

THE
TRUE AND THE FALSE.

BY

A. C. DIXON,

PASTOR OF THE IMMANUEL BAPTIST CHURCH,
BALTIMORE, MD.

“We are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ.”—1 JOHN 5: 20.

“There shall arise false Christs.”—MATT. 24: 24.

PUBLISHED BY
WHARTON, BARRON & CO.,
10 E. FAYETTE ST., BALTIMORE.

Copyright, 1890,

By WHARTON, BARRON & Co.

PREFACE.

THE object of this little book is to turn on the light and let it shine away the darkness.

The first nine chapters give the truth as it is in Jesus, and will, I trust, be helpful to honest doubters. The last ten chapters view Roman Catholicism in the light of the Bible, and is, I believe, a fair and faithful treatment of every subject discussed. I have thought it best not to burden the book with cumbersome references, but the reader may be assured that every statement is supported by the best authorities.

The truth as here presented has already been blessed in confirming the faith of many, and in turning not a few from the errors of Rome. May the God, whose Son and Book it seeks to honor, continue to use it in a wider sphere, and He shall have all the praise.

A. C. DIXON.

Baltimore, Md.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I. JESUS AS A WITNESS	3
II. HISTORY AS A WITNESS	11
III. EXPERIENCE AS A WITNESS	25
IV. THE ENEMY AS A WITNESS	32
V. REASON AS A WITNESS	42
VI. CHRIST THE LIFE	50
VII. CHRIST THE LIGHT	54
VIII. CHRIST THE WAY	60
IX. WHAT SHALL I DO WITH JESUS?	65
X. THE CHRIST OF THE BIBLE AND THE CHRIST OF ROMANISM	67
XI. MARY AND "MARY"	77
XII. THE MIRACLES OF THE BIBLE AND THE "MIRACLES" OF THE PAPACY	89
XIII. THE LORD'S SUPPER <i>versus</i> THE MASS	100
XIV. THE PAPACY DEFINED	109
XV. A FALLEN CHURCH	121
XVI. PETER <i>versus</i> THE POPE	131
XVII. CIVIL LIBERTY AND THE PAPACY	145
XVIII. CONFESSION AND THE "CONFSSIONAL"	158
XIX. THE GOOD IN ROMAN CATHOLICISM AND HOW TO GET AT IT	163

THE TRUE AND THE FALSE.

I.

JESUS AS A WITNESS.

“Jesus Christ who is the faithful Witness.”—Rev. 1: 5.

The two-fold proposition which we offer for your acceptance is this: JESUS CHRIST WAS NOT A PRODUCT OF THE AGE IN WHICH HE LIVED, BUT A NATIVE OF ANOTHER WORLD WHO CAME TO THIS WORLD FOR A PURPOSE; THAT HE WAS GOD AND MAN IN ONE. The geologist, finding a stone where there are no other stones like it, reasonably concludes that it was imported. The botanist, finding a flower where there are no flowers like it, concludes that its seed was brought from another place. A Chinaman, walking down a street of Shanghai, meets an American missionary. The missionary is a man like himself, but in all other respects totally different. His dress, his language, his religion, his thoughts are different from his. A foolish man that Chinaman, if he does not conclude that he has met a foreigner. Now, Jesus Christ was a man like other men, and yet, so different from all other men, that we are justified in believing he was more than man; so different as to warrant the conclusion that he was not a native of this world at all. Our first proof of this proposition is Jesus Christ himself in his claims, his character, and his work.

I. HIS CLAIMS. 1. *Jesus claimed that he was “the Son of Man.”*—There had never been before him in the world such a Son of Man. His claim was not that he was A son of man, nor the son of A man, but THE Son of Man, of all men, of the human race, of humanity. “There is something,” says F. W.

Robertson, "exceedingly emphatic in that expression, Son of Man. Our master is not called the Son of Mary, but as if the blood of the whole human race were in his veins, he calls himself the Son of Man. There is a universality in the character of Christ which you find in no other man. Translate the words of Christ into what country's language you will, he might have been the offspring of that country. Date them by what century of the world you will, they belong to that century as much as to any other. There is nothing of nationality about Christ. There is nothing of that personal peculiarity which we call idiosyncrasy. There is nothing peculiar to any particular age of the world. He was not the Asiatic. He was not the European. He was not the Jew. He was not the type of that century, stamped with its peculiarities. He was not the mechanic. He was not the aristocrat. But he was the man. He was the child of every age and every nation. His was a life world-wide. His was a heart pulsating with the blood of the human race. He reckoned for his ancestry the collective myriads of mankind. Emphatically, He was the Son of Man."

Now was there anything in the environment of Christ to make out of him such a world-wide Son of Man? Just the contrary. He was raised in a mountain village, and village life tends to make men narrow. Travel may correct this tendency, but Jesus did not travel out of Palestine. Born of the tribe of Judah, and, having a legal right to the throne of David, we would naturally expect him to share the narrow bitter feelings of his Jewish kindred, and like them chafe under the loss of national glory. On the other hand he shares none of their narrow feelings. He teaches them a lesson in brotherly love by condemning their priest and levite for passing by on the other side, while he praises the hated Samaritan who stops and helps the wounded man. All through his life there was a conflict between his universal sympathy and the narrow bigotry of his people. When Demosthenes thanked the gods that he was a man and not a beast, a man and not a woman, a Greek and not a Barbarian, he expressed the sentiments of all mankind till Jesus came with the thought of universal brotherhood. The

Jew thanked God that he was a Jew, and not a Gentile. The Roman thanked his gods that he was neither Jew nor Greek, while the Greek was just as thankful that he was neither Jew nor Roman. Every nation on earth thought that it was THE nation, and every man in it thought that he was THE man, because he was better than his neighbors. Jesus was not Jew enough for the Jew, nor Roman enough for the Roman, nor Grecian enough for the Greek. They all rejected him, because he belonged to all alike, and refused to belong to either exclusively. The forces at work in the world at that time did not produce such a man. He evidently brought into the world this new idea, which we find through revelation to be native to the world from which he came.

2. *Jesus claimed that he was the Son of God.*—The high priest said to him on his trial “I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus said unto him, thou hast said.” (Matt. 26:63.) The high priest understood this answer as decidedly affirmative, for he at once rends his clothes, exclaiming “He hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses?” When Pilate wanted to let him go, the Jews cried out, “We have a law and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God.” (John 19:7.) One of the charges flung into his face on the cross was that he said “I am the Son of God.” (Matt. 27:43.) Thus the enemies of Jesus testify that he claimed to be the Son of God. And his friends who were closest to him and best knew his mind admit the claim. “I saw and bare record,” says John, “that this is the Son of God.” (John 1:34.) Paul preached “Christ in the synagogues that he is the Son of God,” (Acts 9:20.) When the centurion, beholding the wonders of the crucifixion said, “Truly this was a son of God,” he simply echoed the claim of Christ and his friends, and the charge of his enemies.

3. *Jesus claimed that he was God.*—As the Son of Man, he was truly man; and as the Son of God, he was truly God. He was not A but THE Son of God. It is evident that his friends and enemies understood him as claiming that in being the Son

of God he was God. Jesus makes the claim so clear that it seems to me no candid mind can doubt it. Listen to these words: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." (John 14:9.) Again: "He that seeth me seeth him that sent me." (John 12:45.) Many men before and after Christ have tried to demonstrate the existence of God. Jesus made no such attempt. His mission was to manifest God in his own person. His claim confirms the message of the angel, "They shall call his name Emmanuel, God with us;" and Paul shows that he had caught his true meaning when he wrote "God was manifest in the flesh." (1 Tim. 3:16.) Jesus was an agnostic to the extent that he taught the impossibility of knowing God the Father, except through himself. "No man knoweth the Father save the Son, and he, to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." (Matt. 11:27.) He claims identity of divine nature with the Father in the words "I and my Father are one." (John 10:30) In many places he calmly claims attributes which none but God can possess. He declares that he is eternal. To the cavilling Pharisees he said "Before Abraham was I am." (John 8:58.) As a man he prays, but in one of his prayers we see a flash of his divinity. "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." (John 17:5.) And, with this eternity of nature, he declares that he has equal honor with the Father. "The Father hath committed all judgment to the Son, that all men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father. He that honoreth not the Son honoreth not the Father that sent Him." (John 5:22-23.) He claims to be omnipresent as to place and time. "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." (Matt. 18:20.) "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." (Matt. 28:20.) He claimed that he had power to forgive sins. (Matt. 9:5-6.) And his enemies were right in their question, "Who can forgive sins save God only?" He claimed to be able to work miracles, even to the raising of the dead. "As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." (John 5:21.) To an unprejudiced mind, there can be no

shadow of doubt as to the fact that Jesus claimed to be God. And those nearest to him who knew him best admit and press this claim. John crowns him Creator of the Universe, "In the beginning was the Word and the Word was God. All things were made by him and without him was not anything made that was made." (John 1:3.) "We are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life." (1 John 5:20.) Those who were with him for three years believed that he knew all things. "Now we are sure that thou knowest all things, and by this we believe that thou comest forth from God." (John 16:30.) Peter said: "Lord, thou knowest all things: thou knowest that I love thee." (John 21:17.) After Jesus had stilled the tempest on the sea of Gallilee "they that were in the ship came and worshipped him saying, of a truth thou art the Son of God." (Matt. 14:33.) His receiving their worship proves that he claimed to be God; their giving their worship proves that they gladly admitted his claim. Paul's "Christ who is over all God blessed forever" (Rom. 9:5) was the true Christ. So that all who to-day deny his divinity are out of harmony with Christ himself and the early church.

4. *Jesus claimed that he was himself the antidote for all evil.*—Men have presented their plans and philosophies for the remedying of earth's ills, but Jesus stands alone in presenting not a system, but his own personality as capable of supplying the need of the soul. To the hungry soul he says, "I am the bread of life." To men who stand perplexed about the way from earth to heaven he says, "I am the way." To Pilate's question: "What is truth?" which is but the echo or the question of all the ages, he replies, "I am the truth." To the seeker after the secrets of life he boldly says, "I am the life." To those who are groping in the dark he says, "I am the light of the world; he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." To a world crushed beneath burdens of guilt, superstition and ignorance he says, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me: and ye shall find rest unto your souls, for my yoke is easy, and my burden is

light." Instead of systems of philosophy or plans of relief, he presents himself. This idea is not of the earth. It was not man's way of doing before or since Jesus came. He stands alone as the one who offers himself as the remedy for all evil. There was nothing in the thought of his age to suggest this; nothing in his environment to foster it. The idea bears the superscription of another world, whose way of doing things is different from ours.

