

The Baptist Examiner

A nation-wide, independent paper, standing foursquare for the distinguishing doctrines of Baptists, and shunning not to declare all the counsel of God.

"To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them" (Isa. 8:20).

Vol. 2, No. 3

ASHLAND, KY., MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1932

Whole No. 19

A Reply To the Recent Encyclical of Pope Pius XI

A MESSAGE TO ROMAN CATHOLICS

In Which We Show That the Roman Catholic Hierarchy Is Not the True Church of the Lord Jesus Christ, and Urge Them to Turn From This False and Apostate Institution to Christ and His True Churches.

By THE EDITOR

Pope Pius XI, the present successor of a line of pagan pontiffs and of another gradually developed and succeeding line of Roman usurpers, sent out a Christmas encyclical, in which he urged the union of all Christians under his dominion.

In reply to the pope's appeal we send out a message to Catholics everywhere, urging them to turn away from **"MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF THE HARLOTS AND OF THE ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH"** *drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus.*" (Rev 17:5, 6).

We thus speak, not through any malice toward Catholics, but because of a desire to awaken them to the true nature of the institution with which they are affiliated. The Roman Catholic Church is the greatest imposter of the ages. We believe it to be pretty clearly foreshadowed in the scarlet woman and mystical Babylon of Revelation. And we would urge our message upon Catholics with special emphasis because the time may not be far-distant when the Man of Sin (2 Thess. 2:3), the Beast of Revelation (Rev. 13), will be revealed; with whom the Roman Catholic Church (represented by the scarlet woman riding on the Beast—Rev. 17:1-4) and the papacy (represented by the second beast or false prophet—Rev. 13:11-17; 19:20) will form a league; ushering in the day of destruction for the Roman Catholic hierarchy, when from heaven it shall be proclaimed. **"Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird"** (Rev. 18:2).

The Scripture says: **"Prove all things; hold fast to that which is good"** (1 Thess. 5:21). Dear Roman Catholic friend, do you know that the teachings of your church are good—that is, that they are according to the truth as taught by Christ and the apostles? You are ready to reply: **"Yes, I know that the teachings of my church are good, because she is the Church of Christ, and the Church of Christ cannot err in her teachings."** All right, be that as it may. But suppose we are able to show you that your church is not the church of Christ? Of course, you think we cannot do that; but will you think with us a little while on the matter? If what we say is not according to the truth of Christ, we do not want you to accept it; and we leave you to be the judge. Not for one moment do we desire to lead you astray, or to force a single belief upon you. All we ask of you is what Paul exhorted the Thessalonians to do.

The Greek word for "prove" in 1 Thess. 5:21 means **"to test, examine, prove, scrutinize."** And the purpose of this is **"to see whether a thing be genuine or not."** All we ask of you is that you **test, examine, prove, and scrutinize your church to see whether it be genuine or not.** If you are unwilling to

do this, then you are unwilling to obey the word of God; and the Scripture says: **"He that is of God heareth God's words."** And if you will not hear them, it may be said of you as it was said of the Pharisees by Christ: **"Ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God."** See John 8:47. Your church cannot consistently object to what we are asking you to do; for, while your church does not accept the Bible as a complete and sufficient guide in faith and practice, yet it does profess to believe in the inspiration of the Scriptures and denies that there is any antagonism between its teachings and those of the Scriptures.

In the interest of the truth and your own spiritual welfare we ask your consideration of the following four reasons why the Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of the Lord Jesus Christ:

1. **The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of Christ because it has a human head, while the church of Christ has no head but Christ himself.** See Eph. 1:22; 4:15; Col. 1:18.

There is not a single passage of Scripture that says anything about the church of Christ having a human head. And, even though the Scriptures were not a complete and sufficient guide in faith and practice, we should expect some historical record in the Scriptures if New Testament churches had a human head.

New Testament churches had no pope. Christ flatly affirmed that such an office should not exist among his followers. He called the attention of the apostles to the fact that the princes of the Gentiles exercised dominion and authority over them, and then he said: **"IT SHALL NOT BE SO AMONG YOU."** See Matt. 20:25, 26 and Luke 22:25, 26. Christ said: **"It shall NOT be so among you."** The Roman Catholic Church says: **"It SHALL be so among you."** Which is right?

Peter was first among the twelve apostles, but his was only a primacy among equals and not a primacy of office or authority. This is shown by the fact that when Paul named the pillars of the church at Jerusalem, he mentioned James first instead of Peter. How could this be accounted for if Peter was pope? Does the officiating priest over a local Catholic body stand higher as a pillar than the pope? And picture a subordinate Roman Catholic prelate administering a stinging public rebuke to the pope for instability and inconsistency as Paul did to Peter. See Gal. 2:11-14.

The power of binding (forbidding) and loosing (allowing) that was given to Peter (Matt. 16:18) was given also to all the apostles alike (Matt. 18:18). And this was merely a gift of authority to the apostles as inspired teachers. Moreover, there is not one word about its being transmissible.

The authority to forgive sins was likewise given to all the apostles alike. See John 20:22, 23. And there is no indication

that this was a transference to them of the prerogative of Christ. We never hear the apostles say to any one: "Thy sins be forgiven thee." Peter directed Simon the sorcerer to seek forgiveness of God. Acts 8:22. Neither did these words of Christ authorize the confessional, for no such institution is found in the New Testament. Neither is there any proof that it existed under the approval of the apostles in their lifetime.

The authority to forgive sins was authority as inspired teachers to lay down the terms of forgiveness. The connection between the impartation of the Holy Spirit and the giving of this authority shows clearly that this authority depended upon the special endowment of the Spirit. The Roman Catholic Church claims the same authority for her clergy, but disclaims inspiration for them. Thus her claim falls for want of a proper foundation. The apostolic office and authority were no more perpetual than apostolic inspiration.

