

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. 9

ASHLAND, KY., WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 1932

Whole No. 25

"In Defense of the Holy Catholic Church"

MR. ROBERT R. HULL, Catholic Layman

Secretary of National Catholic Bureau of Information, Huntington, Ind.

Perhaps the Editor of The Baptist Examiner, on reconsidering, will agree with me that his article entitled, "A Reply to the Recent Encyclical of Pope Pius XI.," is misnamed. It is not a reply to the encyclical letter, "Lux Veritatis," which Pope Pius XI. issued on Dec. 25, 1931, on the fifteenth centenary of the Council of Ephesus. Only the opening paragraph of his article, found in the Febr. 1, 1932, issue of The Baptist Examiner, makes the slightest reference to the papal document; and the reverend Editor gives his readers no idea of its contents except to say that the Pope "urged the union of all Christians under his dominion."

If the Rev. Mr. Simmons proposes to reply to the encyclical, he should consider its contents paragraph by paragraph, seriatim. But he hastily sounds a call 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.'" A decent regard for the feelings of his Catholic readers would have counselled him, even if he is insistent on dragging it in, to keep back the Rev. xvii., 5, 6 stuff until toward the close of his article.

Mouzonitis

Is the Rev. Mr. Simmons afflicted with the same disease which suddenly seized the Methodist Bishop Mouzon? The Bishop's immediate reaction to the papal overtures was "to invite the Pope to join the Methodist Church." The hillbillies of the Methodist hinterland perhaps chortled, slapped one another on the back and exclaimed, "We got a smart Bishop!" But Catholics wondered what particular Methodist church, among some eighteen different brands of Methodist denominations, the smart-Aleck Bishop expected the Pope to join. Is the Pope prepared to decide on the rather fine points of the contentions between southern and northern Methodists which arose out of the American civil war? Does the Rev. Mr. Simmons really think Catholics capable of deciding between the conflicting claims of the different Baptist denominations? He doesn't want us to join the Missionary Board Baptists; yet he leaves the question of these differences between Baptists hanging in the air. We Catholics will have to be resigned to search for "SOME Baptist church," presumably.

Or, would the Rev. Mr. Simmons be content if we merely "turned away from the false and apostate" Catholic system to the welter of negation called "Protestantism?" Will Christ be found there?

The Editor's reply is childish. It reminds me of the little boy who said to the other little boy who had called him a "liar," "You're another!" The Pope invites non-Catholics to come to his communion, and the Rev. Mr. Simmons invites Catholics to leave the Pope: so that the total effect is to confuse "sinners." Does the Rev. Mr. Simmons, on the score of jealousy, feel himself bound to say hard things about the Pope and the Catholic Church? Let him remember Sedecias, the son of Chanaana, who struck Micheas, the prophet who had prophesied truly, on the cheek and cried, "Hath then the spirit of the Lord left me, and spoken to thee?" (3 Kings xxii., 24).

"Pillar and Ground of the Truth."

Far from being in a line of "pagan pontiffs," Pope Pius XI. is the successor of St. Peter, upon whom Jesus Christ built His holy Church. Nothing is historically more certain than that St. Peter was the first Bishop of Rome and that Pius XI. is the present possessor of the office given by Our Lord to St. Peter.

The reference, "Mystery, Babylon the Great," misses the intended mark. **Students of the New Testament and the Fathers know that Gnosticism was the system of Antichrist in primitive Christian times.** The Gnostic heresy is revived in Freemasonry, that terrible, secret power which permeates the Protestant Churches with its influence and leads them on in the assaults on the Catholic Church. Every Protestant Church, which is willing to accept dictation in spirituals from the civil power, is a part of the ungodly Erastian system which is inspired by Freemasonry.

The Rev. Mr. Simmons calls the Catholic Church "the greatest imposter of the ages." I am comforted upon recalling that the foes of truth called the very Master of the house "Beelzebub." We are accustomed to abuse. However, I assert against the Rev. Mr. Simmons that the Catholic Church is "the Bride, the Lamb's wife," "the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth" (1 Tim. iii., 15). She is not perfect on her human side, since she is that "great house" of which St. Paul wrote (2 Tim. ii., 20), in which are to be found "not only vessels of gold and silver, but also of wood and of earth; and some indeed unto honor, but some unto dishonor." But on her divine side she is indefectible from the teaching of Christ and she is the only infallible guide of erring mortals.

The Catholic Church has never been leagued with "the man of sin" nor will she ever be. She will be opposed by that "man of sin" when he appears. "Babylon the Great" is the ungodly, interlocked system of religion, politics and business (prepared by Freemasonry) which today persecute the Catholic Church, just as its predecessor system persecuted her in the days of the pagan Roman empire. Caesar then proclaimed himself God and commanded that divine honors be paid to his statutes. One Church today resists the onward march of Caesaropapism. That Church is the Catholic Church. **The Protestant Churches accept Caesar as their religious head in whatever nation he may command the subordination of spirituals to temporals.**

Typical Protestant Tactics

The Rev. Mr. Simmons cannot prove that the Catholic Church was not founded by Jesus Christ; no more than the atheist can prove there is no God. He can offer objections and conduct a kind of running guerilla warfare, sniping at some of the Church's positions. His tactics are the familiar tactics of Protestant champions: they imagine that, if some Catholic becomes discontented with his Church, he will be gathered in by some one of the attacking parties. With fierce cries the discordant parties rush to the assault, first here and then there. The Calvinist attack differs from the Arminian attack: there is no agreement among the various Protestant bands, except that

all expect some Catholics, by accident rather than design, to fall to them if a breach can be made in the walls.

That the Editor is only objecting is shown by the many questions, beginning each with "Why?" which he asks in paragraphs 17-20 of his article. Let him count these "Whys?"; perhaps if he will do so, his eyes will be opened. I doubt very much if he is in earnest. If we Catholics were able to clear up all his difficulties, the probability is that his attack would shift to other quarters. He will not allow that his positions have been carried and then gracefully yield. For he does not uphold anything definite nor will he ever be found in a definite place. He is simply conducting a skirmish about the walls of "the city set on a hill." It is in a definite place and upholds definite teachings. Perhaps the Editor will tell us why we should leave positive truth for his welter of negativesness.

There is no antagonism between the teaching of the Church and the Sacred Scriptures. But the Bible alone does not give sufficient support to the doctrines of Christianity. These find their sources in Jesus Christ and His apostles, who established the Church before the New Testament (only a partial expression of the Christian revelation) had been compiled. The test employed by the Rev. Mr. Simmons, who attempts to crowd a body of doctrine which is larger than the New Testament into the comparatively narrow limits of the New Testament, is inadequate. Catholic doctrine, however, is not opposed to the teaching of the New Testament.

The Head of the Church

"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." The Editor cites Ephes i., 22; iv., 15 and Col. i., 18 in support. **These passages do not teach that the Church has no human head; they simply teach that Christ is head of the Church.** To interpret them in a sense exclusive of a human head ruling jointly with Christ is to find in them an unwarranted meaning. **God was ever the King of the Israelitish nation; yet this nation at all times in its history (with the exception of a few periods when anarchy prevailed) assembled around some God-appointed leader: prophet, judge, priest or king.** David was king over Israel at the same time that God reigned as Israel's supreme Head in Heaven. This has always been the divine plan.

We Catholics do not deny the pertinency of the scriptures cited by the Rev. Mr. Simmons. Christ is Supreme Pastor of the Church, and the Church is rigorously bound to follow what He has ordained in faith and morals. The Pope must yield strict obedience to Christ, wherever Christ has spoken; he is not able to change one jot or tittle when Christ has ordained. The business of the Pope is to keep the Church within the limitations of the Christian tradition received from Our Lord and His apostles. The attempt of the Editor of The Baptist Examiner to create an issue between Christ and the Pope utterly fails. There is no "Christ vs. the Pope" here, but it is a matter of Christ AND the Pope. Obedience to the latter is compatible with obedience to the former. To receive the Pope as visible head is not to reject Christ as Supreme Head of the Church. Catholics are strictly bound by Christ's Word.

According to the New Testament (St. Matt. xvi., 13-19) Jesus Christ ordained for His Church on earth a visible head. The very terms of this commission imply that St. Peter would have successors in his office. We find St. Peter during his lifetime exerting himself in the duties of the office, and we learn from tradition that his primacy was continued in the Bishops of the church of Rome. After Our Lord has spoken so unmistakably it is futile to make an issue of "Christ vs. the Pope."

The New Testament churches had, in St. Peter, a head on earth to whom they looked as final authority in disputed matters. We find him in the lead again and again. It was St. Peter who opened the dispensation of Christian grace on the first day of Pentecost after Christ's resurrection; it was he who opened the kingdom of heaven to the first converts from the

Gentiles; it was to St. Peter that St. Paul went "lest he should have run in vain" (Gal. ii., 2). Today, in the same Catholic Church, the successor of Peter sounds the doctrinal key-note for the whole Church; and with him must the Bishops of the Church have communion (even as St. Paul in an earlier time) before they exercise their ministry. The churches of the New Testament had a "pope." No matter what St. Peter may have then been called, he had all the substance of the present papal office.

The Primacy of St. Peter

The Editor of The Baptist Examiner quotes against us St. Matt. xx., 25, 26 and its parallel passage in St. Luke (xxii., 25, 26): "It shall not be so among you." We heartily agree: ecclesiastical authorities are not to lord it over their brethren as do the princes of the Gentiles. But this is not to say that they are not to rule at all. No conclusion about what the Church's form of government was to be can be extracted from these passages. They teach that he, who is first among the disciples, ought to imitate Christ: **"Even as the Son of man is not come to be ministered unto, but to minister,"** etc. (St. Matt. xx., 28). Would the Editor contend that Christ had no authority over His disciples? Christ's disciples obeyed Him. One of the Pope's most significant titles is, "Servant of the servants of God" (St. Matt. xx., 27) and he strives to imitate Our Lord in the discharge of his ministry. He does not emulate civil rulers who conceive of their subjects as existing for their aggrandizement.

St. Peter had a primacy of office. The name of Simon was changed to Peter (a rock), or, as it is in the Aramic, Cephas (St. John i., 42). The name of no other of the original twelve apostles was changed. In the apostolic lists of the gospels St. Peter comes first. The Editor of The Baptist Examiner lays much stress on St. James the less being named first in Gal. ii., 6. But James was the Bishop of the church of Jerusalem; and, since it was to the example of this church that the Galatian dissenters had appealed, perhaps it was St. Paul's intention to indicate that he had obtained the recognition of the Bishop of the oldest church in Christendom. Yet, even there, St. Peter is called Cephas.

Just here is revealed the mental bias of the Editor. He supposes that a "subordinate Roman Catholic prelate" cannot administer "a stinging public rebuke to the pope for instability and inconsistency." Nonsense! If the fault is committed publicly and large issues are dependent on the bad example (as in the case of St. Peter's dissimulation), it may become the duty of an inferior prelate to rebuke the Pope. Popes have been rebuked by laymen and even by pious women, and have been humble enough to accept the rebukes in good part. The Editor is setting up a man of straw, for Peter did not err in his teaching but in his practice; infallibility is not guaranteed in the personal life of the Pope. The Pope is infallible only when he proclaims to the whole Church what the Christian doctrine is on a point of faith or morals.

Authority to Forgive Sins

The power of binding and loosing was given to the Church (St. Matt. xviii., 18) and to the apostles (St. John xx., 22, 23), but to St. Peter in particular (St. Matt. xvi., 18). According to St. Matt. xxviii., 20, the apostolic power is transmissible through an apostolic office "unto the consummation of the world." Sacramental absolution was given by the apostles or denied by them. Study the case of the incestuous person in the church of Corinth (1 Cor. v., 3-5; 2 Cor. ii., 5-10). In the most solemn manner and invoking the authority he had received from Christ, St. Paul commanded the putting away of that person. Afterwards, "in the person of Christ" he directed them to receive the penitent and declared that he was forgiven. In the early years of the Church sins were confessed before the whole church. But the old rigor has been mitigated and today only certain very grave sins have to be acknowledged in the face of the whole church. There is a "confessional" wherever con-

fession is made to the church, either publicly or privately (to the Church's minister). According to the New Testament there was a "confessional" in those early times. Moreover, nothing is more certain than that "the authority to forgive sins" included MORE than the right "to lay down the terms of forgiveness." The sinner must seek the forgiveness of God. (Acts viii., 22): if he does not do so, his sins cannot be forgiven. And in the confessional the first word of the Catholic penitent are, "I confess to Almighty God" . . . then, "and to you, father." A Catholic confesses his sins to Almighty God AND to the priest. Nor is it necessary to be inspired directly of the Holy Ghost in order to forgive sins. In the New Testament "the gift of the Holy Ghost" promised to "as many as the Lord our God shall call" (Acts ii., 38, 39), is distinguished from the miraculous "gift of the Holy Ghost" which conferred power to speak in tongues, etc., (Acts x., 45, 46). Since the apostolic age there have been instances of persons who had miraculous gifts of the Spirit; but these were accidents of, and not the substance of, the gift of the Holy Ghost.