II. HIS CHARACTER. To us who have accepted Christ as our teacher his claim is proof enough. The fact that he claims to be God with us settles the question. The fact that he offers himself a remedy for all evil sends us forth proclaiming him as such. The man who pretends to accept Christ as his teacher, and yet refuses to accept his claim to divinity, is grossly inconsistent. There are some, however, who demand more evidence than a mere claim. They wish to know the basis upon which the claim rests. We have a word for them. Indeed, it is for them that we feel most concern. Let me say to such in the outset, there are but three positions we can hold with reference to Christ. "Some said, He is a good man, others said, nay; but he deceiveth the people." (John 7:12.) Jesus Christ was either a madman, a bad man, or a God. None but a God, or a madman, or a deceiver could have made the claims that he did. The strongest minds on earth stand with uncovered heads in the presence of his teaching. The sermon on the Mount, even infidelity is willing to admit, was the utterance of a clear head and a pure heart. The whole trend of his life indicates the soundest mind, filled with the healthy enthusiasm which a great mission inspires. The charge that he was a madman no one is foolish enough to defend. Then we are driven to one of two other positions. He was either God, or the worst of men. We have just seen that he claimed the attributes of divinity. A good man cannot claim to be what he knows he is not. A good man cannot be a hypocrite. Now, does anyone in this day contend that Jesus was a deceiver? I have yet to hear of such an one. A candid Jewish Rabbi of this city admitted in a sermon

a few weeks ago that Jesus was a good man, whose object was to do good, and died a martyr to his mission. Such an admission puts a man who rejects the divinity of Christ in an embarrassing position, for now he must prove that a good man can be a hypocrite; that a good man can be the worst of men. There is no middle ground. Jesus pressed this fact home upon the young man who came to him saying "Good master, what must I do to inherit eternal life?" when he replied, "Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is God?" (Mark 10:17-18.) "To say that I am good is equal to saying that I am God, and if you admit that I am good, *your place is at my feet as a worshiper, and the place for your money is on the altar of my service." The question of Jesus, "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" challenges not only his hearers, but all the ages; and their verdict has echoed the words of Pilate, "I find no fault in this man." Friends and foes who lived close to him and inspected his words and actions confirm the claim that he was good. Peter says, "He did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth." (1 Peter 2:22.) "Ye know," says John, "that he was manifested to take away our sins, and in him was no sin." (1 John 3:5.) We believe that no man lives to-day bad enough to deny this claim, and assert that Jesus was a deceiver. If we could bring from the bottomless pit a man who had been there five thousand years and growing worse every year during that time, and lay before him the facts, I don't believe that even he would be bad enough to claim that Jesus was a bad man. The very thought shocks the consciousness of one who is at all familiar with his character. If, then, no one can be found foolish enough to claim that he was a madman, or bad enough to assert that he was a bad man, surely the verdict that he was good is universal. **AND IF GOOD, HE WAS GOD.**

III. HIS WORK. His work was to establish a kingdom not of this world. (John 18:36.) Such a thought was not of this world. The Jews were looking for a temporal king, to deliver them from Roman rule. If Christ had taken hold of their idea and used it for his own advancement, he would have acted

like a man, and his success could have been explained as the success of Napoleon and Washington can be explained. On the contrary, he opposed the leaders of public opinion, and began the establishment of a kingdom which lives to-day after the kingdoms of Greece, Rome and Egypt have ceased to exist, except in memory. A young man, a poor mechanic, from a mountain village, with no rich, powerful allies, does this in three years! And he does it by the deliberate sacrifice of himself. Men have died martyrs to their mission. But man has never yet planned martyrdom as a part of his mission. Jesus told his disciples that he would go to Jerusalem and be crucified, and on the third day rise again. (Matt. 16:21.) He provides before his death for a memorial of that death. Men do not build monuments to their defeats. The French have no monument to call Waterloo to mind. But Jesus would have his followers remember not the Mount of Transfiguration, but Calvary; not his glory, but his shame. Indeed, He makes his shame the test of discipleship. He tells his followers that they must expect to be hated, persecuted, killed. Men do not try to establish kingdoms in this way. All these things go to prove that Jesus was not native to this world. He was more than man, and, as I see him standing out distinct from and above all others, I cannot resist the impulse to fall at his feet and say with Thomas "My Lord and my God."

II.

HISTORY AS A WITNESS.

“To whom also he showed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs.”—Acts 1: 3.

Gilbert West and Lord Littleton agreed to overthrow Christianity by proving that the resurrection of Jesus Christ and the conversion of Paul were fictions. Mr. West chose the resurrection of Christ, and Lord Littleton the conversion of Paul. The result was that Mr. West in his effort to keep Christ in the grave was himself raised from the dead, and Lord Littleton in his attempt to prove that Paul's vision was a myth, had a vision of himself as a sinner, and Jesus Christ a Saviour. The two friends, after their honest investigations, met to worship Him whose religion they had thought to destroy. Christianity is a religion of facts; and those who will honestly investigate its facts must, like West and Littleton, be convinced that our proposition is true: **JESUS CHRIST WAS NOT A PRODUCT OF THE AGE IN WHICH HE LIVED; BUT A NATIVE OF ANOTHER WORLD WHO CAME TO THIS WORLD FOR A PURPOSE; THAT HE WAS GOD AND MAN IN ONE.** We will study this morning two facts, the existence of which none will doubt; **CHRISTIANITY AND THE BIBLE.** Christianity has been a fact for more than eighteen centuries, and it is such a fact as cannot be accounted for, except on the ground that its founder went along with it, and by his more than human power gave it success. Success in gathering followers is not of itself proof that a religion is of God. Confucius, Mohammed, and Sin have succeeded in that way. Confucius adapted his teachings to Chinese

prejudice. Mohammed offered the sensual, bloodthirsty Turk a harem for a heaven, and, putting a sword in his hand, bade him fight for it. Sin succeeds because men love sin. A dead fish can swim with the current. Christianity, on the other hand, opposed the currents of men's thoughts, appetites and prejudices. In an age when there was no word for humility, Christ commends the poor in spirit. In an age when everybody's idea of greatness was in rising above others, He teaches that true greatness is child-likeness, (Luke 9:48,) and that the measure of every man's greatness is the amount of humble service he performs for the good of others. In an age when to kill an enemy was counted a great virtue, he taught men to love their enemies. He came not adapting his teachings to the spirit of the age, but calling upon men to change their minds and their characters. Opposed to one man and a few poor followers stood Judaism, Paganism, philosophy, and the natural heart. And yet in spite of these He succeeds. He founds no college, has no stated place of meeting around which to rally his supporters, puts no dependence in organization and writes not a word, so far as we know, except one sentence on the sand. "Lo, I am with you alway," He says, and there is no satisfactory accounting for the success of his religion, except upon the ground that after his death he continued to live and do his mighty work.

As Columbus sailed into the mouth of the Orinoco river, some one suggested that it must flow from an island. "No," said Columbus, "such a river as this must drain a continent." And, as we look at this river of Christianity flowing down the ages, we are convinced that it flows from no little island of man's thought and strength, but from the continent of God's wisdom and omnipotence. "Do you believe in a God?" asked a traveller of his devout Arab guide. "Did you see that track in front of our tent this morning?" replied the guide. "Yes." "Well, what sort of a track was it?" "A camel's." "Do you see that sunset?" continued the Arab. "None but God could leave such a track as that." And as we trace the tracks of Christ on earth and down the ages, we believe that none but God could leave such tracks as His. If he had been a mere

man, his religion would have perished soon after his death and burial. Leave out his resurrection and there is no accounting satisfactorily for Pentecost and other scenes that followed. Accept the resurrection, and all is plain enough.

Another fact open before us is the BIBLE. It is such a Book that we cannot account for it, except on the ground that God was its author. Christianity is a Book religion. Jesus appealed frequently to the Scriptures of the Old Testament. The main object of Matthew's gospel is to prove from the Scriptures that Christ is the promised Messiah. The sermons of the Apostles are made up largely of Scripture quotations. The trite saying "Christianity is Christ," is no more true than that "Christianity is the Bible." Those who oppose Christianity, and those who would substitute something else than personal faith in Christ as the conditions of salvation, must get rid of the Bible. Infidelity and Churchism agree in setting it aside. An article of Cardinal Manning a few months ago in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW abuses the Bible and appeals from it to the Church; an article in the same magazine by a champion infidel blasphemer joins the Cardinal in abusing the Bible, and appeals from it to reason. Herod and Pilate are friends in their opposition to the Bible, though they disagree as to the standard of appeal. I am not here as a champion of the Bible. It needs none. It is its own best champion, and has a way of taking care of itself. But I am here to say that it is a Book of which God is the author, and like the Christ it reveals, perfectly human and perfectly divine. And I am no Book-worshipper. I love to see the Old Book tried by all the tests of criticism. There have crept into it some spurious sentences and mistranslations, though not one that effects a single doctrine. There have crept into St. Peter's Cathedral some cobwebs on its arches and around its pillars, but they do not detract from the perfection of the building. It still stands there a monument to the genius of Michael Angelo. The sexton who brushes away the cobwebs simply reveals the beauty of the structure. Honest critics are the sextons who brush away the cobwebs from this grand old Cathedral of truth, and we have no fear that their little brooms will mar its granite walls and pillars.

Let us look now at some reasons for believing that the Bible is of Divine origin.

I. ITS CLAIMS. It claims to be inspired. "Thus saith the Lord" rings all through it, clear as a clarion. "Hear the word of the Lord," says Isaiah. (Is. 1:10.) "The Lord said unto me" claimed Jeremiah. (Jer. 1:7.) "The word of the Lord came expressly unto Ezekiel." (Ezek. 1:3.)

The New Testament puts the seal of inspiration upon the Old Testament. "The Holy Ghost spake by the mouth of David." (Acts 1:16.) "The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." (2 Peter 1:21.) "All scripture given by inspiration of God." (2 Tim. 3:16.) If the men who wrote this book were not inspired, they were liars, and we have to explain how the Book which contains the highest morality ever given to earth could be written by a set of liars. And these bad men at the same time wrote their own doom, for there is no vice more severely condemned in the Bible than deception. To claim that good men wrote the Bible and deny its inspiration is on a par with the claim that Christ was a good man, while he pretended to be what he was not. Either horn of the dilemma pierces through the opponents of inspiration. If good men wrote it, we must explain how good men can be hypocrites. If bad men wrote it, we have the spectacle of the best book in the world being written by bad men, who at the same time denounce themselves most unmercifully. To say that, if it is true, it does not need to be inspired is to talk nonsense, for every one knows the extreme difficulty of ascertaining the truth about anything in history or science. We must accept most statements on the authority of others; and it is very necessary in so important a matter as the relation of men to God that we should have an infallible authority. God the author of the Bible is such an authority. "To err is human." God therefore speaks for himself through men whom he moves to write. The purpose of the Bible is not to speculate or argue, but to reveal. It gives many facts that man cannot learn without a revelation. Men, to re-

veal such facts, must, therefore, be inspired of God. No other ancient sacred book claims to be a revelation from God. The Bible is often compared with the Vedas of India and the Zendavesta of Persia. The Vedas, a collection of poems addressed to mythical deities, make no claim to revelation. The Zendavesta, a mass of speculations into the origin of things, makes no such claim. The Koran, and a few other poor imitations of the Bible, would hardly have thought of counterfeiting, if they had not had the genuine coin before them.