The effort to try to find a basis for the papacy in the command of Christ to Peter to strengthen his brethren is absurd. See Luke 22:32. This command was given to Peter because his denial of Christ and subsequent repentance would eminently fit him for strengthening the weak. But this was not given to Peter in any official sense. Paul did as much strengthening of his brethren as Peter did, if not more. See Acts 14:22; 15:41; 18:23. And Paul did not do his work upon the authority or under the direction of Peter. Paul got his authority as directly from Christ as Peter did. See Gal 1:16, 17. And on one occasion, as already pointed out, Paul found it necessary to strengthen Peter and prevent him from weakening his brethren. Paul founded more churches than Peter did according to New Testament record. And while Paul had much to do with the church at Rome, there is not the slightest certain scriptural mention of Peter in connection with either the city or church. Peter was probably martyred at Rome and may have spent some time there toward the close of his life, but that he was founder and first bishop of the church is untenable to any fair-minded person. Irenaeus and Eusebius unite in making Linus the first bishop of Rome.

It is equally absurd to ground the papal contention on Christ's command to Peter to feed the sheep. See John 21:15-17. In giving this command to Peter, Christ was merely reinstating him after his fall. Feeding the sheep, like strengthening the brethren, was not given to Peter in any official sense. Paul did as much of this as Peter did, if not more; and he did it not upon the authority or under the direction of Peter, but by virtue of a commission received directly from Christ.

Nowhere did Peter assume the role or exercise the authority of a pope. He claimed to be only an apostle (1 Pet 1:1) and an elder (1 Pet. 5:1). And he expressly forbade elders lording it over the heritage or charge allotted to them. See R. V. of 1 Pet. 5:3. The Douay Version's rendering of "klaros" as "clergy" instead of "heritage" or "allotted charge" in this latter passage is a glaring perversion of the plain meaning of the term. "Klaros" is the word from which "clergy" is derived, but such a use of the Greek term was unknown in apostolic times. The clear meaning of the exhortation is that elders and bishops are not to lord it over the churches over which the Holy Spirit makes them overseers. See Acts 20:28. Thus Peter, the alleged first pope, vetoed the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

If Peter was pope, why was he not somewhere, either by himself or some other person, styled "Vicar of Christ," "Universal Bishop," "Head of the Church," "Custodian of the Faith," "Sovereign Pontiff," "Chief Pilot of the Church," "Supreme Pastor of the Faithful," or "Father and Doctor of all Christians?" All of these titles have been applied to popes. Why were none of them or anything similar ever applied to Peter?

If Peter was pope and Bishop of the church at Rome, was

it not an act of presumption on the part of the Apostle Paul to write a long letter to the church at Rome, instructing them in many things, without so much as mentioning Peter? Would a modern Catholic priest, bishop, or Cardinal do that? And how account for the absence of any mention of Peter's authority in the several letters Paul wrote from Rome to other churches? Why was there never any appeal made by the apostles in the New Testament to the supposed supreme and preeminent authority of Peter?

If Peter was pope, why did not the early Corinthian church write to him about matters of faith and morals instead of to Paul? See 1 Cor. 7:1. This is a very appropriate question in view of the question asked by Cardinal Gibbons on page 110 of "Faith of Our Fathers." The Cardinal refers to the fact that the church at Corinth later wrote to Clement, the alleged third successor of Peter, when "some dissension and scandal" had occurred in the church. And he (the Cardinal) asks: "Why did the Corinthians appeal to Rome, far away in the West, and not to Ephesus, so near home in the East, where the Apostle St. John lived?" The Cardinal then adds: "Evidently because the jurisdiction of Ephesus was local, while that of Rome was universal." Now we wish to ask: "Why did not the early Corinthian church appeal to Rome as did the later Corinthian church?" And we reply: "Evidently because the supremacy of Rome had not begun to be recognized at the time of the first appeal as it had at the time of the second." And it needs to be noted that there is not the least trace of modern papal assumption and pretended infallibility in the reply of Clement.

And when the controversy about the necessity of Gentiles keeping the Jewish law arose in the church at Antioch, why were Paul and Barnabas sent to Jerusalem instead of to Rome? Do you reply that it was because Peter was at Jerusalem at this time? If so, we will ask you how he came to be at Jerusalem at this time when he was supposed to be presiding over the "See of Rome?" And why were Paul and Barnabas sent to "the apostles and elders" (Acts 15:2) instead of to the "pope?" Suppose Pope Pius XI was now in New York City and, dissension having come up among the Roman Catholics of Philadelphia, a delegation should be sent to New York to obtain an authoritative settlement of the matter, would that delegation be sent to the Roman Catholic clergy of New York or to the pope? On page 125 of "Faith of Our Fathers," Cardinal Gibbons says: "When a dispute arises in the church regarding the sense of Scripture THE SUBJECT IS REFERRED TO THE POPE FOR FINAL ADJUDICATION. The Sovereign Pontiff, before deciding the case, gathers around him his venerable colleagues, the Cardinals of the Church; or he calls a council of his associates of the faith, the Bishops of Christendom; or he has recourse to other lights which the Holy Spirit may suggest to him. Then, after mature and prayerful deliberation, he pronounces judgment and his sentence is final, irrevocable and infallible." What we are asking is, why was not this method followed in the above controversy? And why did James preside over the council instead of Peter? And if Peter was pope, and his sentence, therefore, "final irrevocable and infallible," why did others speak after Peter had spoken? And why did the council adopt the words of James instead of those of Peter as the context of the letter that was sent out? And Cardinal Gibbons says: "Before becoming a law the Acts of Councils required the Pope's signature, just as our Congressional proceedings require the President's signature before they acquire the force of law." Why is there no mention of Peter's signature being affixed to the decisions of this council at Jerusalem? Has not Luke left out a very important item concerning these decisions?

2. The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of Christ because the institution Christ called his church found concrete expression in local, independent, democratic bodies

called churches, and not in a worldwide hierarchy like the Roman Catholic Church.

When Jesus said: "Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," he spoke of his church as an institution. He here used the term "church" in the generic sense, just as we commonly use the terms man, home, presidency, jury, etc. He founded an institution and promised perpetuity to that institution. This institution was not a hierarchy, but found expression in local, independent, democratic bodies, each of which was called a church. This is the only kind of a church that Christ has on the earth. Each of these churches managed their own affairs. They freely accepted the apostles as inspired teachers because of their confidence in them as those whom Christ had authorized but the apostles exercised no autocratic power over them. These facts are too evident to need any arguments to support them.