In St. Luke xxii., 31, 32, there is a significant change from the plural to the singular. Our Lord said to Simon Peter (v. 31), "Satan hath desired to have YOU, that he may sift YOU as wheat"—meaning the whole company of the apostles, since the plural was used. "But," He continued, (v. 32), "I have prayed for THEE, that THY faith fail not: and THOU, being once converted, confirm THY brethren." In this saying a commission was given to St. Peter. Simon, the weakling, became Peter, the rock, on the day of Pentecost. After that day he never denied the faith. He earnestly proclaimed it in its fullness. Is one unable to see Peter in Pius XI.? Does he see only Achille Ratti? People said of Our Lord Himself, "Is this not Joseph the carpenter's son?"

The Papacy in the Primitive Church

St. Paul, after serving a novitiate of three years, went up to Jerusalem to see St. Peter (Gal. i., 18). He saw no other apostle on that first trip. Then, after fourteen years, he laid his case before the "pillars of the church"—the Pope and his cardinals—"lest perhaps he should run or had run in vain" (Gal. ii., 2). Fearing the Judaizers, he did this privately and not in the face of the whole church. The same procedure is followed by every Catholic Bishop upon his consecration, indeed of every priest upon his ordination. Ministers of the Church must be in communion with the apostolic see. "There is not the slightest certain scriptural mention of Peter in connection with either the city or church" of Rome, the Editor confidently asserts. But what about 1 Peter v., 13? **Peter wrote his first epistle from "Babylon," and the Editor does not fail to let us know that "Babylon" is Rome in Rev. xvii., 5, 6!** Moreover, we have witnesses almost from the beginning of Christianity (Tertullian, etc.) to the fact that St. Peter suffered and died for Christ in Rome.

The Greek verb translated "feed" in St. John xxi, 15-17, is poimaino, which means also "to rule." That our Lord confirmed upon St. Peter a special office one can hardly deny after earnest consideration of the words, "Simon, son of John, lovest thou me more than these" (other apostles)? Immediately following, in the 18th verse, there is a reference in prospect to manner of St. Peter's death in Rome. St. Peter was an apostle and a presbyter (priest), but he was more; everywhere his office of prince of the apostles stands out clearly. **Klutos in 1 Peter v., 3, the Editor points out, means "allotted charge."** Why then not "clergy", since a special charge is referred to: one apart from the lay commonality? "Pastors" are in the mind of St. Peter. This is proved by the words of the apostle in the next (4th) verse. When the Chief Pastor should appear the pastors (Bishops) would receive from Him a reward for their faithfulness. **Pastors were not to lord it over the sheep; they were to perform in humility the duties of their office.** James iii., 1 is of similar import: "Be ye not many masters, knowing that you receive the greater judgment."

Before a thing is named it exists. Thus, there were Christians before they were first so called at Antioch (Acts xi., 26). As time went on titles were attached to the substance of the papacy. Again the Editor's "Why?". I ask him a question. Did not the Church always believe in the Trinity of God? "Why" was this dogma not defined before 325 A. D. at the Council of Nicea? Presumably he is not an Arian. He will answer that the definition of 325 A. D. does not indicate that the Church in that year added to her doctrines. It was no presumption in St. Paul to address the church at Rome. **Together with St. Peter he had labored to found the church in that city,** and the supposed rivalry between the two apostles is a figment of the Editor's imagination. Catholic Bishops are not as jealous of their prerogatives as the functionaries of Baptist missionary boards. Paul's failure to mention Peter's presence in Rome proves precisely nothing; but, had Paul written that Peter never was in the city of Rome, that would be another matter!

The Protestant Objections Considered

Only in case the church at Corinth had thought St. Paul in error and incapable of leading it aright, would it have been proper to appeal to St. Peter. A Catholic church with a grievance must appeal to the Bishop of the diocese before resorting to the Pope, and St. Paul was the immediate superior of the Corinthian Christians. In the time of Pope Clement the church of Corinth was in revolt against its pastor, the Bishop, and its lawful clergy. Since it considered its Bishop and clergy to be in error, Pope Clement was the proper person to receive the appeal. In his reply St. Clement commanded obedience under pain of sin. He did not merely advise them: he made it obligatory to submit to their clergy.

The primatial see of Christendom finds its center in the person of the Pope. St. Peter was first in Jerusalem; afterward he removed to Antioch; finally he came to Rome and established his chair there. He was not "supposed to be presiding over the 'see of Rome'" at the time the dispute about the circumcision of the Gentiles arose in the Church. (The Editor's imagination is at work here). Nor does the Pope rule without taking counsel of his associates—that is another straw man set up by the Editor. The Pope has the right of final decision. When St. Peter had finished speaking, the controversy was over: "all the multitude held their peace" (Acts xv., 12). What St. James, the Bishop of Jerusalem, said afterward was in the nature of amplification of St. Peter's pronouncement. His word was not necessary to make it stand. A Catholic Bishop, after a papal announcement, can bring to it the support of his learning and show that it is in harmony with the Scriptures and add observations of his own (which will be welcome by the Council). The effective word was spoken by Peter. After he spoke, the Pharisees among the disciples (Acts xv., 5) disputed no longer. The procedure of the Council of Jerusalem is followed today by the Pope and his associates; as for, example at the last Council in 1870. Had St. Peter disagreed with the brethren, the edicts of the Council (Acts xv., 28) would not have had the force of law.

It is not denied that the Church has a concrete, local, congregational expression. But it is also true that it has larger visible group expression, and it has a visible expression which is universal. See St. Matt. xvi., 16-19. **St. Peter is made the rock of the Church's foundation; to him are given the keys of the kingdom of heaven.** It is idle to plead that there is no special commission to him there. The apostles exercised no irresponsible authority over their flocks; but sometimes they were obliged to exert the plenary power of their authority, as when St. Paul gave the Corinthians their choice: "What will you? shall I come unto you with a rod; or in charity, and in the spirit of meekness?" (1 Cor. iv., 21).

Has the Catholic Church Perverted the Gospel?

When the Editor makes a mere assertion (such as that the Catholic Church "is not the true church of Christ because it has perverted the gospel"), a general denial is sufficient reply.

The redeeming blood of Christ gives to the sacraments of the Catholic Church their sole power; yet the Editor of The Baptist Examiner persists in considering them apart from Christ's blood. NO ONE, more thoroughly than I, will be found to agree with the statement of the apostle (1 John i., 7) that it is "the blood of Jesus Christ," God's Son, that "cleanseth us from all sin." The Editor errs in interpreting these passages as, by their terms, excluding the sacraments of the Church.

Baptism is more than a symbol. **Christ Himself baptizes and thereby applies His blood to the soul.** The sacraments, because created by Jesus Christ to be channels for the redemption through His blood, perform their cleansing work EX OPERO OPERATO. The method of the Editor is typically Protestant: because, in some of the quoted passages, Word is mentioned but not water, he teaches that baptism is not necessary to salvation. But the New Testament teaches that we establish connection with "the word of life" (Ephes. v., 26) through the baptismal waters. The Editor assures us that "baptism represents, not a birth but, a death and burial;" but baptism is all three: it is death and burial of the old nature AND birth of the new nature. The editor does not preach "a full gospel."

Justification

Justification is affected solely through the power of Christ's redeeming blood. But, if we consider the justified persons themselves, we find that their justification is a state as well as a standing. The hearts of justified persons are really changed: they have "become partakers of the divine nature" (2 Peter i., 4). Their faith is "imputed to them unto" (not, instead of) "justice" (Gen. xv., 6).

The scriptures, cited by the Editor in support of Luther's fiducial faith in justification, assert, not the Lutheran heresy but, the failure of Moses' law and natural morality to justify before God. **They teach that justification initially is by the blood of Christ.** This is the Catholic position. For proof see the dogmatic decrees of the Council of Trent. **Abraham's faith was "counted to him unto justice;"** and, while it is not necessary for the Christian to make a perfect record to be saved (since grace supplies for defects "where the feeble sense fail"), his intention must be good. All Catholic statements, which emphasize the necessity of Christian good works and "the state of grace" for salvation, presuppose that the persons exhorted already are Christians. The Scriptures teach that it is possible to lose the state of grace and lose salvation. **The passages set forth by the Editor lay stress on the security of the soul as long as it clings to the cross of Christ with the good will of a child that is not deliberately disobedient.**

The Baptist Editor makes the grace of justification a mere cloak covering the soul while all the while the heart may be unchanged. But divine grace changes the interior human nature and makes the soul pleasing to God. **The Catholic Church does not teach that "the works that grace enables us to do" are sufficient to save us.** Grace definitely makes up for what is lacking in good works, so that the good intention of the regenerated person is accepted for what is deficient in his good works. **The Editor persists in making us teach that we can be saved by "works done in our own strength."** Yet he has quoted, in the preceding paragraph, the note of the Douay Bible which states that the works acceptable unto justification are "such as follow faith, and proceed from it. This is the consistent Catholic teaching.

St. James declares that Christians are justified by their good works (James ii., 21-23). He cites in support of this thesis the identical verses of Genesis (xv., 6) cited by St. Paul to support his thesis that men are justified by faith "without the deeds of the law" (Romans iv., 1-3). There is no contradiction between St. James and St. Paul, except as it may be created by wrong-headed Baptist theologians and others who follow Luther. Abraham was justified while yet in uncircumcision

(Romans iv., 10); but, together with the faith of his heart went his obedience. By his action he proved his belief in God's promise: example, when he offered Isaac he believed that God would raise up Isaac from the dead to fulfill the promise (Hebr. xi., 17-19).

"What God Hath Joined Together"

The Rev. Mr. Simmons has made justification by faith and justification by works irreconcilable antimonies. Against this putting asunder of "what God hath joined together" I protest. In the kingdom of Christ they ARE reconcilable. Catholic teaching on the subject gives no man the right to boast, since all the Catholic's good works are acceptable to God solely through the merits of Christ's redemption.

God casts away no one whose will is constant in allegiance.

Mortal sin, which causes the death of the soul, means a turning away from God with full consent of the will. God does not save us in spite of ourselves. He requires the co-operation of the justified with the movements of His grace. It is possible to turn back to sin "as the dog to his vomit and as the sow that was washed to her wallow in thimire" (2 Peter ii., 22). Those, who wilfully do so, are in a hopeless state. The deficiency is, not in the power of the Redeemer to keep us in His hand (the scriptures cited by the Rev. Mr. Simmons emphasises this power of the Redeemer), but, in us, should "there be in us a heart of unbelief in turning from the living God."

Did the "Gates of Hell" Prevail?

But the attack of the Rev. Mr. Simmons shifts to the historical sphere. He assures us that the "Roman Catholic Church . . . cannot be traced back to Christ." At any rate it is in possession and has established itself firmly by right of prescription. This fact urges in its favor the probability that it is the oldest Church and can be traced to Christ. Is the Bible the test? **The Church of Christ came before the New Testament.** Priority in time would seem to argue that the New Testament must submit to the test of the church rather than the opposite.

That "corrupted Latin Vulgate of Jerome" is, just the same, the word of God. **I am willing to rest the whole case of comparative reliability of the Catholic and Protestant versions of the Bible on the emergent result of any attempt to find the verses quoted in Romans iii., 10-18, in the Old Testament.** St. Paul solemnly affirms (Romans iii., 10) that the quoted verses are Holy Scriptures. They can be found in Psalm xliii., 1-3 of the Catholic Bible; but find them if you can in the corresponding Psalm (xiv., 1-3) of the Protestant Bible! The Protestant versions seem to give the "lie" to St. Paul, who, being an inspired man, ought to know!

In view of the Saviour's express promise (St. Matt. xvi., 18) that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," it is surprising to read that "the great majority of the churches" fell into apostasy "during the centuries following the apostolic era." **If the Catholic Church "was wedded to the Roman Empire by Constantine," it was very soon divorced.** The "marriage" somehow did not "stick," for we find the Catholic Church severely persecuted by the Arian emperors who succeeded Constantine. The Rev. Mr. Simmons is mistaken. In all recognition of the Church by the civil authority, the Church retained her independence. Nor is the Pope as "Pontifex Maximus" in the Church the same as the pagan functionary of that name. During Rome's pagan period Caesar was the "Pontifex Maximus"—spiritual as well as temporal, head of the whole empire. The Church never submitted to Caesaropapism, but all the heresies have been willing to take Caesar as their religious head. **The Baptist preachers of the South never tire of accusing the Catholic Church of being "unpatriotic" because it refuses to take the American Caesar as its pastor in spiritual, as well as temporal things.** The Protestant-Episcopal Church has been the slave of the State since its very incipency. The King of England to this day extorts from every Bishop of the Es-

tablishment on his consecration acknowledgment of the royal authority "in spirituals as well as temporals."