II. ITS MAKE-UP. I go into a field where the trees are planted in straight rows, the flowers in regular beds, and the streams flow in straight lines. I say at once: "Man has been here. This is man's way of doing." But I go into a forest where the trees are scattered here and there, all alike, and yet each different from the others; the flowers distributed in the meadow and on the hill-side; the streams flowing around graceful curves and sharp bends, obeying the law of gravitation, and yet free in their movements. I say at once: "This is God's way of doing. Man did not plant this forest, nor arrange these flowers, nor make this stream." I open a book and I see preface, introduction, everything arranged according to definite plan. And I have no doubt that man wrote it. But I open this Book and a glance reminds me of the God who made the forest, scattered the flowers, and formed the starry heavens. There is beauty and sublimity everywhere, but no garden-like conformity to rule. To the student of nature's works the make-up of the Bible is a presumption that the God of nature is its author.

III. ITS UNITY. The Bible grew. It was 1500 years in reaching maturity. It is made up of sixty-six books, written by at least forty different men. They differed in language, in nationality, in tastes, in surroundings. Among them were shepherds, kings, fishermen, priests, mechanics, physicians, theologians and law-makers. Some were learned, others unlettered. A book, written in different centuries by men so radically different, would inevitably contain contradictory state-

ments, and would indicate as many purposes as there were authors. Suppose we should select a physician from New York, three preachers of different denominations from Boston, a fisherman from Maine, an office-holder and a Senator from Washington; shut them up in different rooms, and tell each to write a chapter for a religious book we are going to publish. Would not that be a mess of a book? It would take an iron binding to hold it together. Now how is it with the Bible? I am aware that there are some who think they see irreconcilable contradictions in it, but I have been hunting for them more than fifteen years without finding them. There is great variety, which students of nature would expect. But there is a marvelous unity. From beginning to end the doctrine of one God is taught. Where did these writers get the idea of one God? Certainly not from the cultured nations about them. Herodotus, who visited Egypt about five hundred years before Christ, said that gods were more plentiful there than men. In India there were 300,000,000 gods. The Persians worshipped well-nigh everything that they could associate with fire or light. The cities, fields, and groves of Greece were full of imaginary deities, all of whom Rome borrowed and worshipped. And yet all of these writers for 1500 years taught that there was only one God.

Contrast the character of the Jehovah of the Bible with any of the gods of the nations. Jehovah is pure, merciful and just. Saturn, the son of Time, among the Greeks, ate his own children, and, when Jupiter was born, his mother Rhea gave the hungry old father a stone wrapped in swaddling clothes. While he was gnawing on that, she succeeded in getting her child out of his reach. Jupiter was a licentious, vindictive, quarrelsome wretch. He flung poor Vulcan out of heaven and maimed him for life, because he took his mother's part in a family fracas. It was no uncommon thing for Jupiter and all his train to get drunk and make the top of Olympus hideous with their orgies. The scenes enacted in the worship of Baal who kept thrusting his filthy presence upon the Israelites through the surrounding nations, and whom they were at times base enough to worship, ought not to be described before you. How different from these wicked, sensual gods is the God of the Bible who "dwells in the

high and holy place," and "is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity."

There is also a unity of purpose running through the whole Bible. We see it for the first time in the curse upon the serpent in Genesis, and for the last time in the "Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly" of the last chapter of Revelation. Its purpose is to reveal God in Jesus Christ. This thought, like the rising sun, grows brighter and brighter until the perfect day of the gospels. Side by side with this revelation of Jesus the Saviour, we have, in the Old Testament, a dark revelation of man as a sinner. This unity of teaching as to the one God, and the holiness of that God, and the coming of Christ, running through so many minds and so many ages cannot be accounted for, except on the ground that the Book has but one author who moved men to write his thoughts, and kept them from falling into the errors of the times in which they lived. Stand by the foundation of Solomon's temple, while it is building. Here comes a stone brought from a distant quarry, and it finds its place in the building without the touch of chisel. A second stone from another quarry fits exactly into its place. This continues day after day till every stone is in place, and the glorious temple stands there complete. Do you suppose for a moment that these stones have somehow by chance been prepared for their places, and that such a magnificent building had no mind to plan it and superintend its erection? Such a thought would mark you an idiot or a lunatic. Now here is a temple of truth with stones quarried from different ages and different minds without any possibility of consultation; and it has been 1500 years in building. I examine it and I find a wonderful unity of purpose and of teaching. Am I to conclude that all this came of chance? Please do not tempt me to convict myself of fitness for an idiot's home or a lunatic asylum. Dryden was right when he wrote :

"Whence but from heaven could men unskilled in arts
 In several ages, born in several parts
 Weave such agreeing truths? Or how or why
 Should all conspire to cheat us with a lie?
 Unasked their pains, ungrateful their advice,
 Starving their gains, and martyrdom their price."

IV. ITS OMISSIONS. What the Bible does NOT say is a presumption in favor of its inspiration. It never stops to gratify curiosity. When men write biographies, they are careful to give details of boyhood and youth. We have but one incident in the boyhood of Jesus. He appears at twelve years of age, and then suddenly disappears. The Apochryphal writers, manlike, have filled the vacancy with marvelous stories of his childish pranks of power and wisdom. There is no attempt in the Bible at the marvelous. Its simple straight-forward tone in narrating the most wonderful things is a little more than could be expected of men trying to establish a false claim to the miraculous. The miraculous atmosphere about it seems to be its native air. Some one has truly said that Mohammed, Swedenborg, and Joseph Smith knew altogether too much. In their straining after the wonderful and miraculous, they show the unreality of their claims. They overshoot the mark. The dignified silence of the Bible about many things speaks for its truth.

V. ITS FAITHFULNESS. When men write the biographies of friends, they usually magnify their virtues, and minify, if they do not overlook, their faults. Those who belong to a party are careful to keep from the public such actions of their prominent leaders as they think might injure the party. Even the newspapers refuse to uncover the sins of men in high position. A poor hod-carrier gets into a brawl on a back alley, and every paper prints his name the next morning; and, if he has companions in sin, they are at once introduced to the public. But when there is a murder in a suspicious place on a prominent street, and the names of prominent men are in some way connected with the place, all we see is a few dark intimations. Their respectability covers their sins. The Bible on the other hand records, without apology, the sins of its most prominent men. Abraham, the father of the faithful, lies, and his lie is recorded. David commits adultery, and, though he is king, his foul deed is put down in black and white. Peter curses at the trial of Christ, and, though he went out and wept over it, the record is there to recall his sin. Paul and Barnabas, apostles

of good-will, quarrel and separate. Churches to-day try to keep such quarrels out of print, and if we had been called upon to edit the New Testament, and left to our own judgment, we should have decided that it was best for the infant cause to pass over such a family affair in silence. But no. God's ways are not our ways. He is true, not politic, and the facts, as they are, must be recorded. The names of obscure sinners are not mentioned. No one knows the name of the poor thief on the cross or of the woman who was brought to Jesus for punishment. Man would have recorded them and left out Abraham, David, Peter and Paul. Now and then a man like Thomas Carlyle admires this divine way of doing things, and decides that he would like to have his own biography written after the same fashion. Mr. Froude attempts it with the result that no other man will make another such request for the next century; and Mr. Froude would not have done it, if he and Carlyle had been intimately associated in the establishment of an institution, whose very existence was to depend largely upon the character of its supporters.

A lady friend of mine, a constant Bible reader, handed me a list of prominent Bible characters who had committed some great sin, and asked me to explain how the Bible could be inspired with its best characters guilty of such things. "I certainly should not have put them in, if I had written it," she said. Neither would I, nor you. None but God would have done it, for no one else would have felt that he could afford it. The fact that there are some things in the Bible which do not seem to be appropriate for reading in public shocks some people, especially those who would not for the world turn their own hearts inside out for the inspection of the public. If the whole truth were known about the best of us, it might be too bad for the public gaze. God tells the whole truth about men. His object is to reveal man to himself, that he may see the need of a Saviour. The Old Testament is largely a revelation of man. God is revealed more fully in the New. If a good mirror reveals to us a dirty face, we need not smash the mirror to pieces. Better accept the revelation and go wash our face. The Bible is a book

not so much for the public as for the individual. Like a mother, it has something to say to girls and young women, which no one else can tell them. Like a father it has something to say to boys and young men, and it says it in such a way that every one is made better by listening. The Old Book has no prudery. It speaks right out. It tells to all the things they most need to know. Its straightforward honest tone is what one would expect from its author, the God of truth.

VI. ITS INCIDENTALS. The Bible is not intended to teach science, but we do not say this to apologize for its mistakes. I believe in its scientific accuracy. Thomas Paine used to shake his sides with laughter over the ridiculous mistake of Moses in putting light before the sun in his account of creation. But now the ten-year-old school boy joins with the day-laborer in laughing at Mr. Paine's ignorance, as they walk the streets in the almost noon-day glare of the electric light. Any tyro knows now that there could have been light before the sun. At least three thousand years before Geology was thought of as a science, Moses gave what the best geologists tell us was the order of creation and development. Long before Maury was born Solomon gave an accurate description of the trade winds. Thousands of years before the world ever heard of Copernicus and Newton, Isaiah wrote of "the circle of the heavens," and Job said, "He stretcheth out the north over empty space and hangeth the world upon nothing." Even so marvelous an event as the sun standing still at the command of Joshua some scholars think is confirmed by Ovid's reference to a lost day. The pick and shovel of the modern explorer, laying bare tablet and corner stone with their inscriptions, have given confirmation to the Scripture narratives. Dates and names that scholars could not reconcile have become plain enough seen under this new light. Now and then some new theory is announced which overthrows the Bible. The Bible simply waits in a dignified manner until some other theory overthrows this new enemy. The Bible has been overthrown so many times that its friends begin to think it is like a marble cube; turn it over as often as you please, it is

always right side up. Overthrowing the Bible by putting the lever of criticism into these apparent discrepancies reminds one of an attempt to upturn Mount Blanc by inserting a pipe-stem into one of the little crevices on its side. The old mountain continues to stand, while the guide who knows its massive weight, and the weakness of his pipe-stem laughs at the folly of the attempt, if he is not made too sad to laugh by the thought that the traveller he has in charge ought to be in a mad-house.