3. The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of Christ because it has perverted the gospel.

This is the charge Paul brought against the false teachers, the Judaizers, that had gotten in among the Galatian churches. Gal. 1:7. The charge can be brought with even greater weight against the Roman Catholic Church. Let us note how the Roman Catholic Church has perverted the gospel:

(1) It has perverted the scriptural teaching of how we are washed from our sins and how we become children of God. On page 6 of a tract on "The Sacramental System," written by W. M. Collins, and distributed by the International Catholic Truth Society, we read: "The first Sacrament is Baptism, which, as the Church teaches, cleanses us from original sin and makes us children of God." Contrary to this the Scripture says: "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin" (1 John 1:7) and "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:26). Baptism can cleanse only symbolically. "Water" in John 3:5 refers to the word of God and not to baptism. See Jas. 1:18; 1 Pet. 1:23; Titus 3:5; Eph. 5:25-27; John 15:3. Baptism represents not a birth, but a death and burial.

(2) It has perverted the truth concerning the nature of justification. On page 16 of a tract on "What the Catholic Church is and What She Teaches," written by E. R. Hull and published by the International Catholic Truth Society, we read: "Justification consists in the infusion of grace into the soul, by which we are put into a new relation with God." The Greek term for "justify" does not denote the infusion of grace into the soul. When used of God's act toward us, it is used forensically, and has to do not with our state but with our standing. Thus used it denotes God's pronouncement of our righteous standing before him through faith in the atoning, propitiating, vicarious, and redeeming blood of Christ. For the scriptural teaching on justification see Rom. 3:20-28; 4:1-18; 10:4; Gal. 3:11-13; Phil. 3:9.

There is no conflict between Paul and James on justification. Both affirm that it was through faith that Abraham was justified before God. See Rom. 4:2, 3; Jas. 2:23. When James asks: "Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar?" (Jas. 2:21), he used the term "justified," not in the forensic sense, but in the sense of to be evidenced to be righteous, which is another meaning of the term. By offering Isaac, Abraham evinced his faith, and was thus evinced by his act to be in possession of that righteousness that was imputed to him through faith. Thus justification is not by the infusion of righteousness in us, but by the imputation of righteousness to us. The Roman Catholic teaching on justification is designed to prepare the way for the doctrine of salvation by works.

(3) It has perverted the scriptural truth concerning the duration of justification. In the same tract just quoted, on page 17, we read: "The state of justification may be forfeited at any time by the commission of a grave sin." And again

on the same page: "The final destiny of each man is directly determined by the good or evil state in which he dies." But contrary to this we find from the Scriptures that justification is the gift of God. Rom. 3:24. And we find also that "The gifts and calling of God are without repentance" (Rom. 11:29). Repentance is a change of mind. This passage means then that God does not change his mind and withdraw the gifts that he bestows. This would needs be the case if one could forfeit his justification. And then we hear the apostle John as he quotes our Lord: "Vesily, 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). On another occasion Jesus said that his sheep shall never perish. See John 10:28. The Roman Catholic Church says that the justified MAY COME INTO CONDEMNATION AND PERISH. The Scripture says they SHALL NOT. Which is right. All justified persons are born of God, and John declares: "Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world" (1 John 5:4). The Roman Catholic Church says that they MAY OVERCOME THE WORLD OR MAY BE OVERCOME BY THE WORLD ACCORDING TO THE GOOD OR EVIL STATE IN WHICH THEY DIE. Which is right?

(4) It has perverted the scriptural truth on how grace is received. The Roman Catholic Church teaches that grace is received chiefly through the sacraments. "A sacrament," says Cardinal Gibbons, "is a visible sign instituted by Christ by which grace is conveyed to our souls." The Catechism says: "A Sacrament is a visible sign or action instituted by Christ to give grace." This violates the very meaning of grace and makes justification the reward of obedience; and contrary to this we read from the Scriptures: "Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 3:24). This Scripture says that to be justified by grace is to be justified FREELY. The Greek word for "freely" means "Freely, for naught, gratis, gratuitously." Now if we are justified by grace received through sacraments, grace is no more grace and we are not justified "freely, for naught, gratis, gratuitously." If we must be baptized, do penance, be confirmed, and receive the Eucharist and extreme unction in order to have the grace necessary to justification, then justification is a thing purchased, and not a thing bestowed "freely, for naught, gratis, gratuitously." The following Scriptures further show that we are saved freely and wholly apart from our works: "Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned by grace, BUT OF DEBT. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, HIS FAITH IS COUNTED FOR RIGHTEOUSNESS (justification)" (Rom. 4:4, 5). "If by grace, then it is no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace" (Rom. 11:6).

✓ (5) It has perverted the scriptural truth concerning the nature of grace." On page 265 of "Faith of Our Fathers" we find the following: "The grace of God is that supernatural assistance which he imparts to us, through the merits of Jesus Christ, for our salvation." Grace is not mere assistance; it is the free and unmerited favor of God in bestowing salvation wholly apart from our works through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. Rom. 3:24; 4:1-8.

This teaching concerning the nature of grace reduces salvation by grace to salvation by works that grace enables us to do. That this is not a misrepresentation is shown by the following comment on Rom. 3:28 in the Catholic Bible (Douay Version): "The works which he [the Apostle Paul] here excludes, are only works of the law: that is such as are done by the law of nature, or that of Moses, antecedent to faith in Christ; but by no means such as follow faith, and proceed from it."

The above comment on Rom. 3:28 is a clear evasion of the plain meaning of the passage. This will be seen by a study

(Continued on Page Four)

The Baptist Examiner

Published Semi-Monthly By The Editor
At 5025 Williams Avenue,
Ashland, Kentucky

T. P. SIMMONS.....Editor
C. D. COLE, Plant City, Fla.....
ROGER L. CLARK, Martin, Tenn.....
A. N. MORRIS, Doerun, Ga.....
W. M. WEBB, Texarkana, Ark., Tex.....
R. Y. BLALOCK, Caldwell, Idaho.....