The Catholic Church in Possession

Papal possession of the title, "Pontifex Maximus" (meaning high-priest and harmless in itself), is concrete proof of the triumph of Christianity over pagan Erastianism and is the sign of the freedom of religion. "Satan's ecclesiastical masterpiece?" Look for it among the boards of the Baptists and "Campbellites": the magnificoes stop at nothing to gain their ends. Without possessing warrant by divine right to direct people in religious matters, they play the tyrant; and this sort of tyranny (which acts contrary to its own theory of church polity) is the worst of tyrannies. The Pope is honest. He lays his cards on the table at the beginning of the game and says, "Take them or leave them!"

We find the papacy in substance in the writings of the Fathers. The "modern developments" have been in accidents. Christ left His Church free to carry out in specific details His generic directions. St. Clement of Rome and St. Irenaeus assert the rights of the Roman church and the papacy. The second emphatically makes communion with the Roman church the test of Christian fellowship. In the case of St. Cyprian, differences over the question of the rebaptism of heretics arose between him and Pope Stephen; but, since the position of the Church on the question had not then been strictly defined, St. Cyprian continued in the fellowship with Pope Stephen. In a later day St. Augustine placed the question beyond doubt. But St. Cyprian, in his treatise *De Unitate* sent to the followers of the antipope Novatus in Rome, earnestly upheld the claims of the Roman pontiff.

St. Paul's warning (Acts xx., 29, 30) against the teachers of perverse things implies the presence of an objective test of doctrines; but the Rev. Mr. Simmons will allow no such test: he holds that it is a case of "every fellow for himself with the Bible." Nor can his Constantine theory of the origin of the Catholic Church claim for itself any originality. It smacks of that Seventh-Day Adventism which makes the false claim that "Constantine changed the day of the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday." If we believe the Adventist, the Rev. Mr. Simmons has followed Constantine and the Catholic Church into apostasy. Yet he knows very well that the Church observed the Sunday Sabbath from the beginning: the civil edict of Constantine added nothing in the religious sphere. Does the Rev. Mr. Simmons yet contend that Constantine was one of the creators of the Catholic Church?

What Churches Imbined Judaism and Paganism?

It is true that certain heretics "imbibed Judaism and paganism," but the Catholic Church was not involved in the trend. Gnosticism, which was a compromise between Judaism and paganism and a diluted Christianity, was sternly opposed by the Church. The Gnostic trend of "mid—and latter—New Testament times" (against which the fiercest polemics of the New Testament are directed) took all who followed it OUT of the Church. Tertullian laid down the rule by which truth was to be discerned and error avoided in his "rule of prescription." Truth comes first; error comes after truth is on the scene. Tertullian showed that Catholic truth was from the beginning; the Gnostic sects, on the other hand, no matter how vehemently they claimed commission to "reform the Church," were of late origin and outside the line of descent. Some of these sects had been fathered by Simon Magus, but no sect had been founded by an apostle. By Tertullian's rule Baptist churches are heretical bodies. Not one of them has a history earlier than the sixteenth century.

"Baptismal regeneration" so-called was not the mark of apostasy. The outstanding tenet of heresy in apostolic times was the rejection of the sacramental means of grace, starting with the principle that material means could never be of assistance in the salvation of the soul (which was immaterial).

This same Manichean heresy inspires the present Baptist attempt to eviscerate the sacraments.

Baptism and the Mass

We Catholics agree that "without faith it is impossible to please God." But the confusion of the Editor stems from his insistence on making foes of believing and doing. The Catholic knows that these are the subjective and objective aspects of the same thing; the contradictions created by the Baptists between belief and deed would have been utterly incomprehensible to a Christian of primitive times. For instance, see St. John iii., 36, where the Greek verb *apeitheo*, translated there in English Bibles, "believeth not," means also to "be disobedient" (for the latter translation see K. J. Bible, 1 Peter ii., 8 and iii., 1).

In view of what has been said, it appears unprofitable to go into the meaning of the preposition *eis* in Acts ii., 38, because the whole issue is dissipated. In the case of John's baptism faith came after baptism (Acts xix., 3 sq.). Christian baptism is another institution: not the same as John's baptism. Yes, baptism is the "answer of a good conscience," for faith and repentance are the subjective sides of conversion, whereas confession of Christ and baptism (being public acts) are the objective side. Christ has made baptism what it is. All attempts of the Rev. Mr. Simmons to becloud that fact are in vain.

In baptism not only actual (personal) sin is "washed away," but also Adamic (original) sin. Our Saviour uses the pronoun, *tis* (anyone) in St. John iii., 3, 5, where we have the translation "a man" in English versions. Man, woman or child is signified. "He that believeth and is baptized" (St. Mark xvi., 16) is addressed, of course, to adults; but it is a queer sort of mind which sees the exclusion of infants merely because they are not mentioned there.

The mass was instituted by Jesus Christ Himself on the night He was betrayed. It was not derived from Judaism or paganism. Around the nucleus of the words of consecration, pronounced in the words of Our Lord ("This is my body; this is my blood," etc.), a service of prayer and thanksgiving in the centuries after Christ's ascension was built by the Church. But the Mass would remain if everything, save the bare words of consecration, was stripped away. "This do for the commemoration of me" (1 Cor. xi., 25) is a command to the Church to continue the sacrifice.

The "Left" Protestant Development Theory

Those who are sent of God may be called "usurpers" by heretics, even as their predecessors called the Master of the house "Beelzebub." But is the Editor of The Baptist Examiner ignorant of the fact that the very word "priest" in our language is derived from the New Testament Greek word *preputeros*? *Presbuteros* became *presbyter*; *presbyter* became *priester*; *priester* became *priest*. This is sufficient indication of the office and proof that the Catholic priesthood is "scriptural." There was certainly to be in the Church just such a priesthood offering bread and wine as did Melchisedech (Gen. xiv., 18). For "we have an altar" (Hebr. xiii., 10) and this altar is the holy table of the Lord's Supper. (1 Cor. x., 16-21).

The theory of the gradual development of the papacy, to which the Editor brings the support of Waddington, Mosheim and other "left" Protestant historians, is chiefly defective because its protagonists labor under an incorrect conception of Catholic polity. The lower orders of the ministry are not absorbed in the higher; for instance, the Bishops are not mere vicars of the Pope, and the title of Archbishop does not extinguish the office of Bishop. Protestants seem to imagine that the Catholic system is something like that of the old story, in which the layman confesses his sins to the Priest, the Priest carries the report of them on to the Bishop, the Bishop to the Archbishop, the Archbishop to the Cardinal, and through this ascending hierarchy the Pope at length receives the confessions from all quarters. But the Pope must confess his sins to another.

The Baptist Examiner

Published Semi-Monthly By The Editor
4758 Winchester Avenue
Ashland, Kentucky

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

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE

Domestic Subscriptions, per year in advance - - - \$.50
Foreign Subscriptions, per year in advance - - - \$.75

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.

er priest. The present Pope's confessor is a humble Capuchin friar. Archbishop and Cardinal are dignities of honor only. Each Bishop rules his diocese. The Pope does not act unless appeals from the decision of a Bishop come to him.

The infidel, Gibbon, is also on the Editor's side in advocating the theory of "gradual development." He was more radical than Waddington or Mosheim in his opinion. At the root of this theory in the minds of all who advocate it as the delusion that the Church in its organization was bound to follow the Roman civil system. But it is not in Catholicism that one finds supine imitations of political systems. **The Protestant politics are avowedly systems of expediency:** some imitating political "democracies," others "autocracies." But, in all of them, there is certain eventuality to be tyranny because they forsake the organic Church.

Nor can any originality be claimed by the Editor for his "approximate" date for the completion of the papacy under Popes Gregory I. (590 A. D.) and Boniface III. (607 A. D.). This is simply the ancient Protestant theory of the Magdeburg centuriators which has been exploded a thousand times. A title bestowed by the civil power (the Eastern emperor) on Pope Boniface III. added nothing to his religious status.

The Baptist Substitute

What does the Rev. Mr. Simmons offer us Catholics as a substitute? Montanism and its "prophetesses" who claimed direct inspiration of the Holy Ghost and were much like the mediums of the spiritists. After these "strange women" Tertullian in his dotage went. Novatianism, whose founder, the antipope Novatus, was baptized (according to Eusebius) by means of cloths soaked in water which were wrapped about his body as he lay on a sick bed. There is no record that he was ever immersed. Donatism and its Ku-Klux terrorists of those days, the wicked circumcelliones who burned Catholic churches and murdered priests in Africa. Albigensianism, whose leaders were Manichean heretics counselling suicide. The Cathari, "church of the pure," who forgot that the Saviour instructed His disciples to let the cockle and the wheat grow together "until the harvest" when His angels would separate them. The Bogomili, more popular known as "bougiers" and the reputed practicers of unnaturally vice. The Waldenses with the forged documents pretending to prove their succession from the apostles. The Anabaptists and the madmen of Muenster. Many of these fellows were Arians. The first Anabaptists did not baptize by immersion; they got it later on from the Mennonites. By such a route comes the new clergy (Baptist anti-Board) to take the place of old clergy! We Catholics prefer to cling to the successor of St. Peter.

Now, I find that the Editor's "authorities," through whom

he hopes to prove Baptist church successions, are "left" Protestants who wrote to make out against the Catholic Church as bad a case as possible. They might lambaste the Catholic Church with a Baptist club (since "any old stick is good enough to beat a dog with"), but these same Presbyterians in the end rejected the Baptists as "impractical radicals."

I have to say about the ten articles of the Editor's creed: 1st, that the Baptists do not have Jesus Christ as their only head; they have human heads in plenty, little popes galore. 2nd, since it is impossible for any religious body to "take the Scriptures as their only rule of faith and practice," the Baptists do not do so. 3rd, salvation is initially by faith without works, but faith must bear fruit in good works or it is not true faith. 4th, Catholics believe in "a regenerated church membership," but they do not apply the pruning knife which angels alone are able to wield. 5th, immersion is valid baptism and acceptable to Catholics; but, since baptism is a washing in the name of the Holy Trinity, pouring may also be employed as a mode. 6th, the Baptists destroy in substance all the seven sacraments, but retain the shadow of two. Thus, they have "a form of godliness, but they deny the power thereof" (2 Tim. iii., 6). 7th, Catholics cling to the "one mediator" of redemption. But it is proper and right to ask a brother or sister, living or departed, to pray for one. 8th, independency of local churches and "democracy" in church government are impossible of practical realization; actually certain "leaders" and ecclesiastical politicians who thrust themselves forward rule in Baptist churches. 9th, here is another example of having "a form of godliness without power." Baptist church officials may be called "deacons and elders," but they are not successors of the primitive diaconate and presbytery. 10th, actual Baptist practice makes one doubt that Baptists 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." The Baptists of England, had they been able to do so, would have enforced their will in Cromwell's time by political means; and they have a bad record in the southern United States. There they are very strong, but much religious intolerance prevails: "sprinklers" (Methodists) are sternly opposed when they try to establish themselves in Baptist towns; "Campbellite" evangelists are assaulted and "put in the hospital" when they try to establish churches in Baptist towns; and of course, the Catholics. . . . ! But need I say more!

Conclusion

The Baptist churches are heretical religious bodies unknown before the time of Luther's Reformation. I extend an invitation to conscientious members of these bodies to abandon them and apply for membership in God's Holy Church; the Holy, Apostolic, Catholic, Roman Church. Prayerfully submitted.

OUR REJOINDER

By THE EDITOR

The foregoing was written at our invitation. We were desirous of knowing just what would be the reaction of a thorough-going Catholic to our reply to the Pope. We felt that our readers would likewise be interested in this. We are glad to be able to get this reaction from one in so responsible a position as is Mr. Hull. His reply ought to arouse Baptists to a greater interest in the differences between us and Catholics. It also ought to show us how to combat their heresies more effectively. We take the occasion of his reply as a further opportunity of emphasizing Catholic errors and Baptist truths.

Needs to Consult a Dictionary!

Mr. Hull begins by saying that our reply was not a reply. If he will consult a good dictionary, it will enlighten him to the effect that **anything done or said in return is a reply.** We were under no obligation of any kind to take up the pope's encyclical

paragraph by paragraph. We preferred to attack the very citadel of Roman Catholicism rather than spend our time and space with side issues. Of course, Mr. Hull prefers that we should have done the latter.

Not Mouzonitis, But Paulitis and Juditis

Our opponent is not only deficient in lexicology, but he is poor in diagnosis. Our "disease" is quite different from Mouzonitis. It is also much older, and is much worse (for Catholics). It is predominantly a complication of Paulitis and Juditis. It is caused by a certain contagious spirit imbibed from the Scriptures, especially from the writings of Paul and Jude. That spirit is graphically depicted in the following words: "I am set for the defense of the gospel (Phil. 1:27); 'Earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints' (Jude 3); 'And some save, snatching them out of the fire' (Jude 23).