VII. ITS PROPHECIES. I find in this Book the biography of a person written hundreds of years before he was born. His name and the place of his birth over which he could have no control are named. His character and his reception by the people are so accurately given by one of the prophets that his enemies, in their despair, have claimed that this chapter was inserted after his birth, though it is found in a translation of the Scriptures made over three hundred years before he was born. The manner of his death even to the dividing of his garments among the soldiers, the piercing of his body, the kind of persons he would have as his companions in death, all this and more are given without any attempt at double meaning. The prophecies of the Delphic oracle could be interpreted in either of two ways. Not so the Bible. It speaks definitely and these definite prophecies were all fulfilled. How can we account for it? By simply accepting the claim that the God who moved men to write the book could see ahead and tell what was coming to pass, and that he moved them to write what they as men could not possibly have known. This Jesus, whose biography was thus written by the prophets, is himself a prophet, and tells his disciples that certain things would come to pass, while they could see no indications of their approach. He said of Jerusalem: "The days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone above another; because thou knowest not the time of thy

visitation." (Luke 19:43-44.) Now has this been fulfilled? You have but to read Josephus and you will see that it was literally fulfilled, when Titus, the Roman General, laid siege to the city and utterly destroyed it. I might quote from Josephus and show how every clause of Christ's prophecy was fulfilled. A writer in Johnson's Cyclopaedia sums it up in these words: "The terrible dissensions among the Jews, the unspeakable sufferings of the besieged, the agonies of the nation shut up in the walls of Jerusalem, the destruction of more than 1,000,000 Jews, the enslaving of all the youth, the entire demolition of the city, so as to leave no sign of its former occupancy—all this forms one of the gloomiest pages in the annals of man." Was not Christ a prophet, when he said, "Behold your house is left unto you desolate?" And his prophecy, "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the gentiles," was and is still fulfilled. The prophets who wrote hundreds of years before Christ foretold the doom of their beloved city. Jeremiah had said "Zion shall be plowed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps." (Jer. 26:18.) And the name of the Roman who ran his plowshare over the site of the temple is preserved—Terentius Rufus. Julian the Apostate determined to make it appear that the prophecy of Christ was false. He proclaimed his purpose to restore the temple, and it is said that the Jewish women assisted in carrying away in their aprons the dust and debris from the place of the old temple's foundation, weeping tears of joy as they worked. But there came such terrific lightning that the workmen were frightened off, and the impious project failed.

While ancient Babylon was in her glory, a prophet wrote her doom in these words: "Babylon, the glory of the kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency, shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah. It shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation; neither shall the Arabian pitch his tent there; neither shall the shepherd make his fold there; but the wild beasts of the desert shall be there." (Is. 13: 19-21.) "I will also make it a possession for the bittern and pools of water." (Is. 14: 23.) We have but to turn to any authentic book of travels to read the fulfilment of this

prophecy. The place is a desolation, shunned even by the wandering Bedouin. Owls hoot and wild beasts prowl among its ruins. The marshy pools of water and the bittern are there. It is without inhabitant, and will remain so.

Nahum prophesied that Nineveh, then in her glory, should be destroyed by water and fire. History confirms it by stating that, after the swollen river had washed away a part of the wall, the besiegers rushed through the breach and set the city on fire.

Tyre, the queen of the seas, the Liverpool of ancient times, had her doom written for her, while there were no signs of weakness or decay. God said, through Ezekiel, "I will also scrape her dust from her, and make her like the top of a rock." (Ezek. 26: 4.)

We all know that Alexander the Great demolished old Tyre, and with its ruins built a causeway half a mile long on which his soldiers might pass to new Tyre on the island, and from that day to this her site has been like the top of a rock. Of Tyre Ezekiel says again, "Thou shalt be a place to spread nets upon; thou shalt be built no more." (Ezek. 26: 14.) That is the prophecy. Here is the history written by the infidel Volney: "The whole village of Tyre contains only fifty or sixty poor families, who live obscurely on the produce of their little ground and a trifling fishery." Bruce, the traveller, says that Tyre is a "rock, whereon fishers dry their nets."

Of Egypt Ezekiel wrote: "It shall be the basest of kingdoms." (Ezek. 29: 15.) And no one who knows Egypt to-day will be inclined to deny the fulfilment of that prophecy. It was written when Egypt was at the climax of her glory; as if some one should predict of England to-day that she is destined to become the basest of kingdoms.

Of the Jews it was prophesied by Moses and Ezekiel that they should be scattered among the nations, despised, and persecuted, and yet remain distinct. (Deut. 28: 64; Ezek. 6: 8, 36: 19.) We need not be told that this prophecy has been fulfilled, for we have the proof of it every day before us. When you meet a Jew, you know him. They are a distinct nation without nationality. The children of the Germans, English and French,

who came to this country a century ago have become Americans. No one can tell by looking into your face whether your great-grandfather was from England, Germany or France. But a Jew remains a Jew, wherever he may go, and whatever language he may speak. There is something about him which tells you that he is a Jew. In China he has tried to become a Chinaman by adopting the Chinese customs, but the Jew with a pig-tail is still a Jew. No one would mistake him for a Chinaman. Men like Baron Hirsch have advocated their mingling with the gentiles, but all the millions they may spend to bring it about only make the average Jew more determined to remain distinct. The Jew of to-day is a standing miracle in proof of the inspiration of the Bible and the divinity of Christ. Frederick the Great asked a learned man to give him in one sentence a good reason in favor of Christianity, and his reply was, "The Jews, your Majesty." No candid man, it seems to me, can read what the Bible says about these people, and then trace its fulfilment in their history without being convinced that a foresight more than human wrote the book, and a providence more than human has preserved them a distinct people.

I close with a quotation from a recent address by Mr. Spurgeon: "There was a man in Scotland who had a piece of cloth stolen. The thief was found with the piece of cloth in his house. The maker and owner of the cloth swore to it. The judge at the trial said, there are hundreds of such pieces of cloth made in this district and put out in the fields to dry. How can you swear to it as your piece? Well, said the man, 'I can swear to it by this: I have a number of tenter hooks upon which I hang my cloth, and there are holes in this piece which are exactly at the same distance from one another as my tenter hooks. There are two hooks in a certain place and three hooks in another, close together, and the holes in the cloth exactly fit to these tenter hooks, therefore I can swear it is mine.' So we also can swear that this is none other than the word of God, because we find that every historical statement given in the book fits in the tenter hook of absolute fact, which even profane writers do not venture to doubt."

III.

EXPERIENCE AS A WITNESS.

"Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, that I am God."—Is. 43: 12.

THIS is an age of experiment. Christianity is challenged to enter the laboratory and prove its claims. We accept the challenge, and this morning enter the laboratory of experience. If Christianity fails to do what it claims, then reject it; and, if it proves its claims by tests of experience, you of the scientific mind must be honest enough to accept it.

Bear in mind that some people cannot understand certain experiments. Let a painter illustrate ever so faithfully before an audience of blind people, or a musician before an audience of deaf people, and they will be none the wiser. We are at the same disadvantage in illustrating the workings of spiritual forces before any part of an audience who have no spiritual discernment. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." (1 Cor. 2:14.) A worldly man on reading a page of Whitfield's diary pronounced it all cant. A convention of moles who had met to discuss the experiences of eagles would naturally make some mistakes, while eagles discussing the experiences of moles would doubtless talk wide of the mark. A man, to appreciate the experience of another, must have a similar experience. We are all in danger of supposing that what we have not experienced has never been experienced. A man near the equator would not believe a missionary who told him that he lived in a country where, in cold weather, the water became hard enough to hold

up the weight of his elephant. An arctic explorer tells us that, after two years of life amid the northern ice, he found it difficult to conceive that there was any open water or land in the world. Such is the power of experience to unfit us to judge of experiences with which we are not familiar. And yet the facts of Christian experience are so evident that we have hope of at least gaining a hearing from those whose lives do not verify them, and our prayer is that they may be led to desire such an experience and to seek it, for, "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God." (John 7:17.) And now to the tests :

I. DOES GOD ANSWER PRAYER IN THE NAME OF CHRIST?

A few years ago, Mr. Huxley challenged the Christian world to produce a single unmistakable answer to prayer. George Muller accepted the challenge, not by parading himself before the world as a man of great virtue and faith, but by quietly praying and trusting God to supply the needs of a large orphan asylum at Bristol, England. There it stands to-day with its hundreds of orphans fed and clothed, and no one solicited to do it but God. J. Hudson Taylor sees the need of missionary work in the interior of China, and prays to God for men and money. At this moment there are in the China Inland mission more than three hundred and fifty missionaries, all supported without soliciting a dollar from any one but God. And, in order that we, as a church, may not have a shadow of doubt on this subject, two men known to us all, one of them a member of this church, are now in North Africa with their families working for the salvation of the Mohammedans, dependent on no Board or convention for supplies, but trusting God for daily bread. What better answer could be given to the challenge?

But those of us who have been praying and receiving answers from God for many years need not be referred to these world-wide demonstrations. We have enough in our own experiences to satisfy us. I could prove by one-half of this congregation that they have asked of God and received just what they asked, in ways which left it beyond doubt that God

had answered their prayers. Excuse me for referring to just one instance in my own experience. In my first pastorate I preached on alternate Sundays to two small churches. I was to remain nine months, and then go to the Seminary. After the first three or four weeks I found myself praying daily that I might be permitted to baptize one hundred people before leaving the field. The burden of desire grew, and the prayer in hours of rest or devotion became almost as constant as my breathing. It at last took the form of Gideon's prayer that, if God would give me just one hundred, I would have a proof never to be doubted that he answers prayer. To make a long story short, persons were converted and baptized from time to time, till on the last Sunday of my pastorate the number had reached ninety-four. As I rode to the country church to preach my last sermon, I was full of praise, and more than once told God that I accepted the prayer as answered, for more than one hundred had professed conversion, though only ninety-four had been baptized. At the close of the sermon five more presented themselves for baptism, with the request that I baptize them that afternoon. Imagine, if you can, my feelings, as I rode to the mill-pond, three miles distant, to see my prayer answered within one. And I praised God as if not one were lacking, having accepted his answer as already given. While we were singing and praying by the side of the mill-pond, a man touched me on the shoulder and said: "Mr. D., you know I have been a believer for several months, and I must follow Jesus, if you will baptize me." "Are you ready with a change of clothing?" I replied. "No matter about that," was the ready response. I baptized him, and he went home three miles in his wet clothes. Just one hundred, not one more nor less. No theory of accidental circumstances can explain this, as you would see more clearly, had I time to trace the chains of providence which during those nine months led up to it. Within the past two months there have been many answers to prayer in connection with our work here. The sceptic need not tell us that God does not answer the cries of his people. We have made the scientific test, for we have been in the laboratory of experience, and what we have learned by such experience it is very

unscientific to doubt. The Bible is full of answers to prayer, and the lives of God's people are just as full as the Bible. Our text-book and our experiments agree. And for men to doubt the Book and the experiments who know little of the former and absolutely nothing, as they confess, of the latter, marks them as unscientific and unworthy of respect. If they would know for themselves, let them come into the Christian laboratory of experience by trusting God and living for him. Those who really do that never doubt that God answers prayer.

