this world. The combined hosts of Satan and all his angels had no power to overthrow and destroy the church of the living God, when persecuted and pursued by the great dragon.

The church of Christ, symbolized by the woman, fled to the

wilderness, where she was preserved 1260 days, but from the wilderness she came forth, fair as the moon, clear as the sun and terrible as an army of banners.

As seen in the foregoing Controversy, the Roman Catholic Church is wholly destitute of the characteristics of the true church of God, as given in these scriptural definitions. It is as different from the simple New Testament "congregation of baptized believers, joined together in the doctrine and fellowship of the gospel" as a huge tiger differs from a lamb. The mere assumption of churchship by that despotic institution no more proves it to be the true church, than the assumption of the Pope to be God, proves that he is God. The sad mistake of many Protestants lies in the fact that they have supposed that the Roman Catholic Church, though now frightfully apostate and corrupt, was once the true church of God. Though the hierarchy was born in A. D. 312, it did not become the Roman Catholic Church until A. D. 606. The Roman Catholic Church is totally destitute of *apostolicity*, and therefore is not the true church of God.

The above cited Scriptures, proving the perpetuity of the organic kingdom and the church of Christ, furnishes no support whatever to the preposterous claims of the Roman Church. The fact that the devil has existed from pre-apostolic times is no proof that he is a true apostle. The very same organic kingdom and church of Christ, having identically the same laws and ordinances, has been perpetuated through all the Christian centuries to the present time. The truth of this statement is almost universally admitted by Biblical critics and historians.

Jesus said: "Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore wise as serpents, and harmless as doves." Matt. 10:16. "Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you; and ye shall be hated of all nations

for my name's sake." Matt. 24:9. As the true church has been hated by "all nations," it has never been in union with these civil governments. The Roman Catholic Church has been supported as the national Church by the Roman Empire, and it is absolutely impossible for it to make any just claim to be the true church of Christ. The union of the Roman Church with the Roman Empire is graphically described in Revelation as follows :

"So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness: and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet color, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication: and upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH. And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus: and when I saw her, I wondered with great admiration." Rev. 17:3-6.

This woman in "purple and scarlet" sitting upon a scarlet colored beast, "full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns" describes accurately and powerfully the relation existing between the Roman Empire and the Roman Catholic Church. This drunken woman for long centuries had complete control of the bloody dragon beast. Instead of being the "mother and mistress" of the true church of Christ, this devilish polluted woman is "the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth." Instead of the nations composing the Roman Empire being in league with the church of Christ, that church was hated by "all nations," forming this bloody empire. Another picture describing the relation existing between this empire and the true church is given by John, Rev. 12th chapter.

"And there appeared a great wonder in heaven; a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars:

And she being with child cried, travailing in birth, and pained to be delivered.

And there appeared another wonder in heaven; and behold a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads.

And his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth: and the dragon stood before the woman which was ready to be delivered, for to devour her child as soon as it was born.

And she brought forth a man child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron: and her child was caught up unto God, and to his throne.

And the woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there a thousand two hundred and threescore days.

And there was war in heaven; Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels.

And prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven.

And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him.

And I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ: for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night.

And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto the death.

Therefore rejoice, ye heavens, and ye that dwell in them. Woe to the inhabitants of the earth and of the sea! for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time.

And when the dragon saw that he was cast unto the earth, he persecuted the woman which brought forth the man *child*.

And to the woman were given two wings of a great eagle, that she might fly into the wilderness, into her place, where she is nourished for a time, and times, and half a time, from the face of the serpent.

And the serpent cast out of his mouth water as a flood after the woman, that he might cause her to be carried away of the flood.

And the earth helped the woman, and the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed up the flood which the dragon cast out of his mouth.

And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make

war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ."

In this wonderful vision, the woman is the symbol of the true church. *Crowned with the twelve stars*, representing the twelve apostles as the first organic members; *clothed with the sun*, represents the righteousness of Christ who is the "sun of righteousness." *The moon under her feet*, shows that she is not guided by the moonlight of the old dispensation. This great red dragon represents the Roman empire which persecuted the true church. His tail drawing down the third part of the "stars of heaven" represents the drawing away of the false ministers. As the man of sin represents the line of Popes, so the man child represents the gospel ministry, born of the church. The ruling of the nations with a rod of iron, represents the work of Christ in bringing the nations into subjection to his authority, through the gospel ministry. Being near the throne of God, indicates that the true ministers are specially called and kept by his power. The eagle wings, given to the woman and her rapid flight to the wilderness, indicate the flight of the main body of the church before the persecution of the Roman empire. The twelve hundred and sixty days of the woman in the wilderness shows that the church was hidden or obscured from view for twelve hundred and sixty years. The dragon which was the Roman empire, lead on by the devil himself, "was wroth with the woman." The dragon's greatest enmity was against the ministry represented by the man child. His next fury was against the church, represented by the woman; but she escaped. His third degree of wrath was against the "remnant of her seed" which were the scattered members in the Roman empire that failed to make their escape. It will be observed that "Michael and his angels" representing Christ and his disciples, fought against the dragon and his angels and finally "overcame him by the blood of the lamb

and by the word of their testimony, and they loved not their lives unto the death." The ministers of Christ did not fight with carnal weapons, but they fought with the "blood of the lamb" and "by the word of their testimony," though many of them lost their own lives. Surely the Roman Catholic Church which has been supported by this monstrous bloody beast, cannot be the true church of God.

TWENTIETH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because she lacks the "wilderness" history.* Instead of being driven into the wilderness by that bloody dragon, she was mounted upon his back and spurring him on to deeds of darkness, blood and desolation. In our next we will give additional testimony to the perpetuity of the true church of Christ, independent of Rome, down to the present time. She has kept pure the doctrine of the gospel through all the ages.

THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

PROPOSITION: *Resolved that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of God.*

CHURCH PROGRESS, Affirms.
AMERICAN BAPTIST, Denies.

CHURCH PROGRESS' TWENTY-SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE—MINUS, *having "ignominiously" retreated.*
(November 26, 1891.)

The *Church Progress* received a large number of new subscribers on its boasting promise to conduct the Controversy with the AMERICAN BAPTIST for six months. The terms were all agreed upon and strictly adhered to by the BAPTIST. To cover its overwhelming defeat, the *Progress* closed its columns against the investigation, thereby cheating its subscribers out of their money. Was it a scheme on the part of the *Progress* (knowing from the start that the Roman Church could not bear the light of investigation) to secure a large number of subscribers, by boldly promising to prove that the Roman Church is the true church of God, and then retreating to keep its patrons in ignorance? Was this an honest, straightforward transaction? Was it not a Jesuitical scheme to cheat the people? The *Church Progress* has, by its retreat, acknowledged that the Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God. Her only safety lies in keeping the people in ignorance concerning her doctrines and practices.

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S TWENTY-SIXTH NEGATIVE.

As our twentieth negative argument, in our last, we stated that the Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God

because she lacks the "wilderness" history. Since the birth of the hierarchy in 312 and the establishment of the Roman Church in 606, the history of that huge despotism is incorporated in the history of the nations of Europe. Its history is publicly read and known of all men, as a great political hierarchy in the garb of religion, which has borne despotic rule over the nations. This Roman Babylonish Church was never compelled to fly "into the wilderness," from the face of any persecuting power. In fact, she herself, in league with the Roman empire, was the great persecuting power, described as "the woman drunken with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." Rev. 17:6. But, on the other hand, the true church of Christ was never popular with the nations. She was called "this sect" "everywhere it is spoken against." Acts 28:22. Jesus said to his church, "Ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake." Matt. 24:9. Also, Jesus said: "They shall put you out of the synagogues; yea the time cometh that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service." John 16:2. The Savior did not come to destroy men's lives but to save them; and as his executives on earth, his churches have never persecuted others for their religious views. The true church has never been a cruel, persecuting murderer, in the name of her Master! Though grievously persecuted herself, it is her glory that she has never persecuted others, whatever may have been their doctrines or practices.

As seen in our last, the great dragon with seven heads and ten horns representing the political Roman empire, urged on by the State Church hierarchy, persecuted, and made war against the sun-clothed woman representing the true church. "But to the woman were given two wings of a great eagle that she might fly into the wilderness, to her place" "prepared of God, that they should feed her there a thousand two hundred

and threescore days." The true church was not destroyed by the dragon, but escaped into the wilderness, to her place prepared of God, where she remained twelve hundred and sixty years, as symbolized by the twelve hundred and sixty days. Thus the true church was hidden from the face of the dragon, and, by many, was supposed to have no existence upon the face of the earth. But it must be remembered that the Roman Church, as the Babylon of Revelation, during these years of the darkness of the world's history, was "drunken upon the blood of the saints and upon the blood of the witnesses of Jesus." She was not drunken upon her own blood, nor upon the blood of infidels, but upon *the blood of the saints and witnesses of Jesus*. As they were witnesses of Jesus, they testified to the whole truth, by actions as well as words, which testimony embraced his church with her ordinances. Instead of being corrupted and destroyed in the wilderness, the true church was preserved, nourished and fed on pure gospel food, during the entire twelve hundred and sixty years of her wilderness history. As the Romish Church is wholly destitute of such a wilderness history, she is not the true church of God, symbolized by the winged woman. The wonderful allegorical, poetical book, called *The Song of Solomon*, beautifully describes the church in the wilderness, and her relation to her affianced husband. This song was doubtless penned as a prophetic history of the church in the wilderness. That beautiful love Song says: "I am the rose of Sharon, and the lily of the valleys. As a lily among thorns, so is my love among the daughters. As the apple tree among the trees of the wood, so is my beloved among the sons. I sat down under his shadow with great delight, and his fruit was sweet to my taste." Song of Solomon. 2:1-3. The true church was "a lily among thorns" during the dark ages. She sat under the shadow of "the apple tree" representing Christ, "with great delight,"

saying "and his fruit was sweet to my taste." She was fed upon the bread of heaven. Of her the Bridegroom says: "Thou art beautiful, O my love, as Tirzah, comely as Jerusalem, terrible as an army with banners." "There are threescore queens, and four-score concubines, and virgins without number. My dove, my undefiled is but one; she is the only one of her mother, she is the choice one of her that bore her. The daughters saw her, and blessed her; yea, the queens and concubines, and they praised her. Who is she that looketh forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners?" Song 6:4,8-10. This shows that the true church was not apostate, but was the true, undefiled affianced bride of Christ. There were many other women, so are there many other religious organizations, but the Bridegroom says: "MY DOVE, MY UNDEFILED IS BUT ONE." Also, she is as "fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners." She is *the church militant, the fighting church*. She fights with "the whole armor of God," not with carnal weapons. To her the Bridegroom says: "Thy neck is like the tower of David builded for an armoury, whereon there hang a thousand bucklers, all shields of mighty men." Song 4:4. Her ornaments are "bucklers and shields of mighty men." In the wilderness she was persecuted, though not destroyed. She says: "The watchmen that went about the city found me, they smote me, they wounded me; the keepers of the walls took away my veil from me." Song 5:7. Many a cruel stroke of persecution, from the "watchmen" of the Roman Catholic Church, fell upon the affianced bride of Christ. Like her Beloved, she was wounded with many stripes. At the close of the twelve hundred and sixty years she came up out of the wilderness. The bride says:

"My beloved spake, and said unto me, Rise up, my love, my

fair one, and come away. For, lo, the winter is past, the rain is over and gone: The flowers appear on the earth; the time of the singing of the birds is come, and the voice of the turtle is heard in our land. The fig tree putteth forth her green figs, and the vines with the tender grape give good smell. Arise, my love, my fair one, and come away. O my dove, thou art in the clefts of the rock, in the secret places of the stairs, let me see thy countenance, let me hear thy voice; for sweet is thy voice, and thy countenance is comely." Song. 2:10-14.

This describes the church as hidden "in the clefts of the rock, in the secret places of the stairs." But she is commanded to "rise up" and "come away" because the long winter of her wilderness history is past. The question is: "Who is this that cometh up from the wilderness leaning upon her beloved." Song 8:5. We answer this momentous question: It is the church of Christ, His affianced bride, symbolized by the woman, that flew into the wilderness twelve hundred and sixty years before, from the face of the dragon. As the Roman Catholic Church has never been hid in the wilderness, she can make no claim whatever to be the true church of God. It must be remembered that the true church is not an hierarchy. Locally, it is simply a congregation of baptized believers, associated together in the doctrine and fellowship of the Gospel. Three or more of such believers, meeting in a private house, or cave in a rock, may be a true church of Christ. Or a church may be composed of hundreds meeting in one place, for the worship of God. Such churches have existed independent of Rome from the time of Christ to the present; and as the *church institution*, as defined in our last, this church, symbolized by the woman, has continued uncorrupted and true, through all her wilderness history of persecution. That there have been true witnesses for Christ all the time, is generally admitted by Biblical scholars and critics. The true church is to be found and identified by her Bible characteristics, independent of the Church of Rome.

John Wesley, in his Notes on his own translation, commenting on Matt. 16:18, says: "*Shall not prevail against it*—not against the church universal so as to destroy it. And they never did. There hath been a small remnant in all ages." See Wesley's Notes. Matthew Henry's Commen-

tary on the same passage, says: "*Christ here promises to preserve and secure his church where it is built; the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; neither against this truth nor against the church which is built on it.*" Also Henry's Commentary takes the same position concerning the church symbolized by the woman in the wilderness as we have given above. The same position is taken by the learned Dr. Clark in his Commentary, concerning the perpetuity of the church. In his Oral Discussion with Archbishop Huges, Rev. John Breckinridge, a Presbyterian, claims a succession of true witnesses for Christ from the ancient Waldenses and Albigenses. See p. 135. Alexander Campbell, in his debate with Bishop Purcell, p. 77, says:

Every sect and individual, as I said before, is passive in receiving a name. Sectarian names are generally given in the way of reproach; thus the disciples were first called Christians at Antioch, most probably in derision; yet it was a very proper name. Call us what you please, however, it does not change nature or race. The disciples of Christ are the same race, call them Christians, Nazarenes, Galileans, Novations, Donatists, Paulicians, Waldenses, Albigenses, Protestants, or what you please. A variety of designation effects not the fact which we allege; we can find an unbroken series of Protestants—a regular succession of those who protested against the corruptions of the Roman Church, and endeavored to hold fast the faith once delivered to the saints from the first schism in the year 250 A. D., to the present day; and you may apply to them what description or designation you please."

Various Protestant denominations, though they admit their immediate origin from the Roman Babylon, claim that these ancient witnesses were their ancestors in faith and practice. Baptists however, though *protesting* against Rome in all her features of error, do not claim to be Protestants in the historical import of that term. They claim their origin from the ministry of Christ and his apostles, and that under various names they have existed to the present time. They disclaim all connection whatever with the turbulent Ana-baptists of the Peasant's War of the sixteenth century. Baptists claim to be the wilderness church of prophecy, symbolized by the winged woman. The very fact that their history was obscured in the dark ages, they claim is an argument in their favor. They contend that the true church disappeared into the wilderness from the view of the dragon and other foes, and remained twelve hundred and sixty years and then came out into the

full light of history. They think that the flight of the church, symbolized by the woman, occurred about 425 when persecutions were waged against the Novations by the Emperors Theodosius and Honorius, and they came out of the wilderness about the year 1686, when the army of Louis XIV. of France, and the Duke of Savoy slaughtered so many of the ancient Waldenses in the valleys of Piedmont, after which the remnant of this persecuted people appeared about eight hundred thousand strong, in the different countries of Europe, as Baptists. Of the Baptists, the Lutheran historian Mosheim, says: "The true origin of that sect which acquired the denomination of Ana-baptists by their administering anew the rite of baptism to those who came over to their communion, and derived that of Mennonites from the famous man to whom they owe the greatest part of their present felicity, is hid in the depth of antiquity, and is, of consequence, extremely difficult to be ascertained." See Church History, p. 490. The historians, Dr. Ypeij, Professor of Theology, and Rev. I. J. Dermout, learned Pedo-baptists of the Dutch Reformed Church, wrote a history of their own church in which they devote one chapter to the Baptists. They clearly distinguish between the Muntzer Ana-baptists and the true Baptists. They say: "We have now seen that the Baptists who were formerly called Ana-baptists, and, in latter times, Mennonites, were the original Waldenses; and who have long in the history of the church, received the honor of that origin. On this account the Baptists may be considered as the only Christian community which has stood since the days of the apostles, and as a Christian society, which has preserved pure the doctrines of the gospel through all ages." See Religious Encyclopedia p. 796. The discussion of this subject is found in an historical work called Baptist Succession, by D. B. Ray, and published by the National Baptist Publishing Company, of St. Louis. In this work it is shown that the ancient Waldenses possessed the peculiarities of modern Baptists, though the modern Waldenses are Pedo-baptists. Whatever may be the merits of the different claimants to represent the witnesses of Christ in the dark ages, it is absolutely certain that the Roman Catholic Church, instead of being the church of Christ, was the great

persecuting power against the true disciples of Christ.

TWENTY-FIRST NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God because of its evil fruits.* The Savior says: "Ye shall know them by their fruits." Matt. 7:16. It is well known that in all countries controlled by the Roman Catholic Church society is utterly corrupt and desperately depraved. In such unfortunate countries, truth and virtue are almost entirely banished. Statistics of the criminals in the different countries of Europe were published in a book called Evenings with Romanists, by Rev. M. Hobart Seymour, in 1856. These statistics show a frightful balance of crime in favor of Roman countries over those where the rulers are Protestants. Of the city of Rome, Mr. Seymour p. 43 records:

"The actual population is sometimes considerably more, and sometimes far less. In 1800, it was 153,004; and in 1813, it was only 117,882. And in 1836 it rose again to 153,678. In this last year, the births were 2,258 boys and 2,115 girls; being a total of 4,373 births as appears by Bowring's Report, as laid on the table in the House of Commons. The result therefore, is, that while the total number of births is 4,373, the total number of foundlings is 3,160."

Thus it appears that when the city of Rome was in her glory under the spiritual and temporal power of the Pope Pius IX., about two-third of the children born in the "eternal" city were bastards, while in England the illegitimate births were reported as only four out of every hundred. That is, out of every one hundred children born, ninety-six were legitimate and only four were illegitimate. While in the city of Rome, out of every three children born, two were illegitimate. This fearful state of immorality may be regarded as the fruits of Romanism. Murder and other crimes were reported in nearly the same proportion. Such are the horrible fruits borne by the Roman Catholic Church in those countries where she has entire control. Surely the Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because of the bad fruits which she bears.

The space allotted to the Papal Controversy has only allowed room for a few, out of the many arguments, which can be made against the Roman Catholic Church claims, to be the true church of God. We make a summary of our negative arguments as follows:

FIRST: *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because she makes the church the savior of men, instead of Jesus Christ alone.* The Scripture proofs are found in our first, second and fifth negative articles. The Roman Church consigns all persons, men, women and children, even to unborn infants to damnation, unless they have membership in the Church of Rome! Their fanaticism and folly is such that the infants even of Roman parents, dying in infancy without baptism are not allowed a burial in their church cemeteries. But, on the contrary, the Bible teaches us unmistakably that all who come to Christ through repentance and faith, are saved by grace. Unconscious infants are saved through the atonement of Christ, so they need no baptism or church membership. Romanists themselves admit that infant baptism is not required in the Scriptures. Priest McGuire in his debate with Mr. Pope in Dublin, 1827, says: "I called on my opponent to produce proofs from the Scripture, authorizing the baptism of infants." Debate p. 164. But Mr. Pope failed to produce any Scripture authorizing the practice. Infant communion came in practice in connection with infant baptism, after the apostolic age. The Catholic dictionary says: "Further, it is the custom in the East to communicate infants just after baptism, and this use, Fleury says, continued in the West till the opening of the ninth century, while even in the thirteenth, communion was given to children in danger of death." p. 200. Speaking of the Eucharist, the Catechism of the Council Trent, p. 171, says: "In some places, it is true, an ancient practice prevailed of giving the Holy Eucharist even to infants; but, for the reasons already assigned, and for other reasons more consonant to Christian piety, this practice has been long discontinued by authority of the same Church." Not only infant baptism for salvation and infant communion prevailed with the false churches, from which emanated the hierarchy and finally

Romanism, but the Roman Church established the so-called baptism of Church bells! Describing this foolish ceremony, the Catholic Dictionary says:

"The Bishop washes the bell with blessed water, signs it with oil of the sick outside, and with chrism inside, and lastly places under it the thurible with burning incense. He prays repeatedly that the sound of the bell may avail to summon the faithful, to excite their devotion, to drive away storms and to terrify evil spirits. This power, of course, is due to the blessings and prayers of the Church, not to any efficacy superstitiously attributed to the bell itself. Thus consecrated, bells become spiritual things, and cannot be rung without the consent of the ecclesiastical authorities." p. 74.

Speaking of infant baptism, the Dictionary says: "In the middle ages and in modern times various sects have repudiated infant baptism. It is difficult to give strict proof from Scripture in favor of it, nor can it be denied that in the early ages persons often deferred their own baptism or that of their children, except in danger of death, from a dread of incurring the responsibilities of a Christian life." p. 61. Also the Roman Catholic Dictionary defines: "Baptism (from *Baptismos*, dipping or immersion in water). A spiritual meaning was given to baptism by St. John the Baptist, who baptized or immersed his disciples in the Jordan, to signify the repentance and renewal by which the whole man was to be cleansed and purified." It is not only the testimony of Roman Catholics, but the majority of Protestant Lexicographers and critics define the original word *baptizo* to mean immersion, and that immersion was the prevailing practice with the primitive churches. In the Presbyterian Assembly held in Cincinnati in 1885, a resolution was offered by a certain Presbyterian judge to reject the ordinances of the Roman Church as "unscriptural, and its baptisms totally invalid." Though this resolution failed to be adopted by the General Assembly, the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, published at Philadelphia; reviewed the Presbyterian arguments in which the learned Roman Catholic *Quarterly* said:

"Although natural water is the remote matter of baptism, its application, either by immersion, infusion or aspersion, is the proximate matter of the sacrament. Up to the thirteenth century both the Greek and Latin Churches used immersion in the solemn administration of baptism. In fact, our Lord and his apostles baptized with this rite. Christ himself was baptized in this way by St. John, for in St. Matthew 3:16 we read: 'And Jesus being baptized, forthwith came out of the water.' Why, then, do Presbyterians baptize by aspersion, since our Lord's practice is against it? Will the judge tell us why his sect has given up the scriptural mode of baptism, which the Baptists logically preserve? The Catholic Church, as the infallible custodian of the matter and form of the sacraments, claims the right to interpret them, and modify them with accidental conditions. No such claim is made by the Presbyterians. May we not justly, therefore, tax Presbyterian baptism with being invalid, judged by this judge himself, since it is not administered as St. John the Baptist, as our Lord and his apostles, and as the whole Christian Church generally administered it up to the thirteenth century, that is, by immersion? Is there not apostasy here?"—*American Catholic Quarterly Review*, July, 1885, p. 507.

None, according to the Scriptures, were admitted to baptism in the apostolic churches, until they had brought forth fruits meet for repentance, and exercising heart faith in Christ, had become the children of God. Baptism was not administered to the children of Satan to make them the children of God. None except the saved, in the sense of pardon, were admitted to baptism and church membership.

OUR SECOND NEGATIVE ARGUMENT reads: *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because of its unscriptural claim to infallibility.* These claims are treated in our negative articles as follows: Second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh, fourteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth. No one was required to believe the dogma of the Pope's infallibility until A. D. 1870. It is now made essential to salvation to believe this horrid blasphemy.

OUR THIRD NEGATIVE ARGUMENT affirms that *the Roman Catholic Church is not the true Church of God, because she rejects the Bible standard of authority and rule of government for her own traditions.* The proofs and arguments are found

in the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, ninth, tenth, eleventh, thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth negative articles. We drove the *Church Progress*, as the reader will remember, from the Scriptures to tradition, and then showed conclusively from its own confessions that its traditions were anti-scriptural and therefore false.

FOURTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because of her idolatrous sacrament of the Eucharist or Mass.* This subject is treated in the BAPTIST'S negative articles seventh, eighth, tenth and twelfth. In these we showed the idolatry of the Roman Church in its worship of every particle of bread and wine, as if there was a whole entire God in each particle. This is perhaps the grossest polytheism which is practiced by any class of Pagans in the world. The proofs of this were overwhelming and the answers feeble and unavailing.

FIFTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because of her unscriptural sacrament of baptism.* Our proofs are found in the BAPTIST'S ninth, tenth, eleventh and twelfth negative articles. We showed that the Roman Church taught positively the damnation and eternal punishment of all unbaptized persons, including infants. The Bible arguments against these abominable heresies were completely triumphant, with scarcely a show of answer from the *Church Progress*.

SIXTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because of her unscriptural sacrament of confirmation.* The discussion of this point is found in the BAPTIST'S eleventh negative article. The *Church Progress* made no argument against this.

SEVENTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because of her unscriptural sacrament of marriage.* This subject is treated in the

AMERICAN BAPTIST'S eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth and eighteenth negative articles. It was shown in this argument that instead of being the conservator and protector of the marriage relation, that the Roman Church teaches that all who are not married by her authority are living in adultery, and that even the marriage of a Roman Catholic with an unbaptized person is invalid. Also, the Roman Catholic Church teaches that the innocent party is bound for life to an adulterous partner. In purely Roman Catholic countries, the marriage relation is almost entirely overthrown.

EIGHTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because of her unscriptural sacrament of Extreme Unction.* Arguments on this subject are found in the AMERICAN BAPTIST'S twelfth and thirteenth negative articles, to which no reply was attempted. This obscene, filthy sacrament marks Rome as anti-Christian.

NINTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God because of her unscriptural sacrament of Orders.* This subject is treated in the BAPTIST'S twelfth, thirteenth and fifteenth negative articles. It involves the seven grades of the ministry of the Roman Church.

TENTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God because of her anti-scriptural sacrament of Penance and Confession.* This horrible sacrament of corruption is treated in the AMERICAN BAPTIST'S thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth negative articles. The vulgarity and filthiness of the Roman confessional is too fearful to be reprinted in the English language. Surely the Roman Catholic Church is "the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth."

ELEVENTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God because of her anti-scriptural*

tural hierarchy. The claims of this fearful hierarchy called the "Roman machine" is treated in the AMERICAN BAPTIST'S sixteenth, seventeenth and nineteenth negative articles.

TWELFTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because of her idolatrous worship of Mary, saints, images and relics.* This idolatry of Rome is treated in the AMERICAN BAPTIST'S seventeenth and eighteenth negative articles. We did not have room for one tenth of our negative proof upon this subject. With Romanists Mary becomes Mediatrix and Savior.

THIRTEENTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God because of her anti-scriptural purgatory.* This money-making "Roman machine" is treated in the nineteenth negative article. The emissaries of Rome rob the people of millions of dollars to pay for masses for their relations in purgatory.

FOURTEENTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God because of her Society of Jesuits.* The arguments on this point are contained in the twentieth and twenty-first negative articles. The so-called "Company of Jesus," under Ignatius Loyola, is perhaps the most infernal and devilish institution ever concocted outside of hell itself. It is evidently one of the three unclean spirits, like frogs, mentioned in Revelation.

FIFTEENTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God because of her bloody Inquisition.* This blood-curdling and fiendish institution is treated in the BAPTIST'S twenty-first and twenty-second negative articles. Hundreds of thousands of the human family have been butchered by this diabolical tribunal, and yet they call it the "Holy Inquisition" (?). One had just as well speak of the "holy devil."

SIXTEENTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic*

Church is not the true church of God because of her unparalleled blasphemy of the infallibility of the Pope. This subject is treated in our twenty-first negative article. In the declaration of the infallibility of the Pope it seems that the climax of blasphemy was reached by the Roman Church. On the day that the Pope thus made himself God, and his godship was accepted by the Church, the whole papal hierarchy was doomed to misfortune and final ruin. On that day God's wrath was manifested in Rome by flashing lightnings and pealing thunders, that made the city tremble to her dark foundations. On that day Napoleon III. declared war against the Prussians and immediately withdrew his troops from Rome. Then followed the fall of the "Eternal City" into the hands of the victorious Emanuel. From that time forward one calamity after another followed toward the final overthrow of that system of iniquity and usurpation.

SEVENTEENTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God because she is a huge political despotism.* This subject is treated in the twenty-second and twenty-third negative articles. The proof is plainly shown by the testimony of Romanists, that the Pope to this very day claims temporal, as well as spiritual power, over the whole earth.

EIGHTEENTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God because it is totally destitute of Christian unity.* This subject is treated in the twenty-third and twenty-fourth negative articles in which it is shown that the Roman Church has produced more divisions than any other religious organization. Its unity is a unity of war and antagonisms, within and without.

NINETEENTH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because of her lack of apostolicity.* This important theme is treated in the AMERICAN

BAPTIST'S twenty-fourth negative article. The Roman Church was born several centuries too late to be the apostolic church. The proof is positive.

TWENTIETH NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because she lacks the "wilderness" history.* This is discussed in the twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth negative articles. The history of the true church of God, lies through the the wilderness of obscurity, in which for twelve hundred and sixty years she was hidden from the face of the dragon power.

TWENTY-FIRST NEGATIVE ARGUMENT. *The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because of her evil fruits.* Truly she is "the mother of harlots and the abominations of the earth." It seems that nearly all the religious heresies and abominable immoralities that have appeared since the rise of the Roman hierarchy, have had their origin directly or indirectly from that Church. She has slaughtered hundreds of millions of the human family, either for their religious principles, or to satiate her ambition for dominion over the whole world. The Roman Church by her intrigues, has caused wars between mighty nations and kingdoms for long series of years, simply in order to weaken these kingdoms, so that the Pope could wield his scepter over them. From the history of popery it appears that the blotting out of a whole nation, to gratify the ambition of the Pope, would not move one cord of sympathy in his callous soul. Neither the heart rending pleadings of parents, even mothers, for the lives of their children, nor the melting appeals of female innocence for the protection of their virtue, could reach the cold and frozen heart of the "Roman machine." Even in the present day, thousands of the victims of Roman cruelty are serving out, in the penitentiaries of the church, called convents, their lives. Thousands of girls, in chains, even in our own Ameri-

can government, in these dungeons dark, vent their hopeless wails, where no ear of pity or mercy ever hears, they plead for liberty, but no heart is ever moved with compassion. They are scourged with cords, they are manacled, they are starved, they die in wretchedness, but cruel Rome is unmoved. Why? All because they have dared to disobey the holy "Mother Church." (?) And yet, the perpetrators of these "deeds of darkness" have the intolerable affrontery to come forth in the light of day and claim churchship for that institution which has done more to destroy the human family, to subvert all virtue, to wrap the world in midnight and finally to people hell with more souls of the lost than any other agency the devil has set in motion since the world began.

Well may Pollock, of this cruel mother, say :

* * * "With horrid relish drank the blood,
Of God's peculiar children, and was drunk;
And in her drunkenness dreamed of doing good.
The supplicating hand of innocence,
That made the tiger mild, and in his wrath
The lion pause—the groans of suffering most
Severe were naught to her: she laughed at groans:
No music pleased her more, and no repast
So sweet to her as blood of men redeemed
By blood of Christ. Ambition's self, though mad
And nursed on human gore, with her compared
Was merciful."

"And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held:

And they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?

And white robes were given unto every one of them; and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow servants also and their brethren, that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled." Rev. 6:9-11.

"Avenge, O Lord, thy slaughtered saints, whose bones
Lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold:
Ev'n them who kept thy truth so pure of old,
When all our fathers worshipped stocks and stones."

—Milton.

"And a mighty angel took up a stone like a great millstone, and cast it into the sea, saying, Thus with violence shall that great city Babylon be thrown down, and shall be found no more at all."
Rev. 18:21.

APPENDIX A.

The claim that the Roman Catholic Church established the canonicity of the Bible is not only absurd but utterly false. The canonicity of the Old Testament was established long before the Christian dispensation, and the New Testament was accepted and regarded as containing the standard of authority long before the existence of that hierarchy known as the Roman Catholic Church. The hierarchy began in A. D. 312, and became the Roman Catholic Church, A. D. 606. Infidels claim that the canonicity of the Bible was established by the Council of Nice, while Romanists claim that it was established still later, in the year 393, by the Council of Hippo. Many valuable facts have been gathered and published by H. L. Hastings in his Anti-Infidel Library. In the tract called "Who Made the New Testament," from which we quote as follows:

"Doubtless thousands of infidels to-day really believe that the Council of Nice by some vote, or trick, or juggle, settled the canon of the Scriptures, and separated what they call the 'spurious Gospels' from the genuine ones. But in fact no such thing was done at the Council of Nice; and in fact no such thing could have been done by any council, with any authority or effect. The votes of councils could no more settle the canon of the New Testament than the vote of a town council could decide what were the laws of a state or nation. The question of the inspiration or authenticity of the New Testament never came up at the Council of Nice, which was called for an entirely different purpose; namely, to settle certain ecclesiastical and doctrinal differences which prevailed, and reform certain abuses which existed.

"The statement is nevertheless currently made in infidel literature, that at the time of the Council of Nice about fifty

different Gospels were in circulation among Christians; and that the Council selected from the mass those bearing the names of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, voting these into the canon, and voting the others arbitrarily out.

“Now,” says the learned Professor Ezra Abbot, of Harvard University, who has spent many years among the old records of those days, and who has them all, and can read them all;—“I venture to say, without fear of contradiction, that there is not the slightest evidence in ecclesiastical history for the truth of such a statement. More than that; there is not the slightest evidence that the Council of Nice had anything whatever to do with settling the canon of the New Testament. It was not called for any such purpose; nothing relating to the subject appears in the canons or the acts of the Council; no writer of the fourth, or fifth, or sixth, or seventh, or eighth, century has even hinted that the matter came before the Council in any way. The only shadow of authority for ascribing to the Nicene Council any action respecting the sacred books, is this anonymous author of the *Synodikon*, not earlier than the last half of the *ninth* century, and even that does not confirm it in any particular. It says nothing of fifty Gospels; it says nothing about the Gospels at all, or about any vote of the Council, but merely describes a grotesque and ridiculous miracle. The writer says, ‘The Council made manifest the canonical and the apocryphal books in the following manner. Laying them down by the side of the divine table in the house of God, they prayed, beseeching the Lord that the divinely inspired books might be found *on* the table and the spurious *underneath*, and this took place.’”

“To quote this book as ‘a historical record’ is about as sensible as it would be to quote ‘Mother Hubbard’ in a work on feeding dogs, or ‘Jack the Giant-Killer’ in a treatise on raising beans.

“‘The truth is,’ continues Professor Abbot, ‘that the acceptance of the books of the New Testament as genuine and authoritative, *was not due to any votes of councils, but to the gradual agreement among Christians on such grounds of evidence as SATISFIED THEM.*’

“In other words, the millions of early Christian believers,

who met the storms of persecution, and perilled their lives and based their eternal hopes upon the truth of the gospel of Christ, did not accept that gospel upon evidence that would have been insufficient to settle the ownership of an acre of land or a yoke of oxen. No! but from trustworthy men, bound to them by closest ties of sympathy and affection,—men who were neither knaves, nor fools, nor fanatics; but who, in the honesty of their souls, had sacrificed their prospects and hazarded their lives in the defense of the faith which they had embraced;—from these men, in spoken discourses, or in written treatises and epistles, authenticated by their own hands, and conveyed by trusty messengers, they received, not guesses, theories, nor opinions, but statements of *simple facts* and occurrences with which they had been intimately connected, or which they had personally witnessed or participated in.

“Paul, writing to the Corinthians of Christ’s resurrection, boldly declared that he had not only himself seen him alive in glory subsequent to his crucifixion, but that more than two hundred and fifty men, besides the apostles, were then living on the earth, who had seen the risen Christ; and John and others wrote and spoke of what their eyes had seen, and ears had heard, and hands had handled of the Word of Life. And these books and records, authenticated by containing ‘the salutation’ by an apostle’s ‘own hand,’ which was ‘the token in every epistle,’ were copied and carried from church to church; and the later ones were not received into companionship with the earlier till after the most rigid scrutiny and most careful authentication. And this was before ecclesiastical councils were called or thought of, and they had no more to do with the matter when they, hundreds of years afterwards, published lists of the books which they received as canonical, than a Conference of Methodist ministers have when they, in their Articles of Faith, publish the same list of books as canonical; or than a writer on natural philosophy has to do with settling the order of the universe, when he says he believes in the attraction of gravitation.

“And as it regards those romancing, spurious, apocryphal gospels and other books, resembling some of the pious novels of the present day, they were, from the very first, rejected,

- spurned, denounced and abhorred, as vile impostures, by the church who sealed their testimony with their blood.

"The early Christians read, and believed, and quoted the same books that we read, and believe, and quote, and in the same way that we believe and quote them; and they did this for generations before councils ever meddled with the subject; and the proofs of this fact are abundant and incontrovertible.

"Robert Phillip repeats the following incident as received from the lips of John Campbell, the well-known African missionary and explorer, who said:

"I remember distinctly an interesting anecdote referring to the late Sir David Dalrymple, better known to literary men abroad by his title of Lord Hailes, a Scottish judge. I had it from the late Rev. W. Buchanan, one of the ministers of Edinburgh. I took such interest in it that, though it must be about fifty years since he told it, I think I can almost relate it in Mr. Buchanan's words:

"I was dining some time ago with a literary party at old Mr. Abercrombie's, father of General Abercrombie, who was slain in Egypt at the head of the British army, and spending the evening together. A gentleman present put a question which puzzled the whole company. It was this: 'Supposing all the New Testaments in the world had been destroyed at the end of the third century, could their contents have been recovered from the writings of the first three centuries?'

"The question was novel to all, and no one even hazarded a guess in answer to the inquiry. About two months after this meeting, I received a note from Lord Hailes, inviting me to breakfast with him next morning. He had been one of the party. During breakfast he asked me if I recollected the curious question about the possibility of recovering the contents of the New Testament from the writings of the first three centuries.

"I remember it well,' said I, 'and have thought of it often, without being able to form any opinion or conjecture on the subject.'

"Well,' said Lord Hailes, 'that question quite accorded with the turn or taste of my antiquarian mind. On returning home, as I knew I had all the writings of those centuries, I

began immediately to collect them, that I might set to work on the arduous task as soon as possible.' Pointing to a table covered with papers, he said, 'There have I been busy for these two months, searching for chapters, half-chapters and sentences of the New Testament, and have marked down what I have found, and where I found it, so that any person may examine and see for himself. I have actually discovered the whole New Testament from those writings, except seven (or or eleven) verses (I forget which), which satisfied me that I could discover them also. 'Now,' said he, 'here was a way in which God concealed or hid the treasure of his Word, that Julian, the apostate emperor, and other enemies of Christ who tried to extirpate the Gospels from the world, never would have thought of; and though they had, they never could have effected their destruction.'