Deciding Conflicting Claims

We are asked if we "think Catholics capable of deciding between the conflicting claims of the different Baptist denominations." We answer, just as capable as they are of deciding between the conflicting claims of the Roman Catholic Church and the Baptists. In fact there is but one "Baptist" denomination. All others carry some qualifying designation, such as General, Freewill, Primitive, Seventh Day, etc. And the task of deciding "the conflicting claims of the different Baptist denominations" is not nearly so great as was the task of deciding the conflicting claims of the various claimants of the papal chair in the latter part of the fourteenth and early part of the fifteenth centuries, when, for forty years, the Roman Catholic Church was rent asunder. A part of the time there were three claimants to the papal chair, and we are told by the Catholic Encyclopedia that "Saints, and scholars, and upright souls were to be found in all three obediences." Does Mr. Hull consider Catholics of that day capable of deciding the conflicting claims of these rival popes? If so, and if Catholics have not greatly degenerated since then, he need not disparage their ability to decide "the conflicting claims of the different Baptist denominations."

Baptist Differences

Baptists do have some differences among them. So did New Testament churches. Some New Testament churches permitted and practiced some things that others did not. And some of them were more affected by error than others. Compare the seven churches addressed by John in Revelation with each other; also the churches of Galatia and the church at Corinth with other New Testament churches. Baptists much prefer their present differences to the damning heresies championed by the pope and his coadjutors. And we are happy in leaving the reconciling of our differences to God's only vicar and vicegerent on earth today—the blessed, unerring Holy Spirit, who indwells every believer (1 Cor. 6:19), giving to each one the capacity of qualitative discernment of truth from error (1 John 2:20, 27).

What Kind of a Baptist Church Should Catholics Join?

We are willing for Catholics, when saved by the Spirit of God through wholehearted faith in the blood of Christ, to join any Baptist church that takes the Bible as its only and all-sufficient guide in faith and practice and seeks diligently to follow that guide.

System of Antichrist Not Mystery Babylon

It is true that Gnosticism was the system of Antichrist, but Gnosticism was not Mystery Babylon. Mystery Babylon has its seat at Rome (Rev. 17:9). This Gnosticism never did. And Gnosticism was never so popular and powerful as Mystery Babylon is pictured as being. Neither did Gnosticism ever persecute as Mystery Babylon is represented as doing. See Rev. 17:2, 18; 18:3, 11 and 17:6.

No Affinity With Freemasonry

Mr. Hull's intimation that we are led by Freemasonry in our assault on the Roman Catholic Church is humorous in the

light of our last issue, which carried a treatise on "The Evils of Secretism," this being chiefly an attack on Freemasonry. Because of this attack we have been accused of being in league with the Roman Catholic Church! And now it is hinted that we are led by Freemasonry in our attack on Roman Catholicism!

Mr. Hull is exactly right in his statement that the Gnostic heresy is revived in Freemasonry; however it is revived in only a mild and modified form. We are unalterably opposed to Freemasonry. **Freemasonry today is injuring Baptists far more than it is Roman Catholics, and far more than Roman Catholicism is injuring Baptists, because Freemasonry has entrenched itself on the inside of Baptist churches, while it is wholly outside of Roman Catholicism, and Roman Catholicism is wholly outside of Baptist churches.**

But we are more consistent than is Mr. Hull. We are opposed to every secret order of every name under the shining canopy of the heavens, no matter how fair its name or worthy its purposes. Organized secretism for religious or fraternal or benevolent purposes is wholly and irretrievably wrong for a Christian. It is wholly opposed to the Spirit of Christ, who said "In secret have I said nothing" (John 18:20). But, doubtless, Mr. Hull would defend the Knights of Columbus; yet the only essential difference between Freemasonry and the Knights of Columbus is that the former is a revival of Baal worship and modified Gnosticism and the latter is perpetrated by Mystery Babylon and is more pronouncedly and distinctively erroneous in its teachings because it binds its devotees to obedience to the pope, while Freemasonry is far more liberal with its members.

If Mr. Hull is not a member of the Knights of Columbus, we shall be glad to furnish him any information he wishes concerning its secret work (with the exception of its password, which is changed every year). We have the complete ritual and a brief account of its history before us now. And we are looking just now at a picture of the Captain of the Guard as he sits on the floor supposedly bleeding and dying from a pistol wound in his heart inflicted by the Secret Service Man. This is the culminating trick to stir the sinful fury of the candidates to a murderous rage! A wonderful piece of work to be sponsored by an institution that claims to be the bride of Christ! Selah.

Roman Catholicism and Apostate Israel

Our opponent's reference to Israel suggests two striking analogies between apostate Israel and Roman Catholicism. Israel rejected God as their king and asked for a human king (1 Sam. 8:7). In like manner Roman Catholics have rejected Christ as the head of the church and the Holy Spirit as God's vicar in establishing a human head and a human vicar. Just as Israel's act was a rejection of God as their king, so the action of Roman Catholics is a rejection of the headship of Christ and the office of the Holy Spirit to the individual Christian.

Again apostate Israel exalted tradition to a place of equality with the word of God, even, in many cases, making the word of God of no effect. **So also has Roman Catholicism.**

A Challenge to Prove Tradition

We challenge Mr. Hull or any other Catholic from the pope on down to establish by reliable and credible historical proof that Christ and the apostles taught any definite truths or enjoined any specific practices that are not contained in the New Testament. In the early ages of Christianity, when mythology was rife, when paganism was both warring against and greatly altering beliefs and practices, and when copies of the Scripture were scarce, men were driven to assert apostolic authority for prevailing practices to defeat the enemy. An impartial study of the times will deliver any fair-minded person from the error of believing every assertion of apostolic authority by early prelates. When one sees the looseness and arbitrariness of the Scripture interpretations of some of these "Fathers," he is not surprised to note their appeal to apostolic authority for support of that for which they could not seem

to twist the Scripture sufficiently to furnish support. For instance, Augustine made "compel" in Luke 14:23 signify the **"coersive authority of the church."** Thus, as has been said, let **"read this parabolic message of love from our Lord into a death warrant for 'heretics.'"** Catholics themselves (and even Mr. Hull, as we shall see) deny the statements of the "Fathers" when it suits them to do so. We want to ask Mr. Hull if, in the light of 2 Tim. 3:16, the Pharisees were right in asserting the authority of their traditions. Then tell us what reason there is for assuming that God did not give a complete written revelation for this dispensation when he did for the former. We know our questions vex you, Mr. Hull, but they are so pertinent we cannot refrain from asking them.

Naming That Which Did Not Exist

It is true, as Mr. Hull asserts, that ordinarily a thing exists before it is named. But in the papacy Roman Catholics have named something that did not exist in New Testament times. Certainly the Council of Nicea did not originate the doctrine of the trinity. It is clearly taught in the Scripture. But not so with the papacy. When the Vatican Council decreed the infallibility of the pope it had nothing to back it but a gradually developed assumption.

Mr. Hull vs. Eusebius, Jerome and Other Authorities

We have said already that Catholics deny early traditions when it suits them to do so. We here cite a concrete case. Mr. Hull said we used our imagination in the statement that Peter was supposed to be presiding over the "See of Rome" at the time of the council at Jerusalem. We admit that we used imagination, but it was not ours that we used. In a tract by Rodney Pope, published by the Catholic Truth Society of Ireland, and carrying the usual authorization, we read: **"He [Peter] is supposed to have arrived in Rome in the year 42-43. Eusebius, St. Jerome, and the old Roman Calendar, published by Bucherius, say that St. Peter held see of Rome for twenty-five years."** Now the date of the council at Jerusalem, according to the chronology of the Catholic Bible, was 49-51. Nor is this our only authority. The Catholic Bible dates the writing of Peter's first epistle about 48. And "Babylon" in 1 Pet. 5:13 is supposed by Catholics to be Rome, from which Peter is said by them to have written this epistle. And since the Catholic Bible (1 Peter 5:13) affirms that there was a church at that time in "Babylon," Peter, being supposed to be the founder and first bishop of it, must certainly be supposed to have been presiding at Rome previous to the council at Jerusalem. Now whose imagination did we use? It is hard on the dignity of the secretary of the National Catholic Bureau of Information to make such stupid blunders as this and to show such an unfamiliarity with Catholic writings and traditions. Better quit writing poetry a while, Mr. Hull, and read up a little.

Authority to Forgive Sins

We are told that nothing is more certain than that the authority to forgive sins included more than the right to lay down the terms of forgiveness; yet in all the New Testament record Catholics can cite only one supposed case of priestly absolution. That one case is the mention of Paul's forgiveness of the incestuous man at Corinth (1 Cor. 5:1-5; a Cor. 2:5-10). But in this case we have only Paul's personal forgiveness of this man. The phrase **"in the person of Christ,"** is improperly translated. The Greek word for "person" is translated the same in five other places in the King James Version, but it is translated **"face" fifty-five times and "presence" seven times.** And in none of these places is there such a use of the term as is here alleged by Catholics. This was not the proper term for Paul to use if he had meant to say that Christ was here forgiving the man's sin through him. Had he meant this, he had good explicit words to use. He could have used **"hyper,"** as he did in 2 Cor. 5:20 and Philm. 13, or he could have used **"dia,"** as he did also in 2 Cor. 5:20. **"Face" or "presence"** is the undoubted meaning of **"prosopon"** in the passage under discus-

sion, and this is the sense given by Thayer, the greatest authority on New Testament Greek. Paul's meaning here is that he forgave with a consciousness that Christ was beholding his act, and that he was here acting, as the follower of Christ ought ever to act, with a sense of responsibility to Christ and a concern for his approval.

Careful study quite clearly reveals the occasion of the mention of Paul's forgiveness of this man. Since Paul had written to the church commanding the exclusion of this man, the church, through respect for Paul's authority as an apostle, was hesitant about receiving him again without knowing the apostle's attitude toward it. It is clear from 2 Cor. 7:5-9 that Titus came from Corinth into Macedonia to Paul just previous to the writing of this epistle and brought him information about the church. It is evident that Titus told Paul how the church had obeyed his former instructions concerning the exclusion of this man. Then Titus, doubtless, told Paul of the man's sorrow (2 Cor. 2:7), and of the desire of the church to know what he would have them do with regard to the man. Thus the apostle wrote them his will in the matter. He told them to forgive him and that he would join them in it. In other words, he told them not to stand back any longer through fear of displeasing him. Paul and the Corinthian church forgave this man just as a Baptist church today forgives and receives back the excluded when they become penitent.

Apostolic Power Not Transmissible

Matt. 28:20 does not prove the transmissibility of apostolic power. When Christ promised his presence to the end of the age, we believe he spoke not to the apostles as such, but to the church as an institution. This is a far more valid interpretation than the Roman Catholic interpretation, for an official successor to an apostle had to be one that had accompanied with the apostles from the baptism of John (Acts 1:21, 22). There is as much grounds for asserting that the inspiration of the apostles was to be transmitted as there is for asserting that any other prerogative was to be transmitted. If, as Catholics teach, the apostles did not give us a complete written revelation, then there is need for perpetual inspiration. If apostles needed inspiration to pass on and interpret the teachings of Christ (and they did—John 14:26), and if they did not give us a complete written revelation, then their successors would stand, in this respect, in the same need of inspiration. And without inspiration, infallibility is a chimera.

In Matt. 28:20 Christ promised his perpetual presence with the church. And his presence has never been with the Roman Catholic Church; because the promise of his presence was conditioned on obedience to his commission, and the Roman Catholic Church does not faithfully perform a single item in that commission. She does not preach the gospel of Christ, but preaches instead another gospel. She does not baptize; only pours. Neither does she teach the all things of Christ, and in many cases teaches the direct opposite.

Catholic Church Not Founded by Jesus Christ

Mr. Hull says that we cannot prove that Jesus Christ did not found the Catholic Church. Yes, we can prove that to the satisfaction of any fair-minded person. In the book of Acts and in the epistles of Paul we have an outline history of the church that Jesus founded, covering a period of more than thirty years. Now if we were to rewrite this history in modern parlance, substituting other modern towns for those mentioned and giving other names to the various characters, and changing the incidental circumstances to prevent its recognition as a reproduction of New Testament history, no one in the world would take the subject of the history to be the Roman Catholic Church. Ardent Roman Catholics would be farther from doing this than any one else. **In this history there would be no mention of a pope or a human head of the church. We would find no appeals to the supreme authority of any one individual. There would be no archbishops nor cardinals. And, if the history were written with linguistic accu-**

racy, there would be no mention of any priesthood in the churches except the high priesthood of Christ and the common priesthood of all believers. The confessional would be conspicuous for its absence. So would the invocation of Mary and the adoration of images. A diligent search would reveal no reference to the Lord's supper as a sacrifice, therefore, no mass; no praying for the dead; no extreme unction (the anointing of Jas. 5:14 was not with a view to the death of the individual, but for his recovery); no pouring of water for baptism and no pouring of infants; no hierarchal church government; no holy water; no Lent and no Easter. What a queer history of the Roman Catholic Church this would be! Selah.