Contributing
Editors

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE

1 Year in advance - - - - - \$1.00
6 Months in advance - - - - - \$.50
Foreign Subscriptions, per year - - - - - \$1.25

The paper will not be sent to any one beyond time paid for, except by special arrangement.

Entered as second-class matter Jan. 6, 1932, at the post office at Ashland, Ky., under the act of March 3, 1879.

We have decided to extend our special subscription offer to March 1, 1932. We want to give everybody a chance to subscribe for a good Baptist paper in spite of these hard times. Baptists ought to read more. We are trying to give them some good reading. And we are trying to put it within their reach financially. The subscriptions are coming in very gratifyingly. We invite every truth-loving Baptist to join our family of readers, which now extends into twenty-five or more states located in every section of the nation. We invite all our friends to help us increase that family and to extend it into every one of the forty-eight states. **REMEMBER THAT UNTIL MARCH THE FIRST THE BAPTIST EXAMINER IS ONLY FIFTY CENTS A YEAR.** If you receive a sample copy of this issue, it is a personal and urgent invitation to you to subscribe.

We hope the Lord will in some way provide the funds to issue our reply to the pope's encyclical in pamphlet form. Roman Catholics are publishing immense quantities of their literature for free distribution, and are scattering it everywhere. Would to God that Baptists could see the need of combating their heresies with sound literature. If you think our reply merits publication in pamphlet form, ask God to supply the funds. If God enables you and puts it into your heart to have fellowship with us in this matter, we shall be glad indeed for you to do so.

A REPLY TO THE RECENT ENCYCLICAL OF POPE PIUS XI

(Continued From Page Three)

of Rom. 1:17; 10:4; Gal. 3:1-14; Phil. 3:9. And the fact that this comment is an evasion is shown by the comment on Rom. 4:4. Seeing that "worketh" in this latter passage is in the present tense, and, therefore, that it could not be referred to works done antecedent to faith in Christ, it is said that it refers to works done in our own strength! Thus we have a fair sample of Roman Catholicism's wicked perversion of the word of God.

The law spoken of in Rom. 3:28 and similar passages is the law of Moses. And, according to Christ's interpretation (Matt. 22:37-40), the law of Moses comprehends every good work of which a man is capable. And the passages given show clearly that works done subsequent to faith in Christ are as

fully excluded from a place in our justification before God as are works done antecedent to faith in Christ. It is declared that Abraham was justified by faith and not by works (Rom. 4:2, 3), and the works of Abraham that are here referred to are works that he did subsequent to and as a result of his faith. They are such as his circumcision, his leaving home and kindred to follow the will of God, and his offering up of Isaac. Paul declares that these works did not justify him, but that his faith was counted for righteousness or justification. We have already shown the different senses in which James uses the word for justification, showing that there is no conflict between Paul and James on this matter.

The true, scriptural way of salvation may be summed up as follows: (A) **Man by nature is a sinner, condemned and lost.** Rom. 3:9, 10, 23; 5:18; Gal. 3:10. (B) **God's justice demands that sin be punished justly.** Rom. 3:26; Heb. 2:2, 3. (C) **Jesus Christ, the sinless Son of God, died as a substitute, the just for the unjust, for all that should ever trust him for salvation.** Isa. 53:4-7; Rom. 10:4; Gal. 3:13; 1 Pet. 2:24; 3:18; Heb. 10:14. (D) **Therefore, all who, having repented of sin, trust, depend, and rely on Jesus Christ as a personal and all-sufficient savior, receive a full, free, perfect, and eternal salvation wholly as a gift of grace.** John 4:10-15; 5:23; 10:27-29; Rom. 3:24-28; 6:23; 8:1; Eph. 1:13, 14; 2:8-10; Heb. 10:14; 1 Pet. 1:5; 1 John 5:4. If Jesus Christ purchased a full salvation for every one that shall ever believe on him, then there is nothing left for them to do but to believe on him. Salvation through faith and salvation by works are the direct opposites of each other. Rom. 3:27, 28; 4:2-5. So are salvation by grace and salvation by works. Rom. 11:6. If the Roman Catholic teaching on salvation were true, then man would have occasion to boast, but the scriptural way of salvation excludes boasting. Rom. 3:27.

By faith in Christ we receive the merits of his death, by which the penalty of our past, present, and future sins is remitted, and by which the perfect righteousness of Christ is imputed to us (Rom. 3:22; 4:3; Phil. 3:9), and by which we receive a perfect standing before God. Henceforth we are no longer reckoned as sinners in the sight of God. Henceforth God deals with us not as sinners, but as his children. When we sin he chastens us (1 Cor. 11:31, 32; Heb. 12:5, 6), but we are not condemned with the world; neither are our sins charged against us (Rom. 4:8), because Christ has suffered our full penalty and robbed the law of its power to condemn us (Rom. 10:4). Believers in Christ have eternal life, and can never come into condemnation (John 5:24). They are Christ's sheep, and can never perish (John 10:27-29). They have drunk of the water of life, and will never thirst again (John 4:14). They are sealed by the Holy Spirit until the day of redemption (Eph. 1:13, 14; 4:30). They are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation (1 Pet. 1:5). They are begotten of God and destined to overcome the world (1 John 5:4). They were foreknown of God, elected in Christ before the foundation of the world, and predestinated to be conformed to the image of Christ (Rom. 8:29; Eph. 1:4). They will never fall away and be lost because they can never go back into sin (1 John 3:9). God works in them both to will and to do his good pleasure (Phil. 2:13), thus completing the work he begins in salvation (Phil. 1:6). God's law has been written in their hearts (Heb. 8:10), and they serve God through faith that works by love (Gal. 5:6). They serve God, not in order to be saved, but because they are saved. They are under the new covenant, in which God promises that he will not turn away from them and that they shall not depart from him (Jer. 32:40). This, dear friend, is the true Bible teaching on salvation. If you have not received the Lord Jesus Christ as your savior, we urge you to do so at this moment. **"Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved."** (Acts, 16:31).