"The labor of effecting this feat must have been immense; for the Gospels and Epistles would not be divided into chapters and verses as they are now. Much must have been effected by help of a concordance. And having been a judge for many years, a habit of minute investigation must have been formed in his mind.'

"The facilities for investigating this question are ample and easily accessible to any intelligent student. The Ante-Nicene Library, published by T. and T. Clark, of Edinburgh, comprises some twenty-four octavo volumes, averaging about five hundred pages each. In these twelve thousand octavo pages of printed matter are comprised nearly all the extant writings of some fifteen or twenty of the most eminent Christian authors who lived *before* the year A. D. 325, when the Council of Nice was convened. One of the volumes also contains such remains of those spurious, uncanonical and fictitious Gospels, Acts, etc., as have come down to us from early ages. In these twelve thousand pages, all of which are accessible to skeptics in English translations, which can be compared with the originals by those who are competent to do so, will be found an overwhelming avalanche of evidence upon the question of the origin of the New Testament Scriptures.

"These men, some of whom were cotemporary with the apostles, and others who, as their immediate successors, were

well acquainted with their associates and cotemporaries, give in these writings the most positive and unmistakable evidence as to the New Testament books which they received, and as to the estimation in which those books were held. They quote passage after passage, and page after page of the same Scriptures that are quoted to-day and read in every Christian assembly. They quoted the books which we quote; they quoted them as we quote them; they received them as we receive them, and this long before the Council of Nice or any other council had anything to say about the canon of the Scriptures.

"Polycarp, who was martyred A. D. 155 or 156, after having served Christ eighty-six years, and who was, during some thirty years of his long Christian life, cotemporary with the Apostle John, whose disciple he was, quotes in his Epistle to the Philippians nearly forty passages from our New Testament; and Justin Martyr, who wrote about A. D. 140, or some forty years after the decease of the Apostle John, quotes again and again the very words which we now read in the New Testament. In the writings of Irenæus, A. D. 178; Clement, A. D. 194; Tertullian, A. D. 200; and Origen, A. D. 230, are to be found 8723 quotations from the New Testament, including every book which we accept as canonical.

"In the sixth chapter of his *Demonstration of the Truth of the Christian Religion*, Dr. Keith records the number of quotations from the New Testament which can be seen in works which are still extant, by the writers whom we have named. He reports seven hundred and sixty-seven (767) passages quoted by Irenæus, from every book in the New Testament except the third Epistle of John, and the Epistle of Jude; three hundred and eighty-nine (389) passages quoted by Clement, from every book except the Epistle of James and the second and third Epistles of John, and the Epistle of Jude; eighteen hundred and two (1802) passages, or, if repetitions are included, more than *three thousand* passages, quoted by Tertullian, from every book in the New Testament except the Epistle to James, the third of John, the second of Peter, and the Epistle of Jude; while the works of Origen yet extant, contain five thousand seven hundred and sixty-five (5,765) quotations from the New Testament, including every book contained

therein, and *excluding all of the so-called apocryphal books, about which infidels sometimes talk so freely*. Many works of Origen and other authors of those times have perished, but it is probable that if Origen's entire writings had been preserved, if the New Testament had been lost, it could have been reconstructed from them alone.

"The learned, conscientious, accurate and painstaking critic, Dr. S. P. Tregelles, when speaking of Origen, who died about A. D. 254, says: 'In his writings he makes such extensive use of the New Testament, that although a very large number of his works are lost, and many others have come down to us only in defective Latin versions, we can in his extant *Greek* writings alone (I speak this from *actual knowledge* and *examination*), find cited at least *two-thirds of the New Testament*; so that, had such a thing been permitted as that the Gospels, and some of the other books, should have been lost, we might restore them in a great measure by means of the quotations in Origen.'

"These authors which we have named comprise but a portion of the authors who wrote *before* the Council of Nice; but these are sufficient to settle forever this question of the authenticity of the New Testament Scriptures. And it is thus demonstrated that if, at the time of the Council of Nice, every book contained in our New Testament had been blotted out of existence, not only every fact and statement contained in them, but also nearly every *sentence* now found there, could have been recovered from the now extant writings of men who had lived, and written, and quoted them as authentic and authoritative, long before the Council of Nice was ever thought of. And if the numerous other Christian writings of those days which are lost could be discovered, the number of quotations would doubtless be largely multiplied.

"Hence we may justly conclude that those 'Gospels' which Justin Martyr (A. D. 140) informs us were then read in the public assemblies of the Christians every Lord's day; those 'authentic writings' which Tertullian (A. D. 200) informs us could be found in his time by any inquirer, in the custody of the churches of Corinth, Philippi, Thessalonica, Ephesus and Rome; those sacred Scriptures which the Emperor Diocletian

(A. D. 303) ordered to be surrendered and burnt, that he might destroy the foundations of Christianity, and which the apostates delivered up, while the faithful guarded them at the peril and loss of their lives; those Scriptures of which the next emperor, Constantine, twenty-seven years later (A. D. 331), in a letter still extant, ordered his learned friend Eusebius to provide *fifty copies*, carefully transcribed by expert penmen upon prepared parchments, which were to be paid for out of the imperial treasury, sent in two of the imperial carriages for the personal examination of the Emperor, and then placed in the churches of the imperial city of Constantinople, to be read there every Lord's day;—were not dependent for the establishment of their authenticity or authority upon the Council of Nice, the Council of Laodicea, or any other council, but upon the unimpeachable testimony of men who testified what they saw, and sealed their testimony with their blood; and that faithful men, receiving the sacred records from the apostles' hands, have handed them down from generation to generation, to the present day. And it is a remarkable fact that there is now in the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg a Greek manuscript of the Holy Scriptures which was discovered by Dr. Tischendorf in the convent at the base of Mt. Sinai, in 1859, which it is thought by good judges may be one of the very copies prepared by the order of the Emperor Constantine A. D. 331, and perhaps presented to the convent by the Emperor Justinian, at the time of its foundation, in the sixth century.

"We have thus glanced briefly at a few of the facts bearing upon this subject, which demonstrate the antiquity and authenticity of the New Testament books, and show that they existed in apostolic times, and were received from apostolic hands, as authentic and authoritative records. And for intelligent infidels to be humbugged into the belief that millions of Christian men hazarded their lives and their all on the vote of some council that was not assembled till hundreds of years after they had suffered the loss of all things for their faith, and sealed their testimony with their blood; or to be deluded into the idea that an old, anonymous fable, written by some ignorant scribbler who lived five hundred years after the Council of Nice was dead and buried, hunted up by an old German book

worm, and printed as a literary curiosity, is worthy of a place in this controversy, as "a historical record translated from the Greek," only illustrates the proverbial credulity which seems to be a characteristic of skeptical minds.

"The fact that councils more recent than that at Nicæa, published to the world lists of books which they received as of divine authority, may be important to the councils, but is of no importance to the books themselves. A town meeting or a village caucus might publish to the world the volumes they receive as the statutes of a State, or the general laws of a nation, but their publication of the fact has *no possible connection with the authority of those laws*. If they receive them as authoritative, well and good; if they do not receive them, other people do; and the government is abundantly able to enforce them. And as it would be impossible to impose a forged *law* upon a mighty nation, so it was impossible to impose a forged *gospel* upon the universal church. In either case detection would be certain and rejection sure. Yet notwithstanding this, such forgeries have been attempted at different times, and it is proper to devote a little attention to the spurious gospels."

W. C. BROWNLEE, D. D.

In his letters in the Roman Catholic Controversy, W. C. Brownlee, D. D., published in New York, 1834, to the Roman priests in the Controversy, Mr. Brownlee says:

"What the Roman Catholic Church claims as the only infallible rule, is a thing absolutely beyond the reach of the Pope, or any council. It is positively impracticable of application by mere mortals!

"Were it not for the impiety of the thing, it were a piece of pleasant humor to hear a Roman priest descanting about the *obscurity* of the Bible; and melting in pathos about the impossibility of God's own rational creatures understanding a plain and luminous message of the Gospel from their Creator! Now, in opposition to all his declamation, it is evident that the priest never feared, nor even believed the obscurity of the Bible. It is because it is 'so small a book,' and of such easy access; and because it is plain and clear, that he does fear it;

and labor to keep it out of the hands of the laity. If it were obscure, it would do 'Holy Mother' no harm!

"But, let any one look at the 'infallible rule' of the Catholic Church. 1st. It includes the Scriptures, with the apocrypha, with all its fictions and indecencies. Now, I tell you gentlemen, the Pope, and your church can no more wield the sword of the Spirit, and fix infallible interpretations; and subdue the human soul; and produce faith; and create a new heart in man; and convey divine grace,—all which our infallible word, and judge do,—than they can create a new Ireland; or even cleanse the Augean stable of his Holiness' court at Rome.

"This is not all. In your rule, and as an essential part of it, you reckon all the acts and decisions of 'Holy Mother Church.' These are deposited in, at least 8 folio volumes of the Popish Bulls; in 10 folio volumes of Decretals; in 31 folio volumes of Acts of Councils; in 51 folio volumes of the Doings and Sayings of the Saints,—'Acta Sanctorum.' And add to all this, at least 35 volumes of the Greek and Latin fathers; in which are to be found that part of your rule called *the unanimous consent* of the fathers. And to all this chaos of unread, unexamined, unimagined materials, you add the almost boundless list of *unwritten* traditions, which, like the learned German's book, contain 'observations and dogmas on all things,—and somethings besides:—'traditions which have floated down on the wind, and the miasmatic air of Rome for nearly 1260 years.

"All these cumbrous and enormous additions made to the Holy Scriptures, constitute the Roman Catholic rule: the Pope is *judge*. This judge must know the Holy Bible infallibly and wholly; he must be minutely, perfectly, and infallibly acquainted with all the above-named 135 folio volumes; he must know infallibly all their unknowable contents; reconcile all their irreconcilable contradictions; know minutely, and infallibly, all the cases, and wants of all his dear flock, namely, the cardinals, prelates, priests, and lay subjects; he must know the hearts of all; and be able to send light into the human mind, and uprightiness into the human conscience; he must know the merits, perfectly, of each contending partizan, and order of friars; and set forth, in a plain, clear, and luminous page,

every truth to settle disputes; so that if the combatants do not see it, his *infallible rule* may yet convince and convert all the predestined children of heaven!" *Letters, p. 21.*

Such is the enormous unknown and unknowable Roman Catholic creed which every Romanist must swear to and believe on pain of damnation. In contrast with the simple gospel of Christ and New Testament rule of faith, the Roman rule of faith is a vast "continent of mud," in which Romanists are overwhelmed.

DECREES OF TRENT.

In the fourth session of the famous Council of Trent, which met the 8th of April, 1546, the Roman Catholic canon of Scripture was established by decrees and anathemas. After adding to the Word of God the books called the apocrypha, the Roman Church canonized the Latin Vulgate imperfect translation, as their Bible. We quote from the Decrees as follows:

"But if anyone receive not, as sacred and canonical, the said books entire, with all their parts, as they have been used to be read in the Catholic Church, and as they are contained in the old Latin Vulgate edition; and knowingly and deliberately condemn the traditions aforesaid; let him be anathema." Also, we have the "DECREE CONCERNING THE EDITION, AND THE USE, OF THE SACRED BOOKS." Thus, "Moreover, the same sacred and holy Synod,—considering that no small utility may accrue to the Church of God, if it be made known which out of all the Latin editions, now in circulation, of the sacred books is to be held as authentic,—ordains and declares, that the said old and Vulgate edition, which, by the lengthened usage of so many ages, has been approved of in the Church, be, in public lectures, disputations, sermons, and expositions, held as authentic; and that no one is to dare or presume to reject it under any pretext whatever.

"Furthermore, in order to restrain petulant spirits, it decrees that no one, relying on his own skill, shall,—in matters

of faith, and of morals pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrine,—wresting the sacred Scriptures to his own senses, presume to interpret the said sacred Scriptures contrary to that sense which the holy mother Church,—whose it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures,—hath held and doth hold; or even contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers; even though such interpretations were never (intended) to be at any time published. Contraveners shall be made known by their Ordinaries, and be punished with the penalties by law established.

“And wishing, as is just, to impose a restraint, in this matter, also on printers, who now without restraint,—thinking, that is, that whatsoever they please is allowed them,—print without the license of ecclesiastical superiors, the said books of sacred Scripture, and the notes and comments upon them of all persons indifferently, with the press oftentimes unnamed, often even fictitious, and what is more grievous still, without the author's name; and also keep for indiscriminate sale books of this kind printed elsewhere; (this Synod) ordains and decrees, that, henceforth, the sacred Scripture, and especially the said old and Vulgate edition, be printed in the most correct manner possible: and that it shall not be lawful for anyone to print, or cause to be printed, any books, whatever, on sacred matters, without the name of the author; nor to sell them in future, or even to keep them, unless they shall have first been examined, and approved of, by the Ordinary; under pain of the anathema and fine imposed in a canon of the last Council of Lateran; and, if they be Regulars, besides this examination and approval, they shall be bound to obtain a license also from their own superiors, who shall have examined the books according to the form of their own statutes. As to those who lend, or circulate them in manuscript, without their first having been examined and approved of, they shall be subjected to the same penalties as printers; and they who shall have them in their possession, or shall read them, shall, unless they discover the author, be themselves regarded as the authors. And the said approbation of books of this kind shall be given in writing; and for this end it shall appear authentically at the beginning of the book, whether the book be written or printed;

and all this, that is, both the approbation and the examination, shall be done gratis, that so what ought to be approved, may be approved, and what ought to be condemned may be condemned.

“Besides the above, wishing to repress that temerity, by which the words and sentences of sacred Scripture are turned and twisted to all sorts of profane uses, to wit, to things scurrilous, fabulous, vain, to flatteries, detractions, superstitions, impious, and diabolical incantations, sorceries, and defamatory libels; (the Synod) commands and enjoins, for the doing away with this kind of irreverence and contempt, and that no one may henceforth dare in any way to apply the words of sacred Scripture to these and such like purposes; that all men of this description, profaners and violaters of the word of God, be by the bishops restrained by the penalties of law, and others of their own appointment.” *Decrees of Council of Trent, by Waterworth, pp. 19-21.*

Thus the Council of Trent has placed its infallible decree upon a translation made by Jerome, who was a fallible man. Therefore, the Roman Catholic Bible is not the true unadulterated Word of God as it came from the lips of inspiration. The Roman Bible is a corruption of the sacred Scriptures. Also, this *decree* was intended to “restrain petulant spirits” from interpreting the sacred Scriptures contrary to the sense of the Roman Church, or contrary to the “unanimous consent of the fathers”! Every one of common information knows that there is no unanimous consent of the fathers. Those Greek and Latin fathers contradict each other on nearly every question of faith and morals. Those who dare to read and understand the Scriptures for themselves are to be punished “with the penalties by law established.” Also, this decree forbids and restrains printers, “without license of ecclesiastical superiors,” from publishing the Holy Scriptures, under pain of anathema and civil punishment and fine imposed by the Council of Lateran. Neither was anyone allowed to possess, read,

lend or circulate the Scriptures without the approbation given in writing, by the Church authorities. Such persons were to be by the bishops restrained by penalties of law and other penalties of their own appointment. According to the Council of Trent, the Word of God to the Catholic is a sealed book. He is not allowed to read and understand it for himself.

"CONGREGATION OF THE INDEX."

The Council of Trent, in 1564, enacted "Ten Rules of the Congregation of the Index of Prohibited Books," which were approved by Pope Pius IV. The committee appointed at Trent, under whose supervision these rules were made, was made permanent, and exists at Rome to the present day, under the name of "the Congregation of the Index." The fourth rule reads as follows:

"Inasmuch as it is manifest from experience that if the Holy Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue, be indiscriminately allowed to every one, the temerity of men will cause more evil than good to arise from it; it is, on this point, referred to the judgment of the bishops, or inquisitors, who may, by the advice of the priest or confessor, permit the reading of the Bible translated into the vulgar tongue by Catholic authors, *to those persons whose faith and piety, they apprehend, will be augmented and not hindered by it*; and this permission they must have in writing. But if any one shall have the presumption to read or possess it without such written permission, he shall not receive absolution until he have first delivered up such Bible to the ordinary. Booksellers, however, who shall sell, or otherwise dispose of Bibles in the vulgar tongue, to any person not having such permission, shall forfeit the value of the books, to be applied by the bishop to some pious use; and be subjected by the bishop to such other penalties as the bishop shall judge proper, according to the quality of the offense. But regulars shall neither read nor purchase such Bibles without a special license from their superiors." From Dowling's History

of Romanism, pp. 492, 493, where the original Latin may also be found.

Thus, according to the highest authority of the Church of Rome, the Congregation of the Index, appointed by the Pope, even the Roman Catholic Bible itself is *prohibited* on pain of *damnation!* For, if *absolution* is not granted, according to Roman theology, the guilty party is lost. One even possessing a Roman Catholic Bible without written permission of the "bishop or inquisitor," "shall not receive absolution," unless he delivers up his Bible to the Roman officer. Thus the proof is clear, that instead of being the conservator of the Bible, the Roman Catholic Church is *the enemy* of the Word of God.

PRIEST THOMAS MCGUIRE.

In the debate between Pope and McGuire, in Dublin, 1827, Mr. McGuire, the Roman priest, says:

"We have the Latin Vulgate, the noble translation of St. Jerome, and approved of by the Council of Trent—that is our acknowledged and authentic Bible." *Debate, p. 38.*

Thus a very imperfect translation was adopted as the standard, instead of the original pure Word of God. Again, on page 39, Mr. McGuire says:

"If every individual is to be constituted interpreter of the Scriptures, the day will arrive when the clergy will be thrown overboard; and they will be glad to fly from the machinations of those who would make every old woman in the country an interpreter and expounder of the sacred word of God."

Exactly! This is what Rome fears, that the free reading of the Scriptures by the people will overthrow the Roman clergy. Let the Bible be read and understood by the people if the "clergy will be thrown overboard." Also, Priest McGuire says:

"But the Catholic who believes in the Church established by Christ, finds his faith upon the authority of that Church. All difficulties vanish before him; the atheist or the deist may start

several objections which he cannot answer, but *"the Church is the solution of all difficulties."* *Debate, p. 83.*

The loyal Romanist, in his ignorance, is to take the testimony of the Church as his rule instead of the Word of God. And with him, the rule of the Church is the rule of the priest. This is priestcraft. On page 101 Priest McGuire puts a question to Mr. Pope, thus:

"If the Bible exclusively contains the word of God, will Mr. Pope show us from the Bible, the procession of the Holy Ghost—baptism with the sign of the cross—consubstantiality—and that infants may be baptized contrary to the practice of Christ and his apostles?"

Also, on page 93 of the Debate, Priest McGuire says:

"The Roman Catholic child, when baptized, receives the aid of the Holy Ghost. He promises at baptism to obey the Church; and I proved the object of his obedience entitled to it. But the illumination of which Mr. Pope speaks never can be proved. It is adapted only to sublimated imaginations. It is unfortunate that Mr. Pope appeals to the Bible to decide our controversy—for the Bible is a dumb judge."

Thus it appears that Romanists reject the Bible as the standard of authority. How can such a Church be the Church of God?

As the priests are so very fallible, and often very wicked, the traditions in their keeping are certainly fallible and contradictory.

"FATHER" SMARIUS.

In his Points of Controversy the Romish writer, p. 79, says:

"If the Scriptures had been the only touch-stone to test truth and heresy, the Church would never have condemned, as heretics, those who denied doctrines not clearly contained in the Scriptures. This, however, she did from the very be-

ginning of Christianity. Thus, the baptism of children is, according to the showing of many separated churches, not clearly proved from the Bible to be necessary unto salvation; and yet the Council of Miletus condemned as heretics such as deny this doctrine. The Quarto-decimani were also condemned as heretics, because they would not believe that Easter should always be kept on the fourteenth day of the moon; a doctrine which it is not easy to prove from the Scriptures alone. Again, how could the early writers of the Church have held it a peculiarity of heretics to appeal always to the Scriptures for the doctrines which they advanced, or which they denied, if it was the very rule which Christ himself had established, as the only test of truth and error?"

Also, on page 81, Smarius, of the Scriptures, says:

"They do not enumerate the precise points which are to be believed of necessity unto salvation. They do not teach the necessity of infant baptism, nor specify the change of the Sabbath to the Sunday. Where will you find in them, that those who were baptized in heresy, must not be rebaptized? or that baptism should be administered by immersion instead of by sprinkling? They do not clearly settle the order and subordination of the pastors of the Church. Nor is it clear from them whether there should be bishops, or elders only. Finally, they do not establish distinctly the number of the sacraments and their nature."

REV. "FATHER" WENINGER.

In 1861, Father F. X. Wininger, D. D., published his Manual of the Catholic Religion, which was endorsed by John Henry Luers, Bishop of Fort Wayne. On page 23 of this Manual we have the following:

"Q. Where are the Traditions of the Church to be found?"

"A. In the living ministry of the Church, in the writings of the Holy Fathers, and in the approved ecclesiastical writers of the first centuries of Christianity. The best known are the following: St. Hermas, St. Clement of Rome, St. Ignatius the Martyr, St. Polycarp, St. Justin the Martyr, Athenagoras, St. Irenaeus, St. Cyprian, Tertullian, St. Athanasius, St. Hilary,

St. Basil, St. Ephrem, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Ambrose, St. John Chrysostom, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, and a host of others down to the time of St. Bernard, St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Bonaventure.

Of all these, St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome and St. Gregory the Great are called, by way of distinction, the four Doctors of the Church."

COMMANDMENTS OF THE CHURCH.

The celebrated Roman Catholic theologian, Liguori, in his Mission Book, page 264, says:

"A. The Christian is bound to keep the commandments of the Church, because the Church has received from God the power to make laws; and because, being our Spiritual Mother, we are bound as children to obey her."

But the Church is to obey the commands of Christ, who is the only Law Giver. Also, on page 265, Liguori says:

"Q. Are we bound to keep these laws of the Church as faithfully as the commandments of God?

"A. We are; for our Lord spoke to the Church when he said: *He that heareth you heareth me; and he that despiseth you despiseth me.*" (St. Luke 10:16.)

Thus it is admitted that *the laws of the Church* are different from *the commands of God*.

FATHER WENINGER.

In his Manual of Religion, page 218, Priest Weninger says:

"Q. How many commandments of the Church are there that are binding on all the faithful?

"A. There are five; namely,

"1. Thou shalt keep the holidays or feasts instituted by the Church.

"2. Thou shalt hear mass with due devotion on Sundays and holidays of obligation.

"3. Advent, Lent, Ember-days, and vigils, thou shalt fast. On Fridays, also, flesh thou shalt not eat.

"4. Confess your sins at least once a year, to your pastor,

or another priest duly authorized, and receive the blessed sacrament at Easter-time.

"5. Thou shalt not solemnize marriage at certain prohibited times."

POPE PIUS VII.

John Dowling, in his History of Romanism, page 621, makes a summary statement of Rome's acts of hatred to the Bible, which we transcribe as follows:

"With respect to Rome's hatred to the Bible in the vulgar tongue, we have seen that the Council of Trent, in the fourth rule of the Congregation of the Index (p. 429), declares that its indiscriminate use will be productive of 'more evil than good.' Such is still the doctrine of Rome. Within the last thirty years, several papal bulls, or circulars, have been issued, condemning Bible Societies and the free circulation of the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue. One by Pope Pius VII., in 1816; one by Leo XII., in 1824; another by Pius VIII., in 1829, and two by the present Pope, Gregory XVI., in 1832 and 1844. It will be sufficient to give a brief extract from the circular of Pius VII., in 1816, and more copious extracts from the bull of 1844, which, on account of its exhibition of the present character of Popery, is the most valuable of them all. In a letter addressed to the Primate of Poland relative to Bible Societies, and dated June 26th, 1816, Pope Pius VII. uses the following language:

"We have been truly shocked at this most crafty device (Bible Societies), by which the very foundations of religion are undermined. We have deliberated upon the measures proper to be adopted by our pontifical authority, in order to remedy and abolish this pestilence, as far as possible,—this defilement of the faith so imminently dangerous to souls. It becomes episcopal duty, that you first of all expose the wickedness of this nefarious scheme. It is evident from experience, that the Holy Scriptures, when circulated in the vulgar tongue, have, through the temerity of men, produced more harm than benefit. Warn the people entrusted to your care, that they fall not into the snares prepared for their everlasting ruin."

POPE GREGORY XVI.

Pope Gregory XVI. issued a Bull. against Bible Societies and the circulation of the Bible among the people, May 8th, 1844. Mr. Dowling, in his History of Romanism, to show Rome's unchanging hostility to the Bible, makes copious extracts from this Bull of Pope Gregory, as follows:

"Venerable Brothers, health and greeting Apostolical:— Among the many attempts which the enemies of Catholicism, under whatever denomination they may appear, are daily making in our age, to seduce the truly faithful, and deprive them of the holy instructions of the faith, the efforts of those Bible Societies are conspicuous, which, originally established in England, and propagated throughout the universe, labor everywhere to disseminate the books of the Holy Scriptures, translated into the vulgar tongue; consign them to the private interpretation of each, alike among Christians and among infidels; continue what St. Jerome formerly complained of—pretending to popularize the holy pages, and render them intelligible, without the aid of any interpreter, to persons of every condition—to the most loquacious woman, to the light-headed old man, to the wordy caviler; to all, in short, and even by an absurdity as great as unheard of, to the most hardened infidels." The Pope then proceeds to remark that these societies "only care audaciously to stimulate all to a private interpretation of the divine oracles, to inspire contempt for divine traditions, which the Catholic Church preserves upon the authority of the holy fathers; in a word, to cause them to reject even the authority of the Church herself."

The Pope then proceeds to eulogize the tyrannical and bloody persecutor of the Waldenses and founder of the Inquisition, for his zeal against "Bibles translated into the vulgar tongue."

"Hence the warning and decrees of our predecessor, Innocent III., of happy memory, on the subject of lay societies and meetings of women, who had assembled themselves in the diocese of Metz for objects of piety and the study of the Holy Scriptures. Hence the prohibitions which subsequently ap-

peared in France and Spain, during the sixteenth century, with respect to the vulgar Bible.

"It became necessary subsequently," he adds, "to take even greater precautions, when the pretended reformers, Luther and Calvin, daring, by a multiplicity and incredible variety of errors, to attack the immutable doctrine of the faith, omitted nothing in order to seduce the faithful by their false interpretations and translations into the vernacular tongue, which the then novel invention of printing contributed more rapidly to propagate and multiply. Whence it was generally laid down in the regulations dictated by the Fathers, adopted by the Council of Trent, and approved by our predecessor, Pius VII., of happy memory, and which (regulations) are prefixed to the list of prohibited books, that the reading of the Holy Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue, should not be permitted except to those to whom it might be deemed necessary to confirm in the faith and piety. Subsequently, when heretics still persisted in their frauds, it became necessary for Benedict XIV. to superadd the injunction that no versions whatever should be suffered to be read but those which should be approved of by the Holy See, accompanied by notes derived from the writings of the Holy Fathers, or other learned and Catholic authors.

"Notwithstanding this, some new sectarians of the school of Jansenius, after the example of the Lutherans and Calvinists, feared not to blame these justifiable precautions of the Apostolic See, as if the reading of the holy books had been at all times, and for all the faithful, useful, and so indispensable that no authority could assail it.

"But we find this audacious assertion of the sect of Jansenius withered by the most rigorous censures in the solemn sentence which was pronounced against their doctrine, with the assent of the whole Catholic universe, by two sovereign pontiffs of modern times, Clement XI. in his unigenitus constitution of the year 1713, and Pius VI. in his constitution *actorem fidei* of the year 1794. Consequently, even before the establishment of Bible Societies was thought of, the decrees of the Church, which we have quoted, were intended to guard the faithful against the frauds of heretics who cloak themselves

under the specious pretext that it is necessary to propagate and render common the study of the holy books.

"Since then, our predecessor, Pius VII., of glorious memory, observing the machinations of these societies to increase under his pontificate, did not cease to oppose their efforts, at one time through the medium of the apostolic nuncios, at another by letters and decrees, emanating from the several congregations of cardinals of the Holy Church, and at another by the two pontifical letters addressed to the Bishop of Gnesen and the Archbishop of Mohilif. After him, another of our holy predecessors, Leo XII., reprov'd the operations of the Bible Societies, by his circulars addressed to all the Catholic pastors in the universe, under date of May 5, 1824. Shortly afterwards, our immediate predecessor, Pius VIII., of happy memory, confirmed their condemnation by his circular letter of May 24, 1829. We, in short, who succeed them, notwithstanding our great unworthiness, have not ceased to be solicitous on this subject, and have especially studied to bring to the recollection of the faithful the several rules which have been successively laid down with regard to the vulgar versions of the holy books."

Alluding to the recently formed society called the Christian Alliance, the Pope says:

"This society strains every nerve to introduce among them, by means of individuals collected from all parts, corrupt and vulgar Bibles, and to scatter them secretly among the faithful. At the same time, their intention is to disseminate worse books still (!!), or tracts designed to withdraw from the minds of their readers all respect for the Church and the Holy See."

After referring with evident alarm to the fact of the translation into Italian of those excellent works, D'Aubigne on the Reformation, and McCrie's Reformation in Italy, the Pope proceeds as follows:

"With reference to works of whatsoever writer, we call to mind the observance of the general rules and decrees of our predecessors, to be found prefixed to the index of prohibited books; and we invite the faithful to be on their guard, not only against the books named in the index, but also against those proscribed in the general proscriptions.

"As for yourselves, my venerable brethren, called as you are to divide our solicitude, we recommend you earnestly in the Lord, to announce and proclaim, in convenient time and place, to the people confided to your care, these apostolic orders, and to labor carefully to separate the faithful sheep from the contagion of the Christian Alliance, from those who have become its auxiliaries, no less than those who belong to other Bible Societies, and from all who have any communications with them. You are consequently enjoined to remove from the hands of the faithful alike the Bibles in the vulgar tongue which may have been printed contrary to the decrees above mentioned of the Sovereign Pontiffs, and every book proscribed and condemned, and to see that they learn, through your admonition and authority, what pasturages are salutary, and what pernicious and mortal. * * * Watch attentively over those who are appointed to expound the Holy Scriptures, to see that they acquit themselves faithfully, according to the capacity of their hearers, and that they dare not, under any pretext whatever, interpret or explain the holy pages contrary to the tradition of the Holy Fathers, and to the service of the Catholic Church."

After more remarks in a similar strain, the Pope proceeds, in the following words, to renew the condemnation of the Bible Societies, and to confirm all preceding decrees against the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue:

"Wherefore, having consulted some of the cardinals of the Holy Romish Church, after having duly examined with them everything and listened to their advice, we have decided, venerable brothers, on addressing you this letter, by which we again condemn the Bible Societies, reprov'd long ago by our predecessors, and by virtue of the supreme authority of our apostleship, we reprove by name and condemn the aforesaid society called the Christian Alliance, formed last year at New York; it, together with every other society associated with it, or which may become so.

"Let all know, then, the enormity of the sin against God and his Church which they are guilty of who dare to associate themselves with any of these societies, or abet them in any

way. Moreover, we confirm and renew the decrees recited above, delivered in former times by apostolic authority, against the publication, distribution, reading and possession of books of the Holy Scriptures translated into the vulgar tongue."

The circular letter from which the above copious extracts are transcribed is superscribed as follows: "Given at Rome from the Basilic of St. Peter, on the 8th of May, in the year 1844, and the fourteenth of our Pontificate." Signed, Gregory XVI., S. P. *Dowling's History of Romanism*, pp. 622-624.

In the face of the above denunciations of Bible Societies and Bibles themselves, even as translated by Roman Catholics, will any one have the hardihood to affirm that the Roman Church is the friend of the inspired Scriptures?

APPENDIX B.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY.

PRIEST MCGUIRE.

In his debate with Mr. Pope, in 1827, in Dublin, Ireland, the Roman priest, McGuire, said:

"I admit the fact of Stephen throwing the body of the Pope into the Tiber, and the greater scoundrel he was, I affirm, for so doing. I admit there were some bad characters among the Popes. But I have already drawn a distinction between infallibility and impeccability. Besides, I never said that the infallibility of the Pope formed a portion of my creed. Christ promised his church that she would never fail in the faith, but that promise never implied that her children should be incapable of sin. As I have already told you, there were eleven monstrous bad Popes out of nearly three hundred good and virtuous characters which adorned the chair of Peter." *Pope and McGuire Debate*, p. 277.

But there is no evidence that there were three hundred good and virtuous Popes. As a rule the Popes are utterly corrupt.

BISHOP PURCELL.

In his debate with Alexander Campbell, Bishop Purcell, concerning the priesthood, says:

"The Catholic Church teaches that, *however illicitly he may exercise it, no authority on earth can take even from a degraded priest the power of consecrating*. Schismatical bishops, when duly ordained themselves, could ordain bishops, priests and inferior clergy. We admit the baptism of Methodists and Baptists by aspersion, or immersion, as I have already explained; and even the orders of the English Episcopal Church are contested, on the ground of the very serious doubt whether

the first of their bishops was, himself, consecrated by a bishop, or if so, by a valid formulary." *Campbell and Purcell Debate*, p. 74.

According to this, and Roman theology in general, a Roman Catholic priest can never be deprived of his priestly orders. However drunken and profligate he may be, he may pardon other sinners!

—
HON. W. E. GLADSTONE.

Concerning papal infallibility, Mr. Gladstone says:

"But the heresy of Honorius, to say nothing of other Popes, became, from his condemnation by a General Council, and by a long series of Popes as well as by other Councils, a matter so notorious that it could not fade from the view even of the darkest age; and the possibility of an heretical Pope grew to be an idea perfectly familiar to the general mind of Christendom. Hence in the Bull *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio*, Paul IV. declares (1559) that if a heretic is chosen as Pope, all his acts shall be void *ab initio*. All Christians are absolved from their obedience to him, and enjoined to have recourse to the temporal power. So likewise in the Decretals themselves it is provided that the Pope can only be brought to trial in case he is found to deviate from the faith.

"It is an opinion held by great authorities that no pontiff before Leo X. attempted to set up the infallibility of Popes as a dogma." *Vaticanism, An Answer to Reproofs and Replies*, p. 39.

This shows clearly that the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope was not claimed as a dogma of the Church in the early ages. On page 43 Mr. Gladstone again says:

"Now upon this question there are at least two independent lines of argument, each of which, respectively and separately, is fatal to the Ultramontane contention; this contention being that, for want of the confirmation of Pope Martin V., that decree fell to the ground.

"First: Pope Martin V. derived his whole power to confirm from his election to the papal chair by the Council. And the Council was competent to elect, because the See was vacant. And the See was vacant because of the depositions of the

three rival Popes; for if the See was truly vacant before there had been no Pope since the schism of 1378, which is not supposed by either side. But the power of the Council to vacate the See was in virtue of the principle asserted by the decree of the Fifth Session. We arrive then at the following dilemma. Either that decree had full validity by the confirmation of the Pope, or Martin the Fifth was not a Pope; the cardinals made or confirmed by him were not cardinals, and could not elect validly his successor, Eugene IV.; so that the papal succession has failed since an early date in the fifteenth century, or more than four hundred and fifty years ago.

"Therefore the decree of the Fifth Council must upon Roman principles have been included in the *materiæ fidei* determined by the Council, and was confirmed by Pope Martin V."

Thus Mr. Gladstone shows the utter absurdity of papal infallibility.

—
BISHOP PURCELL.

In his debate with Alexander Campbell, Bishop Purcell, concerning bad Popes, remarks:

"I have no special apology to offer for a Pope who is a bad man. He should be the pattern of the flock from the heart. He should be the salt of the earth—the light of the world. He should remember that the 'mighty shall be mightily tormented,' and that 'a most severe judgment shall be for them that bear rule if they walk not according to the law.' *I should not be surprised if these bad Popes were at this moment expiating their crimes in the penal fires of hell. But what is the proper inference to be deduced from their melancholy aberrations? If they like Lucifer have fallen, bright lights from the firmament of religion, do the heavens no longer proclaim the glory of God?*" *Debate*, p. 145.

On page 146 he continues:

"Stephen VI. had the body of Formosus dug up and cut off his fingers. My friend has taken this from Pope and McGuire's discussion, and has seen the answer there. In this unpardonable act of Stephen, we at least discern zeal for the rules of discipline, which forbade the transferring of a bishop from one

see to another. For this offense the needless act of severity was done. It shows the Popes expose what they think wrong in Popes; just as my friend would know nothing of their misdeeds, if Catholic historians had not had sincerity, piety and zeal to denounce them."

It was shown in the regular discussion that the infallible(?) Stephen condemned the dead body of Formosus for his infallible acts. This puts infallibility against infallibility!

INFALLIBILITY OF JUDAS.

In his debate with Mr. Pope, Priest McGuire said:

"Though Judas betrayed his Master, he did not deny the faith—he committed the sin for money, and he supposed that his Master would escape from his enemies. Though he betrayed his Master, he was guilty of no breach of faith." *Debate, p. 91.*

We freely admit that the Popes of Rome, in their betrayal of Christ, are the successors of Judas.

HON. W. E. GLADSTONE.

In his Vaticanism, An Answer to Reproofs and Replies, page 41, Mr. Gladstone says:

"That the definitions of the Pope in faith and morals, delivered *ex-cathedra*, are irreformable, and are invested with the infallibility granted by Christ in the said subject matter to the Church. (Chap. 4.)

"Now let us turn to the Council of Constance.

"This Council, supported by the following Council of Basle before its translation to Ferrara, had decreed in explicit terms that it had from Christ immediate power over the universal Church, of which it was the representative.

"That all were bound to obey it, of whatever state and dignity, even if papal, in all matters pertaining to faith, or to the extirpation of the subsisting schism, or to the reformation of the Church in its head and its members.

"In conformity herewith, the Council of Constance cited, as being itself a superior authority, three Popes to its bar. Greg-

ory XII. anticipated his sentence by resignation. Benedict XIII. was deposed, as was John XXIII., for divers crimes and offenses, but not for heresy. Having thus made void the papal chair, the Council elected thereto Pope Martin V."