Local Assembly Only Kind of Church Christ Has

We deny that the church "has a visible expression that is universal." This is a papal assumption pure and simple. We challenge Mr. Hull or anybody else to prove that "ekklesia" can be applied properly to an unassembled or unassembling group. No authority for such a use of the word can be found in the Greek. And it is the height of folly to suppose that Christ and the apostles used the term not only in a hitherto unknown sense without giving any intimation of so doing, but in a sense that violates the essential meaning of the word. An "ekklesia" is an assembly, and nothing else. It has never meant anything else and will never do so etymologically. At the coming of Christ for his saints (Matt. 25:1-13; 1 Thess. 4:15-17), all the saints of the first resurrection and rapture will constitute the general church (Heb. 12:23), but that is yet future, and when it comes, it will be an assembly.

Christ Taught the Equality of the Apostles

"And there arose also a contention among them, which of them was accounted the greatest" (Luke 22:24). Could such a contention arise in the modern Catholic clergy as a whole? Do not all the clergy know that the pope is their official superior? So the apostles evidently did not know they had a pope. They seemed to be as ignorant of that as Baptists are today. How much they were in need of instruction on this point! And how strange Christ did not on this occasion fully and forever settle this contention by telling them he had appointed Peter his vicar and that they were to look to Peter as their human spiritual head! Instead of doing this, Christ did the very opposite. He affirmed that there was to be among them no greatness of office or authority, but only the greatness of service. And it was not the manner of the exercise of authority, by the Gentile lords, but the fact of it that Christ here condemned among the apostles.

We are asked if we would contend that Christ exercised no authority over his disciples. No, we would not contend that; but Christ authorized none of his disciples to imitate him in the exercise of authority. He appealed to his example of service and not to his exercise of authority as a pattern for them.

Peter Neither the Founder Nor Bishop of Church at Rome

Mr. Hull, with others, asserts that the church at Rome was founded jointly by Peter and Paul. But note absurdity of such an idea. Paul wrote to the Romans about 57 A. D. (according to the Catholic Bible). At the time he wrote the faith of the Romans was spoken of in the whole world (Rom. 1:8). Are we supposed that with such faith there was yet no church at Rome? Yet Paul had not yet visited the city (Rom. 1:13). And the Catholic Encyclopedia says: "Paul would have worded his epistle otherwise if the community addressed were even immediately indebted to his apostolate." This is another embarrassing predicament for the secretary of the National Catholic Bureau of Information to get himself into.

Nor is it to be supposed that Peter founded the church alone. Explicit tradition to this effect cannot be traced further back than the latter part of the second century. Had Peter been founder of the church, the absence of any scriptural mention of that fact would be strange indeed. And had Peter been the bishop of this church, even though he were absent when Paul wrote to

the Romans, the failure of Paul to mention Peter in his Roman letter is stranger still. The Catholic Encyclopedia sees this difficulty and seeks to avoid it in the following way: "An epistle like the present would hardly have been sent while the Prince of the Apostles was in Rome, and the reference to the rules (xii, 8) would then be difficult to explain." This is a lame subterfuge. We may confidently say that such an epistle would not have been addressed to a church over which the pope was presiding, whether he were present or absent at the time. Irenaeus makes Linus the first bishop of Rome in the following words: "After the Holy Apostles (Peter and Paul) had founded and set the church in order they gave over the exercise of the episcopal office to Linus."

Peter Not a Pope

Christ's prayer for Peter and the changing of his name indicate that Peter was a leader among the apostles, but they do not prove a primacy of office for Peter. As we have shown already, Christ gave to all the apostles the same authority he gave to Peter as their leader. See Matt. 16:19; 18:18; John 20:22, 23. Peter was a leader among official equals just as one Baptist pastor may be a leader among a group of pastors. Paul went to Peter (1 Gal. 1:18) just as a comparative novice in the ministry today might go and seek the counsel and advice of an older and experienced preacher. Peter never exercised papal authority, and there is not one hint that Peter was ever consulted as having superior official authority over other apostles.

No Pope at Jerusalem Council

Mr. Hull fails to tell us why Paul and Barnabas were sent to "the apostles and elders" instead of to Peter for a settlement of the circumcision controversy. We quoted Cardinal Gibbons to the effect that "When a dispute arises in the church regarding the sense of Scripture THE SUBJECT IS REFERRED TO THE POPE FOR FINAL ADJUDICATION," and we asked why this procedure was not followed in this controversy. But we got not a word in reply. We asked also why there is no mention of Peter's signature being attached to the decisions of this council since Cardinal Gibbons tells us that the pope's signature is necessary before the acts of councils acquire the force of law. But not a word did we get in reply. Our opponent passed these questions by, and then, to cover his embarrassment, he accused us of implying that the pope ruled without taking counsel of his associates. We did nothing of the kind. We quoted from Cardinal Gibbons how the pope has recourse to his associates. The point we made is that, according to Cardinal Gibbons, controversies are to be referred to the pope and then he settles them in that way that seems best to him, but this controversy was referred, not to Peter, but to "the apostles and elders." The reason for this is that this council was a Baptist council instead of a Roman Catholic council! Selah. While Peter was influential at this council, just as any Baptist preacher might be influential at a Baptist council, yet we may say with the forceful words of McClintock and Strong: "It is, however, to be remarked that on that occasion he exercised no one power which Romanists hold to be inalienably attached to the chair of Peter. He did not preside at the meeting; he neither summoned nor dismissed it; he neither collected the suffrages nor pronounced the decision." A very queer Roman Catholic council methinks! If one were compelled to pick out a pope at this council, any sensible person not blinded by prejudice would select James and not Peter. James both presided and pronounced the decision! Selah.

"Sacraments"

Do "sacraments" have any saving efficacy? They do not. Jesus Christ instituted no "sacraments." He gave us two symbolic ordinances, and Roman Catholics have grossly perverted both of them. Roman Catholicism got its baptismal regeneration and transubstantiation from the ceremonialism of Judaism and the mysticism of paganism. When Christ spoke of the necessity of eating his flesh and drinking his blood in order to have

life (John 6), he clearly showed that he spoke figuratively of receiving him through faith (vs. 33-36, 47, 63). Catholics are not only out of harmony with the correct interpretation of Christ's words, but they are out of harmony with their own interpretation. Christ made eating his flesh and drinking his blood a condition of spiritual life, and Catholics say that this refers to partaking of his body in the "Eucharist," yet they teach that regeneration takes place in baptism, which is administered previous to partaking of the "Eucharist." Then again the Catholic Church goes counter to its own interpretation of Christ's words in that he commanded both the eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood, and they withhold the cup from the laity. If partaking of bread is to be recognized as eating both the body and blood, why did Christ give the cup to the apostles? Are we to follow Christ, or are we to modify his teachings and example to suit whims and circumstances? And since the cup was given to represent the shed blood of Christ (Matt. 26:27; Mark 14:24; Luke 22:20), how can the blood be supposed to be in the flesh? (These are some more of those vexing questions, Mr. Hull). The Catholic Bible lays much stress on "or" instead of "and" as the proper translation in 1 Cor. 11:27, but it passes silently and cunningly over "and" in verse 26. According to this latter verse the Catholic laity do not show the Lord's death.

If "sacraments" are enjoined upon us, then they, involving overt acts of obedience, are works of righteousness. Therefore, to say that we reach the blood of Christ through "sacraments" is a denial of such passages as Rom. 3:24; Eph. 2:8, 9; Titus 3:5; Rom. 11:6.

Baptism has nothing to do with salvation except to symbolize it. It represents a death and burial, and, of course, a resurrection; but it does not represent a birth. There is nothing about it that is analogous to a birth. We again invite Catholics to peruse the following passages which show that baptism is not essential to salvation: Matt. 3:13 with Titus 3:5; Rom. 1:16 with 1 Cor. 15:1-4 and 1:14-17 and 4:15; Acts 16:30, 31; John 4:1. That "water" in John 3:5 refers to the word of God is proved by Jas. 1:18; 1 Pet. 1:23; Titus 3:5; Eph. 5:24-27; John 15:3. "There is no suggestion in Eph. 5:26 that 'we establish connection with the 'word of life' through the baptismal waters.'" This passage simply likens regeneration to a washing in water, and states that this washing is accomplished by the word. There is no reference here to baptism.

Mr. Hull in his reply lays a great deal more stress on the blood of Christ than does the Catholic Bible, Cardinal Gibbons, and a numerous and varied collection of Catholic tracts and pamphlets in our possession. The Catholic Bible silently passes over nearly all the passages that mention the blood of Christ. Cardinal Gibbons has chapters on baptism, penance and other "sacraments," but if he so much as mentions the blood of Christ in his whole book, we have been unable to find it. And we have more than thirty outstanding Catholic pamphlets that treat on varied subjects of Catholic faith. Some of them treat on redemption and justification; yet in all of them we have been unable to find the least reference to the cleansing blood of Christ. If left alone, Catholics put supreme emphasis on "sacraments" and good works, for they find this an effective way to hold sway over the souls of men. But if they are hummed, they quickly deny the plain logic of their doctrines. There is no place for the attachment of any saving efficacy to the overt acts of men if the blood of Christ is sufficient as an atonement for the soul.

In Possession of What?

In response to our statement that the Roman Catholic Church cannot be traced back to Christ, we are told: **"At any rate it is in possession and has established itself firmly by right of prescription."** We ask, in possession of what? We know full well that she is in possession of the remains of Roman paganism, which is well indicated by the pope's possession of the title "Pontifex Maximus." And we know, too, that she is

in possession of the most deceptively false and damning system that is sponsored today under the guise of Christianity. And she is in possession of all the marks of Mystery Babylon. In these we grant that she has firmly established herself by prescription. But instead of it being by prescription, it is by infant baptism; by legal force and every feasible means of coercion; and by bloody, dastardly persecution that she has established herself in her present place of world prominence. Had she granted to the "heretics" of the early and middle ages the freedom she now hypocritically cries out for when she fancies she sees the least hint of its abridgment, had she left men free from every manner of coercion to choose her, refuse her, or renounce her, and had she been satisfied to increase her membership in only the scriptural way instead of adopting infant "baptism," by means of which she fastens her poisonous fangs on the infant and, from the very beginning of its impressionable period, injects her venom into its plastic mind and thus, as Satan's agent, blinds the minds of children, **"lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ . . . should shine unto them"**—had she done these things, as she ought to have done since she claims to be the church of Christ, then today she would not have superior numbers to boast of. Without infant "baptism" a few centuries would leave only a shadow of the present Roman Catholic Church. Yet, after taking these unfair, unscriptural advantages, she will boast of her numbers. Her glory is her shame, and she is so blind she knows it not. Would that God might have pity on her and open her blinded eyes!

Gates of Hell Have Not Prevailed!

Christ's promise that the gates of hell should not prevail against his church (generic sense) did not mean that none of his churches would fall into error. The New Testament record makes this certain. Neither did his promise mean that the majority of his churches would remain true to his word. When they ceased to conform to the essential New Testament pattern, he removed the candlestick (Rev. 2:5) and spewed them out of his mouth (Rev. 3:20). **It was from these dead, apostate churches that the Roman Catholic hierarchy sprung. Thus the Roman Catholic Church is a development from apostate Baptist churches, and it is with propriety that we invite Roman Catholics to return to that institution from which Roman Catholicism apostatized.**

Christ's promise concerning the church meant that his church as an institution, expressed in local, independent, democratic organisms, should never be overcome. This promise was fulfilled through the minority that remained comparatively free from the errors which finally headed up in Roman Catholicism. Christ's church is here today, just as it has been here every single minute since he founded it. It is expressed today, as in other days, in local, independent, democratic organisms. The editor is happy to be pastor of one of these.

A Bold Challenge Accepted

Mr. Hull says: **"I am willing to rest the whole case of the comparative reliability of the Catholic and Protestant versions of the Bible on the emergent result of any attempt to find verses quoted in Romans iii., 10-18, in the Old Testament."** We gladly accept and agree to this proposition. Let the reader, if possible, get two copies of the King James Version, and open one of them at the passage mentioned above. Now open the other one at Psa. 14:1-3 and you will find verses 10-12 of Rom. 3. Then turn to Psa. 5:9 and 140:3 and you will find verse 13. In Psa. 10:7 you will find verse 14. Verses 15-17 will be found in Isa. 59:7, 8. Verse 18 is taken from Psa. 36:1. This proves the case and, according to Mr. Hull's own proposition, we have established that the King James Version is more reliable than the Catholic Bible. Selah. Paul did not say that all this quotation was to be found in one place. Mr. Hull, we tell you again that you had better take some time off and read up a little.