4. **The Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of Christ because it cannot be traced back to Christ.**

John J. O'Hara, a Roman Catholic priest of Bradley Beach, N. J., in a tract, says: **"It is our bounden duty to investigate the origin and claim of all churches to decide which one can be traced back to Christ."** We urge upon you these words from one of the leaders in your church. We ask you to investigate the origin and claim of your church and see if it can be traced back to Christ.

Even in your Catholic Bible you will fail to find anything that resembles the Roman Catholic Church. And your Catholic Bible is the most prejudiced translation of the Bible that has ever been made. It is not a faithful translation of the original languages, but is a translation of the corrupted Latin Vulgate of Jerome. Jerome was a devotee of Origin's oracular or arbitrary method of interpreting the Scriptures, and, as nearly as he dared to, Jerome made the Bible say what he wanted it to. The Catholic Bible is the supreme attempt to prove the scriptural origin of the Roman Catholic Church, and this attempt has proved a dismal failure.

The Roman Catholic Church came about as a result of a great apostasy from New Testament faith by the great majority of the churches during the centuries following the apostolic era. Judaism and heathenism were amalgamated with these churches, and they were wedded to the Roman Empire by Constantine. This brought so-called Christianity into the same place that paganism had occupied as the state religion of the Roman Empire. The previous partial amalgamation of corrupt Christianity with paganism was now hastened to completion. As paganism had a pontiff, so this so-called Christianity had to have one. And as Rome was the capitol and center of paganism, so it had to be of this corrupted Christianity also. Thus an incipient papacy was given foundation and tremendous impetus. The papacy descends not from Peter, but from the Roman Pantheon where sat the Pontifex Maximus, the pope of paganism. In the place of the Pantheon now stands the Vatican. And in the place of the Pontifex Maximus now sits the Roman usurper and false prophet, known as the pope, ruling over Satan's ecclesiastical masterpiece.

No trace of modern papal authority can be found in the writings of Barnabas, Hermas, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Polycarp, nor Irenaeus, nor in the writings of any earlier or contemporary person. Tertullian knew nothing of modern papal authority, and attacked the then mild and occasional claims of the Bishop of Rome. Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, speaks of bishops of equal authority, and opposed Stephen who tried to play pope on a small scale.

Paul predicted the apostasy that resulted in the Roman Catholic Church when to the Ephesian elders he said: **"After my departing shall greivous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them"** (Acts 20:29, 30). This apostasy was not long manifesting itself, and the Roman Catholic Church was in the process of development before the benighted Constantine wrought this Satanic work. The steps in the development of the Roman Catholic Church may be outlined as follows:

(1) **As Chrisitanity advanced two classes of churches were soon found to exist.** One class began to imbibe Judaism and heathenism. This came about through Jews and pagans embracing Christianity and bringing their Judaism and paganism with them. Such an influx pleased covetous bishops and they raised no voice against it. Origin encouraged this leavening work by seeking to harmonize the teachings of Christ with those of Plato. This class of churches was beginning to manifest itself mildly even in mid and latter New Testament times. The other class of churches, like the church at Philadelphia (Rev 3:10), kept the word of God and strove heroically against the threatening tide of error and corruption from Judaism and paganism. The breach between the true and the false churches grew wider and wider.

(2) **As a result of contact and mixture with Judaism and**

paganism the apostatizing churches early adopted the dogma of baptismal regeneration. Both Judaism and paganism invested rites and ceremonies with mystical saving efficacy. This led to a like investment of baptism. Because the newly baptized often enjoyed a more vivid assurance of salvation along with spiritual blessings and manifestations, and, like the eunuch, went on their way rejoicing, the belief was encouraged that regeneration took place in and through baptism. A false interpretation of certain Scriptures were appealed to in support of this dogma. These Scriptures are Mark 16:16; John 3:5; Acts 2:38; 22:16; Rom. 6:3; Gal. 3:27; 1 Pet. 3:21.

That to make these Scriptures teach baptismal regeneration is a false interpretation of them is shown by the following scriptural facts. Baptism is a work of righteousness because it is fulfilling righteousness (Matt. 3:13) and obedience to a commandment (Acts 10:48), and Paul says that we are not saved by works of righteousness (Titus 3:5). Paul says that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation (Rom. 1:16), and the gospel does not include baptism (1 Cor. 15:1-4; 1:14-17; 4:15). When the Philippian jailor pointedly asked the way of salvation, Paul did not mention baptism as a condition of salvation (Acts 16:30,31). In New Testament days disciples were **made** and then **baptized** (John 4:1), and not made by baptism, which would be the case if the doctrine of baptismal regeneration were true.

The latter part of Mark 16:16 shows that faith is the one indispensable condition of salvation. John 3:5 has been discussed previously. In Acts 2:38 Peter was answering not the specific question of how to be saved, but a broader question: **"What shall we do?"** Thus he gave a broader answer than Paul did to the jailor. On later occasions when Peter gave specific instructions on how to be saved, he did not mention baptism. See Acts 3:19. The Greek preposition for **"for"** in Acts 2:38 is **"eis."** Peter commanded baptism **"eis"** the remission of sins just as John baptized **"eis"** repentance (Matt. 3:11). But John did not baptize **in order to repentance**, because he demanded repentance as a prerequisite to baptism (Matt. 3:7,8). Neither did Peter command baptism **in order to salvation**. Peter commanded **baptism with respect to salvation that was already possessed** just as John baptized **with respect to repentance that had already been experienced**. Peter commanded baptism **"eis"** as a result of salvation, just as the Ninetites repented **"eis"** as a result of the preaching of Jonah (Matt. 12:41; Luke 11:32). Peter vindicates himself of this paganistic dogma when in 1 Pet. 3:21 he implicitly states that baptism is not the washing away of the filth of the flesh (carnal nature), but the answer (or response) of a good conscience toward God. And he says that baptism saves only in the same sense that the water of the flood saved Noah and his family. Now the water of the flood saved Noah and his family only in the same sense that Abraham's works justified him. Abraham's works justified him, not in the sense that they gave him his standing before God, but only in the sense that they manifested the standing he already had with God. So the water of the flood saved Noah and his family only in the sense that it manifested their salvation. It was the ark that **actually** saved. The coming of the water brought the source of danger, and the fact that they were in the ark caused them to be borne up by the water; and thus the difference between them and the rest of the inhabitants of the earth was manifested. In the ark they were safe whether it ever rained or not. The ark was a type of Christ. It is being in Christ that actually saves us. And just as Noah and his family went into the ark before the water came, so we get into Christ by faith before we are symbolically baptized into his death and put him on before men. This explains Rom. 6:3 and Gal. 3:27. Just as the water of the flood represented the destruction from which Noah and his family were delivered, and manifested their deliverance, so baptism pictures the death

from which we are saved and manifests our salvation. This is the only sense in which it saves.