All history is agreed that at the time referred to by Mr. Gladstone, there were three Popes contending for the chair of St. Peter at one time. Thus the Church of Rome represented a three headed monster. But the Council of Constance cut off these heads and established another in the person of Pope Martin V. What went with the infallibility of these three Popes who were expelled from the popedom?

DOWLING'S HISTORY.

John Dowling, in his History of Romanism, concerning the establishment of popery, says:

"Boniface, who succeeded to the Roman See in 605, was so far from having any scruples about adopting this 'BLASPHEMOUS TITLE' that he absolutely applied to the Emperor Phocas, a cruel and blood-thirsty tyrant, who had made his way to the throne by assassinating his predecessor: and earnestly solicited the title with the privilege of handing it down to his successors. The profligate emperor, who had a secret grudge against the Bishop of Constantinople, granted the request of Boniface, and after strictly forbidding the former prelate to use the title, conferred it upon the latter in the year 606, and declared the Church of Rome to be head over all other churches." *History of Romanism, p. 55.*

Boniface III. was the first real Pope of the Roman Church. Gregory, his predecessor, denounced the claim of universal bishop as blasphemous, and as the characteristic of anti-Christ.

"UNIVERSAL BISHOP" BLASPHEMY.

Gregory the Great, as he was called, the predecessor of Boniface, who first received the title of "Universal Bishop," denounced such a claim as blasphemy. We quote from Dowling's History of Romanism, as follows:

"Besides these vain pretensions, Gregory wrote epistles to his ambassadors at Constantinople, to the patriarch John, and to the emperor Mauritius, in which in various passages he denounces the title of universal bishop as 'vain,' 'execrable,' 'anti-Christian,' 'blasphemous,' 'infernal' and 'diabolical.' In his letter to the Patriarch of Constantinople, he pleads with him thus: '*Discipulis Dominus dicit, autem nolite vocari rabbi, unus enim Magister vester est, vos omnes fratres estis.*' &c. 'Our Lord says unto his disciples, be not ye called rabbi, for one is your Master, and all ye are brethren.' What, therefore, most dear brother, are you, in the terrible examination of the coming Judge, to say, who, *generalis pater in mundo vocari appetis?* desire to be called, not father only, but the general father of the world?

"Beware of the sinful suggestions of the wicked, I beg, I entreat and I beseech, with all possible suavity, that your brotherhood resist all these flatterers who offer you this name of error, and that you refuse to be designated by so foolish and so proud an appellation. For I indeed say it with tears, and from the inward anguish of my bowels, that to my sins I attribute it, that my brother cannot to this day be brought to humility, who was made bishop for this end, that he might lead the minds of others to humility. It is written, 'God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace to the humble;' and again it is said, 'he is unclean before God, who exalteth his heart;' hence it is written against the proud man, 'Quid superbis, terra et cinis?' 'Earth and ashes, why art thou proud?'

"*Perpende, rogo, quia in hac presumptione pax totius turbatur ecclesia.*' &c. 'Consider, I entreat you, that by that rash presumption is the peace of the whole church disturbed, and the grace poured out in common upon all contradicted: in which you can increase only in proportion as you carefully decrease in self-esteem, and become the greater the more you restrain yourself from this name of proud and foolish usurpation; love humility, therefore, my dearest brother, with your whole heart, by which concord among all the brethren and the unity of the holy universal church may be preserved. Truly, when Paul the apostle heard some say, 'I am of Paul, I am of Appolos, I am of Cephas,' he vehemently abhorring the

tearing asunder of the Lord's body, by which they, in some sense united his members to other heads, cries out, 'Was Paul crucified for you, or were you baptized in the name of Paul? If, then, he would not suffer the members of the Lord's body to be, as it were, particularly subject to certain heads, beyond Christ, and they apostles too, what will you say to Christ, the head of his universal church, in the trial of his last judgment, who endeavor to subject all his members under the title of universal? Whom, pray, do you propose to imitate by this perverse name, but him, who despising the legions of angels, his companions, endeavored to break forth, and ascend to an elevation peculiar to himself, that he might seem to be subject to none, and to be above all of them? Who also said, 'I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of heaven; I will be like the Most High.' For what are all your brother bishops of the universal church, but the stars of heaven, whose lives and preaching give light among the sins and errors of men, as in the darkness of night? Above whom, when you thus desire to elevate yourself by this haughty title, and to tread down their name in comparison of yours, what do you say but I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of heaven?

"*Atque ut cuncta brevi singulo locutionis astringam,*' &c. 'And that I may sum up all in one word: the saints before the law, the saints under the law, and the saints under grace, the gospel,—all these, making up the perfect body of our Lord, are constituted but members of the church; none of them would ever have himself called universal. Let your holiness then acknowledge how he must swell with pride, who covets to be called by this name, which no true saint would presume to accept. Were not, as your brotherhood knows, my predecessors in the Apostolic See, which I now serve by God's providence, called by the Council of Chalcedon to this offered honor? but none of them would ever allow himself to be named by such a title—none snatched at this rash name, lest if he should seize upon this singular glory of the pontificate, he should seem to deny it to all his brethren.

"*Sed omnia quæ prædicta sunt, fiunt: rex superbiæ prope est et quod dici nefas est, sacerdotum est præparatus exitus*

(vel exercitus) ei qui cervice militant claiouis. 'But all things which are foretold are come to pass; the king of pride approaches, and O, horrid to tell, the going forth of (or the army of the priests), is ready for him, who fight with the neck of pride, though appointed to lead to humility.'

"In his letters to the emperor Mauritius, Gregory reiterates the same sentiments. On account of their importance, the following extracts from these letters are subjoined: 'The care and principality of the whole church,' says Gregory, 'is committed to St. Peter; and yet he is not called 'universal apostle'—though this holy man, John, my fellow priest, labors to be called 'universal bishop.' I am compelled to cry out, 'O the corruption of times and manners?' Behold the barbarians are become lords of all Europe: cities are destroyed, castles are beaten down, provinces depopulated, there are no husbandmen to till the ground. Idolators rage and domineer over Christians; and yet priests, who ought to lie weeping upon the pavement in sackcloth and ashes, covet names of vanity, and glory in new and profane titles.'

"Do I, most religious sovereign, in this plead my own cause? Do I vindicate a wrong done to myself, and not maintain the cause of Almighty God, and of the church universal? Who is he who presumes to usurp this new name against both the law of the Gospel and of the canons? We know that many priests of the church of Constantinople have been not only heretics, but even the chief leaders of them. If, then, every one of that church assumes the name by which he makes himself the head of all good men; the Catholic church, which God forbid should ever be the case, must needs be overthrown when he falls who is called universal. But far from Christians be the blasphemous name, by which all honor is taken from all other priests, while it is foolishly arrogated by one. This man (John) contemning obedience to the canons, should be humbled by the commands of our most pious sovereign. He should be chastized who does an injury to the holy Catholic church, whose heart is puffed up, who seeks to please himself by the name of singularity, by which he would elevate himself above the Emperor. We are all scandalized at this. Let the author of this scandal reform himself, and all

differences in the church will cease. I am the servant of all priests, so long as they live like themselves—but if any shall vainly set up his bristles, contrary to God Almighty, and to the canons of the fathers, I hope in God that he will never succeed in bringing my neck under his yoke—not even by force of arms.'

"These urgent letters of Gregory appear to have been unavailing. The patriarch John, indeed, was soon afterwards removed by death from his archiepiscopal dignity; but Cynacus, who succeeded him as bishop of Constantinople, adopted the same pompous title as his predecessor. Having had occasion to dispatch some agents to Rome, in the letter which he wrote to the Roman pontiff Gregory, he so much displeased him by assuming the appellation of 'universal bishop,' that the latter withheld from the agents somewhat of the courtesy to which they considered themselves entitled, and, of course, complaint was made to the emperor Mauritius of the neglect which had been shown them. This circumstance extorted a letter from the Emperor at Constantinople to the Bishop of Rome, in which he advises him to treat them, in the future, in a more friendly manner, and not to insist so far on punctilios of style, as to create a scandal about a title, and fall out about a few syllables. To this Gregory replies, 'that the innovation in the style did not consist much in the quantity and alphabet; but the bulk of the iniquity was weighty enough to sink and destroy all. And, therefore, I am bold to say,' says he, 'that whosoever adopts, or affects the title of universal bishop, has the pride and character of anti-Christ, and is in some manner his forerunner in this haughty quality of elevating himself above the rest of his order. And, indeed, both the one and the other seem to split upon the same rock; for as pride makes anti-Christ strain his pretensions up to Godhead, so whoever is ambitious to be called the only or universal prelate, arrogates to himself a distinguished superiority, and arises, as it were, upon the ruins of the rest.'

Let the reader ponder well the sentence last quoted, in this epistle of Gregory, confessedly one of the most eminent of the Roman bishops, and who has, by them, been canonized as Saint Gregory; in which he places the brand of

anti-Christ on whoever assumes this title, and then judge whether we are not justified in pronouncing the era of the papal supremacy, when only two years after Gregory's death, Pope Boniface III. sought for and obtained the title of universal bishop, as the date of the full revelation on anti-Christ. We do but repeat the opinion so emphatically expressed by St. Gregory only a few years before the actual occurrence of this remarkable event in the history of popery. Boniface, who succeeded to the Roman See in 605, was so far from having any scruples about adopting this 'blasphemous title,' that he actually applied to the emperor Phocas, a cruel and bloodthirsty tyrant, who had made his way to the throne by assassinating his predecessor; and earnestly solicited the title, with the privilege of handing it down to his successors. The profligate emperor, who had a secret grudge against the Bishop of Constantinople, granted the request of Boniface, and after strictly forbidding the former prelate to use the title, conferred it upon the latter in the year 606, and declared the Church of Rome to be head over all other churches. Thus was Paul's prediction accomplished, 'the man of sin' revealed, and that system of corrupted Christianity and spiritual tyranny which is properly called **POPERY**, fully developed and established in the world. The title of universal bishop, which was then obtained by Boniface, has been worn by all succeeding Popes, and the claim of supremacy, which was then established, has ever since been maintained and defended by them, and still is down to the present day." *Dowling's History of Romanism*, pp. 52-55.

Other historical proofs might be introduced, showing that the Roman Catholic Church, with a "universal bishop" as its head, had its origin A. D. 606. Therefore, the Roman Catholic Church is nearly six centuries too young to be the true church of Christ.

TESTIMONY OF CORMENIN.

Cormenin, a Roman Catholic historian, says:

"Baronius, notwithstanding his devotion to the Holy See, avows that the ninth century was a time of desolation for the

Church. 'Never,' says he, 'had divisions, civil wars, the persecutions of pagans, heretics, and schismatics caused it to suffer so much as the monsters who installed themselves on the throne of Christ by simony and murders. The Roman Church was transformed into a shameless courtesan, covered with silks and precious stones, which publicly prostituted itself for gold; the palace of the Lateran was becoming a disgraceful tavern, in which ecclesiastics of all nations disputed with harlots the price of infamy.

"Never did priests, and especially Popes, commit so many adulteries, rapes, incests, robberies, and murders; and never was the ignorance of the clergy so great, as during this deplorable period. Christ was then assuredly sleeping a profound sleep in the bottom of his vessel, whilst the winds buffeted it on all sides, and covered it with the waves of the sea. And, what was more unfortunate still, the disciples of the Lord slept more profoundly than he, and could not awaken him either by their cries of their clamors. Thus the tempest of abomination fastened itself on the Church, and offered to the inspection of men the most horrid spectacle. The canons of councils, the creed of the apostles, the faith of Nice, the old traditions, the sacred rites, were buried in the abyss of oblivion, and the most unbridled dissoluteness, ferocious despotism, and insatiable ambition usurped their place. Who could call legitimate pontiffs the intruders who seated themselves on the chair of the apostles, and what must have been the cardinals selected by such monsters?" *History of the Popes, Vol. I., Cormenin, p. 274.*

Also, on page 156 of his "Faith of Our Fathers," Cardinal Gibbons remarks:

"In fine, the Pope is also styled the *Chief Pilot* of the Church. It was not without a mysterious significance, that our Lord went into Peter's bark instead of that of any of the other Apostles. This bark, our Lord has pledged himself, shall never sink, nor depart from her true course. How can you imagine a storm-proof, never-varying bark under the charge of a fallible pilot?

"The Council of the Vatican in promulgating, in 1870, the Pope's Infallibility, did not create a new doctrine, but con-

firmed an old one. In proclaiming this dogma, the Church enforces as a law the principle which has always existed as a matter of fact."

No inspired writer ever styled the Pope the "Chief Pilot of the Church." Neither is there a word said in the Scriptures about Peter's supremacy. It is all a Romish forgery. Well, what about the "mysterious significance" of our Lord's entrance "into Peter's bark"? Did this prove Peter's infallibility and the infallibility of his successors to the end of time? If so, the "mysterious significance" of our Lord's riding on a certain ass' colt proves the infallibility of the owner of the colt, as well as his successors, down to the end of time! Why did not the Savior ride on some other man's colt unless he wished to establish the supremacy of the owner? Such is the infallible logic of Rome! "How can you imagine a storm-proof, never-varying" donkey "under charge of a fallible owner"? Bosh!

The infallibility of the Pope is now claimed as essential to salvation. Prior to the decree of the Vatican Council no Catholic was required to believe the dogma of the Pope's infallibility. Though believed by some, many of the ablest Roman Catholics themselves repudiated the doctrine as utterly false. Some of the ablest bishops opposed this blasphemous innovation with overwhelming eloquence and logic, even in the Vatican Council itself. The learned Bishop Strossmayer, of Bosnia, in his remarkable Vatican speech against the infallibility of the Pope, said:

"Nay, more! to my utter astonishment, I find nothing said [in the Scriptures] about a Pope, successor of St. Peter and Vicar of Jesus Christ any more than about a successor of Mohammed." He continued: "But having just risen from the reading of the New Testament from beginning to end, I declare to you before God, lifting my hand toward yonder great crucifix, that I find in its pages no trace of the papacy as it now exists."

The learned priest McGuire, in his discussion with Mr. Pope, in Dublin, Ireland, in 1827, rejected the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope. But should a priest reject that doctrine now, since 1870, he would incur the penalty of eternal damnation! Thus, instead of never changing, the Roman Catholic Church has introduced a new condition of salvation as late as 1870. Also, in his debate with Alexander Campbell, Archbishop Purcell rejected the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope; and as a member of the Vatican Council opposed the infallibility dogma until the decree was passed over his head; after which he was compelled to close his eyes and swallow down this blasphemous absurdity, or incur the penalty of damnation.

"A Complete History of the Popes of Rome," translated from the French of Louis Marie de Cormenin, was published by James B. Smith & Co., Philadelphia, 1850. Cormenin was a Roman Catholic, but did not believe in the infallibility of the Popes. Romanus, as Pope, succeeded the short reign of Stephen VII. He erased the decrees which Stephen made against Formosus. Cormenin says:

"In fact, the tenth century is the most fertile in disasters and calamities! Monsters, unworthy of the name of man, governed empires. Never was ignorance so profound; and the cardinal Baronius himself exclaims: 'The tenth century should be called the age of iron, on account of the innumerable evils with which it was filled; the age of lead, on account of the tyranny of popes and kings, and the age of obscurity, on account of the sterility of literature and science!'

"Before arriving at the history of this deplorable period, we should warn our readers, that scandals and abominations will fill the reigns of the Roman pontiffs; that the churches of Christ will become places of prostitution; that courtezans will dispose of the keys of heaven; that bishops and popes will prostrate themselves at their knees; and that, during more than two centuries, incestuous and pedantic priests will soil the steps of

the altar! Finally, fifty pontiffs, apostates, murderers and wantons are about to occupy the chair of St. Peter!

"And nature, as if she wished to leave a strange remembrance of that period, gave birth to a monster with the head of a lion, and a human body. Platinus, Genebrard, Stella, Baronius, in their writings, call the pontiffs of that age simoniacal priests, magicians, sodomites, tyrants, robbers, and assassins. Romanus preserved his rank among these execrable Popes, though he only occupied the Holy See for four months." *Cormenin's History of the Popes*, p. 275.

The infallibility of the fiends of the dark world might be claimed with the same show of reason and common sense, as to claim infallibility for these fifty monster Popes, who committed the most revolting crimes in the dark catalogue of sin and pollution.

Pope John X., who came to the popedom A. D. 912, was the bastard son of a priest and a nun. The powerful Theodora, the mistress of Pope Serguis, became enamored of him, and prepared the way for his elevation to the popedom, and caused him to be ordained Pope as successor of Pope Lando. Pope John X. approved the ordination of Hugh, the son of Count Herbert, as Archbishop of Rheims, at the age of five years! Of Marozia, the shameless daughter of Theodora, Cormenin says:

"This execrable woman, after this public scandal, became tired of her husband, and entered into a sacreligious commerce with John the Tenth; joining cruelty to luxury, she became jealous of the pontiff, and to revenge herself on him for his intercourse with her mother and sister, she resolved to assassinate him, and forced her husband to execute the crime. The infamous satellites, commanded by Guy and Marozia, forced the palace of the Lateran, murdered the brother of the Pope, bound him with cords, and cast him into prison, where they strangled him beneath mattresses, towards the end of the year 928. A death worthy of such a Pope. John the Tenth was ambitious, avaricious, an apostate, destitute of shame, faith,

and honor, and sacrificed everything to his passions. He held the Holy See about sixteen years, to the disgrace of humanity." *History of the Popes*, p. 286.

John XI. came to the throne in 931. He was the son of Pope Sergius III. and Marozia, and guilty of the most horrible incest on record. He was finally overcome and imprisoned by his brother, Alberic. Of his shameful imprisonment and death, Cormenin says:

"Heresy, impiety, debauchery, poisoning, robbery, incendiarism, and murder followed in their train and covered Europe with disasters from the Bosphorus to the Baltic, and from the extremity of Portugal to the Ural Mountains. We must not then be astonished, in the midst of the frightful convulsions which agitated all kingdoms, at seeing courtézans command in Rome, occupy the part of the Holy Spirit, dispose of the Holy See at their pleasure, and place upon it the fruit of their adulteries and incests.

John the Eleventh, enervated by the excesses of the table and the debauchery, lived in debility until 936, when death came to put an end to the harsh captivity which his brother had imposed upon him. For a long time this degraded pontiff did not leave his prison, unless surrounded by the satellites of Alberic, and only to celebrate divine service in the great solemnities." *Cormenin's History of the Popes*, p. 288.

Pope John XII. came to the pontifical throne 956. He was the bastard son of Alberic and Marozia, the result of the most horrible incest. Alberic himself was the son of Marozia. Maimburg says of John the Tenth:

"After his exaltation, Octavian changed his name, but not his morals; for it is certain that there have never been priests who dishonored the pontifical title by all kinds of vices and crimes more than he did. God, however, permitted that his death should be as painful and unfortunate as his existence was shameful and deplorable." p. 292.

Also, the Roman Catholic historian, Cormenin, in his History of the Popes, on page 296, says:

"When one sees such monsters as John the Twelfth, seated on the apostolic chair, it is impossible to believe that the divine Spirit is incarnate in the pontiffs; for it would then be that humanity would reject Christianity itself as an anti-social religion, as its fundamental dogma would repose upon the most profound immorality. Vainly do the cardinal Baronius, Platinus, Father Maimbourg, and the greater part of ecclesiastical historians avow that the church was then governed by unworthy popes. This confession is not sufficient to justify the institution of the papacy; on the contrary, it condemns it, since it corroborates this truth, that men elected and consecrated pontiffs have surpassed in their dissoluteness all that was most hideous in the material doctrines of paganism."

Cormenin, with the better class of Roman Catholic historians, utterly reject and repudiate the claim of infallibility for these monster pagan popes.

APPENDIX C.

THE UNITY OF ROME.

The unity of God's children in his true churches is the unity of love—"the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." But the so-called unity of Rome, is the unity of force and fear. There is unity, such as it is, in the world of woe, prepared for the devil and his angels. In the year 1870, Victor Emanuel, King of Italy, determined that the city of Rome should be freed from the despotism of the Pope and all Italy united into one kingdom. At that time Pope Pius the IX. had an army of Zouaves, numbering about ten thousand, gathered from various countries, to defend his person and temporal power, against the Italians, who were determined to overthrow the Papal government. There is a small publication from the pen of Rev. Father Eugenius de Gerlache, Chaplain to the Papal Zouaves, called the "Last Days of the Papal Army," issued in 1870. On page 9 of this publication we have the following:

"His Holiness then went round to the Zouaves, who remained on their knees; to each of them he gave his hand to be kissed, addressing to each an affectionate word, and handing to him a medal commemorative of the 8th of December, 1854."

This shows that these poor deluded soldiers were political, as well as spiritual slaves, and worshippers of the Pope. On page 11 of "The Last Days of the Papal Army," we have the following:

"Two difficulties, very different in their nature, but both of

equally great importance, presented themselves in reference to the defence of Rome; one arose from the position of his Holiness as Head of the Church and Prince of Peace, the other resulted from the smallness of the means of defence. One must have been in Rome to have an idea of the extent of the wall of Aurelian, which had to be defended by an army of 10,000 against five bodies of troops, each containing from 11,000 to 12,000 men, and provided with a formidable artillery. Near the Porta Salara, where I was stationed during the six days of the siege, the fissured and tottering wall was supported by wooden props, and was not more than two feet and a half broad."

Instead of being able to crush kings and emperors by the word of his power, the Pope was here brought into such a strait that two great difficulties embarrassed him. One was, that "His Holiness" was "the Head of the Church and Prince of Peace"! And yet he stood at the head of the political army ready to slaughter the members of his own Church, who were making war upon their own "Holy Father"! *Roman Catholics boast of the unity of the Church!!* The second great difficulty that confronted the Pope was the smallness of his army, of only 10,000 men, to defend himself and the city against 50,000 Roman Catholics who were not quite humble enough to kneel and kiss his hand. In his perilous position, the Pope wrote a letter to his General, Kanzler, Papal Army, page 13, as follows:

"GENERAL,

"Now, when a great sacrilege and a most enormous injustice is on the point of being consummated, when the troops of a Catholic king are besieging the Capital of the Catholic universe, my first impulse is to thank you, General, and our whole army, for the generous conduct pursued by you hitherto, for the affection shown to the Holy See, and for the resolution you have displayed of defending this metropolis. Let these lines be a lasting document in testimony of the discipline, loyalty and bravery of the troops which have been in the service

of the Holy See. With regard to the duration of the national defence, I feel it my duty to order that it be of a nature sufficient to serve as a protest and to prove the use of violence, and that it be not further extended; let negotiations for a surrender be therefore commenced as soon as a breach has been made in the walls. Whilst the whole of Europe is lamenting the many who have fallen victims in the war now going on between two large nations, let it not be said that the Vicar of Christ, although unjustly assailed, gave his consent to an extensive shedding of blood. Our cause is God's cause, and into His hands we resign the whole of our defence. General, to you and our entire army I give my blessing with all my heart.

"Given at the Vatican, the 19th of September, 1870.

"Pius P. IX."

It seems that the Pope became quite religious all at once, and was averse to the shedding of blood, especially his own blood; therefore, he advises his General to negotiate a surrender. It did look a little hard to see "the troops of the Catholic king" "besieging the Capitol of the Catholic universe." These Catholic children of the Holy Mother Church, with the use of bayonets and cannon, were teaching "His Holiness," their Father, the Pope, that he was unworthy to be a temporal ruler. On the 20th day of September, 1870, the Pope with his 10,000 Zouaves, after a short battle, was compelled to surrender to the victorious army of the king of Italy. The papal army, as foreigners, were disbanded and sent to their native countries. The devout Chaplain, Rev. Father Eugenius de Gerlache, S. J., made his solemn protest, on page 47 of "The Last Days of the Papal Army," as follows:

"I protest against those who treat as *foreigners* the generous Catholics who have enrolled themselves under the standard of the Sovereign Pontiff. Verily, the sons, who make of their breasts a shield for the defence of their venerated father, are not foreigners. The real foreigners at Rome are they who bombard the Vatican. Rome is the spiritual Capitol of German, Irish and American Catholics as well as of Italian

Catholics, under the temporal *Government of King Pius the Ninth*. In a word, in that act of the Italian Ministry I see the violation of positive, of sovereign, and of imprescriptible rights, of rights human and divine."

Thus "the temporal government of King Pius the Ninth" fell to rise no more. The present Pope remains as the so-called "prisoner of the Vatican," pleading piteously for the various governments of Europe to grant him a small scrap of temporal power. Why does he not, like the powerful Popes of the olden time, *demand* his temporal power? Why does he not dethrone King Humbert and put his foot upon his neck in token of the supremacy of St. Peter? Why does not Pope Leo absolve the subjects of the Emperor of Germany from their allegiance, and place a worthy son of the Church on the throne of the empire who will acknowledge the temporal authority of "his Holiness?" But where did the humble apostle Peter ever claim temporal power over the nations of the earth? Surely the Pope is not the successor of Peter. On the contrary, Peter claimed no supremacy over the other apostles, or the Church. The Pope is evidently a blasphemous, religious and political usurper, as well as a cruel despot and tyrant. His cruelty became so unbearable that his own Roman Catholic subjects deposed him from his temporal power. If they were not abject, spiritual slaves, they would rise in their might and obtain their spiritual liberty. "Whom the Son makes free are free indeed."

Count Crotti, a member of the Italian Parliament, and loyal to the Pope, made his protest against the invasion of the Papal States, under date of September 19th, 1870, from which we quote as follows:

"As a Catholic, I cannot bring myself to believe, without heartfelt indignation, that our Government, which professes to be Catholic, will attack with bayonets and batteries the Capitol of Christianity and the august person of the Vicar of Jesus Christ. Worthless is the pretence of respecting his spiritual

power when you rob him of his temporal power. The Vicar of Christ is a Sovereign. He who uncrowns him will have to answer for it to God." *Last Days of the Papal Army, p. 45.*

This "Last Days of the Papal Army" is a small cloth-bound book, written by the Jesuit, "Rev. Father Eugenius de Gerlache," "Chaplain to the Papal Zouaves." This presents a sad picture of the boasted unity of the Roman Church, which represents the unity of pandemonium.

APPENDIX D.

ROMISH BAPTISM.

Baptism is the first of the seven Romish sacraments. Perry's Instructions on the Catechism is a standard Roman Catholic theological work, having the endorsement of Archbishop John Hughes, of New York, the Rt. Rev. Bishop Bailey, of Newark, and the endorsement of Rt. Rev. Dr. Wareing, Bishop of Ariopolis. In his book of Instructions, page 257, Perry has the following:

I. "THE ESSENTIALS OF A SACRAMENT.—*What is a Sacrament?*

"A Sacrament is *an outward sign of inward grace*, or a sacred and mysterious sign and ceremony, *ordained by Christ*, by which grace is conveyed to our souls."

It is a pity that this unscriptural view of a sacrament has been copied by some of the Protestant denominations. On page 261 Perry says:

"II. THE NUMBER OF THE SACRAMENTS.—How many Sacraments *has* Christ instituted? Seven. This is an Article of Faith: 'If anyone shall assert (says the Council of Trent) that the Sacraments of the New Law were not all of them instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord; or that there are more or fewer than seven, viz., Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Order, and Matrimony; or even that any one of these seven is not truly and properly a Sacrament; let him be anathema.' These seven Sacraments supply the various *wants of the spiritual life*, corresponding to those of the temporal life."

Though the Savior only instituted two church ordinances, one to monument His death and the other His resurrection,

Rome has invented seven sacraments to bestow spiritual life! On page 264 Perry continues:

"It is of the nature of two of them, viz., Baptism and Penance, to give the *first grace*; i. e., to produce sanctifying grace in those who are *destitute of it*—they put *sinners* in a state of grace—they raise souls that are dead in sin, to the life of grace (hence they are called *Sacraments of the dead*). It is of the nature of the other five to *increase* sanctifying grace in those who *already possess it*: for the worthy reception of these five requires a *previous* state of grace (hence they are called *Sacraments of the living*). Nevertheless, there may be circumstances in which even these five confer the *first grace*; that is, they may restore us, like the Sacrament of Penance, to the *state of grace*."

OFTEN TO BE RECEIVED.

"V. THE REITERATION OF THE SACRAMENTS.—Can each Sacrament be received more than once? Three of them, viz., Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Order, can be received *only once during life*; and the reason is, because they imprint a *character*, or spiritual mark, on the soul, which can never be cancelled. This spiritual mark, or character, consecrates the soul to God in a special manner for his *servants*—for his *soldiers*—for his *ministers*." *Perry's Instructions, p. 266.*

De Harbe's Catechism is endorsed by Cardinals Wiseman and McCloskey. On page 247 of this Catechism we read thus:

"XI. How do we know that there are seven Sacraments?

"We know it because the Church, 'which is the pillar and ground of the truth,' (1 Tim. 3:15), has at all times taught and used these seven."

This is untrue. The churches in the time of the apostles had only two church ordinances—Baptism and the Lord's Supper. The fact that centuries after the apostolic age the Roman Catholic Church established seven saving sacraments, is proof positive that she is not the church of Christ.

WHAT IS BAPTISM?

The great Roman Catholic theologian, Liguori, in his Mission Book, page 266, has the following:

"Q. What is baptism ?

"A. Baptism is the *Sacrament of Regeneration, in which man is born again to eternal life, by the washing of water and the Word of God.*

"Q. What are the effects of Baptism ?

"A. The principal effects of Baptism are: 1st, The pardon of sin, whether original or actual; 2d, The infusion of sanctifying graces into the soul; and, 3d, The indelible impress of the Christian character.

"Q. Is Baptism necessary to our salvation ?

"A. Yes; it is necessary, and for all men.

"Q. Why is Baptism so necessary for all ?

"A. Because all men were born under the curse of sin; and because our Lord has said that *'unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.'* (St. John 3:5)."

According to the Roman Church, all the unbaptized, men, women, and infant children, are *unregenerate*, and dying without baptism are lost. Also, concerning the benefits of baptism, the Roman theologian, Perry, in his Instructions, page 268, says:

"*What is baptism?*—Baptism is a Sacrament by which we are made Christians, children of God and heirs of heaven; and are cleansed from original sin, and also from actual sin, if we be guilty of any.

"*How is baptism given?*—By pouring water on the child, while we pronounce the words ordained by Christ."

Also, De Harbe, in his Catechism, page 242, has the following:

"17. What does the sinner receive in the Sacrament of Baptism or Penance ?

"He receives sanctifying grace, and together with it the remission of his sins and interior sanctification, by which he is really made just, acceptable to God, a child of God and heir of heaven. (*Council of Trent, Sess. 6.*)"

We quote from De Harbe, page 248, thus:

"2. Why is Baptism the first Sacrament ?

"Because before Baptism no other Sacrament can be validly received.

"3. Why is Baptism the most necessary Sacrament ?

"Because without Baptism no one can be saved."

Also, on page 249, De Harbe continues:

"9. Why do you further say that we are *'regenerated and sanctified to life everlasting'* ?

"Because in Baptism we are not only cleansed from all sin, but are also transformed in a spiritual manner, made holy, children of God, and heirs of heaven."

With these fabulous views of baptism, which make the administrator really the savior of the soul, the foundation is laid for all the priestcraft of Romanism.

WHO MAY ADMINISTER.

The Roman theologian, Perry, in his Instructions, page 270, has the following:

"III. MINISTER OF BAPTISM.—The proper Minister of this Sacrament is a Bishop or Priest; or Deacon, if he be duly commissioned for the purpose. No other person can baptize *solemnly* or with the ceremonies; nor can any others *lawfully* baptize, except in cases of necessity. But in cases of necessity, when a Priest cannot be had, *any* person (man or woman), may baptize; and not only *may* but *must*, rather than let any one die without Baptism. Consequently, all persons should know how to baptize."

Also, the Romanist, De Harbe, in his Catechism, page 250, has the following:

"13. Who can validly baptize ?

"Any person; but, except in cases of necessity, only priests, who have care of souls, are allowed to baptize.

"14. Is the Baptism given by non-Catholics also valid ?

"Yes; it is valid, if they strictly observe it in all that is necessary for Baptism.

"15. What sort of water should be used in Baptism ?

"Any natural water will do for the validity of Baptism. However, when possible, baptismal water, or water blessed for that purpose, should be used.

"16. What intention must he have who baptizes?

"He must have the intention to baptize *indeed*—that is, to do what the Church does, or what Christ has ordained."

Thus it appears that alien baptisms, performed by those who are not even church members, have no higher sanction than the Roman Catholic Church.

CEREMONIES PRECEDING BAPTISM.

Perry, in his Instructions, beginning on page 273, says:

"*First.* The Child, or the person to be baptized, stops at the porch or door of the church; and the Priest declares the advantages and obligations of the faith, which is asked of the Church of God.

"*Secondly.* The Priest breathes on the face of the child, saying, 'Depart from him, unclean spirit; and give place to the Holy Spirit.' For, as Almighty God, when he created Adam, 'breathed into his face the breath of life; and man became a living soul;' so Baptism (as this ceremony represents), causes the soul, that is dead in sin, to become 'a living soul,' by conferring sanctifying grace.

"*Thirdly.* The Priest makes a cross upon the forehead, to teach us that we are not to be ashamed of the cross of Christ; and also upon the breast, to signify that we are to cherish an affection for it in our hearts.

"*Fourthly.* He puts into the mouth a few grains of blessed salt, saying, 'Receive the salt of wisdom.' For salt is an emblem of wisdom; hence, Christ says, to his Apostles, 'You are the salt of the earth.'

"*Fifthly.* He exorcises the child, commanding the devil to depart from him; and then introduces him into the church, going to the font (if there be one); and the Sponsors recite with the Priest, the 'Apostle's Creed' and the 'Our Father.'

"*Sixthly.* He touches the ears and nostrils with spittle, saying: 'Ephphetha,' which is, 'Be opened.' This is taken from the example of Christ, who did the same, when he cured the deaf and dumb man.

"*Seventhly.* He interrogates the child, saying: 'Dost thou renounce Satan?—and all his works?—and all his pomps?' The Sponsors answer in its name: 'I do renounce him—I do

renounce them.' This is a public, solemn, and binding engagement.

"*Eighthly.* The Priest anoints the child on the breast, and between the shoulders, saying: 'I anoint thee with the oil of salvation, in Christ Jesus our Lord.' This is in accordance with what God directed Moses to do: 'Thou shalt consecrate all (the things dedicated to the divine service), with the oil of unction, that they may be most holy.'

"*Ninthly.* The Priest inquires concerning faith in the Blessed Trinity, and in the incarnation, saying: 'Dost thou believe, &c.?' The Sponsors answer, 'I do believe.' For an explicit belief of these mysteries is necessary for the child, when he shall come to the use of reason.

"*Tenthly.* He asks: 'Wilt thou be baptized?' To which the Sponsors answer: 'I will.'

CEREMONIES ACCOMPANYING THE ACT OF BAPTISM.

"Then the Priest baptizes the child; in doing which, he pours the water three times on the head of the child, each time in the form of a cross; and while he is pouring the water he says: 'N., I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' The water he uses is blessed, according to the form prescribed in the Ritual."

All these unscriptural, foolish, and wicked ceremonies attending the so-called baptism of the Roman Church, marks her as the anti-Christian Babylon. The Church puts a lie in the mouth of the unconscious infant, in this wicked ceremony, and then holds him in bondage through life by her "lying wonders."

CEREMONIES FOLLOWING BAPTISM.

Also, Perry has in his Instructions, page 275 and 276, a batch of foolish ceremonies, following, what they call baptism:

"1st. The Priest anoints the child with the Chrism on the crown of the head."

"2nd. The child is clothed with a white garment—emblem of spotless innocence."

"3rd. The Priest gives a lighted taper to the Sponsor."

CANONS OF TRENT.

The Council of Trent, in its seventh session, delivered the following decrees on baptism:

"*Canon I.*—If anyone saith that the baptism of John had the same force as the baptism of Christ; let him be anathema.

"*Canon II.*—If anyone saith that true and natural water is not of necessity for baptism, and, on that account, wrests, to some sort of metaphor, those words of our Lord Jesus Christ: *Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost*; let him be anathema.

"*Canon III.*—If anyone saith that in the Roman Church, which is the mother and mistress of all churches, there is not the true doctrine concerning the sacrament of baptism; let him be anathema.

"*Canon IV.*—If anyone saith that the baptism which is even given by heretics in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, with the intention of doing what the Church doth, is not true baptism; let him be anathema.

"*Canon V.*—If anyone saith that baptism is free, that is, not necessary unto salvation; let him be anathema.

"*Canon VI.*—If anyone saith that one who has been baptized cannot, even if he would, lose grace, let him sin ever so much, unless he will not believe; let him be anathema.

"*Canon VII.*—If anyone saith that the baptized are, by baptism itself, *made debtors* but to faith alone, and not to the observance of the *whole law* of Christ; let him be anathema.

"*Canon VIII.*—If anyone saith that the baptized are freed from all the precepts, whether written or transmitted, of Holy Church, in such wise that they are not bound to observe them, unless they have chosen of their own accord to submit themselves thereunto; let him be anathema.

"*Canon IX.*—If anyone saith that the remembrance of the baptism which they have received is so to be recalled unto men, as that they are to understand that all vows made after baptism are void, in virtue of the promise already made in that baptism; as if, by those vows, they both derogated from that faith which they have professed and from that baptism itself; let him be anathema.

"*Canon X.*—If anyone saith that by the sole remembrance and the faith of the baptism which has been received all sins be committed after baptism are either remitted or made venial; let him be anathema.

"*Canon XI.*—If anyone saith that baptism, which was true and rightly conferred, is to be repeated, for him who denied the faith of Christ amongst Infidels, when he is converted unto penitence; let him be anathema.

"*Canon XII.*—If anyone saith that no one is to be baptized save at that age at which Christ was baptized, or in the very article of death; let him be anathema.

"*Canon XIII.*—If anyone saith that little children, for that they have not actual faith, are not, having received baptism, to be reckoned amongst the faithful; and that, for this cause, they are to be rebaptized when they have attained to years of discretion; or that it is better that the baptism of such be omitted, than that, while not believing by their own act, they should be baptized in the faith alone of the Church; let him be anathema.