No Defense for Dominating and Usurping Boards

Our opponent thinks we will find Satan's ecclesiastical

masterpiece among the boards of Baptists and Campbellites. We think not. The boards are very mild compared with Roman Catholicism. However, we have no defense for any board, committee, group, or individual that seeks to dominate the churches or usurp the place God has given them as the custodians of Christ's commission.

Gnosticism

Gnosticism was one form of diluted Christianity. Roman Catholicism is another. Gnosticism was idealistic and speculative; a mixture of Zoroastrianism, Alexandrian philosophy, and Christian revelation; an extra-ecclesiastical, secret, mystic religion. Roman Catholicism is ritualistic and dogmatic; a mixture of Judaistic and paganistic sacerdotalism and hierarchy, and paganistic mystic ritualism and image worship with Christianity; an intra-ecclesiastical, sacramental religion. Gnosticism was Christianity perverted by learning and speculation. Roman Catholicism is Christianity perverted by sacerdotalism, sacramentalism and hierarchy. Gnosticism was a rival of Roman Catholicism and was therefore opposed by Roman Catholicism. But Gnosticism was also strenuously opposed by Tertullian, the celebrated Montanist.

The Evolution of "Presbyter"

In our reply to the pope we pointed out the reasons for the change from the New Testament ministry to the Roman Catholic clergy. Now Mr. Hull comes to our assistance and reminds us of how the word "presbyter" from "presbuteros," meaning "elder" and expressing the title of a New Testament preacher, evolved into "priest." "Presbyter" became "priester" and "priester" became "priest." Thus, after "presbyter" makes a journey around through the Latin and Anglo-Saxon, the emergent result is "priest." Therefore, of course, "presbuteros" originally meant "priest," and so it ought to be translated, notwithstanding the fact that the New Testament word for "priest" is "hierus," and is never used to designate an office in New Testament churches. Now this is the educated ignorance we are asked to receive from the secretary of the National Catholic Bureau of Information. If you can't receive it, it is because you are not educated (in Roman Catholic sophistry). Is Mr. Hull getting himself all messed up? Well, we rather think he is.

False Assertions

We will take up here and refute certain false assertions that we have not found suitable place to discuss elsewhere.

1. **"Christ himself baptizes and thereby applies his blood to the soul."** Christ baptized with the Holy Spirit on two different occasions in New Testament times (on Pentecost and in the house of Cornelius), but he never baptized any one in or with water (John 4:2); and he does not now baptize with the Holy Spirit. And when he did baptize with the Holy Spirit, that had nothing to do with the application of his blood. His blood is applied through faith alone (Rom. 3:25)—but not the faith that is alone.

2. **"The Baptist Editor makes grace in justification a cloak covering the soul, while all the while the heart may be unchanged."** This is a bald and inexcusable misrepresentation. We plainly stated that **"All justified persons are born of God."** This misrepresentation seems to show that Mr. Hull is ignorant of the difference between justification and regeneration. Because we denied that justification consists of the infusion of grace into the soul, he ignorantly and blindly rushed to the conclusion that we taught a justification that could be had apart from regeneration. Justification is a state, a state of imputed righteousness, a state of favor with God wholly through the merits of Jesus Christ, but justification, of itself, does not affect our natural state. Regeneration does this. Justification imputes righteousness to us; regeneration works righteousness in us. They go hand in hand, but they differ. The former has to do with our standing; the latter with our state. But one cannot be had without the other, for it is in regeneration that we are enabled to believe unto justification.

3. **"The Rev. Mr. Simmons has made justification by faith and justification by works irreconcilable antinomies."** Not so. We showed a clear reconciliation between justification by or through faith and justification by works. Mr. Hull points out no reconciliation between James and Paul, unless, in his statement concerning Abraham proving his belief in God's promise, he means to agree with us; in which case all his drivel about works in salvation is a much-to-do about nothing, and in which case he is out of harmony with Catholic teaching on this point. If James is represented as teaching that works in any way help to accomplish, further, or maintain our legal standing before God, then he is represented as being in conflict with Paul. But he is not. James taught that works are the invariable accompaniments of faith and that they evince us to be in possession of that faith through which we are justified. He uses the term "justified" in a secondary sense, meaning to evince one to be righteous or such as he ought to be.

4. **"The Editor persists in making us teach that we can be saved by 'works done in our own strength.'"** This is another bald and inexcusable misrepresentation. We plainly said, as Mr. Hull noted in his article, that the Catholic teaching **"concerning the nature of grace reduces salvation by grace to salvation by works that grace enables us to do."** Such misrepresentations as this one speaks volumes. They tell in no uncertain terms that Mr. Hull could not answer our arguments as they were; therefore he perverted them into something that he thought he could answer. Sincere, intelligent Catholics will see this.

5. **"The Baptist preachers of the south never tire of accusing the Catholic Church of being 'unpatriotic' because it refuses to take the American Caesar as its pastor in spiritual, as well as temporal, things."** We challenge Mr. Hull to point out the Baptist preachers that have done this. Personally we have never known of it. And if any Baptist preachers have done this, they are not worthy of the name. In fact, we have never known of our government attempting to exercise authority in purely spiritual matters. Mr. Hull's charge and his disrespectful reference to our government as "the American Caesar" are within themselves unpatriotic. These very remarks seem to evidence a vague, inherent aversion to our government, such as we might expect from one who owes allegiance to a foreign pontiff, who not only once exercised temporal power, but still does over a small area, and has never renounced his asserted right to do so even to the utmost extent. It is not the refusal of the Catholic Church to take dictation from the government in purely spiritual matters, but the belief in the right of the church to dominate the state that brings from Baptists and others the charge of un-americanism against Roman Catholicism. Of course, Catholics hypocritically deny this charge, just as in the other things they attempt to cover up the true teachings of the Catholic Church. When Mr. Hull and other Catholics come out in plain words and disavow the Syllabus of Pius IX, which was approved in an encyclical by Leo XIII in 1885, we will believe their protestations of full loyalty to our government in civil matters. Here are a few of the statements made by Pius IX in his Syllabus in defining the rights and powers of the Church:

"She has the right to require the State not to leave every man free to profess his own religion."

"She has the right to deprive the civil authority of the entire government of public schools."

"She has the right of perpetuating the union of Church and state."

"She has the right to require that the Catholic religion shall be the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all others."

We have now gone to the very fountain-head of Roman Catholic authority for these quotations. If there is any way of finding out what the Catholic Church really teaches, surely recourse to the words of the pope ought to be that way. And these sentiments have been reaffirmed over and over again by Cath-

olic leaders and periodicals. We challenge Mr. Hull to disavow these statements from two popes (if not more). Until he does, and until the Roman hierarchy in this country does, we are going to say that **HE AND EVERY LOYAL CATHOLIC IS NOT ONLY A DISLOYALIST, BUT A MENACE TO DEMOCRACY.**

6. "By Tertullian's rule Baptist churches are heretical bodies." Tertullian's rule is said to be: "Truth comes first; error comes after truth is on the scene." With this rule we agree. And it is unfortunate for Mr. Hull that he brought forward this rule, since by it Tertullian was led to sever his relation with Roman Catholicism and identify himself with the Montanists and take up his prolific pen against the errors of Romanism. So instead of this rule being proof of heresy against Baptists, it is exactly that against Catholics as judged by its author. Homer must have been nodding at this point of his reply (and at many other points also).

7. "Baptist churches are heretical religious bodies unknown before the time of Luther's 'Reformation.'" Now it is well known that Baptists are descended from Anabaptists. With this fact in mind we will prove the falsity of Mr. Hull's statement just quoted by two eminent authorities from his own fold. A learned Catholic historian by the name of Baronius says: "The Waldenses were Anabaptists." It is not necessary here that we go into the question of the origin of the Waldenses; it will suffice for the present to state the fact, patent to all students of ecclesiastical history, that the Waldenses existed long before the Reformation. In 1554 Cardinal Hosius, president of the Council of Trent, wrote: "If the truth of religion were to be judged by the readiness and boldness which a man of any sect shows in suffering, then the opinion and persuasion of no sect can be truer and surer than that of the Anabaptists since there have been none for these twelve years past that have been more generally punished. . . ." Then Zwingli, an enemy of the Anabaptists, said at the time of the Reformation: "The institution of the Anabaptists is no novelty, but for thirteen hundred years has caused great trouble in the church." And we take this as a convenient opportunity for adding some other testimonies concerning the antiquity of Baptist faith from those who are not Baptists. Sir Isaac Newton, an eminent English philosopher and Bible student, says: "The Modern Baptists, formerly called Anabaptists, are the only people who have never symbolized with the Papacy." Robert Barclay, a Quaker, says: "There are also reasons for believing that on the Continent of Europe, small hidden societies, who have held many of the opinions of the Anabaptists, have existed from the time of the Apostles." In "Religions of the World," we read: "Baptists claim a higher antiquity than the eventful era of the Reformation. They offer proof in that their views of the church and the ordinances may be traced through the Paterines and Waldenses, the Albigenses, the Vaudoise, the Cathari, the Paulicians, the Donatists, the Novatians, the Montanists of the second and closing part of the first century to the apostles and the churches they founded. Their claim to this high antiquity, it would seem, is well founded, for historians, not Baptists, and who could have no motive except fidelity of facts, concede it."

Finally we read in "Crossing the Centuries," by W. C. King, assisted by many eminent educators, historians and statesmen: "Of the Baptists it may be said that they are not reformers. These people, comprising bodies of Christian believers known under various names in different countries, are entirely distinct and independent of the Roman and Greek churches, having had an unbroken continuity of existence from Apostolic days down through the centuries."

8. "This same Manichean heresy inspires the present Baptist attempt to eviscerate the sacraments." Only ignorance or prejudice or both could cause one to make this charge. Baptists are as far as Catholics from having any sympathy whatsoever with the fundamental principles of Manicheanism, which are a belief in a duality of gods and an ascription of an essential evil nature to matter; therefore, to charge Baptists

with Manicheanism because they deny that "sacraments" have saving efficacy is illogical, foolish and vain.

9. "St. Paul's warning (Acts xx., 29, 30) against the teachers of perverse things implies the presence of an objective test of the truth of doctrines." This warning implies nothing more than the authority of Paul and other inspired teachers. We have the writings of these inspired teachers today as the only test of the truth of doctrines God has provided us with. Jesus said: "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 will to do the will of God have in them the capacity to discern between truth and error. They have this by virtue of the presence in them of the Holy Spirit, God's only vicegerent on earth today (1 John 2:20, 27).

10. "Mass was instituted by Jesus Christ Himself on the night he was betrayed." The mass implies a repetition of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit has plainly said that Christ does not offer himself often "as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood not his own, for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now ONCE in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins; but this man after he OFFERED ONE SACRIFICE FOR SINS FOREVER, sat down on the right hand of God; for by ONE OFFERING he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified" (Heb. 9:25, 26; 10:11, 12, 14). The mass is a denial of the sufficiency of Christ's one sacrifice.

11. "Abraham's faith was 'counted to him unto justice'."

In this statement our opponent evidently means to deny the free imputation of righteousness through faith apart from works. He doubtless means that Abraham's faith only became the actuating cause of his obtaining righteousness by works. The very words of the passage deny such a perversion of it. Why should the word "counted" or imputed be used as it is in this passage if the passage means only that through faith Abraham obtained righteous by works? Such a foolish notion renders the word meaningless. But no passage, or group of passages, no matter how numerous, is too plain to escape the perversion of Mystery Babylon when it does not comport with her paganistic system.

12. "The theory of a gradual development of the papacy, to which the Editor brings the support of Waddington, Mosh-eim and other 'left' wing Protestant historians, is chiefly defective because its protagonists labor under an incorrect conception of Catholic polity." This is not so. There is not the least hint in these quotations that the lower orders of the Catholic ministry are absorbed in the higher. All that is implied in them is that there is a gradation and inequality in the Catholic ministry. That this is true is proved by a quotation from "The Fairest Argument," written by J. F. Noll, editor of OUR SUNDAY VISITOR, under whose auspices the National Catholic Bureau of Information is conducted. Mr. Noll represents the Catholic Church by a tree, and he says: "The leaves represent the Catholic laity throughout the entire world. They are in direct communion with their respective parish priests (the smaller branches of the mystic tree). The priests, in their turn, are in direct communion with their bishops, that is, the larger branches. And all the bishops are in direct and constant communion with the Sovereign Pontiff, that is the trunk, or stem, of the entire tree." This illustration pictures an inequality in the ministry that New Testament churches knew nothing of. We showed how this came about. It was thus that the Roman Catholic graded hierarchy came into existence.