II. DOES GOD REGENERATE MEN THROUGH FAITH IN CHRIST? If we can produce a man or woman who has been not only reformed in life but renewed in nature so thoroughly as to have received a new character, the question is answered, for this scientific age clamoring for facts cannot afford to set aside the facts when they are presented. Thousands of the best men and women in Baltimore claim that by faith in Jesus Christ they have been made to hate what they once loved and love what they once hated; and that not by a gradual process, but suddenly. A gentleman of this city, whom many of you know, went into the Reformed church, on Fayette street, to hear Mr. Moody. He was at the time a drunkard. Mr. Moody held forth Jesus Christ as the only Saviour from sin and habit. The man believed, and has told me that from that day to this he has had no thirst for strong drink. His life has been a continual consecration to Christ who delivered him. I look now into the face of a man who fourteen months ago was delivered from the clutches of the demon of drink, after everything else had failed, by simply committing himself to Jesus Christ. Paul was not more suddenly converted than hundreds of men have been in this city, and changed from bold persecutors to bold defenders. Do you doubt the facts? Then you can doubt the testimony of men whose word you would take on any other subject. A lawyer attended an experience meeting in which he heard sixty men tell what Christ had done for them. At the close he arose and said: "I entered this house a sceptic, but I am used to weighing testimony, and I have heard men whom I know to be truthful testify to-day to the fact that

they have been saved and given new experiences. I would not dare to impeach their testimony in court, and shall I do it here? I will not. I believe that they tell the truth, and if their experience is for me, I want it." A Christian need not be told that he soon had what he wanted, and himself became a witness to the facts he had called in question. A man in the village of my boyhood had to be kept in jail as a protection to the people. I have used him as an illustration of a lost soul, when all the the good is removed and nothing but evil remains. He had killed several men, and, when under the influence of drink, had no regard for human life or property. During a service of an hour and a half in a country church in which the gospel was preached, and Christians joined in prayer for his salvation, that man of sin was so changed that he became not only a good citizen but a meek, quiet worker for the good of others. When I heard from him last, he was still an earnest Christian. Thomas Bilney confessed to Hugh Latimer, the priest, and Latimer perceived that the humble Thomas had something in his heart which he did not possess. Soon Latimer was confessing to Bilney that he wanted such an experience of grace, and the result is known to history. When the priest learned that he was completely saved by the merit of Christ, he ceased to urge the people to do penance, left the confessional, and joyfully went to the stake, supported by the new experience he had first heard of from Thomas Bilney. The sceptics had much to say against the doctrines of Peter and John, but there was one argument they could not answer. The blind man at the gate of the temple had certainly been healed, "and beholding the man healed standing among them, they could say nothing against it." (Acts 4:14.) And Christianity continues to present the same unanswerable argument. Here are the men who have been healed standing among you. A live Lazarus, who was once dead, is our test of the power of Christ. The men whose eyes have been opened are of age, ask them, and they will testify that once they were spiritually blind; faith in Christ gave them a new soul-sight, and they have seen things of which they had never dreamed. "Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, that I am God."

III. IN THIS LABORATORY OF EXPERIENCE DO WE FIND THAT CHRIST AND THE BIBLE MEET THE NEEDS OF OUR BEING? Let us see. We have bodies. Is the health of the body promoted by faith in Christ and his Book? The best code of sanitary laws ever given to the world was written by Moses, and the Jews, who even partially keep those laws, are to-day the longest-lived people in the world. Faith in Christ makes men hopeful, cheerful, happy, and such a state of mind promotes health. The lack of faith gives gloom and melancholy. It is a sad perversion of Christianity, that associates faith with penance and self-torture. We are commanded to "rejoice in the Lord always, and again I say rejoice." (Phil. 4:4.)

We have minds. Does the Bible give us sufficient food for thought? Do you want history? It is the best history ever written, and contains much that can be found nowhere else. Do you like poetry? The Psalms and the prophets have never been excelled. Are you fond of law? Here you can find the foundation of all civil and moral law. Have you a mind for logic? A finer specimen of reasoning than Paul's letters we have never seen. As two infidels were sailing past a lonely island, one asked the other what book he would choose if he had to live alone on that island with only one book. "Shakespeare," he replied. "Well, I should select the Bible" said the other, "for its resources are inexhaustible." Whatever else the second infidel lacked, he had a mind. Men of mind prize the Bible. Even Shakespeare borrowed from it so largely that to rob his works of biblical thought would well nigh pauperize them. Take the Bible out of literature, and you have removed the sun from the heavens.

Need we stop to prove that Christianity makes the highest manhood and womanhood known to the world? Just in proportion as men and nations follow the precepts of Christ they are strong in character. When an Indian prince asked Queen Victoria the secret of England's greatness, she handed him a Bible. It is no accident that the nations who honor the Bible are to-day foremost in the march of civilization. A legend says that Chiron, the centaur, who had charge of Achilles, fed him on the marrow of lions. God's word is, indeed, the marrow of

lions to the men or nations who feed upon it. But for the individual Christ has done more than for the nation. He satisfies the soul. He gives peace of heart. His cross is the cyclone's centre where there is perfect rest. He has answered Job's question, "Can a man be justified before God?" Through him we get rid of our sins. He has taught us to look up and worship. The man who is content with merely a moral life is to be pitied. He sees flowers about his feet and beauties in a narrow range, but he has never seen the stars. Christ bids him look up into a heaven of constellations.

Sin has not only separated us from God, but from one another. Christ binds us together again. Even the revenge of an Indian's nature has been conquered by His love. He leads us to help the helpless. Christianity builds asylums and homes for the friendless. Paganism and infidelity never did either. In building the Hoosac tunnel two gangs of men started to work at the same time on opposite sides of the mountain. The survey was so accurate, and the work so well done, that when they met the sides of their tunnels came within an inch of tallying. So man's need is exactly met by God's provision in Christ and the Bible.

PRAYER IS ANSWERED, MEN ARE REGENERATED, AND ALL THE NEEDS OF OUR BODIES, MINDS AND MORALS ARE MET BY CHRISTIANITY. Surely it has stood the test of experiment.

IV.

THE ENEMY AS A WITNESS.

"Their rock is not as our rock, even our enemies themselves being Judges."
—Deut. 32: 31.

No testimony can be stronger than the favorable testimony of an enemy. It is expected that he will speak against us, and, when he speaks in our favor, it is certain that he has been compelled by the facts in the case to do so. But who are the enemies of Christianity? Jesus said "He that is not with me is against me," and on this principle we must group all who have lived and died without confessing Christ before men as his enemies, though they are not to be classed with open infidels and atheists.

Benjamin Franklin was such a man. Shrewd, calculating, stingy, he gained a wide reputation for common sense, and, though his "Poor Richard's Almanac" has done more to make close-fisted Baptists than almost any other force, we are inclined to forgive him after reading what he had to say of the Book we love and the god-man we worship. "Young man," he says, "my advice to you is that you cultivate an acquaintance with and firm belief in the Holy Scriptures, for this is your certain interest. I think Christ's system of morals and religion, as he left them to us, the best the world ever saw or is likely to see."

Thomas Jefferson is claimed by some infidels as on their side, but the following words do not indicate it: "I have said and always will say that the studious perusal of the sacred volume will make better citizens, better fathers, and better husbands."

Daniel Webster cannot be accused of weakness of mind.

He was not a man to be carried away with what is "suited only for children and weak-minded women." He could sift evidence, weigh arguments and discover fallacies as well as any man whom American history has produced. Here is his tribute to the Bible and the Christ it reveals: "If we abide by the principles taught in the Bible, our country will go on prospering and to prosper; but, if we and our posterity neglect its instructions and authority, no man can tell how sudden a catastrophe may overwhelm us and bury all our glory in profound obscurity. The Bible is the book of all others for lawyers as well as divines, and I pity the man who cannot find in it a rich supply of thought and rule of conduct. I believe Jesus Christ to be the Son of God. The miracles which he wrought establish in my mind his personal authority and render it proper for me to believe what he asserts." Daniel Webster was acquainted with the objections urged against miracles, now so adroitly woven into popular novels. They are not new. For centuries they have been marshaled out in one form or another to do their work of darkness. But they had little weight with a mind like his, that knew how to distinguish between the spurious and the false, and was willing to accept facts when clearly proved, whether they were in harmony or conflict with preconceived notions. To say that miracles cannot be performed; therefore, the miracles recorded in the New Testament are not to be believed was a species of sophistry which his great mind could not endure, for he had before him the clearest and most unimpeachable evidence that miracles were performed by Jesus Christ, and no bare assertion to the contrary had any weight with him.

Ralph Waldo Emerson said: "Jesus is the most perfect of all men that have yet appeared." Charles Sumner wrote to Rev. Jonathan Stearns: "I believe that Christ lived when and as the Gospel says; that he was more than man—namely, above all men who had as yet lived, and yet less than God. I pray you not to believe that I am insensible to the greatness and goodness of his character. My idea of human nature is exalted, when I think that such a being lived and went as a man

among men." Emerson and Sumner did not see, as Daniel Webster saw, the impossibility of maintaining that Jesus was a great and good man without admitting that he was God, for, as we have seen in a former sermon, he claimed that he was God, and no good man could be a hypocrite, claiming to be what he was not. The admission made by all that he was good carries with it irresistibly the conclusion that he was God.

Napoleon Bonaparte, with a mind as discriminating and logical as Webster's, held the same view. "I know men," said Napoleon, "and I tell you Jesus Christ was not a man. Superficial minds see a resemblance between Christ and the founders of empires and the gods of other religions. That resemblance does not exist. There is between Christianity and other religions the distance of infinity. Alexander, Caesar, Charlemagne and myself founded empires. But on what did we rest the creations of our genius? Upon sheer force. Jesus Christ alone founded his empire upon love; and at this hour millions of men will die for him. In every other existence but that of Christ how many imperfections. From the first day to the last he is the same; majestic and simple; infinitely firm and infinitely gentle. He proposes to our faith a series of mysteries and commands with authority that we should believe them, giving no other reason than those tremendous words, 'I am God'" On one occasion General Bertrand expressed to Napoleon his doubt as to the divinity of Christ. "If you do not believe that Jesus Christ was divine," replied Napoleon, "I did wrong to appoint you general." He meant to imply that the man who, with all the evidences before him could not be convinced of the divinity of Christ, would not do to trust with important conclusions on any matter. If such facts will not convince, then no array of facts on other subjects will convince, and in great crises generals should know how to draw correct conclusions from facts before them. The difference between Napoleon and General Bertrand was doubtless the difference between believers and most unbelievers of to-day. Napoleon had taken the pains to investigate the subject; General Bertrand had not. "The Bible," continues Napoleon, "contains a complete series of acts and of historical

men to explain time and eternity, such as no other religion has to offer. If it is not the true religion, one is very excusable in being deceived; for everything in it is grand and worthy of God. The more I consider the Gospel, the more I am assured that there is nothing there which is not beyond the march of events and above the human mind. Even the impious themselves have never dared to deny the sublimity of the Gospel, which inspires them with a sort of compulsory veneration. What happiness that Book procures for those who believe it."

Goethe, the brilliant German poet, did not model his character according to Bible teaching, else he would have been a Christian and a better man, but this fact, much as we may lament it, makes all the stronger the tribute he pays to the literary excellence of the Book. "It is a belief in the Bible," he says, "which has served me as the guide of my moral and literary life. No criticism will be able to perplex the confidence which we have entertained of a writing whose contents have stirred up and given life to our vital energy by its own. The farther the ages advance in civilization the more will the Bible be used." And Goethe might have said with equal truth, "The more the Bible is used the farther the ages will advance in civilization." Witness England, Scotland and the United States with the Bible, in contrast with Spain, Italy, Mexico, and pagan countries without the Bible.