"*Canon XIV.*—If anyone saith that those who have been thus baptized when their children are, when they have grown up, to be asked whether they will ratify what their sponsors promised in their names when they were baptized; and that, in case they answer that they will not, they are to be left to their own will; and are not to be compelled meanwhile to a Christian life by any other penalty, save that they be excluded from the participation of the Eucharist, and of the other sacraments, until they repent; let him be anathema."—*The Decrees of the Council of Trent, by Waterworth, a Roman Catholic writer. pp. 56, 57.*

Such anti-Scriptural teachings concerning baptism mark the Roman Church as anti-Christian. It will be observed that the Roman Church rejects the baptism of John as not Christian. She admits the baptisms performed by heretics that are not members of any church. She teaches that baptism is essential to salvation of little children, even the veriest infants! The horrid theology of the Roman Catholic Church, as published by Peter Dens, requires the baptism of unborn infants. Whole pages in his Latin Theology are devoted to this polluting theme. See Peter Dens' *Theology for the use of Seminaries and Students of Sacred Theology*, Vol. 5, pp. 181-186. Peter Dens' Latin Theology is contained in seven volumes, and is standard authority among Roman Catholics.

APPENDIX E.

THE EUCHARIST, OR MASS.

The Roman Catholic Eucharist, called the Mass, is a perversion of the Lord's Supper into the grossest idolatry. The Roman Catholic Dictionary defines:

"EUCHARIST.—The Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist is stated with great clearness by the Council of Trent, Sess. xiii., xxi. and xxii. The Church regards the Eucharist as a sacrament, and also as a sacrifice, so that our treatment of the subject falls naturally into two great divisions, to which we will add supplementary remarks on the adoration and reservation of the Blessed Sacrament. Considered as a sacrament, the Eucharist is the true body and blood of Christ under the appearance of bread and wine. Like all the sacraments, it was instituted by Christ, and, like them, it consists of an outward part—viz., bread and wine, or the appearance of bread and wine: and an inward or invisible part—viz., the body and blood of Christ, with the grace which they impart to those who communicate worthily."

The Roman Church holds, in the Sacrament of the Mass, that another real sacrifice of the flesh and blood, soul and divinity of Christ is made to God the Father, for the remission of sins.

The Roman Catholic theologian, De Harbe, in his Catechism, defines Eucharist as follows:

"9. Did Christ give also to His Apostles power to change bread and wine into His Sacred Flesh and Blood?"

"Yes; he gave them that power with these words: '*Do this for a commemoration of me.*' (Luke 22:19.)"

"10. To whom did this power pass from the Apostles?"

"It passed from the Apostles to the Bishops and Priests.

"11. When do the Bishops and Priests exercise this power?"

"At Mass, when they pronounce over the bread and wine these words: 'This is my Body, this is my Blood.'

"12. Is there, then, after the consecration, no longer bread and wine on the altar?"

"No: there is then on the altar the true Body and the true Blood of Jesus Christ under the appearances of bread and wine.

* * * * *

"13. How long does Christ remain present with His Sacred Flesh and Blood?"

"As long as the appearances of bread and wine continue to exist.

"14. Is the Body of Christ alone present under the appearance of bread, and the Blood of Christ alone present under the appearance of wine?"

"No; under each appearance Christ is present entire and undivided as He is entire and undivided in heaven.

"15. When the Priest breaks or divides the Sacred Host, does he also break the Body of Christ?"

"No; he breaks or divides the appearances only; the Body of Christ itself is present in each part entire and living, in a true though mysterious manner." pp. 259, 260.

The unfortunate children of the Church of Rome are required to believe that the Bishops and priests have the power to change the bread and wine into the living Christ. They make a multitude of Christs of the bread, and a multitude of Christs of the wine! It is well known that the Catholic wafer or host is kept on the altar in Roman Churches, to be worshipped as the Living God. In fact, these wafer-gods are carried around in the pockets of the priests when they go to administer the sacrament to the dying!

In the above quotation from De Harbe's Catechism he tries to get over a serious difficulty. As the bread is not bread, but Christ living and entire after consecration, he asks: "How long does Christ remain with his Sacred Flesh and Blood?" He

answers: "As long as the appearances of bread and wine continue to exist." But sad experience reveals the fact that this Catholic bread god becomes stale and mouldy, and breeds worms; then it becomes *transubstantiated* back into mouldy bread! According to Rome, the living Christ becomes a rotten piece of bread. In such cases we have two *transubstantiations*; first, when the priest pronounces the words of consecration the bread becomes the living Christ, the other when this living Christ begins to become mouldy and worm eaten He becomes bread again—mouldy bread at that! But this is contrary to the Scripture, which says: "Neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption."—Ps. 16:10. This demonstrates the fact that the Romish bread-god is not Jesus Christ, the Holy One whose flesh can see no corruption. An able writer appropriately says: "There is thus a double transubstantiation. One is accomplished with the words of consecration, but the other is accomplished without these or any other words of consecration. In one, the bread is transubstantiated into Jesus Christ, at the words of the priest; in the other, Jesus Christ is transubstantiated back again into bread at the sight of the worms."

In fact, the question might be asked, what becomes of the real live flesh, blood, bones, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ which is taken into the stomach of the Roman Catholic? Does He become corrupted and polluted? Horrible to think of! Does He become assimilated and become a part of the physical body of the communicant? If so, Catholic communicants ought to be worshipped with all the reverence and devotion paid to the wafer-god itself. It is really amazing that any one outside of the lunatic asylum could be induced to accept such nonsense.

If the Roman Catholic Church bore no other mark of anti-Christ, its doctrine of the Mass—Eucharist, would stamp it as

a base fraud and counterfeit. It is the practical rejection of the complete sacrifice of Jesus Christ, when he died for the sins of men. Every time the priest officiates at the altar or administers the Eucharist, he pretends to offer Jesus Christ as a *sacrifice* for the pardon of sins. The Romish author, De Harbe, in the Catechism, pages 262, 263, has the following:

22. "Was all Sacrifice to cease with the death of Christ? No; there was to be in the New Law of Grace a *Perpetual Sacrifice*, in order to represent continually that which was once accomplished on the Cross, and apply the fruits of it to our souls."

* * * * *

26. "What, then, is the Mass?"

"The Mass is the perpetual Sacrifice of the New Law, in which Christ our Lord offers Himself, by the hands of the Priest, in an unbloody manner, under the appearances of bread and wine, to His Heavenly Father, as He once offered Himself on the Cross in a bloody manner.

27. "What is the difference between the Sacrifice of the Mass, and the Sacrifice of the Cross?"

"The Sacrifice of the Mass is essentially the same Sacrifice as that of the Cross; the only difference is in the manner of offering."

Here this Catholic author teaches positively that the sacrifice for sins was not completed with the death of Christ; that the Romish priesthood are offering up continually Jesus Christ as a sacrifice for sins! They really claim that the priest at the altar is Jesus Christ himself, in the person of the priest, offering up himself as a sacrifice for the pardon of sins! As Jesus himself administered the Lord's Supper, in its original institution, they claim that Jesus continues to administer the sacrament, by the hands of the priests. They teach the foolish absurdity that Jesus Christ, when he gave thanks, saying, "This is my body" and "This is my blood," had in his own hands his own literal, physical body and blood, though it had not been broken or shed! The same enormous absurdity and

folly is claimed to be perpetrated in the Romish Mass. As the bread and wine are transubstantiated, in the hands of the priest, into the literal flesh and blood of Jesus, the priest is also *transubstantiated* into another Jesus Christ!! De Harbe says, as seen in the above: "THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS IS ESSENTIALLY THE SAME SACRIFICE AS THAT OF THE CROSS; THE ONLY DIFFERENCE IS IN THE MANNER OF OFFERING." According to this, the Roman Catholics are keeping up perpetual crucifixions of Jesus Christ. In this, they are no doubt as wicked, and as much instigated by Satan, as those that crucified the Savior on Calvary. "They crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." Heb. 6:6. And yet, intelligent people are called upon to accept such an enormity of blasphemous crime. Christ our passover was sacrificed for us only once. The typical sacrifices of the Old Testament had to be offered continually, because the great atoning sacrifice had not been made. But when Christ himself, the spotless Lamb of God, was offered as a propitiation for the sins of the world, there remains no more necessity for sacrifice. Contrasting the sacrifice of Calvary with the typical sacrifices, Paul says:

"By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once *for all*. And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice forever, sat down at the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. For by one offering he has perfected forever them that are sanctified." Heb. 10:10-14.

It will be observed that Jesus offered himself as a sacrifice "once for all"; "FOR BY ONE OFFERING HE HATH PERFECTED FOREVER THEM THAT ARE SANCTIFIED." But the Roman Catholics by these pretended daily sacrifices, deliberately and wickedly reject the perfect offering of Christ. The Romish Mass

is rebellion and treason against the sacrifice of Calvary. In contrast with the many offerings of the law, Paul says: "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." Heb. 9:28. The Romish priesthood have rejected this One Offering, and established ten thousand offerings, of satanic invention, to offer up their pretended sacrifices for the pardon of sins. Among other things, De Harbe, in his Catechism, page 265, says: "We offer the Mass to God," "As a *Sacrifice of propitiation* for the many offences given to Him." According to this abominable doctrine, the propitiation of Christ, when he offered himself "once for all," was not sufficient for the pardon of sins.

In proof that the priest is regarded as Christ when he officiates in the Mass, we quote from De Harbe's Catechism, page 297, as follows:

"Why has the Church assigned particular vestments for the Priest whilst officiating at the altar?"

"That we may remember that the Priest does not act at the altar in his own person, but as a representative of Jesus, and that he celebrates a most holy Divine Mystery."

As it is in the Confessional, so it is in the sacrifice of the Mass, the priest is to be regarded as Jesus Christ, and revered as such. Accepting these fearful blasphemies, the members of the Roman Catholic Church yield themselves soul and body, in submission to the priest, as to God! In these institutions whatever the priest may do can be no sin; for he is acting the part of Jesus Christ!! This gives the priesthood unlimited power over the members of the Roman Church, in their control.

Some of the abominations of this devilish doctrine are illustrated in Father Chiniquy's "Fifty Years in the Church of Rome." Rev. Charles Chiniquy was fifty years in the Church

of Rome, and twenty-five years a priest, but at last became converted, and has spent more than twenty years in exposing the corruptions of Romanism. In his book, called *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, page 181, Mr. Chiniqy says:

7. "In one of the most sacred books of the laws and regulations of the Church of Rome (*Missale Romanism*), we read, page 58: *If the Priest after the communion vomited, and that in the vomited matter the consecrated bread appears, let him swallow what he has vomited. But if he feels too much repugnance to swallow it, let him separate the body of Christ (the consecrated bread), from the vomited matter, till it be entirely corrupted, and then throw it into the sacrarium.*"

8. "When a Priest of Rome, I was bound, with all the Roman Catholics, to believe that Christ had taken his own body, with his own hand to his mouth, and that he had eaten Himself, not in a spiritual, but in a substantial, material way. After eating himself, he had given himself to each one of his apostles, who then ate him also."

Such are the filthy abominations of Romanism. Jesus Christ bodily in the vomited matter from the vile stomach of the priest! Then the priest, like Peter's dog, "is turned to his own vomit again."!!!

We quote from Waterworth's Decrees of the Council of Trent, pp. 82-84, the Canons on the Eucharist, as follows:

"ON THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST."

"*Canon I.*—If anyone denieth that, in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist are contained truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and consequently the whole Christ; but saith that He is only therein as in a sign, or in figure, or virtue; let him be anathema.

"*Canon II.*—If anyone saith that, in the sacred and holy sacrament of the Eucharist, the substance of the bread and wine remains conjointly with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and denieth that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood—the species

only of the bread and wine remaining—which conversion indeed the Catholic Church most aptly calls Transubstantiation; let him be anathema.

"*Canon III.*—If anyone denieth that, in the venerable sacrament of the Eucharist, the whole Christ is contained under each species, and under every part of each species, when separated; let him be anathema.

"*Canon IV.*—If anyone saith that, after the consecration is completed, the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are not in the admirable sacrament of the Eucharist, but (are there) only during the use, whilst it is being taken, and not either before or after; and that in the hosts or consecrated particles, which are reserved, or which remain after communion, the true Body of the Lord remaineth not; let him be anathema.

"*Canon V.*—If anyone saith either that the principal fruit of the most holy Eucharist is the remission of sins, or that other effects do not result therefrom; let him be anathema.

"*Canon VI.*—If anyone saith that, in the holy sacrament of the Eucharist, Christ, the only begotten Son of God, is not to be adored with the worship, even external, of latria: and is, consequently, neither to be venerated with special festive solemnity, nor to be solemnly borne about in processions, according to the laudable and universal right and custom of holy Church; or, is not to be proposed publicly to the people to be adored, and that the adorers thereof are idolators; let him be anathema.

"*Canon VII.*—If anyone saith that it is not lawful for the sacred Eucharist to be reserved in the *sacrarium*, but that immediately after consecration, it must necessarily be distributed amongst those present; or that it is not lawful that it be carried with honor to the sick; let him be anathema.

"*Canon VIII.*—If anyone saith that Christ, given in the Eucharist, is eaten spiritually only, and not also sacramentally and really; let him be anathema.

"*Canon IX.*—If anyone denieth that all and each of Christ's faithful of both sexes are bound, when they have attained to years of discretion, to communicate every year, at least at Easter, in accordance with the precepts of holy Mother Church; let him be anathema.

"*Canon X.*—If anyone saith that it is not lawful for the celebrating priest to communicate himself; let him be anathema.

"*Canon XI.*—If anyone saith that faith alone is a sufficient preparation for receiving the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist; let him be anathema. And for fear lest so great a sacrament may be received unworthily, and so unto death and condemnation, this holy Synod ordains and declares that sacramental confession, when a confessor may be had, is of necessity to be made beforehand, by those whose conscience is burthened with mortal sin, how contrite even soever they may think themselves. But if anyone shall presume to teach, preach, or obstinately to assert, or even in public disputation to defend the contrary, he shall be thereupon excommunicated."

Such are the fearful curses (anathemas) against those who hold the truth concerning the Lord's Supper, in contrast with the superstitions and abominable idolatry of the Roman Catholic Mass.

APPENDIX F.

PENANCE AND CONFESSIONAL.

"ON THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT OF PENANCE."

The Decrees of the Council of Trent has fifteen Canons on Penance, with a dreadful curse attached to each. We here insert commencing with the sixth Canon, thus:

"*Canon VI.*—If anyone denieth, either that sacramental confession was instituted, or is necessary to salvation, of divine right; or saith that the manner of confessing secretly to a priest alone, which the Church hath ever observed from the beginning, and doth observe, is alien from the institution and command of Christ, and is a human invention; let him be anathema.

"*Canon VII.*—If anyone saith that in the sacrament of Penance, it is not necessary, of divine right, for the remission of sins, to confess all and singular the mortal sins which after due and diligent previous meditation are remembered, even those (mortal sins) which are secret, and those which are opposed to the two last commandments of the Decalogue, as also the circumstances which change the species of a sin; but (saith) that such confession is only useful to instruct and console the penitent, and that it was of old only observed in order to impose a canonical satisfaction; or saith that they who strive to confess all their sins wish to leave nothing to the divine mercy to pardon; or, finally, that it is not lawful to confess venial sins; let him be anathema.

"*Canon VIII.*—If anyone saith that the confession of all sins, such as it is observed in the Church, is impossible, and is a human tradition to be abolished by the godly; or that all and each of the faithful of Christ, of either sex, are not obliged thereunto once a year, conformably to the constitution of the great Council of Lateran, and that, for this cause, the faithful

of Christ are to be persuaded not to confess during Lent; let him be anathema.

"*Canon IX.*—If anyone saith that the sacramental absolution of the priest is not a judicial act, but a bare ministry of pronouncing and declaring sins to be forgiven to him who confesses; provided only he believes himself to be absolved, or (even though) the priest absolve not in earnest, but in joke; or saith that the confession of the penitent is not required, in order that the priest may be able to absolve him; let him be anathema.

"*Canon X.*—If anyone saith that priests who are in mortal sin have not the power of binding and loosing; or, that not priests alone are the ministers of absolution, but that to all and each of the faithful of Christ is it said: *Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven, and whose sins ye shall forgive they are forgiven them, and whose sins ye shall retain they are retained*; by virtue of which words everyone is able to absolve from sins, to wit, from public sins by reproof only, provided he who is reproved yield thereto, and from secret sins by a voluntary confession; let him be anathema.

"*Canon XI.*—If anyone saith that bishops have not the right of reserving cases to themselves, except as regards external polity, and that therefore the reservation of cases hinders not but that a priest may truly absolve from reserved cases; let him be anathema.

"*Canon XII.*—If anyone saith that God always remits the whole punishment together with the guilt, and that the satisfaction of penitents is no other than the faith whereby they apprehend that Christ has satisfied for them; let him be anathema.

"*Canon XIII.*—If anyone saith that satisfaction to sins, as to their temporal punishment, is nowise made to God, through the merits of Jesus Christ, by the punishments inflicted by Him, and patiently borne, or by those enjoined by the priest, nor even by those voluntarily undertaken, as by fastings, prayers, almsdeeds, or by other works, also of piety; and that

therefore, the best penance is merely a new life; let him be anathema.

"*Canon XIV.*—If anyone saith that the satisfactions, by which penitents redeem their sins through Jesus Christ, are not a worship of God, but traditions of men, which obscure the doctrine of grace, and the true worship of God, and the benefit itself of the death of Christ; let him be anathema.

"*Canon XV.*—If anyone saith that the keys are given to the Church only *to loose*, not also *to bind*; and that, therefore, priests act contrary to the purpose of the keys, and contrary to the institution of Christ, when they impose punishments on those who confess; and that it is a fiction that, after the eternal punishment has, by virtue of the keys, been removed, there remains for the most part a temporal punishment to be discharged; let him be anathema." Decrees. p. 108.

As bishops and priests alone, according to Rome, have the power of absolution in the sacrament of Penance, then the salvation of every soul is placed in the hands of the priesthood. This is the part of Rome's anti-Christian system which enthrones every priest in the judgment seat of Christ, to open or shut heaven, against the sons of men. These self-constituted priest-gods claim the right and power over the entire human family, to send them to heaven or hell according to the pleasure of their wills. Also, these *anti-Christ*s claim authority as *judges* to assess the amount and character of punishment or penance necessary to salvation!

They have so completely usurped the throne of God that Jesus Christ has no longer power on earth to forgive sins! The Roman theologian Deharbe, in his Catechism, p. 277, has the following:

"10. But could we not also receive forgiveness of our sins by confessing them to God alone?

By no means; or else the full power which Christ gave to the Priests of retaining or remitting them according to their judgment, would, indeed, be vain and useless."

Thus the priests have usurped the place of Christ so that

he has no power on earth to forgive sins! It all belongs to the priests. Priest Weninger D. D., in his *Manual of the Catholic Religion*, pp. 126, 127 has the following:

"Q. Who are they in the Church that have the power to forgive sins?"

A. All those priests empowered by their ordinaries; namely, by the holy power of the keys, which Christ gave to St. Peter and his successors first of all, and who then, by conferring the ecclesiastical jurisdiction or mission, impart the necessary authority to the subordinate pastors and priests of the Church for exercising this power, in order that, by the administration of the Sacrament of Penance to the faithful their sins may be forgiven.

Q. Is any sin so great that it cannot be forgiven?"

A. No; for Christ says without restriction: 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them,' (John xx, 23), provided that the sinner himself do not place any obstacle, but with due preparation confess his sins, sincerely purposing to sin no more."

According to this fearful blasphemy, the priests of Rome have not only robbed Christ of the power to forgive sins, but have arrogated to themselves authority and power to forgive all sins, even the unpardonable sin which Christ says shall never be forgiven in this world nor in the world to come.

The Romish Church, without any authority from the Scriptures, divides sins into two general classes—mortal and venial. Deharbe in his *Catechism*, p. 223 has the following:

"What particular kinds of sins are there?"

1. The seven Capital or Deadly sins. 2. The six sins against the Holy Ghost. 3. The four sins crying to Heaven for vengeance; and, 4. The nine ways of being accessory to another person's sins.

What are the seven Capital Sins?"

1 Pride; 2 Covetousness; 3 Lust; 4 Anger; 5 Gluttony; 6 Envy; and 7 Sloth."

It is a little remarkable that the Church of Rome does not

place lying and stealing among the Capital Sins. Notwithstanding the Bible says, "all liars shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: Which is the second death." (Rev. 21:8.) Yet the Roman Church justifies lying (or makes it a sin of small turpitude.)

Roman theologians even teach that it is lawful to commit perjury for the good of the Church. Instead of the priests' having the power to reconcile sinners to God, Paul says:

"And all things are of God who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to-wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespases unto them; and hath given to us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." 2 Cor. 5:18-20.

This completely overthrows the Romish doctrine that the work of *reconciliation* and power of pardon is in the hands of the Church. "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself," though he has committed to us the *word* of reconciliation. The gospel, which proclaims the *word* of reconciliation, is given to the church. The apostles, as "ambassadors," were sent out to make known this good news of reconciliation. They had not the power of reconciling man to God, but they prayed them to "be ye reconciled to God."

THE CONFESSIONAL.

The secret confession of all sins of every grade to the priest, is held by Rome to be an essential part of the sacrament of Penance.

The intolerable filthiness and wickedness of the Roman confessional is such that, if the masses of the people knew the darkness of its turpitude, it would be immediately swept, as a vile nuisance, before the storm of indignation of an insulted people.

It mantles the cheek with shame to be compelled, in the interest of truth and righteousness, to uncover this sewer of iniquity. The Romish confessional is a moral pest house where disease and death, and eternal ruin of the soul and body are propagated.

Liguori in his Mission Book, speaking of the penitents in the Confessional, says: "Their only security is to be found in *implicit obedience* to their confessor," p. 303. The priest, out of whose mouth, as an open sepulchre, comes the most foul and devilish questions, must be **IMPLICITLY OBEYED!!** This places every penitent completely in the hands of the priest.

The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of God, because of its abominable Confessional.

Those ministers of darkness, who framed the Council of Trent, knew fullwell that there is no authority in the Word of God to show that Christ instituted such a Sacrament. They appeal to no passage of Scripture for the "practice of secretly confessing to the priest alone," as observed "by the Church of Rome." Where does the Bible teach that "Christians of both sexes" are bound to observe this secret confession to the "priest alone" once a year? All of these anathemas of Rome, against those who pronounce this superstitious and degrading sacrament merely a human tradition, fall perfectly harmless. The time has passed when the emissaries of Rome have it in their power to execute her bitter curses against those who reject her corruptions.

Roman Catholic theologians and writers themselves freely admit that the Confessional furnishes the most dangerous temptations to the priests, as well as the penitents. The Romish theologian Liguori says: "Many priests have lost both God and their own souls, by hearing the confessions of women and holding communications with them." Quoted by J. G. White in his "Deeds of Darkness," p. 110. If this secret con-

fession to the priest is essential to salvation, why not have the husbands, fathers, mothers, or brothers present to protect their friends against the foul temptations of the priests. Not so. This does not suit the priesthood. The priest alone in a private room, must take the wife from the husband and propound questions, and whisper vulgarity in her ear, which if propounded by the husband she would forsake him forever. She would regard him as a beast, and yet, in the nineteenth century, such practices are tolerated by a deluded people.

Charles Chiniquy, who was fifty years in the Church of Rome and twenty-five years a priest, became converted and came out. From his valuable book called "Fifty Years in the Church of Rome," page 119, we quote as follows:

"Liguori, in his treatise on oaths, question 4, asks if it is allowable to use ambiguity, or equivocal words, to deceive the judge when under oath, and at number 151 he answers: 'It is certain, and the opinion of all theologians, that for good reasons one may be permitted to use equivocations and to maintain them by oath; and by good reasons we mean all that can do any good to the body or the soul.'

According to this testimony of the Catholic theologian Liguori, "one may be permitted to use equivocations and to maintain them by oath!!" In plain English this means that one may tell a lie and swear to it, in harmony with Romish theology. Again, Liguori says:

"A culprit, or a witness, questioned by a judge, but in an illegal manner, may swear that he knows nothing of the crime about which he is questioned, though he knows it well, mentally meaning that he knows nothing in such a manner as to answer." *Idem*.

The Catholics are taught to swear lies willfully, provided there is a prospect of keeping the matter a secret. Again, Father Chiniquy quotes Liguori as saying:

"He may swear that he knows nothing when he knows that

the person who committed the crime committed it without malice (as affirm. Salm. to c. 2, No. 259, and Elb. No. 145); or again, if he knows the crime, but secretly, and that there has been no scandal (as we are assured by Card, No. 51). When a crime is well concealed; the witness, and even the criminal, may and even must swear that the crime has not been committed! The guilty party may yet do likewise, when a half proof cannot be brought against him." *Idem.* p. 120.

The Romish theology makes criminals in the Confessional by tempting persons to sin, and pardoning their sins, and then requiring such criminals to "swear that such crimes have not been committed!" Such is the degrading and devilish doctrine of the Romish Church. Again, on page 120, Mr. Chiniquy, has the following:

"Liguori asks himself (Question 2): If an accused, legally interrogated by a judge, may deny his crime under oath, when the confession of the crime might cause his condemnation and be disadvantageous to him? And he answers: It is altogether probable that when the accused fears a sentence of death, or of being sent to prison, or exiled, he may deny his crime under oath, understanding that he has not committed this crime in such a manner as to be obliged to confess it."

According to the Romish doctrine, the most flagitious crimes may be committed and pardoned in the Confessional, and there the guilty wretch is taught to swear before the courts that he has not committed the crime. Surely the Romish Church, with such fiendish doctrines, cannot be the true church of Christ. Again Mr. Chiniquy says:

"Liguori asks whether a woman, accused of the crime of adultery, which she has really committed, may deny it under oath? He answers: 'Yes, provided that she has been to confess, and received the absolution; for then,' he says, 'the sin has been pardoned, and has really ceased to exist.' * * * Liguori maintains that one may commit a minor crime in order to avoid a greater crime. He says: 'It is right to advise any one to commit a robbery or fornication in order to avoid a murder.'" p. 121.

The above shows plainly that the false swearing taught by the Church of Rome grows out of the Confessional. The criminal may deny her crime, "PROVIDED THAT SHE HAS BEEN TO CONFESS, AND RECEIVED THE ABSOLUTION; FOR THEN THE SIN HAS BEEN PARDONED, AND HAS REALLY CEASED TO EXIST!"

The Confessional is the polluted fountain from which flows the corrupt stream of the Romish "abominations of the earth."

The Romish theologian, Liguori in his Mission Book, p. 270, puts it thus:

"Q. What is satisfaction?"

"A. Satisfaction is a temporal punishment accepted, or self-imposed for sin. It consists in prayer, fasting, alms-giving, and other works of penance. In the Sacrament of Penance, it is the penalty imposed by the Priest upon the penitent who confesses."

Thus it appears that the "satisfaction" may be any penalty, just or unjust, good or bad, "imposed by the priest upon the penitent who confesses!"

The "Garden of the Soul" is a standard Manual of religious instruction for the members of the Romish Church. It has the indorsement of Archbishop John Hughes of New York. On page 225 of this Catholic work, we have the following:

"THE METHOD OF CONFESSION."

"Kneeling down at the side of your ghostly father, make the sign of the cross, saying: 'In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.' Then ask his blessing in these words:

"'Pray, Father, give me your blessing for I have sinned.' Then say the first part of the *Confiteor*, as follows:

"'I confess to Almighty God, to the blessed Virgin Mary, to blessed Michael the Archangel, to blessed John Baptist, to the holy apostles Peter and Paul, to all the Saints, and to you, Father, that I have sinned exceedingly, in thought, word, and deed, through my fault, through my most grievous fault.'

"2. After this accuse yourself of your sins, either according

to the order of God's commandments, or such other order as you find most helpful to your memory, adding after each sin the number of times you have been guilty of it, and such circumstances as may very considerably aggravate the guilt; but carefully abstaining from such as are impertinent or unnecessary, and from excuses and long narrations.

"3. After you have confessed all that you can remember, conclude with this or like form :

"For these and all other my sins, which I cannot at this present call to my remembrance, I am heartily sorry; purpose amendment for the future; and most humbly ask *pardon of God*, and penance and *absolution* of you my ghostly father."

Where in the New Testament is it recorded that any penitent knelt at the feet of one of the apostles as his "ghostly father," to whisper into his ear all his sins of thought word, or deed, and finally to ask absolution of said "ghostly father"? This places the priest between the penitent soul and God himself. The theology of the Romish Church requires the priest to ask of the penitent the foulest questions which imagination can conceive. Such slavish submission to the priest places the people entirely under the control of the priesthood.

Of all the inventions of Satan, the Confessional is perhaps the most fiendish. Though the Confessional, even in this land of gospel light, is very corrupt, it has not here borne its full harvest of degradation and ruin, as in Catholic countries. If this country should ever come under the dominion of Rome, (which it must not,) then the blighting curse of the Confessional would fill the land with corruption and death. Dowling in his *History of Romanism*, p. 335, gives the picture of the Confessional in Spain, thus :

"A single fact will be sufficient to show the awful extent in popish countries of this crime of illicit intercourse with females at confession. About 1560, a bull was issued by Pope Pius IV., directing the Inquisition to inquire into the prevalence of this crime, which begins as follows:—'Whereas certain eccles-

astics, in the kingdoms of Spain, and in the cities and dioceses thereof, having the cure of souls, or exercising such cure for others, or otherwise deputed to hear the confessions of penitents, have broken out into such heinous acts of iniquity, as to abuse the sacrament of penence in the very act of hearing the confessions, nor fearing to injure the same sacrament, and him who instituted it, our Lord God and Savior Jesus Christ, by *inticing and provoking, or trying to intice and provoke, females to lewd actions, at the very time when they were making their confessions,*' etc., etc. Upon the publication of this bull in Spain, the Inquisition issued an edict requiring all females who had been thus abused by the priests at the confessional, and all who were privy to such acts, to give information, within thirty days, to the holy tribunal; and very heavy censures were attached to those who should neglect or despise this injunction. When this edict was first published, such a considerable number of females went to the palace of the Inquisitors, in the single city of Seville, to reveal the conduct of their infamous confessors, that twenty notaries, and as many inquisitors, were appointed to minute down their several informations against them; but these being found insufficient to receive the depositions of so many witnesses, and the inquisitors being thus overwhelmed, as it were, with the pressure of such affairs, thirty days more were allowed for taking the accusations, and this lapse of time also proving inadequate to the intended purpose, a similar period was granted not only for a third but for a fourth time. Maids and matrons of every rank and station crowded to the Inquisition. Modesty, shame, and a desire of concealing the fact from their husbands, induced many to go veiled. But the multitude of depositions, and the odium which the discovery threw on auricular confession, and the popish priesthood, caused the Inquisition to quash the prosecutions and to consign the depositions to oblivion. And thus for fear of the disgrace that would be brought upon an apostate church and its vicious and corrupt priesthood, these abominable crimes were hushed up, and their vile perpetrators permitted, with their hands all defiled as they were with the filth of unhallowed lust, to minister at the altar and to enjoy still, in the words of Pope Urban,

'the eminence granted to none of the angels, of creating God, the Creator of all things.' Well was it for these priests that they did nothing *worse* than to pollute the confessional with their filthy lusts; had they been guilty of the crime so much more horrible, in the estimation of Papists of denying that the bit of bread consecrated by hands like theirs was the eternal God, the Lord Christ, with 'his body, soul and divinity,' they would not have slipped through the hands of these holy inquisitors so easily. For this latter crime, hundreds of heretics had, within a few years, been burned alive by popish butchers at Smithfield, and the fires kindled by the bloody Mary, were scarcely extinguished in England, when the events I have just related occurred in Spain, such is popish morality, and such is popish justice."

Such was the Confessional when Rome had entire control. Such would it be in this country if the Roman Church should gain control, as she is striving to do. Those Protestants (and a few called Baptists) who give to Roman Catholic churches and colleges, or send their children to be educated in Romish schools, are aiding to bring about such a state of things as above described.

The Confessional is not only the nursery for the seduction and ruin of females, but it also gives license and encouragement to other foul deeds of darkness.

APPENDIX G.

PURGATORY.

The Roman Catholic Purgatory was invented, by the corrupt priesthood, and is used as a powerful means of exhorting money from a deluded people. It was introduced as a dogma of the Roman Church in the Council of Florence, which held its session from 1439 to 1442. It is defined in the Catholic Dictionary thus :

PURGATORY. A place in which souls who depart this life in the grace of God suffer for a time because they still need to be cleansed from venial, or have still to pay the temporal punishment due to mortal sins, the guilt and the eternal punishment of which have been remitted. Purgatory is not a place of probation, for the time of trial, the period during which the soul is free to choose eternal life or eternal death, ends with the separation of soul and body. All the souls in Purgatory have died in the love of God, and are certain to enter heaven. But as yet they are not pure and holy enough to see God, and God's mercy allots them a place and a time for cleansing and preparation. At last, Christ will come to judge the world, and then there will be only two places left, heaven and hell."

This doctrine of Purgatory is a proof that the religion of Rome does not purify the souls of her subjects. She foolishly proposes for them to be purified by torture in the future world. Every Bible student knows that this is an absurd falsehood. In its twenty-fifth session, the Council of Trent issued its

"DECREE CONCERNING PURGATORY."

"Whereas the Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy

Ghost, has, from the sacred writings, and the ancient traditions of the Fathers, taught, in sacred Councils, and very recently in this œcumenical Synod, that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls there detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, but principally by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar; the holy Synod enjoins on bishops that they diligently endeavor that the sound doctrine concerning Purgatory, transmitted by the holy Fathers and sacred Councils, be believed, maintained, taught and everywhere proclaimed by the faithful of Christ. But let the more difficult and subtle questions, and which tend not to edification, and from which for the most part there is no increase of piety, be excluded from popular discourses before the uneducated multitude. In like manner, such things as are uncertain, or which labor under an appearance of error, let them not allow to be made public and treated of. While those things which tend to a certain kind of curiosity or superstition, or which savor of filthy lucre, let them prohibit as scandals and stumbling-blocks of the faithful. But let the bishops take care that the suffrages of the faithful who are living, to-wit, the sacrifices of masses, prayers, alms, and other works of piety, which have been wont to be performed by the faithful for the other faithful departed, be piously and devoutly performed in accordance with the institutes of the Church; and that whatsoever is due on their behalf, from the endowments of testators or in other way, be discharged, not in a perfunctory manner, but diligently and accurately by the priests and the and others who are bound to render this (service).” Decrees by Waterworth. p. 232.

This Council of Trent decreed that “there is a Purgatory,” which is a falshood, and that souls in Purgatory are helped by the prayers and alms of the people. Instead of helping souls in Purgatory the funds they pay to the priest for their benefit go into the greedy pockets of the priests. Receiving funds by the priests to get souls out of Purgatory, is getting money under false pretence. It is a miserable confidence game by which people are robbed. The Council of Trent says: “that

the Sacrament of the masses is propitiatory both for the living and the dead.” The deluded people are encouraged to pay immense sums of money to the priests for masses to deliver the souls of their friends who are supposed to be in Purgatory.

When the greedy priests wish to extort money from the superstitious slaves of Rome, they preach sermons in which they horror up the minds of the living with the fearful torture of their relatives in the flames of Purgatory. No one that has a feeling heart would refuse to pay his last dollar to the priest for masses to relieve the suffering soul of his father, mother, brother, sister or child, from the excruciating tortures of this Romish fiction called Purgatory.

In the Poor Man’s Catechism, a standard Roman Catholic work for the common people, on page 194 we have the following :

“Very probably the soul of a father, or mother, or brother, or sister, or wife, or husband, may be suffering great torments there for sins they committed on your account : this is their cry to you : *Have pity on me, at least you my friends, for the hand of our Lord hath stricken me :* and, though it should happen that those you pray for are not in want of your prayers, your tenderness and charity God is equally pleased with. If it be great charity to assist the distressed in this world, who suffer, under the hands of God’s mercy, in prisons, in chains, in banishment, and death; how much greater charity to help those who are suffering in the other world, under the hand of divine justice ? O what is the grief of one to the other ! What the torment ! If, again, you are commanded to visit and assist by your alms the imprisoned ; we have the same command to think and pray for the dead. ‘It is not in vain,’ says St. John Chrysostom, ‘that oblations are made for the dead ; it is the ordinance of the Holy Ghost, who designs we should help one another.’ Help, then, those who are detained in the prison of purgatory, till they have paid the last farthing. Descend, in thought, into those inferior parts of just punishment, and see what the souls here detained are suffering for lesser faults than you are guilty

of; enter in thought into that place with a holy sorrow, tears, and contrition for your own sins. Think again of the greatness of their punishment; it is beyond expression."

Thus the priests of the Roman Catholic Church succeed in extorting, hypocritically and unlawfully, vast sums of money from the ignorant people by means of Purgatory. Surely the priests are they that "devour widows' houses and for a pretense make long prayers."

APPENDIX H.

THE IDOLATRY OF ROME.

The establishment of image worship in the Roman Catholic Church required a long and desperate struggle, before even Roman Catholics themselves would yield to this abominable idolatry. In his History of Romanism, Dowling says:

"In 754, during the pontificate of Stephen II., the Emperor proceeded to redeem this pledge by convening a council at Hiera, opposite to Constantinople, consisting of 338 bishops, the largest number that had ever yet assembled in one general council. This Numerous council after continuing their sessions from the 10th of February, to the 17th of August, with one voice condemned the use and the worship of images, as a custom borrowed of idolatrous nations, and entirely contrary to the practice of the purer ages of the church. On the nature of the heresy they express themselves in the following language. 'Jesus Christ hath delivered us from idolatry, and hath taught us to adore him in spirit and in truth. But the devil, not being able to endure the beauty of the church, hath insensibly brought back idolatry, under the appearance of Christianity. persuading men to worship the creature, and to take for God a work to which they gave the name of Jesus Christ.'

The decree of faith issued by this celebrated council was as follows: 'The holy œcumenical council, which it hath pleased our most authordox emperors, Constantine and Leo, to assemble in the church of St. Mary and Blachernas in the imperial city, adhering to the word of God, to the definitions of the six preceeding councils, to the doctrine of the approved fathers, and the practice of the church in the earliest times, pronounce and declare, in the name of the Trinity. and with one heart and mind, that NO IMAGES ARE TO BE WORSHIPED; *that to*

worship them or any other creature, is robbing God of the honor that is due to him alone, and RELAPSING INTO IDOLATRY. Whoever therefore, shall henceforth presume to worship images, to set them up in the churches, or in private houses, or to conceal them; if a bishop, priest, or deacon, shall be degraded, and if a monk or layman, excommunicated and punished as guilty of a breach of God's express command, and of the imperial laws, that is, of the very severe laws issued by the Christian emperors against the worshippers of idols." Hist. of Romanism, Dowling, p. 162.