The good conscience mentioned by Peter cannot be the conscience of a lost person, for the conscience of a lost person is an evil conscience. Heb. 10:22. The conscience is not good until the blood of Christ has been applied. And then, after the blood of Christ has been applied through faith, baptism comes as the seeking of a good conscience to please God. Salvation before baptism, blood before water.

Washing in Acts 22:16 is only figurative and symbolical. It is the blood that actually cleanses. 1 John 1:7.

The dogma of baptismal regeneration led first to the baptism (immersion) of small children (not infants) toward the beginning of the third century. Then infant baptism (immersion) came, and finally, at a comparatively late date, sprinkling was substituted for baptism. It was reasoned that if baptism was essential to salvation then it ought not to be put off, but should be administered as early as possible.

Then it was only a short step from the doctrine of baptismal regeneration to the application of the idea of sacramental grace to the Lord's supper, by which the supper was transformed from a simple memorial into a "sacrament." Then the poisoning influence of Judaism and paganism further wrought upon this ordinance and produced the Roman Catholic mass, no trace of which can be found in the New Testament.

(3) Another downward step, which developed with the error we have just discussed, was in the form of sacerdotalism and ministerial usurpation.

This step came about largely like the former, through an effort to assimilate Judaism and paganism with Christianity. The New Testament recognizes no priesthood except the high priesthood of Christ (Heb. 3:1; 4:14) and the common priesthood of all believers (1 Pet. 2:5; Rev. 4:10). And the government of New Testament churches was democratic, with equality in the ministry. George Washington says: **It is true that in the earliest government of the first Christian society, that of Jerusalem, not the elders only, but the whole church were associated with the apostles; and it is even certain that the terms bishop and elder [or ancient] or presbyter, were, in the first instance, and for a short period, sometimes used synonymously, and indiscriminately applied to the same order in the ministry.** Mosheim, the greatest Lutheran historian, says: **"It was, therefore, the assembly of the people which chose rulers and teachers, or received them by free and authoritative consent when recommended by others. The same people rejected or confirmed by their suffrages, the laws that were proposed by their rulers to the assembly; excommunicated profligate and unworthy members of the church; restored the penitent to their forfeited privileges; passed judgment upon different subjects of controversy and dissension that arose in their community; examined and decided the disputes which happened between the elders and deacons; and, in a word, exercised all that authority which belongs to such as are invested with sovereign power."** Again Mosheim says: **"Whoever supposes that the bishops of this golden age of the church correspond with the bishops of the following centuries must blend and confound characters that are very different, for in this century and the next, a bishop had charge of a single church, which might ordinarily be contained in a private house; nor was he its lord, but was in reality its minister or servant.—All churches in those primitive times were independent bodies, or none of them subject to the jurisdiction of any other. For though the churches which were founded by the apostles themselves, frequently had the honor shown them to be consulted in doubtful cases, yet they had no judicial authority, no control, no power of giving laws. On the contrary, it is as clear as noonday that all Christian churches had equal rights."** Robinson, in his Ecclesiastical researches, page 55, says: **"During the first three centuries Christian congregations all over the**

East subsisted in separate independent bodies, unsupported by the government, and consequently without any secular power over one another."

But early in the centuries following the apostolic era sacerdotal terms were applied to the ministry, at first only in a figurative sense or as titles of honor. But with the rise of sacramentalism the figurative and honorary gave way to the literal and actual. Along with this sacerdotalism came a distinct separation between the clergy and the laity, and the government of the churches was taken completely out of the hands of the laity. Then came the exaltation of "bishops" above the elders (or ancients). Then the "bishops" in the city churches began to assert authority over the urban churches. The next step was for the "bishops" in the larger city churches to assert authority over the "bishops" in the smaller city churches. These came to be known as archbishops. Then the archbishops of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople, and Rome asserted superior authority and came to be known as Patriarchs.

(5) The final step in the establishment of the Roman Catholic Church was the establishment of the primacy and universal dominion of Rome.

The gradual progress toward hierarchism and centralization (impelled by lust after power, greed for money and fame, the influence of Judaism and paganism, and an effort to combat paganism, which relied much on centralization for strength), which had exalted Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople and Rome above the other cities worked toward the establishment of the primacy of Rome. Then came the union of "church" and state with the effect already noted. It then remained only for Rome to compel the recognition of her primacy and power; to conquer the religious world as she had the political world. This she did approximately, and under Gregory (A. D. 590) and Boniface (A. D. 604) the power of the papacy was made absolute and universal. Thus the majority of churches, overwhelmed in the great apostasy, developed into the greatest impostor of the ages.

Now dear Catholic friend, are you ready to say to us: **"Since you affirm that the Roman Catholic Church is not the true church of Christ, but an imposter, what have you to offer in its stead?"** In its stead we have to offer that institution that Jesus founded and which he has perpetuated to this day in fulfillment of his promise that the gates of hell should not prevail against it. In beginning to trace the steps in the development of the Roman Catholic Church we remarked that along with the apostatizing churches there was a minority of true churches, such as that at Philadelphia (Rev. 3:8), which kept the word of God. And we remarked that the breach between these churches grew wider and wider as time advanced. At first they were not distinguished in name. But beginning with A. D. 156 they began to be called **Montanists** after their most distinguished leader of that time, who arose in Phrygia. Montanism was chiefly a protest against the growing laxity of discipline in the majority of churches, because doctrinal error had not proceeded far in their day. But the Montanists held to New Testament faith. In the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, Moller says: **"Montanism was not a NEW form of Christianity; nor were the Montanists a new sect. On the contrary Montanism was simply a reaction of the old, the primitive church, against the obvious tendency of the day to strike a bargain with the world and arrange herself comfortably in it."**