Thomas Carlyle, "rough, tough and gruff," but true, called Jesus "our divinest symbol. Higher has the human thought not yet reached. A symbol of quite perennial, infinite character: whose significance will ever demand to be anew inquired into and anew made manifest." James Anthony Froude, the historian, expressed what all honest inquiry must lead to, when he said: "The most perfect being who has ever trod the soil of this planet was called the man of sorrows." Charles Dickens is classed by some among the distinguished unbelievers. The following clause in his will shows what became of his unbelief when he came to think of going out of the world: "I commit my soul to the mercy of God, through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and exhort my dear children humbly to try to guide

themselves by the teachings of the New Testament." This suggests the words of Shakespere, which you can find in the introduction of any good copy of his works : "I commend my soul into the hands of God, my Creator, hoping and assuredly believing, through the only merits of Jesus Christ my Saviour, to be made partaker of life everlasting." Is there an infidel in the land with brass enough in his composition to class Dickens and Shakespere with shallow-brained fanatics who are to be pitied because they do not know any better, or to accuse them of accepting without investigation what a more thorough search would have led them to reject.

Even Byron, dissolute as he was, was compelled by his study of Christ's words, works and character, to exclaim, "If ever man was God, or God-man, Jesus Christ was both."

We will now take a step farther and consider the admissions of men who have openly opposed the claims of Christ and the Bible, some of whom have spent their lives in trying to destroy Christianity. A church-house in Japan was built partly of stones which were once cast at some missionaries by an infuriated mob. The missionaries preserved these missiles of destruction and used them in constructing a house to the glory of God. It is our purpose now to gather from the writings of men whose personalities have been as so many missiles hurled against Christianity some stones, that we may work them into the walls of the temple of truth. It has been said that God can use the very devils as a chain-gang to work the Christian's road to heaven. Certain it is that he "makes the wrath of man to praise him."

Let us begin with Matthew Arnold, the modern "apostle of sweetness and light." We are glad to find that he has a few sweet things to say about the sweetest of all Books and its author: "To the Bible" says Mr. Arnold, "men will return because they cannot do without it. The true God is and must be pre-eminently the God of the Bible, the eternal who makes for righteousness, from whom Jesus came forth, and whose spirit governs the course of humanity." Diderot, a French infidel, made this confession: "No better lessons can I teach my child

than those of the Bible." Professor Huxley no one will accuse of having any partiality for the old Book, and yet he is compelled to admit that he does not see how we can get along without it. "I have always been strongly in favor of secular education without theology," he says, "but I must confess that I have been no less seriously perplexed to know by what practical measures the religious feeling, which is the essential basis of moral conduct, is to be kept up in the present utterly chaotic state of opinion on these matters without the use of the Bible."

John Stuart Mill, the born sceptic, whose writings have done more perhaps than any other man's of this age to unsettle belief, yet gives us a foundation stone for the temple of Christ's divinity. "Who among his disciples," he asks, "or among their proselytes, was capable of inventing the sayings of Jesus, or imagining the life and character ascribed to him? Certainly not the fishermen of Galilee; as certainly not Saint Paul, whose character and idiosyncrasies were of a totally different sort; and still less the early Christian writers. When this pre-eminent genius is combined with the qualities of probably the greatest moral reformer and martyr to his mission who ever existed upon earth, religion cannot be said to have made a bad choice in pitching on this man as the ideal representative and guide of humanity; nor even now would it be easy, even for an unbeliever, to find a better translation of the rule of virtue from the abstract into the concrete, than to endeavor so to live that Christ would approve his life." Another admission that he was good, indeed the best, which is equal to saying that he was God.

Rousseau, whose writings did so much to bring on the French revolution, was an infidel, and yet he says of Christ: "Can it be possible that the sacred personage whose history the Scriptures contain should be a mere man? Where is the man, where the philosopher, who could so live and so die without weakness and without ostentation? When Plato describes his imaginary righteous man, loaded with all the punishments of guilt, yet meriting the highest rewards of virtue, he exactly describes the character of Jesus Christ. What an infinite disproportion be-

tween the son of Sophroniscus and the Son of Mary. Socrates dies with honor, surrounded by his disciples listening to the most tender words—the easiest death that one could wish to die. Jesus dies in pain, dishonor, mockery, the object of universal cursing—the most horrible death that one could fear. At the receipt of the cup of poison, Socrates blesses him who could not give it to him without tears; Jesus, while suffering the sharpest pains, prays for his most bitter enemies. If Socrates lived and died like a philosopher, Jesus lived and died like a God.” Poor Rousseau and poor France! How much happier both would have been, if they had worshipped and served this Son of God and Son of Man. The world might then have been spared the pain of reading the blackest page in modern history. Of the Bible Rousseau writes: “Peruse the books of philosophers with all their pomp of diction. How meagre, how contemptible are they when compared with the Scriptures. The majesty of the Scriptures strikes me with admiration.” Rousseau spoke thus because he had read the Bible. Some other men who have written against the Bible confessed that they were ignorant of it. Thomas Paine looked into it long enough to catch a glimpse of Christ, and, in one of his better moments, he said: “The morality that Christ preached and practiced was of the most benevolent kind.” But Thomas Paine’s opinion of the Bible should have little weight, for he virtually confesses his ignorance of it when he wrote of a Scripture quotation: “I know not how this passage is pointed, for I keep no Bible.” He wrote his bitterest denunciations of the Book in a house where there was no Bible. David Hume, who wrote against the credibility of miracles, confessed that he had never “read the New Testament with attention.” Edward Gibbon, who made some flings at the Old Book, confessed that he had read only the Gospel of John, and the first chapter of the Gospel of Luke. Men who do not like the light of the sun are those who have never seen the sun.

Pecaut, another French infidel of note, as he looks at the character of Christ, is constrained to put this wreath of praise upon His head: “Christ’s moral character rose beyond com-

parison above that of any other great man of antiquity. No one was ever so gentle, so humble, so kind as he. In his spirit he lived in the house of his heavenly father. His moral life is wholly penetrated by God. He was the master of all, because he was really their brother."

It is difficult to believe that Ernest Renan was not an earnest believer, after we have read what he says of Jesus Christ, and yet we know that he lost his professorship in the University of Paris on account of his infidelity. While studying the character of Jesus, he can hardly refrain from falling at his feet and worshipping him as he deserves. "All history," he says, "is incomprehensible without him. He created the object and fixed the starting point of the future faith of humanity. He is the incomparable man to whom the universal conscience has decreed the title of Son of God, and that with justice. In the first rank of this grand family of the true sons of God we must place Jesus. The highest consciousness of God which ever existed in the breast of humanity was that of Jesus. Repose now in thy glory, noble founder! Thy work is finished. Thy divinity is established. Thou shalt become the corner-stone of humanity so entirely that to tear thy name from this world would rend it to its foundations. Between thee and God there will no longer be any distinction. Complete conqueror of death, take possession of thy kingdom, whither shall follow thee, by the royal road which thou hast traced, ages of adoring worshippers. Whatever may be the surprises of the future, Jesus will never be surpassed. His worship will grow young without ceasing; his legend will call forth tears without end; his sufferings will melt the noblest hearts; and all ages will proclaim that among the sons of men there is none born greater than Jesus. Even Paul is not Jesus. How far removed are we all from thee, dear master. Where is thy mildness, thy poetry? Thou to whom a flower didst bring pleasure and ecstasy, dost thou recognize as thy disciples these wranglers, these men furious over their prerogatives, and desiring that everything should be given to them? They are men; thou art a God."

In harmony with this are the words of England's great statesman, politician, and author, Benjamin Disraeli: "The

wildest dreams of their rabbis have been far exceeded. Has not Jesus conquered Europe and changed its name to Christendom? All countries that refuse the cross wither, and the time will come, when the vast communities and countless myriads of America and Australia, looking upon Europe as Europe now looks upon Greece, and wondering how so small a space could have achieved such great deeds, will find music in the songs of Zion and solace in the parables of Galilee."

Mr. Charles Darwin, who declared that the natives of Terra del Fuego were too low to be improved, sent to a missionary society a contribution of twenty-five pounds after he had visited the island and had seen what Christianity was doing for them.

Now why is it that men who are known to the world as infidels make such concessions? Simply because infidels are not made by studying the Bible and the character of Christ. They are infidels while, as in the case of Ernest Renan, they look at the caricatures of Christianity seen in its representatives, or while they puzzle their brains over mysteries which cannot be solved any more than other mysteries in nature. When they turn from these things to Christ, as revealed in the Scriptures, their respect is won, their admiration, and sometimes adoration, is called forth.

Another explanation may be found in the experience of Mr. Hegard, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Copenhagen, and until recently the champion of atheism in his country. He has just published a revised edition of his works, and here is an extract from its introduction: "The experiences of life, its sufferings and grief, have shaken my soul and have broken the foundation upon which I formerly thought I could build. Full of faith in the sufficiency of science, I thought to have found in it a sure refuge from all the contingencies of life. This illusion is vanished; when the tempest came, which plunged me in sorrow, the moorings, the cable of science, broke like thread. Then I seized upon that help which many before me have laid hold of. I sought and found peace in God. Since then I have certainly not abandoned science, but I have assigned to it another place in my life." Such experiences make

men revise their books and their ways of living. May we not hope for such a revision of some books published in America? I have the authority of a man of integrity and wide learning in New York city for saying that "of twenty infidels, lecturers and writers, who have been prominent in the last thirty years, sixteen have abandoned their infidelity and openly professed faith in Christ and joy in his salvation." Truly "The morning light is breaking."

M. Renan sums up his infidelity in these words: "We are living on the perfume of an empty vase. Our children will have to live on the shadow of a shadow. Their children, I fear, will have to live on something less." To be sure, the assets of infidelity have run low. It is bankrupt, and can't pay half a cent on the dollar. Compare with this Paul's assets of Christianity. "I have fought the good fight; I have finished my course; I have kept the faith. Henceforth there is laid for me a crown of righteousness which the Lord the righteous judge will give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." Poor infidelity has no "henceforth." If it has, it is like going into an unexplored cavern in Mammoth Cave, not knowing but that you may fall down a precipice a thousand feet. Christianity is following the guide who throws his light upon our way, till we come into the day of a glorious "henceforth." The death-scene of Thomas Paine, now well authenticated, and the words of Ethan Allen to his dying daughter, tell us plainly that infidelity has little stock in trade upon which its followers may draw in emergencies. Better be wise like Professor Hegard and give up "the perfume of an empty vase," for the vase full of richest treasures, "shadow of a shadow" for the eternal substance; for truly "Their rock is not as our rock, even our enemies themselves being judges."

V.

REASON AS A WITNESS.

"Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord."—Is. 1 : 18.

Reason is a witness easily influenced. Prejudice is often its master. No argument can prevail against prejudice. It is blind, and will not see, though you pour a flood of light in its eyes. The Pharisees had prejudged Christ, and made up their minds that he was only a man; and when they heard him say, "Thy sins be forgiven thee," they "began to reason, saying, who is this that speaketh blasphemies?" Their prejudice kept them from drawing the right conclusion. Their reason, uninfluenced by prejudice, would have said that He who could work such miracles was God, and therefore had the right to forgive sins. Under the control of prejudice these Pharisees were careful to strain out little gnats of difficulty, while they swallowed whole camels of absurdity, hair, hump, hoofs and all. Galileo proved to the Inquisitors that the earth was round, and revolved upon its axis, while the sun remained stationary, but they laughed at his reasons. Prejudice had put out their eyes. The weather-vane on the top of a steeple in New York became fixed, so that those who observed it were misled as to the direction of the wind. Reason is a weather-vane easily fixed by prejudice, so that no wind of argument can move it.