But finally in the year 787 a Council was called at Nice which decreed:

"That holy images of the cross should be consecrated, and put on the sacred vessels and vestments, and upon walls and boards, in private houses and public ways. And especially that there should be erected images of the Lord God, our Savior Jesus Christ, of our blessed Lady, the mother of God, of the venerable angels, and of all the saints. And that whosoever should presume to think or teach otherwise, or to throw away any painted books, or the figure of the cross, or any image or picture, or any genuine relics of the martyrs, they should, if bishops or clergymen, be deposed, or if monks or laymen, be excommunicated. They then pronounced different anathemas upon all who should not receive images, or who should apply what the Scriptures say against idols to the holy images, or call them idols, or wilfully communicate with those who rejected and despised them, adding, according to custom, 'long live Constantine, and Irene, his mother—damnation to all heretics—damnation on the council that roared against venerable images—the holy Trinity hath desposed them.'" Dowling. p. 164.

From the eighth century forward the Roman Catholic Church has increased in her idolatry, in the worship of images and saints, and especially in the worship of Mary.

ARCHBISHOP KENRICK.

Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis in his Formulary of Prayers for the Sisters of St. Joseph, p. 211 says:

"*Seventh Joyful Mystery*.—After her glorious death, the Blessed Virgin was carried by angels into Heaven, where she was proclaimed Queen of the universe, the Mother and Advocate of sinners."

Also on p. 214, he prays, as follows:

"O refuge of the miserable and hope of the world! do not reject my humble prayer, but mercifully hear and generously grant my petition. Amen."

Liguori, a Roman Catholic theologian, in his Mission Book, endorses the prayer of St. Ephraim, p. 160, as follows:

"O QUEEN of the universe, and most bountiful sovereign! thou art the great advocate of sinners, the sure port of those who have suffered shipwreck the resource of the world, the ransom of captives, the solace of the weak, the comfort of the afflicted, the refuge and salvation of every creature. O! full of grace! enlighten my understanding, and loosen my tongue, that I may recount thy praises, and sing to thee that angelical salutation which thou dost so justly merit. Hail! thou who art the peace, the joy, the consolation of the whole world! Hail! Paradise of delight, the sure asylum of all who are in danger, the source of grace, the mediatrix between God and man!"

This makes "Mary the Queen of Heaven" and "mediatrix between God and man"!!! Also on page 161, the idolatrous St. Liguori, prays:

"Most holy and immaculate Virgin, my Mother Mary, it is to thee, the Mother of my God, the Queen of the world, the advocate, the hope, and the refuge of sinners, that I have recourse to-day, I, who am the most miserable of all. I render thee my humble homage, O great Queen, and I thank thee for all the graces which thou hast bestowed upon me until now, particularly for having delivered me from hell, which I have so often deserved."

On page 169 of the Mission Book Liguori, prays:

"O My Sovereign, and Mother of my God, thou art blessed amongst all women, pure amongst all virgins, and queen of all the heavenly host: all nations call thee blessed. Vouchsafe

that I may publish as much as possible thy greatness, that I may love thee to the utmost of my power and that I may serve thee with all the capacity of my soul."

And on page 173 of the Mission Book, Liguori makes Mary the Savior, thus :

"Happy indeed is every soul which Mary deigns to visit! Let us pray, then, to our dear Lady, that she will be pleased to visit our souls, to sanctify and save them."

Also on page 182, Liguori repeats the same idolatry :

"But if we abandon our sins, and consecrate ourselves to the service of Mary, then that good Mother will succor and comfort us in that last moment, as she has done already to so many of her faithful servants. Let us place ourselves, then, under her protection, with the firm purpose to amend our lives and let us ask her now to assist us in the hour of our death."

On page 188 of the Mission Book, Liguori makes Mary the intercessor for sinners, thus:

"Remember, O most merciful Virgin Mary that it is unheard of, that any one flying to thee for protection, imploring thy help, or seeking thy intercession, was ever forsaken. Animated by this unerring confidence, I hasten to thee, Virgin of Virgins; I fly to thee, O sweet Mother; a wretched sinner, I prostrate myself groaning at thy feet; despise not my prayer, O Mother of the Divine Word, but graciously hear and grant the same. Amen."

THE SCAPULAR.

The Scapular is a strip of cloth worn by the servants of Mary over the shoulders before and behind, under the outer garment, and connected by straps, or strings.

Concerning this wonderful "Scapular of the Virgin Mary" Liguori in his Mission Book, page 188 says :

"Just as men love to have their servants wear their livery, so Mary loves to see her servants wear her Scapular, to show their tender devotion to her, and that they belong to her family. Heretics, according to their fashion, laugh at this devotion, but the Holy Church has approved it by bulls and

indulgences. It is related that, about the year 1251, the Blessed Virgin appeared to St. Simon Stock, an English Carmelite, and giving him this scapular, assured him that all who should die invested with it, would be saved from eternal fire. This vision is so well attested that Pope Benedict XIV. does not hesitate to say: 'We believe this vision to be true, and think it ought to be so considered by every one.' No wonder, then, that this beautiful devotion has become so widely spread, and continues to flourish throughout the Catholic Church."

Such is the heathenish idolatry of this anti-Christian worship of Mary.

According to this foolish idolatry, the wearing of this little double scrap of cloth *saves* "from eternal fire." However wicked and devilish the servant of Mary, wearing this Scapular, may be, he is sure of heaven! He may die in the act of committing the foulest murder, and yet, Mary's Scapular makes him sure of heaven.

THE GLORIES OF MARY.

"The Glories of Mary" is a book of 790 pages devoted to the worship of Mary, written by the celebrated Roman Catholic theologian, Alphonsus Liguori, for the use of the common people.

At the beginning of his Glories of Mary, Alphonsus Liguori offers a prayer to Mary as follows :

"To thee also, I appeal, oh my sweetest Lady and mother Mary. Thou knowest that in thee, next to Jesus, I have placed all hope of my eternal salvation, since all the good I have received, my conversion, my vocation to leave the world, and whatever other graces have been given me by God, I acknowledge them all as coming through thee." p. 11.

And on page 12 he continues :

"Extend, then, that most kind hand of thine with which thou hast delivered me from the world and from hell, and accept it and protect it as belonging to thee."

Thus Liguori acknowledges Mary as the giver of all graces and the deliverer "from hell!" Under the head of Mary as "Queen of Mercy," Liguori quotes, with his endorsement, St. Arnold, thus:

"If Jesus is the king of the whole world, Mary is also queen of the whole world: therefore, says St. Bernardine of Sienna, all creatures who serve God ought also to serve Mary; for all angels and men, and all things that are in heaven and on earth being subject to the dominion of God, are also subject to the dominion of the glorious Virgin." p. 26.

According to this, Mary has dominion over the whole world. On page 27, Liguori says:

"Kings should then principally occupy themselves with works of mercy, but not to the neglect of the exercise of justice towards the guilty, when it is required. Not so Mary, who, although queen, is not queen of justice, intent upon the punishment of the guilty, but queen of mercy, solely intent upon compassion and pardon for sinners. Accordingly, the Church requires us explicitly to call her queen of mercy." p. 27.

According to this, Mary exercises mercy in saving her subjects at the expense of justice! On page 28, Liguori says:

"St. Thomas confirms this in his preface to the Canonical Epistles, saying that the Holy Virgin, when she conceived the divine Word in her womb, and brought him forth, obtained the half of the kingdom of God by becoming queen of mercy, Jesus Christ remaining king of Justice."

Such is the abominable doctrine, that Mary became QUEEN OF MERCY at the expense of justice. Therefore the most abandoned criminals who have recourse to Mary, are saved in spite of the justice of God!!!

Instead of giving the glory of the atonement to God alone, the Roman theologian, Liguori, gives this glory to Mary. He says:

"The second time in which Mary brought us forth to grace was, when on Calvary, she offered to the eternal Father with so

much sorrow of heart the life of her beloved Son for our salvation." p. 42.

Thus Mary is represented as offering up Jesus for our salvation!!! But Christ said: "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth on him should not perish but have everlasting life." John 3:16.

MARY OFFERING HER SON AS A SACRIFICE.

In his Glories of Mary, page 54, Liguori says:

"Those children are much dearer to a mother whose lives she has preserved;—we are those children, for whom, that we may have the life of grace, Mary suffered the pain of sacrificing the dear life of her Jesus; submitting, for our sake, to see him die before her eyes in cruel torments. By this great offering of Mary we were then born to the life of divine grace. So, then, we are children very dear to her, because we were redeemed at such a cost of suffering. Accordingly, as we read of the love which the eternal Father has manifested for men by giving his own Son to death for us, 'God so loved the world as to give his only begotten Son:' as St. Bonaventure remarks, it may be said of Mary also, that she so loved us as to give her only begotten Son. And when did she give him to us? * * * 'But no, Mary would not utter even one word in favor of her Son, to prevent his death, upon which our salvation depended; finally, she gave him to us again at the foot of the cross, in those three hours when she was witnessing his death; because then, at every moment she was offering up for us his life, with the deepest grief, and the greatest love for us, at the cost of great trouble and suffering, and with such firmness, that if executioners had been wanting, as St. Anselm and St. Antoninus tell us, she herself would have crucified him in obedience to the will of the Father, who had decreed he should die for our salvation. And if Abraham showed a similar fortitude in consenting to sacrifice his son with his own hands, we must believe that Mary would certainly have done the same, with more resolution, as she was holier, and more obedient than Abraham. But to return to our subject. How grateful should we be to Mary, for an act of so much love, for the sacrifice she

made of the life of her Son, in the midst of so much anguish, to obtain salvation for us all."

Such is the shocking blasphemy of Romanism which makes Mary the author of salvation by the sacrifice of her Son!

Thus the chief theologian of the Roman Church, Liguori, teaches that Mary, "so loved us, as to give her only begotten Son" for our salvation! That Mary was ready herself to crucify Jesus Christ with her own hands for our salvation.

MARY KILLED A HAWK.

Liguori, in his Glories of Mary, says:

"Father Bernardine de Bustis relates that a hawk darted upon a bird which had been taught to say Ave Maria; the bird said Ave Maria, and the hawk fell dead. By this our Lord wished to show us, that if any irrational bird was saved from destruction by invoking Mary, how much more surely will he be prevented from falling into the power of evil spirits, who is mindful to invoke Mary in his temptations. Nothing remains to be done, says St. Thomas of Villanova, when the devil comes to tempt us, but, like the chickens when the kite appears, to run quickly under the shelter of the wings of our mother." p. 96.

Such is the puerile "lying wonders" of Romanism.

ST. GERMANUS.

St. Liguori quotes with approbation the prayer of St. Germanus:

"Oh my Lady, thou alone art my help, given me by God; thou art the guide of my pilgrimage, the support of my weakness, my riches in poverty, my deliver from bondage, the hope of my salvation: graciously listen, I pray thee to my supplications, take compassion on my sighs, thou my queen, my refuge, my life, my help, my hope, my strength." Glories of Mary. p. 119-120.

Such is papal blasphemy.

MARY THE SAVIOR OF ALL.

Liguori, in his Glories of Mary, heads the first section of his sixth chapter, thus:

"*Mary is an advocate powerful to save all.*"

And on page 201 Liguori says:

"And therefore, says St. Peter Damian, the Virgin has all power in heaven as on earth, being able to raise to the hope of salvation even the most despairing. And then he adds that when the mother asks any favor for us of Jesus Christ (called by the saint the altar of mercy where sinners obtain pardon from God), the Son has so great regard for the prayers of Mary, and so great a desire to please her, that when she prays she seems to command rather (than) request, and to be a mistress rather than a handmaid. Thus Jesus would honor this his dear mother, who has honored him so much in her life, by granting her immediately whatever she asks and desires. St. Germanus beautifully confirms this by saying to the Virgin: Thou art mother of God, omnipotent to save sinners, and needest no other recommendation with God, since thou art the mother of true life.

"St. Bernardine of Sienna does not hesitate to say that all obey the commands of Mary, even God himself signifying by these words, that God listens to her prayers though they were commands. Hence St. Anselm thus praises Mary: The Lord, oh holy Virgin, has so highly exalted thee, that by his favor thou canst obtain all possible graces for thy servants, for thy protection is omnipotent. Thy help is omnipotent, Oh Mary: *Omnipotens auxilium tuum, O Maria;*" as Cosmas of Jerusalem exclaims. Yes, Mary is omnipotent, adds Richard of St. Laurence, since the queen, by every law, must enjoy the same privileges as the king. For as the power of the son and the mother are the same, the mother by the omnipotent Son is made omnipotent. As St. Antonius says: God has placed the whole Church, not only under the patronage, but also under the dominion of Mary." Glories of Mary. p. 201-203.

According to this blasphemous idolatry "The Virgin has all power in heaven and on earth." With Romanists, Mary is "omnipotent" so that all the Church are "under the dominion of Mary"

"MARY CONDUCTS HER SERVANTS TO PARADISE,"

says Liguori; and on page 279 of the Glories of Mary continues:

"In the Franciscan chronicles it is related of brother Leo, that he once saw a red ladder, upon which Jesus Christ was standing, and a white one upon which stood his holy mother. He saw persons attempting to ascend the red ladder; they ascended a few steps and then fell; they ascended again, and again fell. Then they were exhorted to ascend the white ladder, and on that he saw them succeed, for the blessed Virgin offered them her hand, and they arrived in that manner safe in paradise. St. Denis, the Carthusian asks: Who will ever be saved? Who will ever reign in heaven? They are saved and will certainly reign, he himself answers for whom this queen of mercy offers her prayers. And this Mary herself affirms: By me kings reign; 'Per me reges regnant.' Through my intercession souls reign first in the mortal life on this earth, by governing their passions, and then they go to reign eternally in heaven, where, as St. Augustine declares, all are kings 'Quot cives, tot reges.' Mary, in a word, as Richard of St. Laurence says, is the mistress of paradise; since there she commands according to her pleasure, and introduces into it whom she will. Therefore, apply to her the words of Ecclesiasticus, he adds: 'My power is in Jerusalem: I command what I will, and introduce whom I will. And as she is mother of the Lord of Paradise, she is with reason, also, says Rupert, the Lady of Paradise. She possesses, by right, the whole kingdom of her Son.

"This divine mother, with her powerful prayers and assistance, has obtained for us paradise, if we place no obstacle to our entrance there. Wherefore those who are servants of Mary, and for whom Mary intercedes, are as secure of paradise as if they were already there. To serve Mary and to belong to her court, adds St. John of Damascus, is the greatest honor we can attain; for to serve the queen of heaven is to reign already in heaven, and to live in obedience to her commands is more than to reign. On the other hand, he says, that those who do not serve Mary will not be saved; whilst those who are deprived of the support of this great mother, are de-

prived of the succor of the Son, and of all the celestial court." Glories of Mary, pp. 279-281.

This foolish story about "the red ladder" and "the white ladder" is doubtless introduced to teach that the worshippers of Mary reach paradise independent of the blood of Christ! That Mary saves those whom Christ rejects, so that Mary is "the mistress of paradise," since there she commands according to her pleasure, and introduces whom she will!!!

THE MERCY OF MARY GREATER THAN THAT OF CHRIST.

On page 298 Liguori says:

"Hence, says St. Anselm: Our relief is sometimes more immediate when the name of Mary is invoked than when we invoke the name of Jesus. Wherefore Hugo of St. Victor tells us, that if by reason of our sins we fear to draw near to God, because he is an infinite majesty that we have offended, we should not hesitate to have a recourse to Mary, because in her we shall find nothing to alarm us. She is indeed holy, immaculate, queen of the world, and mother of God; but she is of our flesh, and a child of Adam like ourselves.

"In a word, says St. Bernard, whatever appertains to Mary is full of grace and mercy, for she as mother of mercy has become all things to all, and by her great charity has made herself a debtor to the just and to sinners, and open to all the bowels of her compassion, that all may share it. As 'the Devil,' according to St. Peter, 'goeth about seeking whom he may devour,' so, on the contrary, says Bernardine de Bustis, Mary goeth about seeking to whom she can give life and salvation.

"We should understand that the protection of Mary, as St. Germanus says, is greater and more powerful than we can comprehend. And how is it that the same Lord, who was under the old law so severe in punishing, exercises so great mercy toward the greatest sinners? Thus asks the author del Pomerio; and he also answers: He does all this for the love and merits of Mary. Oh, how long since would the world have been destroyed, says St. Fulgentious, if Mary had not preserved it by her intercession. But we may with confidence go to God, as St. Arnold Carnotensis asserts and hope for every

blessing, now that the Son is our mediator with the divine Father, and the mother with the Son. How can it be that the Father will refuse to hear graciously the Son, when he shows him the wounds he has received for sinners? And how can it be that the Son will not graciously hear the Mother, when she shows him the breasts from which she has nourished us? St. Peter Chrysologus says with great energy, that this favored Virgin, having received God in her womb, demands in return, peace for the world, salvation for the lost, life for the dead." *Glories of Mary* pp. 298-300.

This teaches that Mary is more merciful than Christ. That the sinner instead of coming directly to Christ should come to Mary for salvation. that the mercy that Christ exercises is all on account of Mary. Liguori endorses the blasphemy which asks: "How can it be that the Son will not graciously hear the mother, when she shows him the breasts from which she has nourished us?"!!!

Again Liguori says:

"On the other hand, the devils, as Thomas a Kempis affirms, are in such fear of the queen of heaven that at the sound of her great name they flee from him who pronounces it as from burning fire. The Virgin herself revealed to St. Bridget that there is no sinner living so cold in divine love, that if he invoke her holy name, with the resolution to amend, the devil will not instantly depart from him. And she, at another time assured her of this, telling her that all the demons so greatly venerate and fear her name, that when they hear it pronounced they immediately release the soul which they held in their chains." *Glories of Mary*. p. 311.

From this it appears that Mary becomes the Savior of the most outrageous sinner, independent of the blood of Christ.

ROMAN "LYING WONDERS."

In his prophecy of the rise of Popery, Paul says: "Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received

not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." 2 Thes. 2:9, 10.

That wonderful book of idolatry called "Glories of Mary" by Alphonsus Liguori and endorsed by Archbishop John Hughes of New York, contains an account of the idolatrous worship of Mary who is represented as being able to save all sinners who apply to her for salvation. In Roman theology Mary is called the "Mother of Mercy," not of Justice. While Christ can only save sinners upon principles of justice as well as mercy, Mary can save whom she will though they spend their lifetime in the love and practice of the grossest crimes. The pretended miracles of the Roman Church described by Paul as "lying wonders" are designed to increase the superstition and devotion in the worship of Mary.

THE VIRGIN MARY A NUN IN A ROMAN CONVENT.

In his stupid book of idolatry, the Roman theologian, Liguori, represents Mary as endorsing and giving encouragement to the most outrageous crimes. We give an example from the "Glories of Mary" as follows:

"Our advocate has shown how great is her kindness towards sinners by her mercy to Beatrice, a nun in the monastery of Fontebraldo, as related by Cesarius, and by Father Rho. This unhappy religious, having contracted a passion for a certain youth, agreed to flee with him from the convent; and in fact she went one day before a statue of the blessed Virgin, there deposited the keys of the monastery, for she was portress, and boldly departed. Arrived in another country, she led the miserable life of a prostitute for fifteen years. It happened that she met, one day, the agent of the monastery in the city where she was living, and asked of him, thinking he would not recognize her again, if he knew sister Beatrice? 'I knew her well,' he said; 'she is a holy nun, and at present is mistress of novices.' At this intelligence she was confounded and amazed, not knowing how to understand it. In order to ascertain the truth, she put on another dress and went to the monastery. She asked for Sister Beatrice, and behold the

most holy Virgin appeared before her in the form of that same image to which at parting she had committed her keys, and her dress, and the divine mother thus spoke to her: 'Beatrice, be it known to thee that, in order to prevent thy disgrace, I assumed thy form, and have filled thy office for the fifteen years that thou hast lived far from the monastery and from God. My child, return, and do penance, for my Son is still waiting for thee; and strive by thy holy life to preserve the good name I have gained thee.' She spoke thus and disappeared. Beatrice re-entered the monastery, resumed the habit of a religious, and grateful for the mercy of Mary, led the life of a saint. At her death she made known the foregoing incident to the glory of this great queen." *Glories of Mary*. p. 224.

This wretched imposture represents Mary, the mother of Jesus, as coming down from heaven and becoming a "portress" or servant in a convent to accommodate a nun while she lived "the miserable life of a prostitute for fifteen years"!!! Thus Mary is made to become a partner in the crime of this wretched nun. If she will thus favor one nun who worships her, all other nuns may conclude that she will grant them the same indulgence while they live the "life of a prostitute," or commit any other crime which the vile theology of Rome may suggest. Romanists teach that however wicked sinners may live, if worshipers of Mary, she will save them from hell, though they pursue their wicked course to the hour of death. This is evidently why a great majority of the criminals of our land, belong to the worshipers of Mary. They are taught by the priests that she will certainly save them. Thus they die under this "strong delusion," and are lost. Will the *Church Progress* please tell us what became of the prayers to Mary, while she was endorsing that prostitute by acting as servant in the monastery? Did she make her usual Saturday afternoon trip to purgatory to deliver her servants? Was Mary really the Queen of Heaven, during these fifteen years while she was covering

up the devilry of this unfaithful nun? Does not this example license crime in the worshipers of Mary?

THE HEAD OF A DEAD GIRL MAKING CONFESSION.

Among the innumerable "lying wonders" of popery, Liguori, in the "Glories of Mary," has the following:

"Father Eusebius Nierembergh relates, that there lived in the city of Aragona a girl, named Alexandra who, being noble and very beautiful, was greatly loved by two young men. Through jealousy, they one day fought and killed each other. Their enraged relatives, in return, killed the poor young girl, as the cause of so much trouble, cut off her head, and threw her into a well. A few days after, St. Dominic was passing through that place, and, inspired by the Lord, approached the well, and said, 'Alexandra, come forth,' and immediately the head of the deceased came forth, placed itself on the edge of the well, and prayed St. Dominic to hear its confession. The saint heard its confession, and also gave it communion, in presence of a great concourse of persons who had assembled to witness the miracle. Then St. Dominic ordered her to speak and tell why she had received that grace. Alexandra answered, that when she was beheaded, she was in a state of mortal sin, but that the most holy Mary, on account of the rosary, which she was in the habit of reciting, had preserved her in life. Two days the head preserved its life on the edge of the well, in the presence of all, and then the soul went to purgatory. But fifteen days after, the soul of Alexandra appeared to St. Dominic, beautiful and radiant as a star, and told him, that one of the principle sources of relief to the souls in purgatory is the rosary which is recited for them; and that, as soon as they arrive in paradise, they pray for those who apply to them these powerful prayers. Having said this, St. Dominic saw that happy soul ascending in triumph to the kingdom of the blessed." *Glories of Mary*, pp. 273, 274.

According to this enormous falsehood, the young lady was killed in mortal sin, her head cut off and thrown, with her body into the well. "A few days after St. Dominic" called the head

of the dead girl from the well and took "its confession," and "gave it communion"! Why didn't the priest take this head into the secret confessional, instead of hearing its confession "in the presence of a great concourse of persons?" Now, if the head of this dead girl might make its confession in the presence of the people, why may not the heads of living girls make their confessions public also?

But it seems that this fortunate girl was granted the privilege of repentance after death "on account of the rosary." The rosary is a form of the worship of Mary. It would be difficult for the "father of lies" to tell a bigger lie than this.

THE MONKEY DEVIL.

The Roman Catholic theologian, Liguori, in his "Glories of Mary," for the edification of the faithful, has the following:

"We read in the chronicle of the Capuchin Fathers, that there lived in Venice a celebrated advocate, who, by fraud and evil practice, had become rich. His whole life was very bad, and it appears that he had but one good habit, that of reciting every day a certain prayer to the holy Virgin. Yet, even this little devotion saved him from eternal death, through the mercy of Mary. It happened in this way: Happily for himself, he had a great esteem for Father Matthew da Basso, and urged him so much to come and dine at his house, that one day the Father gave him this pleasure. Having arrived, the advocate said to him: 'Now, Father, I will show you something that you have never seen. I have a wonderful ape, who is my valet, washes my glasses, lays the table, and opens the door.' 'This may not be an ape,' answered the Father; 'it may be something more than an ape; order him to come here.' The ape was called again and again, search was made for him everywhere, and he could not be found. At length, he was discovered hidden under a bed in the lower part of the house, but he would not come out. 'Come, then,' said the religious, 'let us go and see him;' and he went with the advocate to his hiding-place. 'Infernal beast,' he said, 'come forth, and in the name of God I command you to tell me what you are.' And

behold, the ape answered that he was the devil, and that he was waiting until that sinner should omit some day to recite his accustomed prayer to the mother of God; for the first time he should omit it, God had given him leave to strangle him, and take him to hell. At these words the advocate cast himself upon his knees to ask help of the servant of God, who encouraged him, and commanded the devil to depart from that house without committing any injury, only he gave him permission, as a sign that he had really gone, to break a piece of the wall. Scarcely had he finished speaking, when, with a great crash, a hole was made in the wall, which, although it was several times closed with stone and mortar, God willed that it should remain open for a long time; until by the advice of the servant of God, it was filled up with a slab of marble, with an angel carved on it. The advocate was converted, and, it is to be hoped, persevered until death in his new course of life." Glories of Mary, pp. 251, 252.

It is not likely that any priest, with average intelligence, believes one word of such silly yarns. They serve, however, to increase the superstition and devotion of those who are completely enslaved by the priesthood.

"A HIGHWAY ROBBER SAVED BY AN IMAGE OF MARY."

It is a part of the theology of Rome to admit lying for the good of holy mother church. Liguori, relates a lying wonder as follows:

"Father Razzi, of the order of Camaldoli, relates that a certain youth having lost his father, was sent by his mother to the court of a prince. The mother, who had a great devotion to Mary, when she parted with him made him promise to recite every day a 'Hail Mary,' and add these words: '*Blessed Virgin, help me in the hour of my death.*' The youth arrived at court, but soon began to lead so dissolute a life, that his master was obliged to send him away. In despair, without means of support, he went into the country and became a highway robber; but even then he did not omit to recommend himself to our Lady, as his mother had directed him. At length he fell into the hands of justice, and was condemned to

death. Being in prison the evening before his execution, and thinking of his disgrace, the grief of his mother, and the death which awaited him, he fell to weeping bitterly. The devil seeing him so oppressed by melancholy, appeared to him in the form of a beautiful young man, and said to him that he would release him from death and prison, if he would follow his directions. The convict engaged to do all that he required. Then the pretended youth made known to him that he was the devil and had come to his assistance. In the first place he ordered him to renounce Jesus Christ and the holy sacraments. The youth consented. He then required him to renounce the Virgin Mary and her protection. 'This,' exclaimed the young man, 'I will never do,' and turning to Mary, repeated the accustomed prayer his mother had taught him: '*Blessed Virgin, help me in the hour of death.*' At these words the devil disappeared. The youth remained in great affliction for the wickedness he had committed in denying Jesus Christ. He invoked the Blessed Virgin and she obtained for him, by her prayers, a great sorrow for all his sins, so that he made his confession with much weeping and contrition. On his way to the gallows, happening to pass before a statue of Mary, he saluted her with his usual prayer: '*Blessed Virgin, help me in the hour of my death,*' and the statue in the presence of all, inclined its head and saluted him. Deeply moved, he begged to be allowed to kiss the feet of the image. The executioners refused, but afterwards consented on account of the clamor of the people. The youth stooped to kiss her feet, and Mary extended her arm from that statue, took him by the hand and held him so strongly that no power could move him. At this prodigy the multitude shouted, 'Pardon, pardon,' and pardon was granted. Having returned to his country, he led an exemplary life, and was always most devoted to Mary who had delivered him from temporal and eternal death." *Glories of Mary.* pp. 212-214.

The teaching of the Roman Church concerning the salvation granted by Mary, encourages sinners to believe that however criminal and blasphemous may be their whole lives, the Virgin Mary will come and save them in the hour of death. Surely because they have rejected Christ as the Savior, and accepted

such abominable idolatries, God sent them "strong delusion that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believe not the truth, but have pleasure in unrighteousness." 2 Thes. 2:11, 12.

ROMAN IDOLATRY ADOPTED FROM PAGANISM.

Concerning the origin of idolatry in the Roman Catholic Church, we quote from a valuable work called "Evenings with Romanists" by Seymour. From pp. 204, 205, we quote:

"I then remarked, that among the theological systems of the ancient heathens of Greece and Rome, this want was met and satisfied, in a way, by the enrollment of their great and useful men among the demi-gods, as Esculapius, Romulus, Bacchus, and a thousand others. It was supposed that the *Dii Majores*, the great gods, as Jupiter, etc., were too much above and beyond the reach of thought, or interest, or sympathy for mortals; and therefore, men had recourse to the *Dii Minores*, or demi-gods, who had once been men on earth like themselves; and who could be supposed capable of the requisite amount of sympathy for them; and who, therefore, could and would stand between them and the great gods, and become their mediators and intercessors." * * *

"The heathen selected a number of the greatest, best, and most useful men, and enrolled them among the demi-gods, and regarded them as their mediators of intercession. The Church of Rome also selected those who were the most remarkable among her members for religion or zeal, or usefulness, and canonized them, placing them in the calendar of the saints, and having recourse to them as mediators of intercession. The two systems seemed one and the same in principle. They were similar attempts to supply the yearnings and cravings of nature, to which we had already adverted. But, I added, that I could not consider them as two different systems, but only as one and the same, regarding one as a continuation of the other;—that however hard it might seem to bear upon the Church of Rome, yet I felt that the system of that Church was only a continuation of the heathen system—that, instead of meeting the wants of the soul as revealed Christian-

ity meets it, she permitted the old system of the heathens to continue; transferring to the saints the worship previously paid to the demi-gods, and substituting Peter, and Paul, and Catherine, and Mary, for Romulus, or a Mercury, or a Minerva, or a Juno."

The proof is overwhelming that the idolatries of the Roman Catholic Church were adopted from heathenism, and are just as degrading among Romanists as among the Pagans themselves. Also, Hobart Seymour on this subject says:

"The heathen philosophers, Hesiod, Plato, and Apuleius, all thus speak of those persons. The last named philosopher says, 'They are intermediate intelligencers, by whom our prayers and wants pass unto the gods. They are the mediators between the inhabitants of earth and the inhabitants of heaven, carrying thither our prayers, and drawing down their blessings. They bear back and forward prayers from us, and supplies from them; or they are those that explain between both parties, and who carry our adorations,' etc. This was the creed of heathenism, and in nothing but the name does it differ from the corresponding creed of Romanism. When the Church of Rome finds members of her communion, whom she regards as signally pious, or illustrious for supposed miraculous powers, she holds that they may be canonized and enrolled among her saints—that then they can mediate between God and man—that they have sufficient favor or influence with God to obtain compliance with our prayers, and therefore they are fitting objects to whom our confessions, invocations and prayers may be offered; or as she expresses it in her creed, 'that the saints reigning with Christ are to be honored and invoked, and that they offer prayers to God for us.' The principle of heathen Romanism, and the principle of Christian Romanism are one and the same, the only difference is in the detail of the names. And the origin of this practice is demonstrative of this; for when it was found, after the establishment of Christianity, in the times of Constantine, when the great object of the court was to promote uniformity of religion, that many of the heathen would outwardly conform to Christianity, if allowed to retain in private their wor-

ship of their guardian or tutelary divinities, they were so allowed, merely on changing the names of Jupiter to Peter, or Juno to Mary, still worshipping their old divinities under new names. This is apparent in the writings of those times, and was thought a measure of wisdom—a stroke of profound policy, as tending to produce a uniformity of religion among the unthinking masses. The invocations of Juno have been transferred to Mary; the prayers to Mercury have been transferred to Paul. We see not how the substitution of the names of Damian or Cosmo for those of Mercury or Apollo, or how the substitution of the names of Lucy or Cecelia for those of Minerva or Diana, can alter the idolatrous character of the practice. In some instances, they have not even changed the names, and Romulus and Remus are still worshiped in Italy, under the more modern names of St. Romulo and St. Remigio. The simple people believe them to have been two holy bishops. I have myself witnessed this near Florence, and even Bacchus is not without his votaries, under the ecclesiastical name of St. Bacco!' The principle and the practice of papal Rome are identical with the principle and practice of pagan Rome. Every argument to justify one, may be equally urged to justify or extenuate the other. And if the principle and practice of pagan Rome are to be denounced as idolatrous, I see not why the very same principle and practice in papal Rome should not be denounced as idolatrous likewise." *Evenings with Romanists.* pp. 230, 231.

It is certainly unwise in the extreme, to furnish government funds to educate the rising generation in the idolatries of Roman Catholic heathenism. It would be just as appropriate to furnish the people's money to educate children in the heathenism of the Chinese.

APPENDIX I.

THE POLITICAL POWER OF POPERY.

Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M. P., in his "Vaticanism: An Answer to Reproofs and Replies," takes the ground that if the Pope succeeds in his designs, "nothing shall remain except an Asian monarchy; nothing but one giddy height of despotism, and one dead level of religious subserviency." p. 8. This is certainly the design of the Pope. On page 17, Mr. Gladstone says: "I again affirm that in his Syllabus, as in his acts, the Pope has condemned liberty of speech and liberty of the press." On page 19, Mr. Gladstone again says:

"Again I support myself by the high authority of Schrader the Jesuit. The following is his Article LXXVII. It draws no distinction of countries:

"In our view it is still useful that the Catholic religion should be maintained as the only State religion, to the exclusion of every other."

"In the appendix remark he observes that *on this account* the Pope in 1856, condemned the then recent Spanish law which tolerated other forms of worship."

It is the design of Rome to establish a state religion where, and when possible. Concerning the political claims of the Pope, in his Vaticanism, page 24, Mr. Gladstone says:

"The reasons advanced by Bishop Fessler in the opposite sense appear to be very weak. When the Pope (by conversion of the 23rd Proposition) declares that preceding pontiffs have not exceeded the limits of their power, and have not usurped the rights of princes, Bishop Fessler replies that we are here dealing only with facts of history, not touching faith and morals, so that there is no subject-matter for a dogmatic

definition. But the depositions of sovereigns were wont to be founded on considerations of faith and morals; as when Gregory VII., in A. D. 1079, charged upon Henry IV. many capital crimes, and as when Innocent III. deposed Raymond of Toulouse for (among other reasons) not proceeding satisfactorily with the extirpation of the Albigenses. The Christian creed itself is chiefly composed of matters of fact set forth as articles of belief. And he who asserts that the acts of Popes did not go beyond their rights, distinctly expresses his belief in the claims of right which those acts involved.

"Fessler's other objection is that the form of the Syllabus does not set forth the intention of the Pope. But he appears to have overlooked the perfectly explicit covering letter of Antonelli, which in the Pope's name transmits the Syllabus, in order that the whole body of Latin Bishops might have before their eyes those errors and false doctrines of the age which the Pope had proscribed. Nor does Fessler venture to assert that the Syllabus is without dogmatic authority. He only says many theologians have doubts upon the question whether it be *ex cathedra*: theological science will hereafter have to examine and decide the matter: in the meantime every Roman Catholic is bound to submit and obey it. Such is the low or moderate doctrine concerning the Syllabus. Thus its dogmatic authority is probable: its title to universal obedience is absolute, while among its assertions is that the Church has the right to employ force, and that the Popes have not exceeded their powers or invaded the rights of princes."

Thus Mr. Gladstone proves that the Popes claimed authority from God to depose political rulers. Commenting on Cardinal Newman's apology for infallibility, Mr. Gladstone concludes thus:

"The lesson received is this. Although pledges were given, although their validity was firmly and even passionately asserted, although the subject-matter was one of civil allegiance, 'no pledge from Catholics was of any value to which Rome was not a party.' (p. 14)." Vaticanism, p. 29.

Re-read the astounding doctrine: THAT "NO PLEDGE FROM CATHOLICS WAS OF ANY VALUE TO WHICH ROME WAS NOT A

PARTY!" This amounts to the maxim ascribed to the Jesuits, that "*no faith is to be kept with heretics.*"

Some have vainly imagined that the political claims of the Popes in the dark ages have been repudiated, and that the Popes recently have claimed no such power. Mr. Gladstone, in his *Vaticanism*; pp. 63, 64, shows to the contrary, as follows:

"ALLEGED NON-INTERFERENCE OF THE POPES FOR TWO HUNDRED YEARS."

"It has been alleged on this occasion by a British Peer, who I have no doubt has been cruelly misinformed, that the Popes have not invaded the province of the civil power during the last two hundred years.

"I will not travel over so long a period, but am content even with the last twenty.

"1. In his Allocution of the 22d of January, 1855, Pius IX. declared to be absolutely null and void all acts of the Government of Piedmont which he held to be in prejudice of the rights of Religion, the Church, and the Roman See, and particularly a law proposed for the suppression of the monastic orders as moral entities, that is to say as civil corporations.

"2. On the 26th of July the same year, Pius IX. sent forth another Allocution, in which he recited various acts of the Government of Spain, including the establishment of toleration for non-Roman worship, and the secularization of ecclesiastical property; and, by his own Apostolical authority, he declared all the laws hereto relating to be abrogated, totally null, and of no effect.

"3. On the 22nd of June, 1862, in another Allocution, Pius IX. recited the provisions of an Austrian law of the previous December, which established freedom of opinion, of the press, of belief, of conscience, of science, of education, and of religious profession, and which regulated matrimonial jurisdiction and other matters. The whole of these 'abominable' laws 'have been and shall be totally void, and without all force whatsoever.'

"In all these cases reference is made, in general terms, to Concordats, of which the Pope alleges the violation; but he never bases his annulment of the laws upon this allegation.

And Schrader, in his work on the Syllabus, founds the cancellation of the Spanish law, in the matter of toleration, not on the Concordat, but on the original inherent right of the Pope to enforce the 77th Article of the Syllabus, respecting the exclusive establishment of the Roman religion." *Vaticanism*, pp. 63, 64.

This settles the question that all the Popes, down even to the present claimed, by divine right, authority over emperors, kings, princes, and all political governments. Those in the United States, that are laboring so earnestly for the establishment of the Pope's temporal power, are laboring to elevate the Pope to authority over all civil governments.