13. "The Scriptures teach that it is possible to lose the state of grace and lose salvation." This is a flat contradiction of 1 John 5:4. This Scripture says: "Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world." With this agrees 1 John 3:9; Rom. 8:29, 39; John 4:13; 5:24; 10:27, 28. We challenge any

Catholic, or any believer in the possibility of a saved person losing salvation, to answer these questions: (1) Is every saved person born of God? (2) If so, will not every saved person overcome the world according to 1 John 5:4? (3) In the light of the promises of Jesus to overcomers in the messages to the churches in Revelation, is it possible for one to overcome and yet not attain final salvation? We will await an attempt to answer these questions. **WE DARE ANY BELIEVER IN THE ABOVE DOCTRINE TO TRY TO ANSWER THEM.** Such passages as 2 Pet. 2:22 have reference to false professors. This is necessarily true in the light of the above passages.

Contradictions

The Catholic system is full of contradictions. Here are some samples from Mr. Hull's reply:

1. "Yes, baptism is 'the answer of a good conscience.'" "In baptism not only actual (personal) sin is 'washed away,' but also Adamic (original) sin." Both of these statements cannot be true. No conscience is good until it is cleaned by the blood of Christ (Heb. 9:14; 10:22). If that cleansing takes place in baptism, baptism cannot be the answer of a good conscience toward God.

2. "Justification is effected solely through the power of Christ's redeeming blood." "Justification initially is by the blood of Christ." The context and other statements prove that this second quotation implies the necessity of good works to justification. Both statements cannot be true. We have here not only contradiction, but two ways of salvation: one for the sinner and another for the saint. Salvation from beginning to end is by one and the same means (Rom. 1:17). Works and grace won't mix (Rom. 11:6).

Other Statements Considered

1. "These passages do not teach that the church has no human head." This was said concerning Eph. 1:22; 4:15; Col. 1:18. These passages do teach that Christ is the only head of the church for at least two reasons: (1) He alone is mentioned as the head of the church by the apostles. Certainly if there had been a human head of the church, there would have been some mention of it. One might as well say there are two Christs and two Gods when the Scripture mentions only one of each as to say that the church has two heads when the Scripture mentions only one. (2) The presentation of the church as a body forbids the thought of two heads. A two headed body is an absurdity.

2. "Peter wrote his first epistle from 'Babylon,' and the Editor does not fail to let us know that 'Babylon' is Rome in Rev. xvi., 5, 6;" We said Babylon in Revelation 17:5, 6 represented the Roman Catholic Church; not the city of Rome. It is stated that "Babylon" in Revelation expresses a mystery. It is, therefore, not to be taken literally there. But there is absolutely no reason for taking it otherwise literally in 1 Pet. 5:13. No one believes that Peter ever was in Rome until near the close of his life except the makers and defenders of Roman Catholic tradition. Charles Higgins, an eminent editor, in his Key to the Bible, expresses substantially the position of the scholarship of the world when he says: "It may be considered a settled point that he [Peter] did not visit Rome before the last year of his life."

3. "The passages set forth by the Editor lay stress on the security of the soul as long as it clings to the cross of Christ." "God casts away no one whose will is constant in allegiance." The Scriptures teach that all saved people will endlessly cling to the cross of Christ (Jer. 32:40; John 4:14; 5:24; 10:27, 28; Rom. 8:29, 30, 35-39; Eph. 1:13; Phil. 1:6; 1 John 5:4; 3:9). And the Scriptures teach that none that come to Christ will be cast out (John 6:37). All that ever come to Christ in true faith will be raised up at the last day (John 6:39). **WE DARE ANY CATHOLIC AND ANY BELIEVER IN THE POSSIBILITY OF A SAVED PERSON FALLING AWAY AND BEING LOST TO ATTEMPT TO HARMONIZE THESE SCRIPTURES WITH THEIR BELIEF.**

4. "If the Catholic Church 'was wedded to the Roman Empire by Constantine,' it was very soon divorced." Constantine brought about an alliance between the Roman Empire and the false churches. He and the false churches agreed to cooperate and support one another. He gave recognition to these churches and put the civil power at their command. He made Christianity the official religion of the Roman Empire. This union was sometimes disturbed later on either by emperors seeking to reinstate paganism or through their sympathy with Arianism. But despite temporary disturbances this union was gradually enhanced until it was absolute and the emperor was a mere vassal of the pope. Under Constantine the union of church and state had its birth and incipency. And it was at late as the latter part of the nineteenth century that Pius XI affirmed the perpetual right of the church to dominate the state. This was reaffirmed by Leo XIII.

5. "Does the Rev. Mr. Simmons yet contend that Constantine was one of the creators of the Catholic Church." Most certainly we do. Constantine greatly accelerated the development of the hierarchy by giving it support, legal recognition, and power. This encouraged the hierarchy to further assimilate paganism in order to fully overcome and replace it in the Roman Empire. This it finally did approximately, and succeeded to the possession of the Pantheon and the title of Pontifex Maximus.

6. "The Protestant Churches accept Caesar as their religious head in whatever nation he may command the subordination of spirituals to temporals." Baptists are not Protestants and, therefore, are not included in this statement. And Baptists accept no dictation from the state in purely spiritual matters. Neither do they claim the right to dominate the state. They have ever stood and spilled their blood for the absolute separation of church and state, and have opposed every encroachment of civil government upon purely spiritual things.

7. "We find the papacy in substance in the writings of the Fathers. The 'modern developments' have been in accidents." Note this statement. He makes no claim that there is any reference in the writings of the "Fathers" to the papacy as it is today. With another step backward we arrive at the apostles, and in their writings we find no reference whatsoever to the papacy. And since the Catholic Church is supposed to have received its traditions from the "Fathers," it is strange indeed that they knew nothing of papal infallibility. It is as clear as day that the papacy is wholly an extra-scriptural and anti-scriptural development.

8. "The confusion of the Editor stems from his insistence on making fcs of believing and doing." Not so; a groundless charge. Believing and doing go hand in hand. We do because we believe. They are the subjective and objective sides of obedience, but they can't be mixed as a means of salvation (Rom. 11:6). We rightly divide the word of truth; Catholics make a hopeless conglomeration of nearly everything they deal with. The primary meaning of "apeitheo" is to be unpersuaded. To be disobedient is the secondary meaning. Because it is used in the secondary sense in some places is no evidence that it is so used in every place. "Pisteuo" is the usual word in the New Testament denoting the act of faith, and it means to trust in and rely on. It has no reference, of itself, to an objective act; although it ever leads to such. "Pisteuo" denotes the fiducial faith that Mr. Hull so abhors.

9. "Christian baptism is another institution: not the same as John's baptism." While this has no practical bearing on any question under discussion, we will yet take space to say that it is not so. It is a baseless assumption. Acts 19:3-5 does not teach that faith came after John's baptism. In the fourth verse we have the words of Paul which plainly show that those baptized by John were expected to believe on the coming Christ at the time of their baptism. These twelve at Ephesus had not been properly instructed, and had not, therefore, exercised faith. For that reason they were reimmersed. Their former

immersion was invalid because it was not preceded by faith. But not so with the immersion of the apostles by John. They exercised faith and were not reimmersed.

10. "The church of Christ came before the New Testament. Priority in time would seem to argue that the New Testament must submit to the test of the Church rather than the opposite." Not any more than priority in time argues that Christ and the apostles should have submitted to Jewish tradition. The church was ever subject to Christ and the apostles. When their essential teachings were fully recorded, as they were finally in the New Testament, then the written revelation became the standard of authority. Until these writings were fully circulated the people had to depend upon such knowledge as they had of these writings and of the apostles' oral teachings. It was thus, through imperfect understanding, fallible memories, contact with paganism and Judaism, and false teachers, that error began to creep in and Roman Catholic tradition had its rise. In 2 Tim. 3:17, the Apostle Paul announced the ultimate design of Scripture. When complete it was to be so perfect as to thoroughly furnish the man of God unto all good works. That this is Paul's meaning, and that he here included more than the Old Testament under the term of "Scripture," is evident from the fact that the Old Testament, while sufficient for its dispensation, was not sufficient to thoroughly furnish the man of God of the new dispensation unto all good works. It told nothing of church polity and duties. Because the church once did not have a complete written revelation to guide her is by no means proof that she should never have such and that, having such, she was not to take that as her sole guide.

11. "The Greek verb translated 'feed' in St. John xxi., 15-17, is *poimaino*, which means also 'to rule'." That "*poimaino*" does not signify absolute rule is established by no less an authority than Peter himself. In 1 Pet. 5:2, 3, "*poimaino*" is contrasted with "*katakurieuo*." This latter word means "to hold in subjection, to be master of, exercise lordship over," and is the very word to denote the rule of the Catholic clergy over laity. Selah! The condemnation of Catholic polity here is so plain that the Catholic Bible was forced to translate "*klaros*" by "*clergy*," which is the Latinized corruption of the Greek word. Mr. Hull's query as to why "*clergy*" should not be the translation here is another case of almost unbelievable crass ignorance and servile stupidity. If Mr. Hull knows anything, he knows that the English word "*clergy*" distinguishes the ministry from the laity, and he has admitted that Peter's meaning is that pastors are not to lord it over the sheep. Yet he asks why not render "*klaros*" by "*clergy*" !!! If Mr. Hull ever frees himself of blind prejudice and mental servility and dares to entertain a single independent thought, he will see the plain fact that the translators of the Douay Version translated "*klaros*" as "*clergy*" in order to eliminate the antagonism between this passage and Catholic polity. The ministry is to feed, shepherd, take oversight of, preside over, govern by influence and counsel, and lead the churches, but they are to exercise no absolute or autocratic power as does the Catholic hierarchy.

12. "St. Peter is made the rock of the Church's foundation." Peter was a part, and only a part, of the foundation of the church in its concrete expression (Eph. 2:20). Christ is the foundation of the church as a spiritual institution (1 Cor. 3:11). In Matt. 16:16-19 Christ addressed Peter as the representative of the apostles. Officially they were in every way his equals. He was merely the leader, representative, and spokesman of official equals.

13. "The Catholic Church does not teach that 'the works that grace enables us to do' are sufficient to save us. Grace definitely makes up for what is lacking in good works, so that the good intention of the regenerated person is accepted for what is deficient in his good works." All right, we will revise our statement and say that the Catholic teaching on grace re-

duces salvation by grace to salvation by works that grace enables us to do, the good intention of the regenerated person. Now this is granting all our opponent has asked. And what does it amount to? It amounts to nothing less than a denial of salvation by grace by ascribing merit to works and good intention. Saving grace is not bestowed because of anything man does or intends to do. Its bestowal is a sovereign, free, wholly unmerited act of God, and it begets man's cooperation, accomplishes good works through him, and produces good intentions in him. The Catholic teaching gives every supposedly saved person the ground to boast that it is because of his good works and good intention that he is saved while the one who has not yielded to the grace of God is lost. It is his good works and good intentions that makes the supposed difference. This is not being justified "freely"—for naught, gratuitously (Rom. 3:24). This is not being accounted righteous without works (Rom. 4:6). This is not being saved by grace through faith and not of works (Eph. 2:8, 9). No true Catholic can say:

"Tis not by works that I have done
I'm depending on Him, I'm depending on Him;
'Tis grace that saves through faith ALONE,
I'm depending on Him to save.

"On Christ my advocate I lean,
I broke God's law, He came between,
He took my place, He bore my sin,
I'm depending on Him to save."

14. "He that believeth and is baptized (St. Mark. xvi., 16) is addressed, of course, to adults; but it is a queer sort of mind which sees the exclusion of infants merely because they are not mentioned there." It is only a mind blinded with prejudice which can see here the inclusion of infants when "believeth" expresses that of which an infant is incapable.

15. "There was certainly to be in the Church just such a priesthood offering bread and wine as did Melchisedech (Gen. xiv., 18). For 'we have an altar' (Heb. xiii., 10 [page E. G. Sisk—Ed.] and this altar is the Holy Table of the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. x., 16-21)." This whole thing is purely an assumption. There is not the least hint that there was to be in the church a priesthood offering bread and wine. As we have said before, so we say again, the New Testament knows nothing of any priesthood except the high priesthood of Christ and the common priesthood of believers. The context of Heb. 13:10 shows that our altar is in heaven where Jesus Christ has gone with his own blood. See Heb. 9:11, 12, 24. There is not a hint of a Christian altar in 1 Cor. 10:16-21. In this passage Paul does not draw an analogy between Jewish and Christian dispensations in respect to an altar, but shows from the fact that those who eat of the sacrifices are partakers of the altar, that to partake of pagan sacrifices is to have fellowship with devils. Turn to your Douay Version, and you will find just this explanation in substance; and you will not find this version here trying to establish the notion of a Christian altar. The whole passage referred to by Mr. Hull is a condemnation of idolatry, as shown by verse 14; absolutely nothing is either said or implied concerning a Christian altar. True Christianity knows nothing of an earthly altar.

16. "The Protestant polities are avowedly systems of expediency." Baptists, not being Protestants, as we have before remarked, are not involved in this charge. And, happily, Baptists are far from being open to this charge. The Catholic and many Protestant polities are, from a temporal standpoint, far more expedient than the polity of Baptists. Baptist church government is temporally inefficient; but, thanks be unto the Lord, it is scripturally consistent.