Beginning in 250 A. D., many of these churches were called **Novatians** after Novatian who led in a division of the church at Rome. Then from 311 A. D., these churches became known as **Donatists** in Africa after Donatus of Carthage, their outstanding leader. Previously the true churches in Africa had been called Montanists. Beginning with the middle of the seventh century the Montanists, Novatians, and Donatists were perpetuated chiefly under the name of **Paulicians**. In fact it has been established that in Armenia the Paulicians were con-

temporary with the Montanists. At the beginning of the eleventh century we find the Paulicians in France being called **Albigenses**. In Italy these were called **Cathari** and **Paterni**, and **Paterines**. In Trace they were called **Bogomils**. They were all descended from the Paulicians. In the valleys of the Piedmont the true churches were known as **Waldenses** from the early part of the fourth century. Other names were applied to the true churches in various places and at various times. From the early centuries the name **Anabaptists** was applied to these true churches because they baptized all who came to them from the corrupt churches. Finally these other names were practically absorbed in the name of Anabaptists. Thus the pure churches were perpetuated through the Anabaptists. Finally the "ana" was dropped and the name **Baptist** was the result. **And today, dear friend, in true Baptist churches we have the present day representatives of New Testament churches.** Baptist churches today stand for what the churches of the New Testament stood for. Their history goes back, as we have pointed out, to New Testament times.

We will now close by giving you two historical testimonies (we could give you more) to the apostolicity of Baptist faith: together with a brief statement of the faith of Baptists.

"It must have already occurred to our readers that the Baptists are the same sect of Christians that were formerly described under the appellation of Anabaptists. This seems to have been their leading principle from the time of Tertullian [who was a Montanist and born fifty years after the death of the Apostle John] to the present time."—Edinburgh Cyclopaedia.

"We have now seen that the Baptists, who were formerly called Anabaptists, and in later times Menonites, were the original Waldenses, and who have long in history 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."—Ypeig and Dermout, Vol. 1, p. 148 of History of Dutch Reformed Church, which the King of Holland appointed the authors to write.

The faith of Baptists may be summed up as follows:

1. They own Jesus Christ as their founder and only head.
2. They take the Scriptures as their only rule of faith and practice. See 2 Tim. 3:16, 17.
3. They believe in salvation wholly by grace through faith and apart from works.
4. They hold to a regenerated church membership.
5. They practice the immersion of believers only as baptism.
6. They have but two ordinances—baptism and the Lord's supper, and they consider these as local church ordinances and symbolic memorials, and not as grace-giving sacraments.
7. They acknowledge no mediator except Jesus Christ, and no priesthood except the high priesthood of Christ and the common priesthood of all believers.
8. They believe in the independency of local churches and in democracy in church government.
9. They have no officers of ordination except deacons and elders (including bishops and pastors).
10. They believe in absolute freedom of conscience and the legal right of every man to worship (or refuse to worship) God according to the dictates of his own conscience. For this reason Baptists have never persecuted and they do not try to force their principles on any body.

And now in closing, dear Catholic friend, in the interest of the truth and your soul's welfare, we again invite you to turn away from a false and apostate institution to Jesus Christ and his true churches. Amen.

The First Baptist Church In America

O. E. RIDENOUR, Bible School Superintendent,
First Baptist Church, Russell, Ky.

Article No. 1

The first Baptist Church of America was not founded by Roger Williams in Providence, R. I., as most historians have written, and the majority of people think. **The first Baptist Church in this country was founded by John Clark in Newport, R. I.** Both churches have claimed this distinction, and the only way to settle this claim and give the honor to the right church is to examine the records which now exist; although many records were lost when the members of these churches were driven southward by the British soldiers during the war.

The Providence church claims to date from the year 1639, while the church at Newport claims the year 1638.

Roger Williams seems to have been providentially raised up as "a herald," "a voice," to proclaim the eternal divorcement of Church and State and the absolute freedom of man to worship according to his understanding of His Word; thus to prepare the way for the coming of His Kingdom into New England and America.

Little is known of the early life of young Roger. The place of his birth is not recorded. This much is known, that Roger Williams, son of William Williams, was baptized on the 24th day of July, 1600, in the Parish church of Guinness, Cornwall, England. His family, being members of the Episcopal Church, he, therefore, was made a member of it in unconscious infancy. Early in life he was brought by God's grace to know "Christ as his personal Savior," to realize that his Savior was also his Lord, and entitled, not only to the supreme love of his heart, but to the supreme service-obedience of his life, and to see that Caesar had no right to come between his soul and his Savior.

These Puritan ideas doubtless account for the opposition of his father and his leaving home for London. His persecution commenced in his father's house, and followed him until the day of his death. These persecutions caused him to flee to the New World in the hope of finding "Freedom to worship God."

After a tempestuous voyage of ten weeks he landed with his young wife, Mary, off Nantasket, February 5, 1631.

He soon received a call to settle over an Episcopal Church in Boston, but declined because, as he wrote to Cotton, he "durst not officiate to an unseparated people"; so thoroughly had he become imbued with that great Baptist's doctrine of religious freedom set forth in their "Confession of Faith", published in London in 1611, viz: "The magistrate is not to meddle with religion or matters of conscience, nor to compel men to this or that form of religion, because Christ is King and Lawgiver of Church and conscience." It was from this pure fountain that Williams drank in the sentiment and principle of soul freedom, which animated and influenced his whole life.

Owing to the opposition of the magistrates, Mr. Williams soon removed to Salem, Mass., and became connected with the church in that place, which was a separated, independent body, answering to the congregational church of today. On the 12th day of April, 1634, he was regularly ordained as its pastor.

From this period dates the controversies he had with the court and clergy (of the Episcopal church, which was the state church of Massachusetts Bay at that time), which disputes, and his unyielding opposition to edicts of the magistrates, resulted in his banishment by the court from the colony. There

are opposing views as to his banishment. The clergy and court aver that it was solely his opposition to the civil government and gross "contempt of court", which is in England and this country today a very grave offense; while his friends say that it was solely for his "religious opinions." That it was for both causes is clearly seen from the charges themselves, which Mr. Williams admits are truly drawn.