W. E. Gladstone in his work called "*Vatican Decrees in their bearing on Civil Allegiance*," published in 1875 among other propositions condemned by Pope Pius IX., p. 123, records the following:

"54. Kings and princes are not only exempt from the jurisdiction of the Church, but are superior to the Church, in litigated questions of jurisdiction."

Apostolic Letter Multiplices Inter, 10th June, 1851.

"55. The Church ought to be separated from the State, and the State from the Church."

Allocution Acerbissimum, 27th sept. 1852."

According to this, the Pope holds that *kings and princes in question of political jurisdiction are under the jurisdiction of the Church!* Also, *the Pope holds that the Church ought not to be separated from the State and the State from the Church.* This union of Church and State has been the cause of nearly all the persecutions which have been waged against the disciples of Christ. For this reason, the Roman Church, as the Babylon of Revelation, is charged with having made "the kings of the earth," "and the inhabitants of the earth" drunk "with the wine of her fornication." Also, Mr. Gladstone quotes the

Syllabus of Pope Pius IX., where that Pope condemns the following propositions:

"78. In the present day, it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion shall be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other modes of worship.

Allocution *Nemo Vestrum*, 26th July, 1855.

78. Whence it has been wisely provided by law, in some countries called Catholic, that persons coming to reside therein shall enjoy the public exercise of their own worship.

Allocution *Acerbissimum*, 27th Sept., 1852.

79. Moreover, it is false that the civil liberty of every mode of worship, and the full power given to all of overtly and publicly manifesting their opinions and their ideas, of all kinds whatsoever, conduce more easily to corrupt the morals and minds of the people, and to the propagation of the pest of indifferentism.

Allocution *Numquam Fore*, 15th Dec., 1856.

80. The Roman Pontiff can and ought to reconcile himself to, and agree with, progress, liberalism, and civilization as lately introduced.

Allocution *Jandudum Cernimus*, 18th March, 1861."

Vatican Decrees in their bearing on Civil Allegiance. pp. 128, 129.

By condemning the above propositions, Pope Pius really affirms that it is expedient "*that the Catholic religion shall be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other modes of worship.*"

Also, the Pope by condemning proposition 78 affirms that persons coming into Catholic countries shall not "*enjoy the public exercise of their own worship.*"

In condemning proposition 79, the Pope affirms that full religious liberty tends "*to corrupt the morals and minds of the people,*" and by condemning proposition 80 the Roman Pontiff ought not "*to reconcile himself to, and agree with, progress, liberalism, and civilization as lately introduced.*"

Thus the Pope by his pretended infallible decrees, has placed himself in direct opposition TO PROGRESS, LIBERTY, AND CIVILIZATION? Popery is the dark ages extended down to the present time. The Roman Catholic Church is not only anti-Christ, but anti-American in every sense of the word.

Another work called "Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance," was written by Cardinal Henry Edward Manning, as a reply to Mr. Gladstone's work of the same name. Cardinal Manning ranked among the ablest writers of the Roman Church. In his Vatican Decrees, page 84, Cardinal Manning has the following:

"I altogether deny the argument, or inference, or call it what you will. I affirm that the deposition of Henry IV. and Frederic II. of Germany were legitimate, right, and lawful; and I affirm that a deposition of Queen Victoria would not be legitimate, nor right, nor lawful, because the moral conditions which were present to justify the deposition of the Emperors of Germany are absent in the case of Queen Victoria; and therefore such an act could not be done."

Exactly. The conditions which were present in the dethronement of Emperors Henry IV. and Frederic II. of Germany, are not present for the dethronement of Queen Victoria, because the Pope lacks the power to enforce his anathema, "*therefore such an act could not be done.*" But, if Pope Leo, in the present day, had the same power to enforce his anathemas against kings and emperors, as did the Popes of the middle ages, he would hurl his thunder-bolts from the Vatican against the crowned heads of Europe and send them tumbling from their thrones. But thanks to the Great Ruler over the nations, the God of Heaven, the "CONDITIONS" have changed "AND THEREFORE SUCH AN ACT COULD NOT BE DONE."

Cardinal Manning, in his Vatican Decrees, page 54, says:

"If, then, the Civil Power be not competent to decide the limits of the Spiritual Power, and if the Spiritual Power can de-

fine with a Divine certainty its own limits, it is evidently supreme. Or, in other words, the Spiritual Power knows with Divine certainty the limits of its own jurisdiction; and it knows therefore the limits and the competence of the Civil Power. It is thereby in matters of religion and conscience supreme."

This is the bold assertion that the Pope is supreme, OVER ALL CIVIL AUTHORITY. In his Vatican Decrees, page 53, Cardinal Manning says:

"If Christian Princes and their laws deviate from the law of God, the Church has authority from God to judge of that deviation, and by all its powers to enforce the correction of that departure from justice. I do not see how any man who believes in the Revelation of Christianity can dispute this assertion: and to such alone I am at present speaking.

'Mr. Gladstone has quoted a passage from an 'Essay on Cæsarism and Ultramontanism,' in which I have claimed for the Church a supremacy in spiritual things over the State, and have made this statement:

'Any power which is independent and can alone fix the limits of its own jurisdictions, and can thereby fix the limits of all other jurisdictions, is *ipso facto*, supreme. But the Church of Jesus Christ, within the sphere of revelation—of faith and morals—is all this, or is nothing or worse than nothing, an imposture and an usurpation; that is, it is Christ or Anti-Christ.'

Cardinal Manning's book from which this is quoted was written in 1875. He boldly reproduces the most abominable claims of the Papacy of the dark ages. He claims that the Pope has a right to judge when Princes deviate from the laws of God, and has authority from God to "enforce the correction of that departure from justice." In other words, the Pope may use political force to punish civil rulers who disobey his laws, which he blasphemously calls the laws of God. Also Cardinal Manning claims that the Pope has authority to fix the limits of his own jurisdiction and can thereby fix the limits of all other jurisdictions, and is, "SUPREME," over all political rulers. He claims that the Church, which means himself, has

all this authority, or it is "an imposture and an usurpation; that is, it is Christ or Anti-christ." We agree with the Cardinal in the latter conclusion, that the Roman Church, especially the Pope, is Anti-Christ.

Cardinal Manning, in his Vatican Decrees, page 73, has the following:

"Bellarmine states his own opinion in these words:

'Temporal Princes, when they come to the family of Christ, lose neither their princely power nor jurisdiction; but they become subject to him whom Christ has set over his family, to be governed and directed by him in those things which lead to eternal life.'

On page 74, he quotes Suarez:

"Suarez lays down precisely the same doctrine as Bellarmine. He says:

'Those authors who teach absolutely that the Pope has Supreme Power, and that *temporal*, in the whole world, mean this, 'that the Pontiff, in virtue of his *Spiritual* power and jurisdiction, is superior to Kings and temporal Princes, so as to direct them in the use of their *temporal* power in order to *Spiritual* ends.'

Thus Cardinal Manning endorses Bellarmine and Saurez in their assertions of the Popes absolute supreme temporal power over "the whole world." It must be remembered by those who think that popery has changed for the better that no Pope has ever retracted one iota of the preposterous claims of the popes of the dark ages.

Once more: In his Vatican Decrees, on page 40, Cardinal Manning states:

"The political conscience of Catholics is not left to the individual judgement alone. It is guided by the whole Christian morality, by the greatest system of ethical legislation the world has ever seen, the Canon Law and the Moral Theology of the Catholic Church."

But the Pope is to decide what is the Canon Law or the Moral Theology of the Catholic Church. Therefore "the pol-

itical conscience of Catholics" is guided by the Pope.

These with innumerable other proofs, settle it beyond all cavil, that the Pope claims supreme spiritual and political authority over the whole world. The only reason he does not enforce his political authority lies in the fact that the Pope lacks political armies to enforce his political authority over the whole world.

OATHS OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE POPE.

The different oaths of Allegiance to the Pope of Rome all require political as well as spiritual obedience to him.

THE BISHOP'S OATH.

The Bishop swears as follows :

"I, N., elect of the church of N., from henceforward will be faithful and obedient to St. Peter, the apostle, and to the holy Roman church, and to our Lord, the Lord N., pope N., and to his successors, canonically entering.

"I will neither advise, consent, nor do anything that they may lose life or member, or that their persons may be seized, or hands in anywise laid upon them, or any injuries offered to them under any pretense whatsoever.

"The counsel with which they shall entrust me by themselves, their messages, or letters, I will not knowingly reveal to any to their prejudice. I will help them to defend and keep the Roman papacy and THE ROYALTIES OF ST. PETER, saving my order, against all men. The legate of the apostolic See, going and coming, I will honorably treat and help in his necessities. The rights, honors, privileges, and authority of the holy Roman Church of our Lord the Pope, and his aforesaid successors, I will endeavor to preserve, defend, increase and advance. I will not be in any counsel, action or treaty in which shall be plotted against our said Lord and the said Roman Church, anything to the hurt or prejudice of their persons, right, honor, state or power: and if I shall know any such thing to be treated or agitated by any whatsoever I will hinder it to my utmost and as soon as I can will signify it to our said Lord, or to some other by whom it may come to his knowledge. The rules of the holy fathers, the apostolic decrees, ordinances or

disposals, reservations, provisions, and mandates, I will observe with all my might, and cause to be observed by others.

HERETICS, SCHISMATICS AND REBELS TO OUR SAID LORD, OR HIS AFORESAID SUCCESSORS, I WILL TO MY UTMOST PERSECUTE AND OPPOSE. I WILL COME TO a counsel when I am called, unless I be hindered by a canonical impediment. I will by myself in person visit the threshold of the apostles every three years: and give an account to our Lord and his aforesaid successors of all my pastoral office, and of all things anywise belonging to the state of my church, to the discipline of my clergy and people, and lastly to the salvation of souls committed to my trust: and will in like manner humbly receive and diligently execute the apostolic commands. And if I be detained by a lawful impediment I will perform all the things aforesaid by a certain messenger hereto especially empowered, a member of my chapter, or some other in ecclesiastical dignity, or else having a parsonage, or in default of those by a priest of the diocese; or in default of one of the clergy of the diocese, by some other secular or regular priest of approved integrity and religion fully instructed in all things above mentioned. And such impediment I will make out by lawful proofs to be transmitted by the aforesaid messenger to the cardinal proponent of the Holy Roman Church in the congregation of the sacred council. The possessions belonging to my table I will neither sell, nor give away, nor mortgage, nor grant anew in fee, nor anywise alienate, not even with the consent of the chapter of my Church, without consulting the Roman Pontiff. And if I shall make any alienations, I will thereby incur the penalties contained in a certain constitution put forth about this matter. So help me God and these holy gospels of God." Dowling's History of Romanism. pp. 615, 616.

This fearful oath taken by each Bishop of Rome, binds him "to depend and keep the Roman Papacy, and the royalties of St. Peter, saving my order, against all men." These royalties of St. Peter, so-called, mean the temporal power of the Pope. Also, the Bishop swears "THAT HERETICS, SCHISMATICS AND REBELS TO OUR SAID LORD, OR HIS AFORESAID SUCCESSORS, I WILL TO MY UTMOST PERSECUTE AND OPPOSE." Thus every

Bishop is sworn to PERECUTE AND OPPOSE, to the utmost of his power, not only "HERETICS," but "REBELS TO OUR SAID LORD," THE POPE!

ROMAN PRIEST'S OATH.

"I, A. B., do acknowledge the ecclesiastical power of His Holiness and the mother Church of Rome, as the chief head and matron above all pretended churches throughout the whole earth; and that my zeal shall be for St. Peter and his successors, as the founder of the true and ancient Catholic faith, against all heretical kings, princes, states or powers, repugnant unto the same; and although I, A. B., may follow, in case of persecution, or otherwise to be heretically despised, yet in soul and conscience I shall hold, aid, and succor the mother Church of Rome, as the true, ancient, and apostolic Church; I, A. B., further do declare not to act or control any matter or thing prejudicial unto her, in her sacred orders, doctrines, or tenets or commands, without leave of its supreme power or its authority, under her appointed, or to be appointed; and being so permitted, then to act, and further her interests more than my own earthly good and earthly pleasure, as she and her Head, His Holiness, and His successors have, or ought to have, the supremacy over all kings, princes, estates, or powers whatsoever, either to deprive them of their crowns, scepters, powers, privileges, realms, countries, or governments, or to set up others in lieu thereof, they dissenting from the mother church and her commands." Romanism: The Danger Ahead, by A. J. Grover, p. 115.

Thus the Priest takes the solemn oath to support the Pope, "AGAINST ALL HERETICAL KINGS, PRINCES, STATES AND POWERS, REPUGNANT TO THE SAME." According to his oath, in case of a conflict between the Pope and "heretical kings, princes, states or powers," the priest must support the Pope. Therefore every priest is sworn to support the Pope against all other political powers. No Roman Catholic bishop or priest can be a loyal citizen of the United States, while he owes his first political allegiance to the Pope of Rome, who is a foreign despot.

THE PRIVATE MEMBER'S OATH.

Though not called an oath, every member of the Roman Catholic Church repeats his oath of obedience to the Pope every time he repeats his creed. The creed of Pope Pius IV., formulated in the sixteenth century, is the creed of every Roman Catholic in the world. In this creed repeated in the name of God, "by God's assistance" the Romanist says: "I promise true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ." He also swears to receive and endorse the "Canons and General Councils."

These sacred Canons and General Councils have endorsed the political power of the Pope; therefore, every Roman Catholic who endorses his creed, endorses the political authority of the Pope. This creed of Pope Pius IV. as recorded in Ligouri's Mission Book, pp. 272-275, we give entire as follows:

"I, N. N., with a firm faith believe and profess all and every one of those things which are contained in that creed which the holy Roman Church maketh use of. To-wit: I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, of all things visible and invisible: and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, born of the Father before all ages; God of God; Light of light; true God of the true God; begotten not made, consubstantial with the Father, by whom all things were made. Who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man. He was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate, suffered and was buried. And the third day he arose again according to the Scriptures: he ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of the Father, and shall come again with glory to judge the living and the dead; of whose kingdom there shall be no end. I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and the life-giver, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son: who together with the Father and the Son, is adored and glorified; who spake by the prophets. And in one holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. I

confess one baptism for the remission of sins; and I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.

"I most steadfastly admit and embrace the apostolical and ecclesiastical Traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church.

"I also admit the holy Scriptures, according to that sense which our holy mother the Church hath held and doth hold, to whom it belongeth to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures; neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

"I also profess that there are truly and properly Seven Sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one: to-wit, Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Order and Matrimony; and that they confer grace: and that of these, Baptism, Confirmation, and Order cannot be repeated without sacrilege. I also receive and admit the received and approved ceremonies of the Catholic Church used in the solemn administration of the aforesaid sacraments.

"I embrace and receive all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the holy Council of Trent concerning original sin and justification.

"I profess, likewise, that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. And that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist there is truly, really and substantially the Body and Blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the Blood; which Conversion the Catholic Church calleth transubstantiation. I also confess that under either kind alone Christ is received whole and entire, and a true sacrament.

"I constantly hold that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrage of the faithful.

"Likewise, that the saints reigning together with Christ are

to be honored and invoked, and that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be had in veneration.

"I most firmly assert that the Images of Christ, of the Mother of God ever Virgin, and also of other Saints, ought to be had and retained, and that due honor and veneration are to be given them. I also affirm that the power of Indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people.

"I acknowledge the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church for the mother and mistress of all Churches; and I promise true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.

"I likewise undoubtedly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and General Councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent. And I condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies which the Church hath condemned, rejected, and anathematized.

"I, N. N., do at this present freely profess and sincerely hold this true Catholic faith, out of which no one can be saved: and I promise most constantly to retain and confess the same entire and inviolate, by God's assistance, to the end of my life." Liguori's Mission Book. pp. 272-275.

Thus in repeating his creed, every Roman Catholic, in the name of God, solemnly affirms and promises "true obedience to the Bishop of Rome," the Pope. True obedience to the Pope includes temporal as well as spiritual subjection. No person can be a true loyal citizen to the United States Government and a loyal subject to the Pope at the same time.

THE JESUIT'S OATH.

The most horrible oath of submission to the Pope, both spiritually and politically, is taken by the Jesuits. We copy the Jesuit's Oath from Dowling's History of Romanism, p. 605, thus:

"I, A. B., now in the presence of Almighty God, the blessed Virgin Mary, the Blessed Michael the Archangel, the blessed St. John Baptist, the holy apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and

the saints and sacred host of heaven, and to you my ghostly father do declare from my heart, without mental reservation, that pope Gregory is Christ's Vicar-General, and is the true and only Head of the universal church throughout the earth; and that by virtue of the keys of binding and loosing, given to his Holiness by Jesus Christ, HE HATH POWER TO DEPOSE HERETICAL KINGS, PRINCES, STATES, COMMONWEALTHS, AND GOVERNMENTS, ALL BEING ILLEGAL, WITHOUT HIS SACRED CONFIRMATION, AND THAT THEY MAY SAFELY BE DESTROYED; therefore to the utmost of my power, I will defend this doctrine and his Holiness's rights and customs against all usurpers of the heretical or protestant authority whatsoever, especially against the now pretended authority and church in England, and all adherents, in regard that they be usurped and heretical, opposing the sacred mother church of Rome.

"I DO RENOUNCE AND DISOWN ANY ALLEGIANCE AS DUE TO ANY HERETICAL KING, PRINCE, OR STATE, NAMED PROTESTANT, OR OBEDIENCE TO ANY OF THEIR INFERIOR MAGISTRATES OR OFFICERS. I do further declare the doctrine of the church of England; of the Calvinists, Huguenots, and other protestants, to be damnable, and those to be damned who will not forsake the same. I do further declare, that I will help, assist and advise all or any of his Holiness's agents in *any place wherever I shall be*; and do my utmost to extirpate the heretical protestant doctrine, and to destroy all their pretended power, legal or otherwise. I do further promise and declare, that notwithstanding I am *dispensed with to assume any religion heretical*, for the propagation of the mother church's interest, to keep secret and private all her agent's counsels, as they entrust me, and not to divulge, directly or indirectly, by word, writing or circumstances whatsoever, but to execute all which shall be proposed, given in charge, or discovered unto me, by you my ghostly father, or by anyone of this convent. All which I, A. B., do swear by the blessed Trinity, and blessed Sacrament, which I am now to receive, to perform and on my part to keep inviolably; and do call all the heavenly and glorious host of heaven, to witness my real intentions to keep this my oath. In testimony hereof, I take this most holy and blessed sacrament of the eucharist, and witness the same furth-

er with my hand and seal, in the face of this holy convent." Dowling's History of Romanism. p. 605.

Prostrate at the feet of his "ghostly father" the Bishop, in the name of Almighty God and all the heavenly hosts, the Jesuit swears that the Pope is Christ's Vicar-General, having "power to depose heretical kings, princes, states, commonwealths, and governments," and unless they have the endorsement of the Pope "they may safely be destroyed." This is the undisguised, real, Roman Catholic doctrine. It is the Ultramontanism so stoutly advocated by the *Church Progress*, and other extreme Papists, in this country. How can such persons be loyal citizens of the United States. Furthermore, the Jesuit swears: "*I do renounce and disown any allegiance as due to any heretical king, prince, or state named protestant, or obedience to any of their inferior magistrates or officers.*"

No well informed person on the subject can believe that a Roman Jesuit can be anything less than a sworn enemy to the United States Government. The Jesuit is a deceitful spy, using all the trickery of Jesuitism to overthrow our institutions, and bring the government of the United States into servile subjection to the feet of the Pope. Let every loyal citizen of this great country meet this deadly foe at the ballot box and sweep away popery from all control in the management in this government.

THE POPE'S ANATHEMA OR CURSE.

At the present time it is understood that the anathemas of the Pope, while meaning the same, are contained in milder words, than when popery was in the glory of its power. We copy the curse pronounced by Pope Pius IX. upon Victor Emmanuel, from Grover's "Danger Ahead," as follows:

"Victor Emmanuel and his patriotic countrymen wrested the temporal power from Pius IX., and liberated the Italian people from the power of the Church of Rome forever, so far

as civil government is concerned. Being otherwise powerless, the pope strikes back, with a curse, which is here given, as printed in the Philadelphia *Morning Post*. It is the perfection of pious swearing by the Vicegerent of God, who said "swear not at all."

"By authority of the Almighty God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and of the Holy-Canons, and of the undefiled Virgin Mary, mother and nurse of our Savior, and of the celestial virtues, angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, powers, cherubims, and seraphims; and of the holy patriarchs and prophets; and of all the apostles and evangelists; and of the holy innocents, who, in the sight of the Holy Lamb, are found worthy to sing the new song; and of the holy martyrs and holy confessors, and of the holy virgins, and of all the saints, together with all the holy and elect of God, we excommunicate and anathematize him, and from the threshold of the holy church of God Almighty we sequester him, that he may be tormented in external excruciating sufferings, together with Dathan and Abiram, and those who say to the Lord God, 'Depart from us; we desire none of Thy ways.' And as fire is quenched with water, so let the light of him be put out forevermore. May the Son who suffered for us curse him. May the Father who created man curse him. May the Holy Ghost which was given to us in our baptism curse him. May the Holy cross which Christ, for our salvation triumphing over his enemies, ascended, curse him. May the Holy and eternal Virgin Mary, mother of God, curse him. May St. Michael, the advocate of holy souls, curse him. May all the angels and archangels, principalities and powers, and all the heavenly armies, curse him. May St. John, the precursor, and St. Peter and St. Paul, and St. John the Baptist, and St. Andrew, and all other Christ's apostles together curse him, and may the rest of his disciples and the four Evangelists, who, by their preaching converted the universal world—and may the holy and wonderful company of martyrs and confessors, who by their holy work are found pleading to God Almighty—curse him. May the Choir of the Holy Virgins, who for the honor of Christ have despised the things of this world, damn him. May all the saints who from the beginning of the world and everlasting

ages are found to be beloved of God, damn him. May the heavens, and the earth, and all things remaining therein, damn him.

May he be damned wherever he may be; whether in the house or in the field, whether in the highway or on the byway, whether in the wood or water, or whether in the church. May he be cursed in living and dying, in eating and drinking, in fasting and thirsting, in slumbering and sleeping, in watching or walking, in standing or sitting, in lying down or walking, *mengendo, cancando*, and in blood-letting. May he be cursed in all the faculties of his body. May he be cursed inwardly and outwardly. May he be cursed in his hair. May he be cursed in his brain. May he be cursed in the crown of his head and in his temples. In his forehead and in his ears. In his eyebrows and in his cheeks. In his jawbones and in his nostrils. In his foreteeth and in his grinders. In his lips and in his throat. In his shoulders and in his wrists. In his arms, his hands, and in his fingers. May he be damned in his mouth, in his breast, in his heart, and in all the *viscera* of his body. May he be damned in his veins and in his groin; in his thighs and genital organs; and in his hips and in his knees; in his legs, feet, and toe nails.

May he be cursed in all his joints and articulations of his body. From the top of his head to the sole of his foot may there be no soundness in him. May the Son of the living God, with all the glory of His Majesty, curse him, and may heaven, with all the powers that move therein, rise up against him—curse and damn him! Amen. So let it be! Amen." Romanism: *The Danger Ahead*. pp. 112-115.

It would be hard for the devil himself to excel this awful curse of the pretended "Holy Father." The modern anathemas of the Pope are as harmless as the old time Pope's Bull against the comet. In fact, his blessings, in modern years, upon political princes and usurpers, have been real curses.

THE POPE'S ANATHEMAS AGAINST PRINCES.

In the Oral Discussion between Archbishop John Hughes and Rev. John Breckenridge, Mr. Breckenridge describes some of the claims and curses of the Popes as follows:

"The Pope of Rome professes to be the vicegerent of God on earth, to dispose of the Church and State at his will. Hence the Pope gave a grant of America to Spain, (which has never yet been revoked,) even before America was discovered. The Pope, Pius V., in his bull against Queen Elizabeth, recites his prerogative in no measured terms. In that bull he deprives her of her kingdom, and releases her subjects from their allegiance to her. 'He who reigns on high, to whom is given all power in heaven and on earth, hath committed the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, *out of which there is no salvation*, to one alone, on earth, namely, to Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and to the Roman Pontiff, successor of Peter, to be governed with the fullness of power. *This one man hath he appointed prince over all NATIONS, AND ALL KINGDOMS, that he may pluck up, destroy, scatter, ruin, plant, build.*' To this latter trust he has been eminently faithful! Here is *godship on earth in church and state*. Where any *liberty* can lurk, in these pretensions, or under this universal theocracy, I am at a loss to conceive.

Again: the bull of Sixtus V. against Henry, king of Navarre, and the prince of Conde, thus runs: 'The authority given to St. Peter and his successors, by the immense power of the Eternal King, excels all the powers of earthly kings and princes. It passes uncontrollable sentence upon all, and if it find any of them resisting God's ordinance, it takes a more severe vengeance of them, and, casting down the most powerful of them from their thrones, tumbles them down into the lowest parts of the earth, as the ministers of the proud Lucifer.'

Among the twenty-seven celebrated Sentences, or Dictates, of Pope Gregory VII. are such as these, viz.:

- 8th. That the Pope alone can use imperial ensigns.
- 9th. That all princes must kiss the feet of the Pope only.
- 12th. That it is lawful for him to depose emperors.
- 17th. That no chapter or book may be accounted canonical without his authority.
- 18th. That his sentence may be retracted by none; and he alone may retract all men's.
- 19th. That he himself ought to be judged by no man.

27th. That he may absolve the subjects of unjust men from fidelity, (to their princes.)

These Dictates are *papal definitions of papal power*. They have been preserved by the papal writers; believed and observed by the priesthood; and never revoked, rescinded, or condemned by any council, or any Pope. Of this Cardinal Baronius is a good witness who asserts, concerning these *Dictates*—*Sententias eas hactenus in Ecclesia Catholica, usu receptas fuisse, quibus reprimetur audacia schismaticorum principum hoc tempore in Romanam Ecclesiam insurgentium. That these sentences had heretofore (to the eleventh century) been received into use in the Catholic Church; by them the audacity of schismatic princes, who had during that time arisen in the Roman Church, had been restrained.*

It were a curious and instructive piece of history to compile into one table, after the example of Bellarmine, not the dozen but the *two hundred* examples, in which *Popes* have actually carried their principles into effect in the excommunication, or deposition, or both, as the case might be, of offensive kings and emperors.

We give below an imperfect tabular view, promising to add, altar, or diminish, at the suggestion of Mr. Hughes, on good evidence of error. We have no doubt his *superior knowledge of this topic in history* will enable him greatly to enlarge the table.

<i>Popes.</i>	<i>Princes excommunicated, or deposed, or both.</i>
Gregory II.....	Leo. III.,
Gregory III.....	Leo. III.,
Pascal I.....	Leo. V.,
John VIII.....	Lewis, King of Germany.
Gregory V.....	Robert, King of France.
Adrian II.....	Lothario,
Gregory VII.....	Henry IV.,
	Balislus, King of Poland.
Urban II.....	Henry IV., Emperor.
	Phillip I., King of France.
Pascal II.....	Henry IV.,
	Henry V.,
Calixtus II.....	Henry V.,
Gelasius II.....	Henry V.,
Adrain IV.....	William, King of Sicily.

Alexander III.....	{ Frederic I., Emperor. Henry II., King of England.
Celestine III.....	{ Henry VI., Emperor. Alphonso, King of Gallicia. Philip and Otho, Emperors.
Innocent III.....	{ John, King of England. Philip II., of France. Ladislaus, King of Poland. Louis VII., and Louis VIII., of France.

This [Innocent III.] was the monster who said. 'It has pleased God so to order the affairs of the world, that those provinces which had anciently *been subject to the Roman Church in spirituals, were now become subject to it in temporal.*' And again: 'Jesus Christ, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, and Priest according to the order of Melchizedeck, hath so united the royal and priestly power, in his church, that the kingdom is but a royal priesthood, and the priesthood the royal power.

He said, 'the church, my spouse, is not married to me without bringing me something. She has given me a dowry of price beyond all price, *the plenitude of spiritual things, and the full extent (latitudinem temporalium) of temporal things.* She hath given me the *mitre, in token of things spiritual; the crown, in token of things temporal,* the mitre, for the priesthood; the crown for the kingdom—making me the *lieutenant* of Him who hath written upon his thigh and upon his vesture, King of kings, and Lord of lords: I ENJOY ALONE THE PLENTITUDE OF POWER, THAT OTHERS MAY SAY OF ME, NEXT TO GOD, *'and out of his fulness we have received!!!'* Such were his blasphemous claims, which the Church of Rome has not *denounced* but *sustained*.

But to continue our list:

Popes.	Princes.
Honorius.....	{ Frederic II., } Emperors.
Gregory IX.....	{ Frederic II., } Wincessaus.
Innocent IV.....	Frederic II., Emperor.
Urban IV.....	{ Manfred and } Kings of Sicily.
Clement IV.....	Conradin.
Gregory X.....	{ Alphonso, King of Portugal. Alphonso X., King of Castile.
Nicholas III.....	Charles, King of Anjou.

Martin IV.....	{ Pêter of Arragon, Michael Paleologus, Emperor.
Honorius IV.....	{ James. Alphonso. } Kings of Arragon.
Nicholas IV.....	{ Alphonso. Alphonso. }
Boniface VIII.....	{ Phillip IV., King of France. Eric VIII., King of Denmark.
John XXII.....	Lewis, of Bavaria, } Emperors.
Benedict XII.....	Lewis,
Clement VI.....	Lewis,
Urban VI.....	{ Jane, Queen, } of Naples. Charles King }
Boniface IX.....	{ Lewis, of Anjou, Richard, Edward, } Kings of England. Wenchelous, Emperor.
Innocent VII.....	Ladislaus, } Kings of Naples.
Alexander V.....	Ladislaus, }
Sixtus IV.....	Ladislaus, King of Bohemia.
Julius II.....	{ Albert, King of Naples. Lewis XII., King of France.
Leo X.....	Stenon, King of Sweden.
Clement VII.....	Henry VIII., } King of England.
Paul III.....	Henry VIII., }
Pius V.....	Elizabeth, Queen of England.
Sixtus V.....	{ Henry III., King of France. Henry, King of Navarre.
Gregory XIV.....	Henry IV., King of France & Navarre.
Innocent VI.....	Ambassador of Louis XIV., of France.

Oral Discussion between Hughes and Breckenridge held in 1855. pp. 242-245.

That the Pope would assume the same authority over temporal princes now, provided he had the means of enforcing his curses, there can be no doubt.

But few are prepared to render proper gratitude to God for the emancipation of the nations from the dreadful anathmas of the Pope. The Jesuits are really the army of the Pope, doing secret service, politically of well as spiritually, for him. They are political spies and informers in every country which they infest. On account of their political intrignes and intolerable meanness, they have been, at different times, expelled from nearly all the kingdoms and governments of earth. Concern-

ing these expulsions, we quote from "Ultramontanism" a work published in Dublin, Ireland in 1868, as follows:

"The Jesuit Society, founded in 1534, and sanctioned by Pope Paul III. in 1540, was expelled from England 1581, France 1594, Portugal 1598; England again 1604; France again 1606; Venice 1606; England again 1610; Russia 1717; Portugal again 1759; France again 1762-3; Spain 1767; Genoa 1767; Venice again 1767; Sicily 1767; Naples 1768; Malta 1768; Parma 1768; all, with the exception of England and Russia, being strictly Roman Catholic States. Eventually the order was suppressed by Pope Clement XIV. in 1773; but continued to exist under other names, and, disguised under the title of 'Brothers of the Faith' it re-entered France, and had there several colleges in its hands, which were closed in 1828; some of them have since been re-opened, and within the last twenty years the number of persons belonging to the order has been doubled. The Society, notwithstanding its abolition by Pope Clement XIV. was re-established by Pope Pius VII. in 1814." Ultramontanism pp. 4, 5. (Foot note.)

This fearful political organization called the Society of Jesus, (Jesuits) was doubtless symbolized by the unclean spirit like a frog, which came out of the mouth of the beast. Rev. 16: 13. The Pope is using this secret political organization, which possesses Satanic wisdom to subvert the institution and liberties of the United States, and subject this country to Papal dominion. Unless the people are aroused to meet this foe at the ballot box, American liberty will be subverted unless prevented by revolution. There is no doubt but the Pope fondly hopes to gain the supremacy in this country. We quote from the sketches of Pius IX. by a Roman Catholic, as follows:

"But if Pius IX. suffers a great deal in seeing our holy religion oppressed in Europe, he consoles himself, however, and smiles with a smile of ineffable joy in viewing America—that America which a short time ago counted few Catholics, but which is now becoming faithful to the Church of Rome—that America in which not long ago our religion was but a very tender, weak plant, now already is becoming a beautiful,

vigorous tree. Yes, the illustrious Pontiff, Pius IX., sees the number of the faithful increasing very fast in America, and our holy religion flourishing like a bright lily in the midst of a beautiful garden. This is the reason why the Pope augments the number of the Bishops and Archbishops, and lately he vouchsafed to honor America by creating one of its children a Cardinal—a Prince of the Roman Church. And let us hope that in a few years more America will be principally Catholic. This happy success will be to the glory of the Church and to the consolation of our Holy Father, the Pope." Sketches of Pius IX. p. 232.

These "Sketches" of "Pius the Ninth, Pontiff and King," was written by Priest Nazareno Graziani, D. D., in the year 1876. Notwithstanding the Pope is loosing his power and authority in Europe "he consoles himself, however, and smiles with a smile of ineffable joy in viewing America." The Pope hopes "that in a few years more America will be principally Catholic," which will be "the consolation of our Holy Father, the Pope."

To accomplish this much desired end, "the Pope augments the number of Bishops and Archbishops" in America while literally flooding the country with his army of Jesuits, who as political spies are preparing this country to submit to the Papal yoke. Instead of one Cardinal in America, the Pope now has two Cardinals with the prospect of another, to wear the red hat, on this continent. War is being made on our public school system, (which is the bulwark of American liberty) by these emissaries of the Pope, who are the determined enemies of free education. Will the free born citizens of the United States bend the knee and bow their necks, to Papal slavery? We cannot believe that they will, because they are already awakening to a sense of the "danger ahead."

"ETERNAL VIGILANCE IS THE PRICE OF LIBERTY."

APPENDIX J.

THE GENERAL COUNCILS.

Robert J. Breckinridge, in his *Papism*, published in Baltimore in 1841, gives a chapter on the General Councils, as claimed by the Church of Rome. Romanists claim nineteen General Councils, the last of which was the Vatican Council held in the City of Rome in 1870, which declared the infallibility of the then reigning Pope Pius IX. These General Councils are also called *Ecumenical Councils*, which means general or universal. We quote from *Papism*, by Breckinridge, commencing on page 44, as follows:

"R. P. Vitus Pichler, a Jesuit, and a doctor both of theology and the canon law, is the author of one of the standard works on theology in the Romish church. His book is called *Theologica Polemica, &c.*, and the copy we have was published at Vienna in 1749, in quarto, with the *imprimatur* of *Fra Paolo Tommaso Manuelli*, inquisitor general of Venice, countersigned by four other worthies, with unpronounceable Italian names, and horrid abbreviations of still more ridiculous titles. These all certify of the book that "non v'esser cosa alcuna contra la santa fede cattolica." He is therefore reliable authority to prove what is Catholicity. We translate from pages 278-285 inclusive, what follows upon the subjects of *general councils which are lawful, general councils which are unlawful, and general councils which are partly lawful and partly unlawful.*

"I. GENERAL COUNCILS WHICH WERE LAWFUL.

I. *Nice*, which was held at the city of Nice. The council of Sardicense, held some years after this, was an appendix to it.

The era of this council was the year of Christ 327; Sylvester being pope, and Constantine the great emperor.

There were present at it 318 fathers. Hosius, Vitus and Vincentius were the pope's legates, and presided at it. Of these, only the first was a bishop, the other two being only presbyters.

This council condemned the heresy of Arius, who denied the Divinity of Christ; and composed the Nicene creed.

2. *Constantinople*; held partly at Constantinople in the east, partly at Rome in the west.

About the year 381, Damascus being pope, and the elder Theodosius emperor.

"There were in it 150 Catholic fathers and 36 Macedonians, or Simi-Arians. The Pope did not preside either personally or by legates, yet he confirmed it as to faith.

The heresy of Macedonius, who denied the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, was condemned, and the Nicene creed confirmed by this council.

3. *Ephesinum*; held at Ephesus the metropolis of Asia Minor.

About the year 430, Celestine being Pope, and Theodosius the younger and Valentinian III., emperors.

Present 200 fathers; Cyril, archbishop of Alexandria, and other legates of the pope presiding.

This council condemned the heresy of Nestorius, who admitting the existence of two persons in Christ, declared the blessed virgin to be the mother of Christ only (*Christiparam*), and not the mother of God, (*Deiperam*) because she only bore the human person of Christ; against which error, the words "mother of God pray for us, &c." were added to the angelic salutation.

4. *Chalcedon*; so called from the city of Chalcedon in Bythnia, where it was celebrated.

About the year 451, Leo the Great being pope, and Marcian emperor.

Present 630 fathers; the legates of pope Leo presided, and he afterwards confirmed the council, but only as it respects matters of faith.

It condemned the heresy of Eutychitis and Dioscoris, who

admitted the existence of but one nature in Christ.

5. *Constantinople II.* About the year 553 Virgilius being pope, Justinian emperor.

Some say 165, others 255 fathers were present. The pope was neither present nor represented by legates, but he approved it by an epistle.

This council condemned the heresy of Origen and the three capitularies of the bishops Theodore, Theodoret, and Iba, but not their persons.

6. *Constantinople III.* To which the synod of Trullana, otherwise called Quini-Sexta, was an appendix.

About 680; Agatho being pope, and Constantine IV., emperor.

Present about 289 fathers. Peter and George, presbyters, and John, a deacon, presided as legates from the pope.

It condemned the heresy of the Monothelites, who asserted that there was only one will in Christ.

7. *Nice II.* About 781; Adrian being pope, and Constantine reigning in the empire with his mother Irene.

Present 350 fathers. Peter an arch-presbyter, and Peter the abbot, presiding as the pope's legates.

Condemned the heresy of the Iconoclasts, the emperors Leo the Isaurian, and Constantine Copronymus; who despoiled the sacred images of Christ and the saints, of all honor.

8. *Constantinople IV.* About the year 869; Adrian II., being pope, and Basil emperor.

There were 102 fathers; and the pontifical legates presided.

Photius, patriarch of Constantinople, who had intruded by force, was rejected, and Ignatius restored. The Iconomacians (or destroyers of images) were again condemned.