A Defense of Baptist Progenitors

In regard to Mr. Hull's charges against the progenitors of Baptists we wish to say in general the following: (1) We are indebted almost wholly to the enemies of these people for in-

formation about them. These enemies, like Mr. Hull, were only too glad to find some way to blacken their names. Consequently false charges were made and their faults were magnified. (2) **It should not be surprising to find that, under the terrible persecution they suffered, they were driven to excesses.** (3) **The whole parties were blamed for the acts of some individuals.** This was done just as Mr. Hull tries to incriminate all "Anabaptists" because of the ones that participated in the Munster rebellion. And, as pertinent to this point, we read from McClintock and Strong: "No distinction is drawn between the sober Christians and the worst fanatics of the party." Catholics strongly object to this method of judging them, but this has ever been their method of judging others. (4) **It was common to class all "heretics" together.** Thus sound Christians were often classed with Manicheans or Manicheans and other errorists were classed with Baptist progenitors. Baptists, therefore, do not assert the soundness of all who were classed under the name of one of their progenitors. (5) **Among people widely scattered, as were the progenitors of Baptists, with few copies of the Scripture in circulation, being by persecution deprived of any general communion and prevented from circulating any literature, irregularities were certain to exist.** Baptists do not assert the absolute regularity of all their progenitors in faith and practice, and we insist on the ground of New Testament record that absolute regularity is not necessary to the recognition of a church as a New Testament church. As long as a church is sound as to the way of salvation, nature and mission of the church, and meaning, place, and purpose of the ordinances we hold it to be a New Testament church. And we maintain that at least the majority of those truly belonging to our progenitors were sound in these things.

We will now pass to particular consideration of the charges Mr. Hull prefers against Baptist progenitors:

Montanists

If Montanists had prophetesses that spoke in mixed assemblies, it was opposed to Scripture; but such did not invalidate Montanist churches as New Testament churches. The church at Thyatira in New Testament times not only had in it a prophetess that was usurping undue authority, but she was a false prophetess and seduced the members of the church to commit fornication and eat things sacrificed to idols. It is also charged that Montanus claimed to be the Holy Spirit, but investigation has proved this to be simply a slander. The Catholic Encyclopedia says that Tertullian embraced Montanism as soon as he knew of it. He was born about 160 A. D. According to the Catholic Encyclopedia he became a Montanist about 207 A. D. Is a man of forty-seven in his dotage?

Novatians

Of Novatian's baptism the Catholic Encyclopedia says: **"He fell into a sickness from which instant death was expected. He was therefore given baptism by affusion."** Novatian's baptism was exactly as good as no baptism, but it was just as good as any Catholic baptism today. But Novatian's irregular baptism did not validate the churches to whom his name was applied. He did not found them nor give them their baptism. They were called after him because he was the outstanding anti-catholic of his day.

Donatists

It may be that some Donatists were driven by persecution to fanaticism and the commission of arson and murder (and the charge may be a fabrication of their enemies), but such was not general among them. And had it been ever so common among them, it would not have been any worse than Catholic councils condemning "heretics" and handing them over to the secular arm for execution. **We challenge Mr. Hull to say that the crimes charged against the Donatists were worse than this.** Cardinal Gibbons asks: **"Is it just or fair to hold the Church responsible for those acts of her children which she disowns?"** We commend this question to Mr. Hull. Until he can prove that Donatists generally practiced or approved of arson and

murder he is inconsistent and unfair in incriminating Donatism in general. Cardinal Gibbons also adds: **"You do not denounce liberty as a mockery because many crimes are committed in her name."**

Paulicians

Against these worthy people Mr. Hull evidently could think of no charge to bring. This is certainly a victory for them. Manifesting every effort to blacken the names of Baptist progenitors he said not one word about the Paulicians. Thanks for the tribute. Mr. Fred C. Conybeare in 1891 in Armenia found an old Paulician book entitled: "Key of Truth." In 1898 Mr. Conybeare issued an English translation of this book accompanied with important facts gleaned from Armenian histories and other sources. From this book we find so much evidence that the Paulician churches were apostolic in origin that Adeny, in "The Greek and Eastern Churches," says: **"It is quite arguable that they should be regarded as representing the survival of a most primitive type of Christianity."** And this writer refers to the Paulicians as **"Ancient Oriental Baptists."** Sir William Jones says: **"I see no reason to doubt that we should see in them the genuine successors of the Christians of the first two centuries."** The Paulicians were out of line with main current of world affairs and consequently were not affected by the maelstrom of error that swept over the Roman Empire.

Albigenses

The Albigenses were Paulicians who migrated and settled in the region of Albi, France. Of the Albigenses the Encyclopedia Britannica says: **"Their descent may be traced with tolerable distinction from the Paulicians."** Schmidt says that they were first called Publicants or Publicani, which he thinks is corruption of "Paulicians." Mosheim, Gibbon, Muratori, Conybeare and others regard the Albigenses as a continuation of the Paulicians in France. They got their name from the town of Albi and the district of Albigeois. There may have been some Manicheans and other errorists residing in this region, who, therefore, were called by the same name of Albigenses. And some few of the descendants of the Paulicians may have wandered off after Manicheism. But the great body of the Albigenses that were descended from the Paulicians were not Manicheans. And the charge that their leaders counselled suicide is probably an exaggeration of their utter aversion of this world and attachment to the next and their willingness, and even eagerness, to suffer as martyrs. **We challenge Mr. Hull to prove more against them in this regard. If he does not prove it, we will regard his charge a misrepresentation and a falsehood.**

Cathari

Mr. Hull's comment concerning the Cathari is pathetically ludicrous. He, in obedience to his mental servility to the absurdities of Roman Catholicism, takes the field in the parable of the sower to represent the church, when Christ said plainly: **"The field is the world,"** and when Paul said to the church at Corinth: **"Purge out the old leaven"** (1 Cor. 5:7), and to the church at Thessalonica: **"Withdraw yourself from every brother walking disorderly, and not according to the tradition which they have received of us"** (2 Thess. 3:6). We have here another proof that the Roman Catholic Church is not the church of Christ: she has arranged herself comfortably in this wicked world and refuses the command of the Lord to separate herself from the ungodly. So this was the worst thing Mr. Hull could think of to say against the Cathari! Again we say, Thanks for the tribute. Selah.

Bogomils

We challenge Mr. Hull to prove his charge, or submit to the accusation of having maliciously slandered these people. The Bogomils were a branch of the Cathari, so-called for the purity of life that they insisted on.

Waldenses

The Waldenses claimed to trace their origin to the secu-

larization of the corrupt churches when they went into a working agreement with the Roman Empire at the Council of Nicea in 325 A. D. Many churches did not send representatives to this council. And in the council there was a minority led by one Leo, a man of noted learning, piety, and power. He and his party denounced all the measures of the council except the first which declared Arianism to be heathenism. The dissenters from this council, therefore, came to be known partially as Leonists. Now one of the worst enemies of the Waldenses, Rainerio Sacchoni by name, called the Waldenses Leonists, and did not deny their early origin. Mr. Sacchoni was a member of the Waldenses for seventeen years. He then became a Catholic and was appointed inquisitor among the Waldenses. And of them he said: "Among all the sects, there is no one more pernicious to the church than that of the Leonists (Waldenses), and for three reasons: In the first place, because it is the most ancient: for some say it dates back to the time of Sylvester (A. D. 325); others to the time of the apostles." And he went on to say that it was the most widespread and that its members lived irreproachable lives. Neander, the great church historian, says: "But it is not without some foundation of truth that the Waldenses of this period [twelfth century] asserted the high antiquity of their sect, and maintained that from the time of the secularization of the church—that is, as they believed from the time of Constantine's gift to the Roman bishop Sylvester—such an opposition finally broke forth in them, had been existing all along." And many of their enemies admit their high antiquity.

Anabaptists

The name "Anabaptist" came to be a general epithet of reproach and was applied to various parties holding diverse principles. Thus we have the charges against the Anabaptists by Mr. Hull. The true Anabaptists, the descendants of the Paulicians and Waldenses, are innocent of all these charges. From McClintock and Strong we read: "It must not be supposed that all the Anabaptists of Germany were engaged in the excesses recited above. In fact, between these excesses and the doctrine of the Anabaptists, properly so termed, there does not seem to be the slightest connection." So Fusslin, a conscientious and impartial German investigator, says: "There was great difference between Anabaptists and Anabaptists. There were those who held strange doctrines, but this cannot be said of the whole sect. If we should attribute to every sect whatever senseless doctrines two or three fanciful fellows have taught, there is no one in the world to whom we could not ascribe the most abominable errors." And, finally, Cornelius, an able and judicious Roman Catholic historian, in speaking of the Munster rebellion, says: "All these excesses were condemned and opposed wherever a large assembly of brethren afforded an opportunity to give expression of the religious consciousness of the Anabaptist membership." The false Anabaptists arose in the Reformation period, and many may have practiced sprinkling or pouring and many of them may have been Arians; but the true Anabaptists never sprinkled or poured, and, if Arianism was among them at all, it was certainly not a general characteristic of the party.

A Defense of Baptist Faith and Practice

In regard to Mr. Hull's criticism of the ten articles of Baptist faith and practice given in our reply to the pope, we have to say: (1) **Baptists own only the Lord Jesus Christ as their head.** Their short-comings do not invalidate their ideal. As long as they hold and strive to realize this ideal, they are doing far better than Catholics who do not hold it. (2) **That some Baptists do some things for which they have no scriptural authority we freely admit, but we challenge Mr. Hull to point any item of faith or practice essential to a Baptist church for which we do not have grounds in the precepts, principles, practices, and precedents of Scripture.** (3) **Salvation, from beginning to end, is wholly by grace through faith and without**

works, however faith always expresses itself in works; but those works are an evidence of salvation and not a means toward it. (4) **We have already shown the fallacy of his comment on this point.** (5) **Immersion is the only scriptural mode of baptism as is evidenced both by the meaning of the Greek term and the significance of the ordinance.** There is not a hint of any mode of baptism except immersion in the Bible. (6) **Baptists have both of the ordinances Christ gave to his church and have maintained them free from paganistic corruption.** (7) **It is proper to ask a living brother or sister to pray for one, but there is no Scripture for asking this of the dead or recognizing any mediator in heaven except our one mediator, Jesus Christ.** (8) **Again we say that an imperfect realization of an ideal does not invalidate that ideal.** When Baptists are true to their principles all ruling is by a majority vote of the membership assembled at an orderly meeting. If this is not democracy and independence, tell us what is. (9) **Baptist deacons and elders are according to the New Testament pattern.** (10) **We challenge Mr. Hull or any other Catholic to attempt to prove the assertions by Mr. Hull under this number, or else submit to the charge of having falsified.** We challenge him to cite cases where improper methods have been used against Methodists in Baptist towns, or to name the "Campbellite" evangelists whom Baptists have assaulted and "put in the hospital," or, at least, tell us where the assaults took place. We doubt that he can prove his charges here, but, if he can, we certainly want the proof. And if he can prove some isolated instances of this kind, we would commend to his consideration again the question of Cardinal Gibbons quoted in our discussion of Donatists. The Baptists in England of Cromwell's time fought only for liberty. It is possible that there were some fanatics among them that desired more; but, if so, they did not represent the sentiment and will of Baptists, for Featley, one of their opponents, says that they taught: "That it is the will and command of God, that since the coming of his Son the Lord Jesus, a permission of the most Paganish, Jewish, Turkish, or Anti-Christian Consciences and worships be granted to all men in all Nations and Countries . . . That the doctrine of Persecution in case of Conscience (maintained by Calvin, Beza, Cotton, and Ministers of the New England Churches) is guilty of the blood of the souls crying for vengeance under the Altar."

Now we are through. We challenge Mr. Hull and the whole Catholic world to reply to what we have said. Particularly will be waiting to hear from Mr. Hull on the points where we have especially challenged him.

And once more we appeal to Catholics and urge them to turn from their dead works to the living God through faith in Jesus Christ; and "dare not trust the sweetest frame, but wholly lean on Jesus' name"; and that, having done this, they turn from Mystery Babylon to the true churches of the Lord Jesus, which have an unbroken perpetuity from apostolic days down to the present.

(We are sorry that lack of space prevented us from noting every point of Mr. Hull's reply).

WANTED

Men and women to represent a large book and Bible publishing house in the sale of standard religious and educational books and a complete line of Bibles. If you will sign up for one hundred and twenty days of eight hours each, the company will give you a guarantee of three dollars per day, which is to be made up, if necessary, at the end of the one hundred and twenty days. During this period you get forty per cent profit on all you sell. Then at the end, if you have not made \$360, the company pays you the difference. Extra time is allowed to make up lost time. Write us today if you are interested.