Self-interest is another influence very powerful with our witness. It is hard for a man to see a good reason for what he knows to be against his interest. A mere excuse in the scale with self is heavier than the strongest reason. Read the parable of the Husbandmen in Luke 20, and you will see how forcibly

Jesus shows this weakness of reason when under the control of self-interest. "When the husbandmen saw him, they reasoned one with another, saying, This is the heir: let us kill him, that the inheritance may be ours." If they had been unselfish and loyal to their master, their reason would have said: "This is the heir; let us pay our rent or give up the vineyard to him, if he wishes it. He is here now to look after his own, and it is reasonable that we should let him do it." Their reason did the bidding of selfishness, and led them to murder. And reason is still the slave of self-interest.

Desire, appetite and passion, fickle as they are, often rule reason with an iron rod. What we desire is apt to appear reasonable. The child wants the razor or poisonous flower, and no amount of reasoning will convince it that it is not best for it to handle such dangerous things. Men are children grown up, and just as unreasonable when strong desire takes hold of them. The appetites make reason their abject slave. I talked with a man the other day who had been wrecked by strong drink. He admitted that he ought not to drink. He abused himself for dragging into such depths his wife and children. He declared that he knew whiskey did him only harm in body and mind. And yet he was doubtless drunk again before night. Reason was in chains. Appetite had bound it, and was compelling it, either to stand aside and not interfere, or else serve like one of a chain-gang. It reminded me of a boy seen in front of a window, where was kept a large snake. The shop-keeper wondered that the boy should remain still so long, until he noticed that his eyes were fixed with a wild stare upon the snake. He answered no call, and noticed nothing about him, till he was dragged away from the fatal charmer. The boy seemed to have no reason while under the strange power of the snake's piercing stare. And there are in this city to-day not less than a thousand men, who are no more influenced by reason than was that poor boy. Their passions have transfixed them to some sin and they are held to it by a power over which reason has no control.

France once decided to displace the Bible and worship reason, and selected as the goddess of reason a dissolute woman. They

acted more wisely than they knew, for a more appropriate object could not have been selected. Men who boast that they are ruled by reason are nearly always the slaves of passion; certainly these frenzied Frenchmen were. The free-thinkers who boast that reason is their God are nearly all of dissolute lives. Their passions scourge their reason into subjection. A dissolute woman would still be an appropriate goddess for them.

Reason is controlled largely by the affections. The Pharisees "reasoned in their hearts." Love is proverbially blind, and to nothing is it blinder than to argument. It leaps to conclusions. No argument prevails with us against those we love. A good deacon in a church of which I was pastor, was called in by a suffering wife to protect her against a brutal husband. Reason was altogether on the wife's side, and the deacon took advantage of it to shame the brute into better manners, but he had not proceeded far before the wife took sides with the husband and insinuated to the deacon that his room was more desirable than his company.

Even imagination can influence our witness. Indeed, imagination is one of the greatest foes to reason. When it gets full control of a man, he must be sent to an asylum for the insane. And in sane people it may get such control that reason rarely has a chance to speak. Poets are not apt to be good logicians. There is a poetry of science which influences some scientists more than reason. The theory of evolution appeals strongly to the imagination, and with some there is no difficulty about filling all the gaps which the facts in the case leave open. And in the case of spontaneous generation imagination has led some to affirm what facts and reason both deny. Some prominent scientists talk about the primal germ of life coming into existence without a creator as glibly as if it had been settled by experiment that spontaneous generation is possible. On the other hand, it has been settled that, in the present state of knowledge, it is impossible. Imagination has usurped the place of experiment and reason. This imaginary science is the kind that so often contradicts the Bible.

Ignorance is another enemy to be watched. People used to be frightened by comets, and reason was as much to blame

for it as anything else. They were taught that such extraordinary appearances were harbingers of evil; and, when a comet appeared, it was reasonable for them to suppose that some calamity was at hand. When it was learned that comets were subject to law and their appearance could be accounted for, their reason drew a different conclusion and appeased their fears. Reason controlled by ignorance and imagination has been the enemy of progress in all ages. When Stevenson announced that he could draw with his engine a train of cars at the rate of twenty miles an hour, it appeared unreasonable to not a few members of parliament, and their reason, shocked by the assertion, hastened to oppose the fanatical scheme. The speeches made in opposition to it appealed to reason to show the absurdity of the measure. They were ignorant, and poor reason could do no better than serve their ignorance. We have heard of the six blind men of Hindoostan, whom the king led into a room, where there was a large elephant, and commanded each one to touch the beast in but one place, and then tell him what it was like. The first touched its side and decided that it was like the side of a house covered with hair. The second touched his tusk and decided that it was made of ivory. The third took it by the tail, and declared that it was like a snake. Each one reasoned well with the light before him, and yet all were wrong. This reminds us of the reasoning of some people against Christianity and the Bible. Thomas Paine admits that he kept no Bible. Gibbon declared that he never read the New Testament with attention. David Hume confessed that he had read only the Gospel of John and one chapter in Luke. Is it any wonder that men should write wildly about a thing of which they know so little? Here is an illustration for the children. I have heard of a farmer's wife whose hen, eating a certain amount of barley, laid one egg a day. She concluded to double the amount of barley, hoping that with twice the amount of food her hen would lay two eggs a day. The result was the hen grew fat, and did not lay at all. Her reasoning was very correct. It only lacked the element of knowledge. She did not know the nature of hens. Æsop's man who killed the goose that laid the

golden egg made the same mistake. No man should claim infallibility for his reason, unless he knows everything. If he can establish the fact that he knows all things, then we may follow without questioning the deductions of his reason. But ignorance as to one point may cause him to lead us into error. When Job said "I will reason with God," he spoke very foolishly, as he afterward acknowledged. Paul advises us to "cast down reasonings and every high thing that is exalted against the knowledge of God."—2 Cor. 10:5. We who know so little should not put our reason up against Him who knows everything.

We have spent so much time proving the character of our witness that we have little time left to hear his testimony. But such character-proving is very important with a witness so much quoted in this age. That reason is influenced by so many things is not altogether to its discredit. If you could find a man who is influenced only by reason, whose affections, imagination, desire and passion, did not move him to anything, but who decided everything in the cold light of reason, you would have the devil incarnate. Such a man no one would wish for a friend. The Lord pity the woman who might marry him. There is something in us besides reason, unless we are the children of the Devil without any mixture of other blood. There is something in God higher than reason, else we had never been redeemed. "God so LOVED the world that he gave his only begotten son." Rationalism would turn men into devils of cold calculation. God would use their reason under the control of truth and love. "Come now, let us reason together, saith the Lord." He can furnish the knowledge necessary to right conclusions. Such is the object of revelation, and all who are following reason without a revelation are misled. Agnosticism is the world's latest admission that man cannot by searching find out God. God must reveal himself. In the Bible he has done so, and for you to think that without the help of such a revelation you can be guided by fickle and fallible reason is a mistake which every reasonable man ought to have sense enough not to make. Indeed we can explain such mistakes only on the ground

of some hallucination that hushes the voice of reason altogether.

Christianity deals in facts. The birth, life, death and resurrection of Christ are facts. There is no fact in history better established than his resurrection: and when that is once accepted, there is no difficulty in accepting his other miracles as facts. The Sophists of Athens claimed that they could prove anything by a course of reasoning. Socrates rebuked their folly and called attention to the facts. Scientists at one time tried to establish their pet theories by an appeal to reason. Bacon did the world a service by magnifying facts, and putting reason in its proper place. First ascertain the facts, and then draw your inferences from them. Benjamin Franklin once came upon a company of philosophers, who were discussing the reason why a bucket of water will weigh no more after a fish is put in it than it did before. Some of them gave very plausible explanations of it. "Well, gentlemen," asked Franklin, ever noted for his common sense, "Is it true? Let us get a bucket of water and a fish, and test it." The test was made, and it was found to be utterly false. When the fish was added, down went the scales. Let us first get at facts. Is sin a fact? Is it a fact that sin pollutes, degrades, and causes suffering and death? Is it a fact that we may get rid of sin? Then let our reason prompt us to do so. Such is the reasoning of the text, "Though your sins be as scarlet they shall be white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool." God has provided a way by which we may get rid of sin, and it is the only way. "The blood of Jesus Christ his son cleanseth us from all sin." Reason uninfluenced by prejudice and evil passion, must impel you to accept God's way, and be rid of what you know brings ruin.

Reason emphasizes the necessity of the new birth. As to how the new birth takes place reason has nothing to do. There is no such thing as the reason how. The how has to do only with the realm of observation. No one can tell how food keeps up the mysterious union between matter and spirit. But any one can think of reasons why it does this. The wisest cannot explain just how I move my hand, but the most simple may be able to tell why I do it. The "why" and the "how" belong to two

widely different realms ; and yet there has been a modern attempt to confound them. The man, who rejects the new birth because he cannot understand how it takes place, calls himself a rationalist. His senses are so coarse that he cannot perceive how it is done ; and though he gets on no better trying to explain the mysteries of the natural birth, he declares it irrational in men to accept what they cannot understand. It is rational in men to accept what facts demonstrate, though they cannot understand it. For a man to refuse to accept what he cannot understand would put him in his grave in less than a month, for he would neither eat, drink, nor sleep. The fact that eating, drinking, and sleeping are just what he needs is plain enough ; but, if he were called upon to explain all about the process of each and their relation to life, he could not do it. I knew a learned scientist who was sent to a lunatic asylum because he refused to do anything he could not understand, and would not, therefore, eat until some one would explain to him just how food supported the mysterious thing called life. He was irrational. And rationalism is irrationalism pure and simple. It is an attempt to push reason out of her realm and make her do service for which she has no capacity. There are many reasons why a man must be born again. God says that he must, and he knows. Without the new birth he could not enjoy heaven, etc. But there are no reasons HOW we may be born again. Reason, we repeat, has nothing to do with the how.

Reason deals with the fitness of things. "It is not reason," said the Apostles, "that we should leave the word of the Lord and serve tables." The rich man of the parable was a fool, in that he did not see the suitableness of thing. He laid up in barns food for his soul, and said : "Soul thou hast much goods laid up for many years ; take thine ease eat, drink, and be merry." He was like a man who would lay up for his family a winter's supply of earth, stones and stubble, things that they could not eat. God demands of us nothing unreasonable. It is fitting that we should love with our whole hearts one who loves us so deeply. It is fitting that we should give all we have and are to Him who gave his only begotten Son for us. When we think of Calvary

with its love and suffering, all for us, no sacrifice we can make ought to be considered great. Annie Askew, when she let her tormentors rack her on the wheel till her bones were broken, rather than deny her Lord, did no unreasonable thing. The heroism of the martyrs which led them through fire and flood was no fanaticism, but the most reasonable return to God for what he had done for them.