9. *Lateran I.* So-called from the Lateran palace at Rome.

About the year 1122; Calixtus II., being pope, and Henry V., emperor.

More than 300 fathers attended; the pope presiding in person.

Called to make peace between the church and the empire, and to promote the war against the Saracens for the recovery of the holy land.

10. *Lateran II.* About 1139; Innocent II., being pope; under the emperor Lothair II., or Conrad king of the Romans. About 1000 fathers; the pope presiding in person.

Condemned the anti-popes Anacletus and Victor. Passed acts concerning the right of clergy, and the reformation of morals.

11. *Lateran III.* About 1179: Alexander III., being pope and Fredric I., emperor.

About 300 fathers; the pope presiding in person.

The Cathari, whom some called Waldenses, and Albigenses, were condemned as heretics. Many things determined concerning the election of the pope, and the reformation of morals.

12. *Lateran IV.* In the year 1245; Innocent IV., being pope, and Frederic II., emperor.

There were present about 400 bishops; besides about 800 inferior prelates, the pope himself presided.

Condemned the heresies of the Albigenses and the errors of the abbot Joachim. Passed acts for settling the peace of Christendom, and for recovering the holy land.

13. *Lugdunense. I (Lyons.)* So called from the city of Lyons in France.

In the year 1245; Innocent IV., being pope, and Frederic II. emperor.

There were 140 fathers present, and the pope presided in person.

They excommunicated and deposed the Emperor Frederic II., called Barbarossa, as a rebel against the pope; and directed an expedition into Palestine.

14. *Lugdunense II. (Lyons.)* The year 1274; Gregory X., being pope, and Rudolph emperor.

Almost 1000 fathers present, of whom 500 were bishops, the pope again personally presiding.

Condemned the heresy of the Greeks, who say that the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son, but from the father alone. A union was made with the Greeks, whose emperor, Michael Paleologus was himself present. They united in an act for the recovery of Palestine.

15. *Vienense.* (*Vienne.*) So called from the city of Vienne, in France.

Held in 1311; Clement V. being pope; and Henry VII., emperor. This pope framed the constitutions which are called the canon law, *Clementine.*

About 300 bishops present, the pope again presiding.

The heresies of the Beghards, the Berguines and the Fratricelli condemned. The order of Templars, (so called, because they dwelt near the temple in Jerusalem) was suppressed. And a new decree for an expedition into the holy land.

16. *Florence.* Held at Florence, in Italy, not having been completed at Ferrara.

Held in 1438, not having been completed at Ferrara; Eugene IV., being pope, and Albert emperor.

Subscribed by 141 fathers. Many others, having departed beforehand. The pope himself presided.

Against the errors of the Greeks, whose emperor, John Paleologus was present. A union of the Greeks and Arminians, with the Latins was effected, but after their return to Greece, they relapsed into their former errors.

17. *Lateran V.* Inchoate in 1512 under Pope Julius II. Complete in 1517, under Leo X. Maximilian I., was emperor.

Present 114 fathers; the pope himself presiding.

Called to heal the schism propogated by the council of Pisa. The *sedition of Luther* prevented the expedition against the Turks which it ordered.

18. *Trent.* (*Tridentinum.*) Commenced at Trent, in Germany, continued at Bononia, and finished at Trent.

Inchoate in 1545, under pope Paul III., continued under Julius III., Marcellus II., and Paul IV. finished under Pius VI., [rather Pius IV.] in 1563. Charles V., and Ferdinand I. were emperors.

Subscribed by 255 fathers. Many could not remain till the end of the council, which lasted 18 years, under the presidency of various pontifical legates.

The Lutherans, Sacramentarians, and other sectaries were condemned. Morals were reformed, *especially amongst the clergy, who were exceedingly corrupt.* In no other council

have so many articles of faith been so clearly elucidated, or strictness of morals so sedulously re-established as in that of Trent.'

Such, according to the Jesuits themselves, are the *eighteen general councils*, which, and which alone, have in all things spoken by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost; decided with the irrevocable certainty of God's judgment, all matters submitted to them; and whose words and actions are, and to the end of all time will be as perfectly obligatory on all the world, as if Jesus Christ our divine Lord, had personally and visibly presided at each of them, and publicly and unequivocally approved them all. Of these *eighteen councils*, we are ready to prove, whenever Archbishop Eccleston will hear us, that at least *twelve* have either *spoken lies or decreed sin.* The reader will observe that the *third* established idolatry; the *seventh* and *eighth*, wickedly condemned those who would not worship images; the *ninth*, *twelfth*, *thirteenth*, *fourteenth*, *fifteenth* and *seventeenth* decreed unjust wars; the *eleventh* and *twelfth* cursed all the saints of God they knew; the *thirteenth* erected the power of the church over all human governments and put the feet of the pope on the neck of the human race; and the *eighteenth*, ripe with the full grown pollution of centuries, decreed all truth into endless night and chaos, and the follies and crimes of all past ages into the place of God's glorious truth!

We have taken the trouble to compare the foregoing statements of *Pichler*, with the still more authoritative declarations of *Cardinal Bellarmine*, himself a Jesuit, and perhaps the best single authority as a writer in the church of Rome. Those who have the opportunity to do so, will find the second volume, pages 3-10, of the Paris edition of 1608, of his great work entitled, *Disputationes de Controversiis Christiana Fidei*, in the book *De Conciliis, &c.* and *chap. v.* entitled, *Concilia*

generalia approbata, all the material statements of *Pichler* confirmed;—and much more to the same general purport. And this is perhaps the general opinion among papists. Yet even these are by no means uniform; and others differ exceedingly from them, and from each other on the subject. Bishop Beveridge reckons but *eight* general councils in all. Dr. Prideaux allows only seven; while Bullinger will admit but six. It is papistical authority which we are now gathering however; and to return to *Pichler*, we find that besides these lawful general councils, he recounts no less than *fourteen* others; half of which he pronounces reprobate, although general, and the other half partly legal and partly illegal. Of these two classes the first is that which follows:

***2. GENERAL COUNCILS WHICH WERE ILLEGAL.**

1. *Antioch*. Held in the year 345; Julius I., being pope, and Constantine Arianus, emperor.

Attended by about 90 fathers.

Unjustly condemned Athanasius; and opened the way for an attempted overthrow of the first Nicene council.

2. *Mediolanense*. (*Milan*). In the year 354; Liberius being pope, and the before mentioned Constantine Arianus, emperor.

About 300 fathers present.

They indirectly condemned the Catholic faith, (wherein is not stated either by *Pichler* or *Bellarmino*. The latter (vol. 2 book 1, chap. 6, let. d.) refers for authority to *Rufinus* lib. 10, c. 20, and to *Socrates*, lib. 2, c. 29.)

3. *Ariminense*. (*Rimini*). Not the one held under pope Liberius in 379.

This was held in 373; Damacus being pope, and the same Constantine Arianus, emperor.

Present about 600 fathers.

The word *Homoousios*, that is *Consubstantial*, was stricken from the creed; partly through ignorance of its meaning, partly by the fraud of the Arians.

4. *Ephesus II*. Which is justly called *Latrocinium* (robbery), for everything was done by violence.

Held in 443; Leo being pope, and Theodosius the younger, emperor.

Present about 128 fathers.

They absolved Euthycheus and confirmed his heresy; drove away the legates of pope Leo; and put to death St. Flavianus, bishop of Constantinople.

5. *Constantinople*. The one which was held under Leo the Isaurian.

Held in 730; Gregory II., being pope, and Leo, called the Isaurian, emperor.

In this council the greater part were laymen.

They decreed against the images of Christ and of the saints.

6. *Constantinople*. The one held under Constantine Copronymus.

About the year 754, Stephen II., or III., being pope.

There were about 338 fathers present.

They decreed that images of Christ and the saints, ought to be totally abolished.

7. *Pisa*; not that (of 1409) which is subsequently reckoned amongst doubtful councils.

Held about 510; Julius II., being pope and Maxilian I., emperor. Called, says *Bellarmino* [vol. 2, lib. i. chap. 6, let. B, page 11] by the emperor and the king of France and certain cardinals, against Julius II., and reprobated a little after in the 2d and 3d session of the council of Lateran, under the same pope.

Bellarmino does not give the number of the fathers present at this council, and *Pichler* says he could not ascertain it.

Pichler adds the same account of its convocation as that given above from *Bellarmino*; merely in addition, designating the council that reprobated this as the fifth of Lateran, and adding the name of Leo X., to that of Julius II.

These councils, the reader will observe, are expressly reprobated and pronounced illegal, and that on the authority not only of papistical doctors of law and theology, but even of popes and lawful general councils. Now, we are ready to

prove, whenever Archbishop Eccleston will hear us, that a greater proportion of these six reprobated councils held and decreed the truth, than of the eighteen councils pronounced by his church to be infallible. The three last of these illegal councils, appear in the main to have judged righteous judgment on the points here named; that is, half of them were right. But of the eighteen infallible ones, two-thirds were wrong and scandalous, in material points of faith and practice. We proceed to the last head of Pichler.

III. GENERAL COUNCILS PARTLY LEGAL AND PARTLY ILLEGAL.

1. *Sardicense*; the appendix to the first Nicene council. Held in 351; Julius I., being pope, and Constantine Arianus, emperor.

Present 300 western fathers, and 73 eastern.

The western fathers affirmed the Catholic faith, the eastern held to the Arian heresy. The acts of the latter are rejected.

2. *Sirmiese*. (*Sirmium*.)

Held in 356; Liberius being pope, and the above mentioned Constantine, emperor.

The number of the fathers unknown.

They drew up two creeds totally different from each other; one Catholic, the other blasphemous. They condemned the heresy of Photinus [*Unitarianism*]; which condemnation is approved by the church.

3. *Quini-Sextum*; held at Constantinople in the Trulline palace, whence its canons are called Trullian.

About the year 602; Sergius being pope, and Justian II., or the younger, emperor. But Bellarmine (vol. 2, lib. 1, chap. 7, p. 11) says the time when it was held is entirely uncertain.

Present 211 fathers: the pope did not preside personally, nor did he send legates; but immediately reprobated it.

They passed 102 canons, which were annexed to the proceedings of the fifth and sixth general synods, and on that account called Quini-Sextum for the fifth Synod published no canons at all. Of these, part only were afterwards received. Bellarmine (in the seventh chapter of the book several times

referred to) gives the eighty-second canon of this council, which tolerated painted images, as a specimen of such as were approved: and this was, he says, approved by pope Adrain, and by the second and fourth acts of the seventh synod, and is therefore valid. For he lays it down expressly that the acts of this synod were void, so far as they were passed in the absence of the pope and his legates.

4. *Frankford*; which hardly deserves to be called general, as no oriental bishops were present.

Celebrated in 794; Adrian I. being pope, and Charlemagne king of the French, (he not having yet attained to the empire).

There were three hundred fathers, and the pope's legates presided.

Approved and confirmed as to that part which declares Christ to be the natural as well as the adopted Son of God. Reprobated so far as it erroneously condemned the seventh synod.

5. *Constance*; celebrated at Constance on the lake Bodamica.

Incomplete in 1414, John XXIII. being pope, and Sigismund emperor: finished 1418, under Pope Martin V.

Present about three hundred bishops, and seven hundred minor prelates.

Suppressed a schism, deposed three anti-popes, elected Martin V. pope, condemned Wicliff and Huss, and *burnt the latter alive*. Approved by Martin V., except the fourth and fifth sessions, which declare the subjection of the pope to a council. Bellarmine informs us that this is reprobated by the last Lateran council, and by the council of Florence.

6. *Basle* (Basil); incomplete at Basle on the Rhine; finished at Lausanne, on the lake of Geneva.

Inchoate in 1431, Eugenius IV. being pope: completed 1449, under Pope Nicholas V.

The number of fathers present not ascertained; the legates of the pope presided part of the time only.

They elected the pseudo-pope Amedeus, duke of Savoy, who was called Felix V. Nothing done by this council is approved, except a few acts about ecclesiastical benefices. Bellarmine adds that this council was reprobated by the last Lateran council.

7. *Pisa*; held at Pisa, in Italy; but it is doubtful whether it was general at all or not.

Held in 1409: Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII. professing to be popes at the same time.

Present one hundred eighty bishops and nine hundred minor prelates.

This council deposed both Gregory and Benedict, and chose Alexander V. pope. Instead of composing, it increased the schism." - Papism, 44-54.

From these records concerning the general councils of the Church of Rome, it appears that their own best writers are unable to determine which were lawful, and which were unlawful. Those councils which were held prior to 606 are not properly called Roman Catholic general councils. Though the hierarchy began in A. D. 312, it is not properly called the Roman Catholic Church until A. D. 606, when Boniface III. received the title of Universal Bishop. As no Roman Catholic, not even the popes themselves, have been able to tell what general councils (or which of their acts) were really lawful, therefore no Roman Catholic, when he swears to receive the acts of general councils as a part of his creed, can possibly know what he binds himself to believe. His creed is bound to be as doubtful as the acts of the general councils.

INDEX
TO THE
PAPAL CONTROVERSY.
CHURCH PROGRESS.

Acceptance of the proposition.....	Page 5
Agreement for discussion.....	" 6
Affirmative Article First.....	" 10
Affirmative Article Second.....	" 25
An infallible church necessary.....	" 31
Affirmative Article Third.....	" 40
Affirmative Article Fourth.....	" 60
All men liable to sin.....	" 61
Affirmative Article Fifth.....	" 81
Affirmative Article Sixth.....	" 99
Affirmative Article Seventh.....	" 119
An infallible interpreter needed.....	" 126
Affirmative Article Eighth.....	" 137
Apostolic Body Infallible.....	" 143
Affirmative Article Ninth.....	" 155
Affirmative Article Tenth.....	" 175
Apology for the Popes.....	" 175
Apostolic Body the teacher.....	" 178
Agustine's Testimony.....	" 179
Affirmative Article Eleventh.....	" 193
Apostolic Succession.....	" 195
Affirmative Article Twelfth.....	" 212
Affirmative Article Thirteenth.....	" 223
"Apostolic Churches had no Bible".....	" 229
Affirmative Article Fourteenth.....	" 246
Authority of the priesthood.....	" 248
Affirmative Article Fifteenth.....	" 265

Absolution.....	Page 270
Apostolic Body Infallible.....	" 272
Affirmative Article Sixteenth.....	" 282
Apostolic Body the rule of faith.....	" 282
Apostolic Body the rule of faith.....	" 283
Authority of the Holy Spirit.....	" 285
Apostolic Body the exponent.....	" 286
Apostolic Body the teaching church.....	" 288
Affirmative Article Seventeenth.....	" 300
Authority of the New Testament.....	" 306
Affirmative Article Eighteenth.....	" 318
Apostolic Body the rule.....	" 318
Boasting by <i>Progress</i>	" 6
Bible not the standard.....	" 41
Bible source of endless dispute.....	" 42
Bible not the sole rule of faith.....	" 63
Bishop of Rome the head.....	" 66
<i>Baptist's</i> perverseness.....	" 81
<i>Baptist's</i> alleged contradiction.....	" 101
Bible accepted on the authority of the Church.....	" 104
Bible interpreted.....	" 104
<i>Baptist</i> charged with contradiction.....	" 119
<i>Baptist's</i> contradiction.....	" 130
Bible not the rule of faith, but the Church.....	" 160
Bible a bone of contention.....	" 162
Bible infallible.....	" 214
"Born of water"—baptism.....	" 216
<i>Baptist's</i> answers reviewed.....	" 228
<i>Baptist</i> makes the Scriptures the standard.....	" 230
<i>Baptist</i> makes the Bible the rule.....	" 252
Bible no support to Rome.....	" 266
Bible not the rule.....	" 267
Baptism before marriage.....	" 269
Bible not the rule.....	" 305
Bible not the rule of faith.....	" 318
Bible not the rule.....	" 319
Bishops to rule the Church.....	" 323
Church and true religion the same.....	" 30
Celibacy of the priesthood.....	" 45

Catholics hold the same doctrine.....	Page 84
Catholics right, or Christ responsible.....	" 85
Church sole rule of faith.....	" 86
Charge of Polytheism answered.....	" 106
Catechism all that is necessary for information.....	" 127
Cyril's Testimony.....	" 137
Canon of Revelation.....	" 140
Catholic Church—who was the founder.....	" 177
Call none father—Answer.....	" 190
Church the standard.....	" 190
Christ enters through closed doors.....	" 217
Confirmation argument not answered.....	" 218
Canon of Scripture established.....	" 253
Church the rule.....	" 268
Confessional not abominable.....	" 301
Cormenin and others rejected.....	" 303
Church an hierarchy.....	" 303
Celibacy.....	" 321
Clergy—Donay version.....	" 322
Confessional explained.....	" 323
Difficulty of making the Bible the rule.....	" 48
Difficulty of going to the Pope for information.....	" 72
Entire Church infallible.....	" 122
Every Catholic infallible.....	" 123
Figurative meanings answered.....	" 29
God whole and entire in every grain of sand.....	" 182
Godship of the priests justified.....	" 247
Gladstone answered.....	" 250
Gladstone's war on the Church.....	" 251
Gladstone criticised.....	" 289
Infallibility claimed.....	" 14
Infallible church necessary.....	" 31
Infallibility not impeccability.....	" 46
Infallibility not impeccability.....	" 61
Infallible interpreter needed.....	" 62
Infallibility of the Church.....	" 64
Infallibility admitted by the <i>Baptist</i>	" 65
Infallibility stated.....	" 82
Infallibility questions.....	" 82

Infallibility illustrated by the President.....	Page 100
Inspiration and infallibility of the Bible.....	" 103
Infallibility further explained.....	" 121
Infalible interpreter needed.....	" 126
Infallibility—answers.....	" 138
Infallibility not impeccability.....	" 155
Infallibility admitted by <i>Baptist</i>	" 156
Infallibility held before 1870.....	" 156
Infallibility—Bishop Purcell's testimony.....	" 157
Infallibility and impeccability.....	" 194
If the Bible is sole rule Rome is not the true Church.....	" 231
John 3:5 means baptism— <i>Church Progress</i>	" 181
Joan Pope, a fable.....	" 232
Marks of infallibility.....	" 26
Marks of unity.....	" 27
Marks of the true church.....	" 176
Marriage—Impediments of Rome.....	" 235
Marriage cannot be dissolved.....	" 270
Marriage sacrament— <i>Baptist's</i> Contradiction.....	" 289
Marriage honored.....	" 325
New Testament not compiled in the time of Ignatius and Irenæus.....	" 163
New Testament not given by Christ.....	" 197
New Testament not the rule.....	" 229
New Testament not authority during the first century.....	" 305
One fold and One Shepherd.....	" 28
Protestant Position.....	" 2
Proposition to be proved "by Scripture, tradition and reason".....	" 15
Peter the foundation.....	" 44
Peter head of the church.....	" 46
Points of Unity.....	" 47
Peccability of Popes admitted.....	" 67
Peter's popedom—ten points.....	" 68
Pope infalible only in official capacity.....	" 99
<i>Progress</i> does not admit false popes.....	" 100
Pope visible, and Christ invisible head.....	" 107

Popes not as bad as represented.....	Page 121
Private interpretation.....	" 125
Pope the center of unity.....	" 137
Private interpretation.....	" 139
Pope—interpreter of the word.....	" 180
Popes not inspired.....	" 195
Persons pardoned by Christ may have been baptized before.....	" 20
Presence of Christ bodily in different places at the same time.....	" 201
Pope included among the apostles.....	" 214
Pope Joan, a fable.....	" 232
Pope Joan fable rejected.....	" 218
<i>Progress</i> questions.....	" 265
Professor Thayer quoted.....	" 266
Pope the head of the Apostolic Body.....	" 301
Pope the Vicegerent of God.....	" 321
Pope the mouthpiece of the Church.....	" 322
Questions to <i>Baptist</i>	" 88
Questions to <i>Baptist</i>	" 121
Questions to <i>Baptist</i>	" 150
Questions by <i>Progress</i>	" 193
Questions unanswered.....	" 212
Reasons for leaving out Roman.....	" 25
Roman Catholic Church explained.....	" 40
Roman explained.....	" 60
Roman rule of faith.....	" 140
Rule of faith, verbal teaching.....	" 142
Reeve and DuPin discredited.....	" 158
Statements.....	" 10-14
Scripture for Peter's popedom.....	" 89
Spirit guides to only one meaning.....	" 105
Sunday adopted by Tradition.....	" 161
Statements of Ignatius and Irenæus.....	" 162
Succession admitted by the <i>Baptist</i>	" 176
Tradition a mark of the true church.....	" 178
Six bad Popes.....	" 195
Succession of the Popes.....	" 196
Sunday not scriptural.....	" 300

Telling the church is telling the pope.....	Page 144
Tradition a part of Revelation.....	" 160
Unity of the church.....	" 66
Unity an essential mark of the true church.....	" 156
Visibility of the church.....	" 14
Visibility of the church.....	" 30
Voice of the apostles, the rule of faith.....	" 160
Women had no part in Church affairs.....	" 304

AMERICAN BAPTIST.

Acceptance of the proposition.....	Page 5
Agreement for discussion.....	" 6
A bishop must be the husband of one wife.....	" 36
Authority of the Scriptures.....	" 115
Absurdity of many bodies of Christ.....	" 190
Apocrypha canonized.....	" 221
Absolution, Roman, unscriptural.....	" 258
Absolution—Bible.....	" 259
Authority of the church.....	" 298
Affirmative Article Nineteenth—Minus.....	" 336
Agreement to publish.....	" 340
Affirmative Article Twentieth—Minus.....	" 351
Affirmative Article Twenty-first—Minus.....	" 361
Absolution by the Pope.....	" 394
Anathema of Queen Elizabeth.....	" 394
Appendix B—Infallibility.....	" 483
Archbishop Purcell on bad popes.....	" 485
Appendix C—Unity of Rome.....	" 499
Appendix D—Romish baptism.....	" 504
All persons licensed to baptize.....	" 507
Alien baptism endorsed by Rome.....	" 508
Appendix E—Eucharist, or mass.....	" —
Bible rule.....	" 97
Body of Christ not from heaven.....	" 171
Bad popes no popes.....	" 184
Bible rule infallible.....	" 187
Baptismal salvation false.....	" 191

Bible—concession of <i>Progress</i>	Page 202
Baptismal salvation condemned.....	" 207
Bible infallibility.....	" 219
Bible of Sixtus V.....	" 220
Born of water not baptism.....	" 223
Bible infallibility admitted.....	" 237
Bible surrendered.....	" 237
Baptism, Roman, erroneous.....	" 259
Bible proprietorship.....	" 274
Bible rule.....	" 275
Bad priests may forgive sins.....	" 280
Bible questions—challenge.....	" 308
Bishop Hogan testifies against bad priests.....	" 330
Bible regeneration gives a new heart.....	" 333
Boasting of the <i>Progress</i>	" 354
Brownlee on Jesuitism.....	" 362
Bloody Inquisition.....	" 368
Bull of Boniface VIII.....	" 382
Bull—Unam Sanctam.....	" 386
Boasting of the <i>Church Progress</i>	" 422
Bible of Rome.....	" 468
Bible, Decrees of Trent on.....	" 469
Bible reading forbidden.....	" 469
Bible prohibited.....	" 472
Bull of Gregory XI. against Bible Societies.....	" 478
Bible proscribed by Gregory.....	" 478
Boniface III. the first real pope.....	" 492
Baptismal salvation.....	" 506
Baptism, ceremonies of.....	" 508
Baptism, ceremonies attending.....	" 509
Church defined.....	" 21
Church institution.....	" 22
Church further defined.....	" 35
Christ the Savior, instead of the Church.....	" 37
Creed of Pius IV.....	" 57
Christ the head of the Church.....	" 59
Commands of Christ to be taught.....	" 79
Christ the only head.....	" 94
Cardinal Gibbons on infallibility.....	" 110

Charge of contradiction refuted.....	Page 129
Canonicity of the Roman Church.....	" 133
Catholic Church—By whom founded?.....	" 147
Church withholds the wine.....	" 181
Christ's body present in different places at the same time.....	" 181
Call no man father—popes.....	" 189
Catholics and Protestants have the same Bible...	" 198
Christ the center of unity.....	" 205
Contradiction of the <i>Church Progress</i>	" 221
Confessional, Romish.....	" 263
Confessional, secrets of.....	" 263
Confessional—foul questions.....	" 294
Confessional—every sin to be told.....	" 294
Confessional—seal not to be broken.....	" 295
Confessional—Horrible doctrine.....	" 295
Confessional—Priests only to forgive sins.....	" 296
Confessional—God cannot forgive sins.....	" 296
Church's executive authority.....	" 310
Clergy instead of flock—a forgery.....	" 311
Confessional Anti-scriptural.....	" 312
Confessional—Catechism of Trent.....	" 313
Confessional indecent.....	" 314
Confessional—fendish doctrine of.....	" 314
Celibacy not Bible doctrine.....	" 328
<i>Church Progress</i> endorsements.....	" 341
Corrupt priesthood—Chiniqny.....	" 349
Corruption of Rome must be exposed.....	" 353
Crime sanctioned by the Jesuits.....	" 360
<i>Church Progress</i> vaunting charge.....	" 376
Cardinal Manning on temporal power.....	" 378
Catholic pledges not binding—Gladstone.....	" 384
Schisms of the Romish Church.....	" 401
Church—Scriptural definition.....	" 416
Catholic Congress for temporal power of Pope...	" 423
Church institution.....	" 430
Church' succession.....	" 433
Church of Christ unpopular.....	" 441
Church in the wilderness.....	" 443

Campbell—Alexander, for succession.....	Page 445
Creed of Rome—Brownlee.....	" 467
"Congregation of the Index".....	" 472
Cardinals and Popes against the Bible.....	" 481
Corrupt Popes.....	" 492
Cardinal Gibbons on Infallibility.....	" 493
Cormenin's Testimony against the Popes.....	" 496
Ceremonies attending baptism.....	" 508
Canons of Trent concerning baptism.....	" 509
Doctrine of the Church infallible.....	" 92
DuPin a Romanist.....	" 167
Difficulty of understanding the Pope's word.....	" 186
Decree of Infallibility—Gladstone's testimony....	" 372
Decree of Infallibility—Phillip Schaff.....	" 373
Demon Frogs.....	" 374
Doctrine of the Inquisition endorsed.....	" 385
Deposing kings by the Pope.....	" 394
Different plans of making Popes.....	" 404
Doctrine of Mary's conception new.....	" 407
Division of the Greek and Roman Churches.....	" 413
Dragon pursued the church.....	" 437
Dowling's History quoted.....	" 477
Dreadful corruption of the Popes.....	" 497
Endorsements of the <i>Progress</i>	" 7
Exposition of the key power.....	" 53
Exposition of Matt. 18:17—"Tell the church".....	" 134
Eucharist—Fourth negative argument.....	" 135
Early departure from the faith.....	" 146
Exposition of 2d Peter 1:20.....	" 151
Eating the flesh of Christ—John 6:48-56.....	" 171
Eucharist—Absurdity of Roman argument.....	" 172
Elders and Bishops—Popes.....	" 185
Extreme Unction.....	" 225
Elders ruled by example.....	" 297
Eleventh Negative argument.....	" 297
Elders ruled by teaching and example.....	" 297
Elders and Bishops, same office.....	" 311
Emperor Otho excommunicated.....	" 390
Ekklesia defined.....	" 425

Establishment of the Roman Church.....	Page 435
Eucharist.....	" 512
First Negative Argument.....	" 23
Fourth Negative Argument.....	" 56
False Popes break the succession.....	" 71
False teachers tried by the church.....	" 116
Fifth Negative Argument.....	" 173
False Apostles.....	" 185
Filthy matter in Rome.....	" 343
Fourteenth Negative Argument.....	" 355
Fifteenth Negative Argument.....	" 366
Fall of Rome.....	" 500
Godship of the priests.....	" 242
Gladstone Vindicated.....	" 237
Gladstone on Infallibility.....	" 486
Gregory the Great against a Universal Bishop....	" 488
Gregory's letters against Universal Episcopacy....	" 490
Historical Introduction.....	" 3
Head—the Pope—corrupt, so is the body.....	" 187
Holy men wrote by inspiration.....	" 277
Hogan's testimony—bad priests.....	" 332
Horrible principles of the Jesuits.....	" 356
Henry's Commentaries for succession.....	" 445
Heresy of Pope Honorius by Gladstone.....	" 484
Importance of discussion.....	" 16
Infallibility of the Church.....	" 74
Impossible creed.....	" 115
Infallibility three fold with the true church.....	" 130
Infallibility a new dogma.....	" 150
Infallibility claimed—for corrupt popes.....	" 166
Infants lost.....	" 174
Infallibility— <i>Progress</i> contradiction.....	" 292
Infallibility in the Pope only.....	" 292
Infallibility in apostolic body.....	" 292
Infallibility— <i>Progress</i> contradiction.....	" 309
Inquisition, The.....	" 366
Inquisition—The pope head of.....	" 367
Inquisition—Catholic Dictionary.....	" 367
Inquisition established.....	" 369

Inquisition—Testimony of DuPin.....	Page 369
Inquisition sanctioned by Emperor Fredric II....	" 370
Inquisition from Dowling's History.....	" 370
Infallibility of the Pope.....	" 372
Infallibility a new dogma.....	" 373
Infallibility revives the middle ages.....	" 385
Inquisition endorsed by Romanists.....	" 386
Inquisition to punish heretics.....	" 387
Infamous Popes—Reeve.....	" 396
Immaculate Conception.....	" 407
Infallibility established in 1870.....	" 408
Infallibility of Judas.....	" 466
Jesuit Society.....	" 355
Jesuitism condemned by French parliament.....	" 356
Jesuits suppressed.....	" 357
Jesuitism by Mosheim.....	" 358
Jesuits secret instructions.....	" 358
Jesuits—testimony of Brownswell.....	" 358
Jesuits oath.....	" 363
Jesuits—Enemies to civil governments.....	" 363
Jesuits disloyal.....	" 364
Jesuits secret instructions.....	" 364
Jesuits—How they capture rich widows.....	" 365
Key Power.....	" 258
Key Power with the church.....	" 261
Key power with the church.....	" 270
Kingdom of Christ not political.....	" 383
Kingdom, Organic defined.....	" 427
Kingdom and church.....	" 429
Lying endorsed by Jesuits.....	" 359
More difficult to understand the Pope than Bible..	" 72
Marriages dissolved by Rome.....	" 224
Marriage—Testimony of Liguori.....	" 225
Marriage invalid without a priest.....	" 242
Marriage—Roman unscriptural.....	" 257
Marriage—Romish.....	" 278
Marriage— <i>Progress</i> Contradiction.....	" 296
Maryville backout.....	" 338
Monster Popes of the tenth century.....	" 495

	Page
Mass—Eucharist.....	512
Negative article first.....	16
Necessity of defining the church.....	19
Negative argument first.....	23
Negative article second.....	32
Negative argument second.....	38
Negative article third.....	50
Negative argument fourth.....	56
Negative article fourth.....	70
Negative argument third.....	76
Negative article fifth.....	90
Negative arguments restated.....	95
Negative article sixth.....	109
Negative article seventh.....	128
Negative article eighth.....	146
Negative article ninth.....	165
Negative argument fifth.....	173
Negative article tenth.....	184
Negative article eleventh.....	202
New Testament written by authority of Christ.....	205
Negative argument sixth.....	208
Negative argument seventh.....	209
Negative article twelfth.....	219
Negative argument eighth.....	225
Negative article thirteenth.....	236
Negative argument ninth.....	236
Negative argument tenth.....	243
Negative article fourteenth.....	235
Negative article fifteenth.....	273
Negative article sixteenth.....	291
New Testament written in the first century.....	293
New Testament the will of Christ.....	297
Negative argument eleventh.....	308
Negative article seventeenth.....	309
Negative Testament the will of Christ.....	316
Negative argument twelfth.....	327
Negative article eighteenth.....	343
Negative article nineteenth.....	344
Negative argument thirteenth.....	344

Negative article twentieth.....	Page 351
Negative argument fourteenth.....	355
Negative article twenty-one.....	362
Negative argument fifteenth.....	366
Negative argument sixteenth.....	372
Negative article twenty-two.....	377
Negative argument seventeenth.....	377
Negative article twenty-third.....	392
Nations destroyed to please the Pope.....	399
Negative argument eighteenth.....	400
Negative argument nineteenth.....	416
New Testament use of ekklesia.....	426
Negative argument twenty.....	439
Negative article twenty-six.....	440
Negative argument twenty-first.....	447
New Testament—who made it.....	459
New Testament from the writings of the first three centuries.....	462
New Testament—testimony of Dr. Treggles.....	462
Only one member of the Roman Church infallible.....	39
Old Testament needed no infallible pope.....	73
Omnipresence of God.....	153
Old Testament Bible rule.....	276
Organic kingdom and church.....	428
Origin of Baptists.....	446
Progress dodges its own proposition.....	50
Popes desperately wicked.....	52
Peter was not pope—ten reasons.....	54
Pope more difficult to understand than the Bible..	72
Pope's teachings flow through corrupt channels..	73
Papal Infallibility.....	90
Popes do not know when they are infallible.....	91
Popes contradict each other.....	92
Popes—thirty-one false.....	111
Private interpretation not the rule.....	113
Polytheism of Romanism.....	114
Popes dreadful characters.....	129
Popes—Six immoral admitted.....	131
Polytheism of Roman Church.....	136

Pastors called father.....	Page 147
Popc—the man of sin.....	" 147
Popes all endorsed by the <i>Progress</i>	" 148
Popes corrupt—Reeve's testimony.....	" 148
Popes crimes, testimony of DuPin.....	" 149
Popes fearful depravity.....	" 150
<i>Progress</i> —to prove proposition "by Scripture and reason".....	" 165
Popes as Gods.....	" 167
"Private interpretation" charge not true.....	" 168
Popes—200,000 necessary.....	" 169
Popes forbidden.....	" 169
<i>Progress</i> admits same Bible.....	" 170
Popes—Twelve infallible at once.....	" 185
Plurality of infallible teachers.....	" 203
Popess Joan, by Priest Jouin.....	" 204
Plurality of Popes, according to the <i>Progress</i>	" 205
Priest gods.....	" 227
Popess Joan by DuPin.....	" 239
Power of fallen priests.....	" 243
Priests as Christ in the confessional.....	" 244
Priests to forgive sins as God.....	" 244
Priests can forgive all sins.....	" 244
"Prelates" not scriptural.....	" 256
Popess Joan.....	" 256
Popes corrupt, by Reeve.....	" 256
Proposition to <i>Progress</i> to discuss the Bible ques- tion.....	" 262
Popess Joan by Cormenin.....	" 297
Perjured priests.....	" 315
Pope the head of the church.....	" 328
Priests utterly corrupt.....	" 331
Priests forgive all sins.....	" 333
Prayer to Mary—Lignori.....	" 334
Praying to souls in Purgatory.....	" 335
<i>Progress's</i> letter of surrender.....	" 337
Purgatory.....	" 345
Purgatory—Souls in.....	" 345
Purgatory not scriptural.....	" 346

Preaching to spirits in prison.....	Page 347
<i>Progress's</i> boasting.....	" 361
Persecution advocated.....	" 389
Pope equal to God.....	" 399
Papal arrogance.....	" 400
Popes against popes.....	" 402
Popes elected in different ways.....	" 403
Protestant churches suckled by the wolf.....	" 414
Popery described in the Bible.....	" 418
Pope Pius VII. against the use of the Bible.....	" 477
Papal infallibility.....	" 483
Priests MaGuire admits some bad popes.....	" 483
Popes deposed by the councils.....	" 486
Popery—when established.....	" 487
Pope Pius XI. in war.....	" 499
Questions unanswered.....	" 291
Romes infallibility ridiculous.....	" 18
Roman in proposition.....	" 82
Roman creed impossible.....	" 57
Roman in the creed of Pius IV.....	" 70
Romanists do not agree in doctrine.....	" 93
Romanists worship 30,000,000 of gods.....	" 93
Rome rejects the Bible rule.....	" 96
Roman infallibility a fraud.....	" 109
Roman Church—two heads.....	" 114
Rome holds "doctrines of devils".....	" 117
Rome—infants lost.....	" 189
Roman traditions uninspired.....	" 238
Rottenness of the confessional.....	" 280
Roman traditions false.....	" 308
Remarks on the backout.....	" 341
Rome the scarlet woman.....	" 343
Rome "the habitation of devils".....	" 362
Rome the mother of false churches.....	" 395
Rome the mother of abominations.....	" 403
Rome destitute of unity.....	" 406
Roman bitter fight against public schools.....	" 411
Rise of the Roman Church.....	" 419
Roman Church not apostolic.....	" 420

Roman war against public schools.....	Page 423
Relation of the kingdom and church.....	" 431
Roman Church never the church of Christ.....	" 432
Rome the Babylonish harlot.....	" 436
Revelation twelfth chapter explained.....	" 438
Rome not the wilderness church.....	" 444
Rome to be known by her fruits.....	" 447
Rome and the Bible.....	" 459
Roman rule by Brownlee.....	" 467
Romish creed.....	" 504
Second negative argument.....	" 39
Sacrament of confirmation.....	" 203
Sacrament of marriage.....	" 209
Same Bible admitted by <i>Progress</i>	" 220
sacrament of orders.....	" 226
Sacrament of confession.....	" 243
Sins forgiven.....	" 276
Surrender correspondence.....	" 339
Souls in purgatory.....	" 345
Surrender apology.....	" 351
Seventeenth negative argument.....	" 377
Supremacy of church over the state by Manning..	" 379
State laws nullified by Romanists.....	" 387
State must yield to the church.....	" 387
Satan the founder of the Romish Church.....	" 417
State Church not Christ's church.....	" 435
Sacraments.....	" 504
Sacraments—Number of.....	" 504
Seven Sacraments.....	" 504
Terms of salvation.....	" 17
Truth more tolerant than Romanism.....	" 18
True infallibility.....	" 32
True infallibility three fold.....	" 105
Transubstantiation.....	" 135
Tradition inspired.....	" 240
Traditions of Rome anti-scriptural.....	" 327
Thirteenth negative argument.....	" 344
Temporal power, by Gladstone.....	" 377
Temporal authority of pope to overthrow nations	" 387

Temporal power of modern Popes.....	Page 393
Thunderbolts of Plus IX.....	" 397
Treason of Pope Leo XIII.....	" 424
Traditions of Rome.....	" 475
Temporal power destroyed.....	" 502
Unscriptural infallibility.....	" 33
Unity lacking in Rome.....	" 166
Ultramontanism from the <i>Church Progress</i>	" 377
Union of Church and State advocated.....	" 388
Union of Church and State.....	" 389
Universal dominion—Gladstone.....	" 392
Ultramontanism of <i>Church Progress</i>	" 410
Ultramontanism.....	" 412
Universal Bishop denounced by Gregory.....	" 487
Vatican decrees.....	" 373
Vulgate Bible—MaGuire's testimony.....	" 473
War between the Pope and his own subjects.....	" 34
Wickedness of Roman Catholics.....	" 38
Wife, simply means woman.....	" 94
Women teachers "infallible".....	" 204
Worship of saints and images.....	" 334

GLOSSARY.