The sentence of the court was for Williams to leave the colony in six weeks. He did not leave and the officers waited on him for twelve weeks! He fled westward during midwinter. Had he left when he was first notified, he would not have had to suffer so many hardships, because of the extreme cold weather. The Indians were all very friendly, their chiefs being his particular friends, and the woods quite familiar. Five months later he came to where Providence now stands. He gave it this name in gratitude to the goodness that it had so well provided for him. Others came from Massachusetts, and they entered into a compact, "only in civil things," and thus became a "town fellowship," and soon—March 4, 1644—he obtained a charter from the commissioners appointed by Parliament for the control of colonial affairs, under which the town became a colony under the title of "Rhode Island and Providence Plantations." Thus was founded a small new society in Rhode Island on the principle of entire liberty of conscience, and the uncontrolled power of the majority in secular concerns.

This compact did not give much liberty of conscience to the colonists. **First**—It defined the boundaries of the state, and that so blindly as to entail a half century of quarrels. **Second**—It included Providence, Newport, and Portsmouth, under the name of "The Providence Plantations," in one government, **in which the majority should rule.** **Third**—It gave liberty to make and execute laws; provided "that **said laws and constitution and punishments be conformable to the laws of England**, so far as the nature and constitution of the place will admit."

"But," says Professor Clark, "the laws of England sanctioned imprisonments, hangings and burning for religious opinions, and, under this charter, a majority could enact those in Rhode Island!" **We can plainly see that Roger Williams did not secure the full and free enjoyment of religious liberty for his people, or Baptists, or anyone else.**

Williams believed that the "gates of hell" had, indeed, prevailed against the church and Kingdom of God, and that their continuity had been lost, and consequently, all authority derived from a Gospel Church to administer the ordinances had been lost; therefore, if the visible church and its ordinances were to be perpetuated on earth, they must be recommenced by someone under the direction of the Holy Spirit. Believing that the Spirit moved upon him to do this work, he, in the year 1639, influenced a company of his followers (eleven in number) to engage with him in this undertaking. This was the manner of it: One of these, Ezekiel Holliman, immersed Mr. Williams, and he (Mr. Williams) returned the kind office and immersed Mr. Holliman and eleven others—all of these had been excluded from the Salem church, not on any charge of immorality but for their Anabaptistical opinions. This church at Salem was a Pedobaptist Church.

So far as can be learned, this was all Roger Williams, or the immersed persons, did to effect the setting up or constituting a visible church. Eld. E. Brown, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Providence, in the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary sermon, April 28, 1889, said: "Our fathers founded and the centuries have handed down to us, a church without a written creed." He could have added, covenant, constitution, or organization! History gives us no intimation that Mr. Williams even statedly preached, or presumed to administer the Lord's Supper, or immerse another person in this group. **He soon repudiated his work as unscriptural and null, and deserted the company—we cannot call it a church—"and in four months"**

Cotton Mather, an eminent Pedobaptist minister and historian, says, "it came to nothing." This is his statement: "One Roger Williams, a preacher, arrived in New England about the year 1630; was first an assistant in the church at Salem and afterwards its pastor. This man—a difference happening between the government and him—cause a great deal of trouble and vexation. At length the magistrates passed the sentence of banishment upon him; upon which he removed with a few of his own sect and settled at a place called Providence. There they proceed not only unto the gathering of a thing like a church, but unto the renouncing of their infant baptism. After this he turned Seeker and Familist, and the church came to nothing."

All authentic records fix the utter extinction of this company at four months. It was gathered in March, and came to nothing in July. **Therefore, Williams' baptism originated and died with him.**

He lived for forty years after this, and it is a well established fact that he never united or communed or affiliated with any Baptist church, either in Newport or Providence. He was not the first, by a large part of a century, to assert by pen or voice the doctrine of religious liberty. He caught his inspiration from the Articles of Faith of the Old Baptist churches in England, and was educated in the doctrine by the writings of Busher and other suffering Baptists in England.

He never, by any legal document that has been discovered, embodied the doctrine of **free and full** freedom of conscience for Baptists, or any other denomination. He did not insert one provision for the enjoyment of free and full religious liberty in the character he obtained from England—to secure which the colonists afterwards sent Mr. John Clark. Roger Williams **was never a Baptist one hour in his life. No authentic document sustains the claim that he was ever the member of, or communed or affiliated with, any Baptist Church.** The claim is utterly absurd, since in less than four months after he was immersed by Holliman he repudiated the act as null, and turned Seeker and Familist, denying that Christ had a visible church on earth, or that there were "any scriptural church, state or ordinances extant."

(This is to be followed (D. V.) by a second article in which Brother Ridenour tells of the founding of the first Baptist church in America.—Ed.)

RESIGNATION TO GOD

A holy, a prudent silence, includes a surrendering, a resigning up of ourselves to God, whilst we are under His afflicting hand, Psalm 28:8, James 4:7. The silent soul gives himself up to God, 1 Sam. 3:18. The secret language of the soul is: "Lord, here am I, do with me what thou pleasest," 1 Sam. 15:25, 26; Acts 11:13, 14.

There was a good woman, who when she was sick, being asked, whether she was swilling to live or die, answered, "Which God pleaseth." But said one that stood by, "If God should refer it to you, which would you choose?" "Truly," she said, "if God should refer it to me, I would even refer it to Him again." It is the part of wisdom to be resigned to God's will.

A man once visited a school for the deaf and dumb, and while in the school room, he wrote this question upon the blackboard: "How is the unfortunate condition of all these children to be accounted for?" One of the children wrote underneath the question this answer? "Even so Father for so it seemed good in thy sight."

A gentleman, who meeting with a shepherd in a misty morning, asked him what weather it would be. "It will be," said the shepherd, "what weather pleaseth me;" and being asked to explain, said: "Sir, it shall be what weather pleaseth God, and what weather pleaseth God pleaseth me." When a Christian's will is moulded into the will of God, he is sure to have His will.—C. D. COLE.