Abbess.—The lady superior of a community of nuns.

Abbey.—A monastery governed by an abbot.

Abbot.—The "father" superior of a community of monks. Sometimes there are double monasteries, one for monks and the other for nuns, adjoining.

Acolyte.—One who follows and waits on the priest, especially in connection with the Mass. He may be a layman.

Advent.—A period between three and four weeks from the Sunday nearest the feast of St. Andrew to Christmas eve. It is called the Season of Advent.

Agnus Dei.—A certain prayer in the Roman Mass, in use since the seventh century. Also, *Agnus Dei* is the name of a figure of a lamb on the wax which remains from the Holy Candles, blessed by the pope on Thursday after Easter in the first and seventh years of his reign. These little wax images are considered very sacred and worn as a charm by Romanists.

Alb.—A loose white linen garment worn by the priests at Mass. It extends from head to foot.

All Saints Day.—This is a feast introduced by Pope Boniface IV., as early as the eighth century. It is observed November 1st in the Roman Church.

All Souls Days.—This is a day observed by the Roman Church in which prayer is offered "for all the souls in Purgatory." It is observed on the second day of November. The Mass said on that day is the "Mass of the dead," that is, the Mass for the souls in Purgatory.

Altar.—In the Roman Church, the table on which the Eucharist is consecrated. It is of stone and covered with three white cloths. The Eucharist, called the Host, is placed on this altar, and worshiped as the great God himself.

Amice.—This is an oblong piece of linen cloth with a cross on it which the priest places on his head, but throws it back on his shoulders while at Mass. It was introduced in the Ninth century.

Anathema.—This means, "let him be accursed." It is considered by Romanists a great calamity for the Pope to pronounce his anathema against any one.

Angels, Feast of.—A feast in honor of guardian angels, instituted by Pope Paul V. It is kept on Sept. 29th. These angels are worshiped by devout Romanists.

Angelus.—This is the name given to the Roman practice of reciting morning, noon and evening, three "Hail Mary's" etc. "A bell called the 'Angelus Bell' rings at the several hours." This custom began with Pope John XXI., in the XIV. century. It is supposed that the ringing of this bell frightens the devils away.

Annunciation.—"The Annunciation of the blessed Virgin" is regarded chiefly as a feast of Mary and is solemnized on the 25th of March. It is supposed to have existed as early as 692.

Archbishop.—This is a chief dignity in the Roman Church who has charge of a diocese and exercises authority over inferior Bishops.

Arch-priest.—A leading priest in the Roman Church who exercises authority over inferior priests.

Ascension, Feast of.—In the Romish Church this feast is celebrated

forty days after Easter. It is attended by a solemn Mass. It was established in 1607, in honor of the ascension of Christ.

Ash Wednesday.—The first day of the forty days of Lent. It is to be observed as a day of *fasting and penance*. In former times the penitents wore a garb to indicate humility, and the bishop put ashes on their foreheads. But, at present, the ashes are applied to all the members of the congregation.

Assumption.—This "Feast of Assumption" is celebrated the fifteenth of August, in honor of the assumption of the body of the blessed Virgin Mary into heaven. Tradition has it that Mary died, but her body was preserved free from corruption and was carried to heaven where it became reunited with her soul. The absurdity of taking the dead body of Mary to heaven is supreme. It is purely an "assumption."

Ave Marie.—This is a prayer to the Virgin Mary, offered by Romanists, also called the "Angelical Salutation." It was formulated and enjoined A. D. 1196.

Baptism.—The Catholic Dictionary says: "Baptism (from *baptismos*, dipping, or immersion in water.) A spiritual meaning was given to baptism by St. John the Baptist, who baptised or immersed his disciples in the Jordan, to signify the repentance and renewal by which the whole man was to be cleansed and purified." "But Christ exalted the act to a dignity beyond the baptism of John, changing the 'baptism of penance' into the sacrament of regeneration." Thus it appears that Romanists, while admitting the original 'mode' of baptism, pervert the design into *baptismal regeneration*.

Baptism of Ships.—"Baptism, or more correctly, blessing, of ships, a form in the Roman Ritual." Some besides Romanists have followed this stupid custom.

Baptistry.—"That part of the church in which solemn baptism is administered. Anciently, when baptism was constantly given to adults and the rite of immersion prevailed, it was inconvenient to baptise in the church itself, and hence after the conversion of Constantine separate buildings for the administration of baptism were erected and attached to the cathedral church." *Catholic Dictionary*.

Basilica.—This name is applied to church houses.

Beatification.—The trial, ceremony and solemn declaration by which a person of supposed superior virtue is declared to be a saint. This solemn mock investigation takes place in the city of Rome where one is appointed, called "the Devil's Advocate," to oppose the beatification of the candidate (though long dead) for sainthood. The trial takes place before the Congregation of Cardinals, and the final sentence of beatification is delivered by the Pope himself, after which the image of the said saint is unveiled and the saint becomes an object of worship.

Baptism of Bells.—The Romish Church has a custom of what is called the Baptism of Bells. When the bell is about to be used for church purposes, in the presence of the congregation, "the bishop washes the bell with blessed water, signs it with the oil of the sick outside, and with chrism inside, and lastly places under it the thurible with burning incense. He prays repeatedly that the sound of the bell may avail to summon the faithful, to excite their devotion, to drive away storms, and to terrify evil spirits." In the baptism of a bell a god-father and god-mother are appointed, and the bell receives a name as though it was an infant. This superstition began to prevail in the tenth century.

Benedictines.—This is an ancient order of Roman monks. St. Benedict established this order in the seventh century.

Bishop.—An officer of the Romish Church superior to a simple priest, who has rule over the diocese as a part of the Roman hierarchy. This is a gross perversion of the New Testament bishop who was only a pastor of a local church.

Bishop Suffragans.—Inferior bishops who assist other bishops who have authority over them.

Blessing.—Instead of the simple form of prayer for the blessing of God

upon persons, the Roman officials, especially the pope, presumes to pronounce his blessing upon those who honor him, as though he was God himself. In connection with a blessing, a plenary indulgence is usually granted, on certain conditions.

Breviary.—A condensed guide book of the Roman Church, containing the prayers for the canonical hours. It is claimed to have been used as early as 1099, but was finally revised and completed under Pius V. in the sixteenth century. The teachings of the Breviary are considered the infallible teachings of the Church.

Bridgittines.—An order of monks and nuns founded by St. Bridget in 1314 in Sweden. "Each monastery is double, for nuns and for monks."

Bull in Coena Domini.—The popes sentence of excommunication formerly published against heretics every Thursday before Easter.

Bullarium.—A collection of popish bulls into one book. The Bullarium containing the bulls of all the popes from Leo the Great to Benedict XIII. is the most celebrated.

Candle-mas.—The second day of February celebrated as the feast of the purification of the Virgin Mary. On that day, the candles for the use of the altar and other sacred purposes are blessed by the bishop.

Canon Law.—The rules of the Roman Church giving directions in faith and conduct. It includes the five books known as the Decretals of Gregory IX.

Canon of the Mass.—The Roman law which guides the priests in the celebration of the Mass.

Canon of Scriptures.—The books of Scripture which are regarded as of divine authority. The final settlement of the canon of Scripture for the Roman Church was determined by the Councils of Florence and Trent.

Canonization.—The Roman Catholic process by which they declare persons to be saints and worthy of "perpetual veneration and invocation," of all Romanists.

Capuchins.—An order of Franciscan friars established in 1526 by the consent of Pope Clement VII. The members of this order wear a peculiar "capucine" or cowl which is long pointed, differing from other friars.

Cardinal.—The highest dignitary in the Roman Church next to the Pope. The cardinals constitute the Pope's council, and are called "The Sacred College." They owe their appointment solely to the Pope, and the Pope owes his appointment solely to the College of Cardinals. Except a very few, all the Cardinals live at Rome with the Pope. They are called Cardinal Priests and Cardinal Bishops. In the twelfth century there were only six Cardinals. At present there are about sixty-five cardinals in the Roman Church. Cardinals are regarded as political as well as ecclesiastical princes. Except a very few, they are all native Italians. Since the declaration of the Pope's infallibility, being appointed by men appointed by himself, the Pope is supreme with absolute power and authority over the Roman Church. However devilish or heretical he may become, there is no power to set him aside.

Carmelites, Order of.—An order of monks established in the twelfth century, whose first monastery was on Mt. Carmel. Berthold was the founder of the Carmelite Order, and its first general. Simon Stock was made general in 1245 and established the worship of Mary in the Scapular. "The order was confirmed by Pope Innocent, in 1247, under the name of the 'Friars of Our Lady of Mt. Carmel.'" They were known as the "White Friars." A society of barefooted nuns became connected with these Carmelites who were called "Discolored Carmelite Nuns."

Carnival.—A special indulgence during the three days before Lent. "The Carnival in Catholic countries, and in Rome itself, is a special season for feasting, dancing, masquerading, and mirth of all sorts." This Roman Catholic Carnival indulges its participants in the grossest sins and abominations. To the shame of our country, these devilish Carnivals are allowed in some of our cities.

Carthusians, Order of.—A very rigid society of monks established in the Chartreuse in France by St. Bruno, in 1088. These monks inhabited a desert sterile mountain, 4,000 feet above the level of the sea. They wore coarse garments and were given to fastings.

Cathedra. A chair in which the Bishop sits. *Ex Cathedra* means from the chair, and is applied to the utterances of the Pope from the imaginary chair of Peter. The old wooden chair of Peter is said to be still preserved in the Vatican Church.

Cathedral.—The raised seat of a Bishop. The Cathedral Church is the Church in which the Bishop presides.

Chalice.—The cup used for the wine in the Eucharist. In the Roman Church these cups are made of gold or silver, and consecrated by the Bishop with chrism.

Chasuble.—The chief garment of the priest celebrating the Mass. It is worn outside of the other garments. It often has a cross on the back.

Chrism.—“Olive oil mixed with balm, by the Bishop” and used by the Roman Church in confirmation, baptism, ordination, consecration of altars, chalices, and blessing baptismal waters. This chrism is prepared on the Thursday before Easter. This custom was established in 816.

Christian Brothers.—This title is given to a Roman Catholic educational fraternity, which was established by Pope Benedict XIII., in 1725.

Christmas Day.—December 25, was established by the Church of Rome as the time of the birth of Christ. While this day is generally observed as a holiday, yet no intelligent person, outside of the superstitions of Rome, believes that Christ was born on that day.

Cloister.—An enclosed apartment in connection with a monastic, cathedral or collegiate building.

Coadjutor.—One who assists a bishop or priest in the discharge of his duties.

Coat, The Holy.—A celebrated relic preserved in the Cathedral at Treves, in Prussia. Romanists regard it as the identical seamless coat worn by the Saviour, up to the time of the crucifixion. This coat is worshiped with great veneration.

Conclave.—The place where the Cardinals assemble to elect Popes.

Concordat.—A treaty between the Pope and a secular power.

Confessional.—The private place, usually in a church, where the priest alone with the penitent, hears the confession of sins.

Confessor.—The priest who hears confessions.

Confirmation.—The Roman sacrament which is supposed to confer grace on those who are already baptized, confirming and strengthening them in the faith.

Congregations, Roman.—To assist him in his work, the Pope has organized a number of permanent congregations, or committees, composed mainly of Cardinals. They are as follows:

1st. “*The Congregation of the Consistory*,”—having jurisdiction over church houses, the removal of Bishops, etc.

2nd. “*The Congregation of the Holy Office of the Inquisition*,”—which was established for the detection and punishment of heretics. This diabolical Inquisition has murdered hundreds of thousands for adhering to the truth of Christ.

3rd. “*The Congregation of the Index*,”—to detect, and prohibit heretical books.

4th. “*The Congregation of Rites*,”—who are to preside over the introduction of new rites and ceremonies in the Roman religion, especially that of establishing saints, images and relics to be worshiped or venerated.

5th. “*The Congregation of Immunities*,”—having jurisdiction over the privileges of the clergy.

6th. “*The Congregation of the Fabric*,”—which is especially charged with everything which relates to the Vatican Church.

7th. “*The Congregation of the Council*,”—instituted by Pope Pius IV. for the interpretation of the decrees of the Council of Trent.

8th. “*The Congregation of Bishops and Regulars*,” which is to take charge of the disputes between Bishops, etc.

9th. “*The Congregation of Discipline*,”—established by Innocent XII. having charge of the discipline of monastic communities.

10th. “*Congregation of the Propaganda*,” or the propagation of the Roman Catholic faith which has charge of the direction and training young men of every nation for the priesthood.

11th. “*The Congregation of Indulgences*,”—which superintends the examination of relics, as well as granting indulgences.

Consecration.—The form of words by which the bread and wine are changed into the literal body, blood, soul and divinity of Christ.

Cope.—A wide vestment of silk, reaching nearly to the feet, opened in front and fastened by a clasp at the back. It is used by the priests in procession with the Mass.

Corporal.—The linen cloth on which the bread is consecrated, covering the whole face of the altar. It must be blessed by a Bishop, or Priest with special authority.

Corpus Christi.—(The body of Christ). The celebration of the institution of the Eucharist on Thursday of the Holy Week. The blessed sacrament is carried in procession on this day. This is a special day of granting indulgences.

Cowl.—The cowl is a garment with a hood, covering the head and shoulders and without sleeves. Worn by Roman monks.

Crib.—The actual crib in which the Saviour was laid is said to be preserved in the Liberian church at Rome. Of course Romanists worship that crib.

Crosier.—The staff given to a bishop on his consecration, as a symbol of his rule over his flock.

Crucifix.—A cross representing Christ crucified, used by Romanists in their idolatrous worship. It seems that this crucifix was sanctioned by the synod of Trullo in 692. This is a favorite idol, especially to be worshipped by the sick, or those about to be executed.

Curate.—One entrusted with the care of souls. The priest who assists the rector or leading priest in the discharge of his functions.

Dalmatic.—A vestment open on each side, with wide sleeves, and marked with two stripes. Worn by Roman deacons at high Mass, and in procession.

Deacon.—In the Roman Church an officer who serves at the altar, whose rank is next to a priest.

Decretals.—The collection of laws and decisions gathered by St. Raymond at the command of Pope Gregory IX. This work was completed in 1234. There are five books of the Decretals which are regarded as authentic and infallible.

Denunciation.—An edict of the Roman Inquisition bearing date of 1677 ordering all persons, under penalty of excommunication, “to denounce to the Holy Office, within the term of one month, all persons whom they may know to be heretics, or suspected of heresy, and the abettors of such” etc. The Catholic Dictionary says:

“Formal heretics, on account of the pestilent and contagious nature of the crime, ought to be denounced even after their death, so that they may be declared excommunicate, be deprived of ecclesiastical sepulture, be disinterred and their bones burned, if they can be distinguished from those of Catholics; if not, they should be burnt in effigy.”

Deposing Power.—According to the Catholic Dictionary “the Pope as the vicegerent of Christ could lawfully excommunicate, and after excommunication depose or procure the deposition of a sovereign who had fallen into heresy.” This deposing power has never been repudiated by the Pope.

Diocese.—A tract of country, or district under the authority of one Bishop.

Dispensation.—"The relaxation of a law in a particular case." The Pope claims authority to "dispense from obligations to God which a man has incurred of his own free will—e. i. by oath or vow." This power the Pope claims by virtue of the keys.

Dolours of the Blessed Virgin.—In 1814, Pius VII., directed that a feast of the Dolours "should be kept on the third Sunday of September" in allusion to the seven sorrows of the Blessed Virgin, in connection with the crucifixion of Christ.

Dominicans.—An order of monks or friars established under the direction of St. Dominic in 1215. The order of St. Dominic has been very popular in the Roman Church.

Easter.—The feast of the resurrection of Christ. The word Easter is derived from the Saxon goddess, *Eastre*. The term Easter, in the King James version is a gross error, where it is put for the Passover. Romanists count Easter, the feast of feasts. This great Easter feast is celebrated by Romanists and others "on the Sunday following the first full moon after the vernal equinox, and because on that day Christ rose again finished the work of redemption, and accomplished our deliverance from the Egyptian bondage of death and hell." "All movable feasts are calculated from Easter." It is a pity that so many Protestants and even Baptists are copying some Easter services from the Church of Rome.

Eminence.—The title given to Cardinals in 1630. It means a political as well as a spiritual power.

Encyclical.—A circular letter of the Pope to all his Bishops, in which he condemns prominent errors, and informs them of the difficulties which impede the progress of the Roman Church.

Epiphany.—A Roman feast kept January 6th to commemorate the manifestation of Christ's glory. (1). When adored by the Magi. (2). In his baptism. (3). In the miracle of changing water into wine. They have a tradition that lights appeared along the Jordan when Christ was baptised.

Eucharist.—"The base perversion of the Lord's Supper into what Romanists call the "sacrifice of the Mass," in which they worship the bread and wine under the name of the "Sacred Host."

Ex-cathedra.—This means from the chair, and is applied to the so-called infallible utterances of the Pope, concerning faith and morals, for the whole Church.

Excommunication.—The separation from the communion of the Church under the power of the keys. With Romanists, it is of two kinds--the minor and the major. By minor excommunication one is deprived of the Sacraments. By major excommunication one is deprived of all ecclesiastical communication, which is equivalent to *anathema*.

Extreme Unction.—The last of the seven sacraments, which is called "the sacrament of the sick." In this sacrament, the priest anoints the body for the sanctification of soul and body, and for preparation for death.

Father.—A title applied to pastors in the third century, but now applied to priests and other officials. This application of the term is directly opposed to Scripture, which forbids us to call any one "father" religiously.

Festivals of the Church.—A vast number of days observed in commemoration of the various saints, as well as those in commemoration of events in the life of Christ. The vast number of saints days marks the Roman Church as anti-Christian.

Franciscans.—An order of monks founded by St. Francis, who died in 1226. With Romanists, St. Francis was an extraordinary man.

Friar.—A title given to the members of Roman mendicant orders, of which there are fourteen. The word *friar* is a corruption of the French *frere* which means brother.

Gallicanism.—This term is applied to the French Catholics who denied

the infallibility of the Pope and his temporal authority over nations. They regard the authority of a general council above that of the Pope. Gallicanism stands opposed to ultramontaniam which is the doctrine of the Italian Romanists who have steadfastly adhered, for centuries, to the infallibility of the Pope and his temporal jurisdiction over all nations.

Golden Rose.—A rose, or flower, made of gold, and blessed by the Pope on the fourth Sunday in Lent. It sent by the Pope as a present to princes and rich ladies, who regard this present as a great favor.

Holy Water.—"Water and salt are exercised by the priest and so withdrawn from the power of Satan." This salt water is supposed to have great virtue in frightening demons, preventing storms and other calamities.

Holy Week.—The week preceding Easter Sunday, every day of which is celebrated as a holy day, among Roman Catholics. Of this week, Holy Thursday is especially celebrated as the time of the institution of the Eucharist. It is called *Mauday-Thursday*. On this day the principal priest or prelate washes the feet of twelve poor men. On this day the Pope washes the feet of thirteen poor persons, all of whom are priests. In this holy week Good Friday is the day for the commemoration of the crucifixion of Christ. On this day the cross is kissed by the clergy and people.

Host.—(from *hostia*—a victim). The Roman name given to the Eucharist, or bread and wine of the supper. They regard the host as Jesus Christ himself, who was offered as a "sacrifice for the living and the dead." This Host is carried in procession for the worship of the people.

Immaculate Conception; The Feast of.—This feast is observed, Dec. 9, in honor of the supposed Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary. With Romanists this is a very sacred day.

Indulgence.—With Romanists this means an amnesty or pardon, granted by the Pope or others authorized by him as "a remission of the punishment which is still due to sin after sacramental absolution, this remission being valid in the court of conscience and before God, and being made by an application of the treasure of the Church on the part of a lawful superior." A "plenary indulgence" is the remission of all the future punishment due to a Roman Catholic who is not in mortal sin. "An indulgence does not only remit, but also satisfies the justice of God for, the temporal punishment of sin." These quotations are from the Catholic Dictionary.

Inquisition.—A tribunal established in the Roman Church in the thirteenth century for the discovery and punishment of heretics. It partook both of the nature of an ecclesiastical and political court, and carried on its blood thirsty work independent of the ordinary civil tribunals. This fiendish institution butchered hundreds of thousands of the human family for differing from the Church of Rome. The Inquisition still exists with headquarters at Rome with the Pope as the chief inquisitor, though it has lost the power of carrying out its fiendish designs.

Introit.—Words uttered by the priest in the Mass at the close of "the Confeiteor" at the altar. It is regarded as the beginning or entrance of the Mass, and is often sung by the choir.

Jesuits.—A notorious society founded under the auspices of Ignatius Loyola in the sixteenth century, with the avowed purpose of counteracting the Reformation under Luther. The Jesuits oath requires absolute servile obedience to the Pope in temporal as well as spiritual matters. This Society is regarded as the army of the Pope, and its members are sent out as spies into all the nations of the earth. The very name Jesuit indicates cunning, craft, deceit, diviltry, and all the ecclesiastical and political meanness that can be conceived.

Kiss of Peace.—In former times this kiss was bestowed at baptism and other solemn occasions. This Pope's feet are kissed as a mark of homage immediately after his installation in office. The Emperor Charles V. is said to have been the last royal person who kissed the feet of the Pope.

Legate.—One who represents the Pope and his authority before other governments. Legates are generally Cardinals.

Lent.—The Roman Catholic fast of forty days before Easter. Except by special permission, Romanists are not allowed to eat meat during this period.

Limbo.—With Romanists, a place supposed to be on the outskirts of hell. Here infants are confined who die without baptism.

Liturgies.—With Romanists, liturgies include all the written forms of service connected with the Eucharist. It is claimed that liturgies existed as early as the fifth century.

Loreto.—A little city in Central Italy not far from Ancona, in which the "Holy House" is preserved which was occupied by the Virgin Mary at Nazareth. Romanists say that this is "the house in which God's mother dwelt for many years with her divine son and St. Joseph," at Nazareth. It is stated that on May 10th, 1231 this "Holy House" was carried through the air by angels to a place called Tersatz, Italy, but after three years and a half was removed Dec. 10th, 1234 to the opposite side of the Adriatic. In 1295 it was removed a third time by the angels, and then a fourth time in the same year, and is now settled in the above named locality. It is said that the Blessed Virgin appeared in a vision to a hermit near by and related the whole affair. This is one of the "Lying Wonders" of the Roman Church.

Low Sunday.—The first Sunday after Easter.

Mantle.—An ornamental vestment worn by subdeacons and by the clergy at Mass. It hangs from the left arm below the elbow. It is of the same color and material as the chasuble. It is often highly ornamented with gold.

Mary, Feasts of.—In the Roman Church there are seven feasts in honor of the Virgin Mary.

- (1) "Feast of Mary the help of Christians, May 24th."
- (2) "Feast of the Blessed Virgin Mary of Mt. Carmel."
- (3) Feast of "St. Mary of Snow." This feast is called the Feast of Snow because it is said the Virgin Mary caused it to snow in August at a place where she wished a church built in her honor. This church was built in Rome by Pope Liberius in the thirteenth century.
- (4) The Feast of "Our Lady of Mercy." It is observed Sept. 24th.
- (5) The Feast of "Our Lady of the Rosary." It is observed the first Sunday in October.
- (6) The Feast of the "Patronage of the Blessed Virgin." It was established in Spain in 1673. It is observed July 9th.
- (7) "The Feast of Our Lady's Expectation."

Besides these, there are many other feasts in honor of the Virgin Mary.

Mass.—The name given to the Roman Eucharist, called the Host. This Mass is called the "Sacrifice of adoration, of praise and thanksgiving." It is also a "Sacrifice of propitiation for sin," etc. Devout Romanists pay for Masses to be celebrated for the souls of their departed friends. *High Mass* is Mass with incense and music with the assistance of a deacon and subdeacon. This Mass service is usually sung. *Low Mass*, is Mass without music. The priest repeats the form without singing. Many other kinds of Masses are observed.

Maundy Thursday.—(See Holy Week.) Thursday before Easter, called Holy Thursday.

Metropolitan.—The leading Bishop of the metropolis of a country or province.

Missal.—The book which contains the complete service of the Masses throughout the year.

Mitre.—The head-dress worn by Bishops, Abbots and other distinguished Romanists. It is copied from the heathen.

Novice, Novitiate.—A term applied to those entering "religious houses," such as nunneries and monasteries, during the first year.

Nun.—A maid or widow who has consecrated herself to God by the three vows of poverty, chastity and obedience, and bound herself to live in a convent under a certain rule.

Nuncio.—A legate or ambassador sent by the Pope to a foreign court.

Oblates.—A congregation of secular priests, divided into different orders. They are employed by the Bishop, and do such work as is assigned to them.

Offertory.—A musical response, which is usually sung by the choir in connection with the Mass.

Oils, Holy.—Romanists have three different kinds of Holy Oils. (1) The oil of *catechumen* used in blessing fonts, in baptism, consecration of churches, altars, etc. (2) *Oil of chrism*. It is also used in blessing the font, in baptism, confirmation, consecration of a bishop and other things. (3) *Oil of the sick*, which is used in Extreme Unction, blessing of bells, etc.

Order, Holy.—The Roman Church has seven orders in the ministry: bishops, priests, deacons, subdeacons, acolytes, exorcists and readers.

Ordinary.—A diocesan Bishop, who in union with the Pope, performs all the ecclesiastical functions in his own right, while priests perform their duties by authority from the bishop.

Palla.—A small cloth of linen used to cover the chalice, or cup containing the wine which is supposed to be changed into the blood of Christ.

Pallium.—A band of white wool worn on the shoulders. It has two strings of the same material and four purple crosses worked on it. It is first worn by the Pope and then sent by him to patriarches, primates, archbishops, and sometimes, though rarely, to bishops. This is regarded as a very sacred thing, because it has touched the body of the Pope!

Palm Sunday.—The Sunday before Easter. It is observed by Romanists in honor of the entrance of Christ into Jerusalem.

Passion Sunday.—The Sunday before Palm Sunday, during Lent.

Patén.—A plate upon which to receive the consecrated Host, or bread of the Mass.

Pater Noster.—The Lord's Prayer as repeated in the Roman liturgies.

Paulists.—An order of missionary priests, established in New York by "Rev. Father Hecker," in 1855.

Pectoral Cross.—A small cross of precious metal worn on the breast of bishops and abbots, as a mark of distinction.

Penance, Sacrament of.—This is one of the most solemn Sacraments of the Roman Church, in which the confession of all mortal sins is required. In this sacrament, the priest is supposed to be Jesus Christ himself, and to really pardon the penitent!

Peter's Pence.—This originally was an annual tax of one penny for every house in England. But Peter's Pence of the present time is a contribution collected by the Bishops from Romanists all over the world, for the maintenance of the Pope.

Pope.—(From *papas* or *papa*). It is a title of respect which was given in the early centuries to venerable pastors of individual churches. But Gregory VII., 1073, formally prohibited the use of this title to any but himself. The Pope claims the titles "Father of all fathers," "The Chief High Priest and Prince of God," "The Regent of the House of the Lord," "The Oracle of Religion," "Our Most Holy Lord God," "Our Lord God the Pope," "The Divine Majesty," etc., etc.

Prelate.—A general name for Roman dignitaries.

Priest.—In the Roman Church the second rank of holy orders. The priest is authorized by the Pope "to bless, rule, preach, and baptize." He is authorized to offer the sacrifice of the Mass.

Primate.—In early times, bishops were called Primates because they held the prime or first position in the Church.

Prior or Prioress.—The ruler of a monastery. So-called since the thirteenth century. A prioress is a woman who occupies a similar governing position over a house of nuns, as occupied by the Prior over the monks.

Propaganda.—The "Sacred Congregation of Cardinals" at Rome for the propagation of the Roman faith. They superintend the preparation, and sending out of missionaries into the different parts of the world.

Purgatory.—An imaginary place where Romanists suppose that Christians are to atone for their sins after death, by suffering indescribable torments in frightful flames, until they are purified!!!

Redemptorists.—"The Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer" founded in 1732, by Alphonsus Liguori. This Society was approved by Pope Benedict XIV., in 1743. The main occupation of these "Redemptorist Fathers" is the "preaching of missions and retreats to all classes of persons." These Redemptorists seem to have been specially charged with proselytizing others to the Roman faith. This congregation is under the government of a Superior-General called Rector Major, who is elected for life and resides in the city of Rome. The nuns, called *Redemptoristines*, belonging to the same order, are usually under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of the diocese in which they reside.

Regulars.—Persons in the Roman Church, of either sex, observing a common rule of life, bound by three vows of religion, obedience, poverty, and chastity.

Relics.—A term used by Romanists to describe bodies, or parts of bodies of departed saints, articles of clothing, or something which is supposed to have been connected with sacred persons or things. "Such as the holy nails, lance, spear, or fragments of the True Cross, the girdle, veil, etc., of the Blessed Virgin." These objects with Romanists are objects of veneration, and even worship, and they suppose that wonderful miracles are wrought by these relics!

Religious.—This is a term applied to those Romanists "who have taken the vows of perpetual obedience, poverty and chastity."

Rituale.—The book which contains the forms to be observed by the priest in the administration of the sacraments, and other religious ceremonies.

Rogation Days.—The Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday before *Ascension day*, as observed by Romanists, are called the *Rogation Days*, because the Litany of Saints is chanted in procession which takes place on each of these three days.

Rosary.—A form of prayer in which fifteen decades of Hail Mary's (prayers to Mary) each of which is preceded by one *Pater Noster* (Lord's Prayer). Thus one prayer is offered to God while ten are offered to Mary. Thus, according to the Rosary, Mary receives ten times as much devotion as God himself.

Saints.—The Council of Trent decreed that it was useful to offer prayers to saints, to secure their intercession for us.

Scapular.—It is a cloth worn on the shoulders, before and behind: connected by straps over the shoulders. This Scapular is worn in honor of the Virgin Mary, as a token of servitude to her. It is taught that the Blessed Virgin appeared to Pope John XXII and informed him that if any of those who wore the scapular went to Purgatory, she herself would descend into Purgatory on the Saturday following their death, and take them direct to heaven! This is a special indulgence granted by Mary.

Seal of Confession.—The obligation of keeping absolutely secret whatever transpires in the confessional. Penitents as well as the priests are bound never to reveal what occurs in the confessional. A priest would as soon see a whole nation destroyed as to reveal the crime which he has learned in the confessional. The law of the Roman Church, should a priest break the seal of the confessional, "condemns such a priest to deposition and perpetual imprisonment in a monastery." This shows that monasteries and convents are penitentiaries where persons are held for life, for the violation of the laws of the Roman Church.

Sisterhoods.—This name is given to the various orders of women who have taken the Roman vows. These *sisterhoods*, are numbered in the Catholic Dictionary as follows:

1st. *Sisters of Assumption*, established in 1839. 2nd. *Sisters of St. Bridgit* founded 1857. 3rd. *Sisters of Charity*, called also *Gray Sisters*, founded 1634. 4th. *Sisters of Charity of St. Paul*. 5th. *Sisters of Charity* (Irish).

6th. *Sisters of the Good Shepherd*. 7th. *Sisters of the Holy Child Jesus*. 8th. *Sisters (Little) of the Poor*. 9th. *Sisters of Mercy*. 10th. *Sisters (Poor) of Nazareth*. 11th. *Sisters of the Poor Child Jesus*. 12th. *Sisters of Providence*. 13th. *Sisters of Notre Dame*, Congregation of. All these sisters are called "religious," having taken the vows of obedience, poverty and chastity.

Stations of the Cross.—A series of objects or pictures representing the different events in the Passion of Christ, each station corresponding to a particular event. These different stations are usually placed around in the church house. There are fourteen of these stations.

Stigmata.—this is the name given to wounds which it is claimed are inflicted, as Christ was on the cross. The story is told in the Catholic Dictionary thus:

"One morning, says St. Bonaventure, about the fourteenth of September, the feast of the Exaltation of the Cross, Francis saw a scap flying towards him. There was a figure of a man attached to a cross between the wings, after the vision disappeared, the hands and feet of the saint were found to be marked with nails, and there was a wound in his side. The wounds were seen by some of the friars, and by Alexander IV. during the lifetime of the saint, and after his death by fifty friars, St. Claire, and a multitude of seculars. St. Bonaventure assures us that he had the testimony of Alexander IV. from the Pope's own lips. The Church keeps a feast of the *Stigmata* of St. Francis instituted by Benedict XII."

It is claimed that other persons have received the same wounds which is regarded as a very great honor.

Stole.—A narrow vestment made of the same material as the chasuble and worn around the neck. The Pope always wears a stole. Bishops and priests wear a stole in the Mass.

Surplice.—A garment of white linen worn by the priest over the cassock in the choir, and in the administration of the Sacraments.

Thurible.—A golden vessel containing incense used by Romanists in their superstitious worship.

Tiara.—The Pope's "head dress, pointed at the top and surrounded by three crowns which the Pope wears as a symbol of sovereignty. This *tiara* is placed upon the Pope's head at his coronation by the Cardinal Deacon who says: "Receive the *tiara* adorned with three crowns, and know that thou art Father of princes and kings, Ruler of the world, vicar of our Savior Jesus Christ."

These three crowns indicate that the Pope has authority in heaven, earth and hell, and is "Ruler of the world," politically as well as spiritually. Jesus Christ at his ascension claimed all power in heaven and earth, and as his Vicar, the Pope claims the same power, thereby making himself equal with God!

Tithes.—In the Roman Church, tithes were originally paid to the Bishops, but with the erection of separate benefices the right to them passed to the parish priests, in whom it is now vested by the common law of the Church." In addition to tithes extorted by the Roman officials, they extort vast sums of money from their members to pay for Masses to deliver souls from Purgatory, to pay for the burial of the dead, for the administration of baptism, etc. Through the extortions of money by the hierarchy, the private members of the Roman Church are usually kept very poor.

Tradition.—In the Roman Church, this means the unwritten teachings handed down verbally through the Pope, Bishops, and Priests. These traditions are claimed to be of divine authority, of which the Pope is the soul judge. The Catholic Dictionary says: "So far from setting tradition, as such, aside, Christ left his church with no written books, and with nothing but tradition to guide it." Also, the Dictionary says: "It was tradition which settled the canon of Scripture." "The authority of Scripture itself was based on tradition." Thus according to Romanism, tradition, which means the will of the Pope, is of superior authority to the Holy Scriptures! The Scriptures must bend to tradition! The traditions mentioned by Paul to be observed, was the inspired word of God which was committed to writing

during the apostolic age, through inspired men. The traditions which contradict the inspired word of God are anti-Christian.

Transfiguration, Feast of.—This feast is observed by Romanists, August 6th, as one of the twelve greater feasts of the Church, and is regarded as next after Easter in importance.

Trappists.—An order of monks, established at LaTrappe, France and said to be governed by very severe rules. They are so rigid that one monk is not allowed to speak to another, except those that rule the monastery.

Trent, Council of.—The great Roman Council of the sixteenth century, which was convened to check the progress of the Reformation. Its first session was held in 1545, under Pope Paul III. and continued under Popes Julius III., Paul IV., and was concluded under Pius IV., meeting from time to time for eighteen years. Its last session was held 1563. The Council of Trent settled the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, which were endorsed by Pius IV., as infallible.

Tunic.—A vestment worn by subdeacons, given them by the bishop at ordination. Like the Dalmatic, previously mentioned, this tunic is also worn by the Bishop.

Ursulines.—An order of nuns founded by St. Angela Merici of Brescia, in 1537. This body was called the "Company of St. Ursula." Convents of this Society have been founded in various countries, and were introduced into America in 1818. They have settlements in New Orleans, St. Louis, and other cities.

Vatican Council.—This last Council of the Roman Church convened December 8th, 1869, and has not been concluded yet. Soon after the declaration of the pope's infallibility, it was interrupted by the war between France and Germany, and was adjourned with the expectation of meeting again. But, as the Pope has been declared infallible, independent of a council, there can certainly be no further need of a general council. The word of the Pope being equal to that of God Almighty, is all that any Romanist needs, to settle any point of doctrine or difficulty.

Veil.—Taking the veil is used for the ceremonies by which a novitiate becomes a permanent nun. The Catholic Dictionary says:

"Every virgin, before the Bishop puts the veil upon her head, kisses his hand." "After their communion each gives up her taper to the bishop, after kissing his hand, and he gives to them all his benediction. Then the abbess pulls their veils down beneath their chins, and so they remain for three days." These are some of the ceremonies of taking the veil.

Vestments.—The various garments used by the Roman clergy in performing their idolatrous worship.

Viaticum.—Eucharist communion given in danger of death. It is supposed to be the last communion, to prepare the participant for the journey to the spirit land.

Vicar, Apostolic.—A bishop, archbishop or some one else appointed under the authority of the Pope and sent out from the Sacred Congregation at Rome, to establish dioceses in foreign countries, or to those countries where the authority of the regular bishop has been interrupted. In 1883 there were 112 apostolic vicariates.

Vicar General.—One appointed by a Bishop to aid him in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs, having the same power as a bishop, within the bounds of the jurisdiction granted him.

Vigils.—With Romanists a watch night observed before a feast. In some cases these vigils are observed only till midnight.

Vulgate.—The Latin translation of the Scriptures made by Jerome. The Council of Trent established the Vulgate imperfect translation as the only authentic Scriptures of the Roman Church. The Catholic Dictionary says:

"But it is not lawful to use any except the Clementine edition in church, or to print any other text of the Vulgate, or even to insert various readings in the margin (Preface to the Clementine edition, *ad fin*): though there is no objection to placing them at the foot of the page."

Whit-Sunday.—This is the name given by Romanists to the feast of Pentecost, which means "White Sunday." It is observed fifty days after Easter in honor of the descent of the Holy Ghost.

"And in her [Rome] was found the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth." Rev. 18:24.