Reason deals with the value of things. I know two men, one of whom values his head of hair more than all the gold of earth. The other values some buttons and beads he carries with him more than the silver of all the mines. These men live together in an asylum for the insane. The lack of reason shows itself in their inability to set true values upon things. It was an ancient custom to try the sanity of men by putting before them an apple and a ball of gold of the same size and shape. If they, moved by appetite, chose the apple rather than the gold, they were declared to be in need of a guardian. Now when God puts before us eternal life with self-denial, it is an appeal to our reason. When Jesus asked "What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" He appealed to men as rational beings to choose the truly valuable rather than the worthless. Be rational, I beg of you, and choose Christ with holiness and heaven, rather than the world with sin and hell.

VI.

CHRIST THE LIFE.

"I am the life."—John 14 : 6.

LIFE begins small and develops gradually. There is in the acorn an embryo tree. After it is planted, it grows so little each day that you can hardly perceive it; but, in process of time, it becomes a giant oak.

Such is the law of nature and of grace. Minerva, springing full-armed from the brain of Jupiter, is a myth; nothing like it in fact. That which reaches maturity soon is usually not worth much. A mushroom springs up in a night and the ephemera grows old in a day; one is a well-nigh worthless plant, the other a worthless animal. There are plants called annuals, which mature in a year and die; others called biennials, which mature in two years. Man is an ETERNAL, and, for his full and complete development, time and eternity may be required. As Christ grew from an infant, so, as Christians, we must begin as babes, and grow in grace and knowledge. The kingdom of heaven is as a grain of mustard seed, and not a keg of powder. Christianity itself began small and gradually permeated society and the world. Let us not despise the day of small things. Small things are prophetic of great things. Little grace predicts great glory; a little faith and love is an earnest of mountain-moving faith and all-consuming affection.

One kind of life, however, never develops into another kind. We hear much of lower animal life developing into higher life. It is a myth. The lower life in plant and animal remains the lower life, and most especially is that true of spiritual life. You need not expect that this sinful nature, earthly and corrupt, will

be, by a process of training, developed into a higher spiritual being. "Ye must be born again." "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit."

Life moves. Machinery is moved. Life has that within itself which causes motion. Too many professing Christians are mere machines; they are moved upon. External forces of example and urging impel them to actions which resemble Christian living. I have seen a miniature clock of Strasburg, from the top of which the Apostles in wood or wax walked out one by one as the clock struck twelve. They looked like real men; they moved like men. Their movement was caused by external forces. There are so many who look like Christians; they act somewhat like Christians; but examine them closely, and you find that the movement does not proceed from the inward life. If we are filled with Christ, we have a life that moves; we are active amid lethargy; we are self-denying amid luxury; we are bold and spiritual amid worldly taunts and worldly pleasures. Little life will cause little movement. We measure life by movement. The oyster has a little life, but so much encumbrance of shell that he cannot move, except as drifted by the wave. Some Christians, with their little life, have so much encumbrance of worldly cares, worldly associations and worldly plans, that their little life fails to move them to activity.

Everything moves along the line of its own individuality. The life of the bird moves in flying; of the fish in swimming; of the horse in walking or racing; of man in the erect posture. Christ, the life within us, moves us along the line of each individual capacity. Can you teach? This life may move you to that. Have you special capacity for money-making? Let the life of Christ in you move you in that direction. Make money for him. Whatever your capacity, mental, spiritual or physical, Christ will move you in some direction to work for him.

Life is an absorbent. Living things are sure to appropriate much of that by which they are surrounded. The tree drinks in the gases; our bodies appropriate the air; trees and bodies take in the light, the heat, the moisture, and make them a part of themselves. The quality of that which is appropriated depends upon the kind of life which appropriates it. Vegetables absorb what would kill men. Man selects the best food. Now, as we go still higher and reach the spiritual life, we expect that it

will demand a purer food still. Yes! Nothing short of heaven's manna can satisfy the soul. The man who, like the rich fool in the parable, would lay up food for his soul in earthly barns, is demented; our souls cannot live upon food which supports the body. Christ is the life of the soul. His is the highest and purest life in earth or heaven. If then we would absorb only what is good and pure and lovely, let us be filled with this Christ-life.

But life is also expulsive. Some men can live in malarial districts, even breathe the coal gases of underground mines, and yet have good health. Their vitality is so great that they repel the poisonous influences about them. The way to keep out the bad is to fill ourselves with the good.

The evil spirit, which departed out of the man, returned and found the house swept and garnished; no wonder he took in seven spirits worse than himself and revelled. Empty lives and empty hearts are inviting places for devils to enter. The man who merely casts the bad from his outward life is sweeping his house and garnishing it for the reception of devils. Now if he would have a strong expulsive life; that which can be in the world and not of it; that which can live by the bogs and morasses of sin; that which can come in contact with all kinds of evil without absorbing it; let him keep full of Christ. He moved amid the worst of men, but his vitality cast off their sins; his goodness flowed to them without receiving in return any of their badness.

Let me warn you, however, against presumption. Do not imagine that your spiritual life is so strong that you have no cause for fear; that you can move in worldly circles, be companions with the bad, frequent places where there is only evil, and yet repel their influence and be unhurt? Beware! presumption goeth before a fall. The secret of your strength is in the realization of your weakness. The strength of the life within you is the consciousness that you have no strength except in Christ; and even if your spiritual vitality is strong enough to thus expose yourself without harm, your influence may lead the weaker to certain ruin. The moderate drinking of John B. Gough's father made his son a drunkard. Your body may not be hurt by sitting in a draught; but your child may do the same and die of pneumonia. "If eating meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no more flesh while the world stands."

Life beautifies. The Desert of Sahara is unattractive, because it lacks life. In what striking contrast is the oasis, where are trees, flowers, verdure and men; and as this unseen, subtle thing called life in the physical world beautifies it, paints its flowers, clothes its landscapes, so Christ, the life of the soul, gives it moral beauty. True, in autumn, the forest leaves are most beautiful in decay; but it is the life in them that paints their beauty; take away all life, and you have the sear, unsightly leaf; and the beauty of the Christian character in the decline of life, when the spring and the summer have passed, and the autumn is come, and the winter is near, is the beauty of a living faith and hope and love. Christ within us insures this moral beauty through all seasons.

Life gravitates upward. The very mole and worm must come up occasionally to the light. The plant in the cellar struggles toward the sun. Though lower life does not develop into higher, yet all life reaches up, and the higher the life the greater this upward tendency. This highest of all life, which we have in Christ Jesus, gravitates toward heaven. The boy may not see his kite in the distance, but he knows it is there, because he can feel the pull of the string. The astronomer knows that a heavenly body is approaching, because he sees that other bodies are attracted by it, though it be out of sight.

There is in the City of Dresden a picture of the Madonna. It is placed in the Cathedral before an altar of incense. Every face in the picture is looking outward and upward, as if toward some invisible object where the incense is ascending. The poet's fancy was to make it picture worshipping souls—their gratitude, their faith, their praises ascending with the incense up to the invisible Father. This life, Christ Jesus within us, is like that picture; it gazes upward; it looks beyond anything within ourselves; it sees the invisible.

VII.

CHRIST, THE LIGHT. '

"I am the light of the world; he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life."—John 8: 12.

WE are told in the first chapter of Genesis that the earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep. God said, Let there be light and there was light. The moral and spiritual darkness which followed the sin of our first parents was denser than the physical darkness of chaos. Into this spiritual darkness the light began at once to shine. The curse upon Satan, if Eve heard it, was to her the first beam of the coming day. The dawn grows brighter, until, in the 53d chapter of Isaiah, it is almost daylight. John the Baptist, though a bright and shining light, was but as the morning star to announce the rising of the sun. Now the sun is up, and we have the noon-tide of its glory in the text: "I am the Light of the World."

A LIGHT TO WORK BY. The moon and stars give a beautiful light, but theirs is a light to sleep by. Walk down the streets of Baltimore at midnight, and you are not surprised to find the stores closed and the houses dark. The people are asleep. Walk down the streets at noonday, and if the stores should be closed, you would feel like crying fire to wake the people from their lethargy. Daylight is the time for work. Jesus Christ went about doing good. His life was one of incessant toil; and those of us who walk in that light must be active like him. If we sleep now, it is with the sun shining in our faces.

A LIGHT WHICH DIRECTS. "He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness." Many false tapers will be seen along the way.

Men, with powerful intellects, kindle other lights; and they are the Will-o'-the-Wisps that lead into the quagmires of sin and death. Christ is the only true light. The "Great Britain," a ship which cost a million dollars, left port with a valuable cargo and three hundred souls aboard. During a storm the captain mistook a wrecker's light for a light-house and the ship was wrecked, the cargo lost, and many passengers drowned; and so those who turn from the true light to guide their vessels of life by these wreckers' lights which appear may expect a like disastrous result. This Christ-light, to us, may not be very bright, on account of our lack of clearness of vision. The sun may be shining in all its splendor, and yet the diseased eye may see little of its light; but it is all that we have, and whatever Christ is to us we should follow. A party of us went down three hundred steps into the gold mine at Kings Mountain. The guide carried before us a little tallow candle; it was all we had, and we followed that flickering taper until it brought us out into the brightness of the sun. And the conviction you now have may be but as the flickering taper. Follow it out, and you will soon be rejoicing in noonday glory.

A LIGHT WHICH PROTECTS. Daylight is a better safeguard than a hundred soldiers. The assassin sneaks in the dark. If I were compelled to pass through the dangerous streets of a great city, I would prefer to go alone in the daytime, rather than with ten thousand men in the dark. The murderer may creep through the ranks in the dark and plunge his dagger into my heart. Jesus Christ, the light, is the soul's protection. "They that follow me shall not walk in darkness." His light is our shield, against which the fiery darts of the wicked fall harmless. A hunter once found himself near a wounded tiger. He heard its growl and the rustle of the leaves under its feet, and he remained crouching in a painful position holding his empty gun one hour, two hours, three hours, four hours, fearing lest the breaking of a stick might cause the hungry beast to spring upon him. By and by the sunlight from the East began to tip the tree-tops and to fling its bright javelins down through the boughs. Then the tiger hied away to its den. The coming light was the hunter's safety. And our sins were like hungry tigers, ever ready to devour us. It was the light from heaven which saved us. The light, Christ Jesus it was which came by faith and drove away

the sins that threatened our destruction. And none are safe, except those who walk in this light.

A LIGHT WHICH BEAUTIFIES. There is something in man which distinguishes him from the beast. He is a ruin, but like the ruins of Thebes he is noble. He has an imagination, a conscience, a reason, a judgment and a memory; and he has these, before conversion, as well as after. Paul, before he was saved, reasoned before the Jewish Sanhedrin, to convince them that he ought to persecute Christians. The difference between Paul before conversion and Paul after conversion was that this light from Heaven had beautified his entire being. A party of us ascend King's Mountain before day. As we painfully climb the steep side, our first view is upon a valley of blackness. As we ascend the darkness appears only more distinct. By and by the sun is rising; the light is shining from the East, and when we reached the summit, we find ourselves standing in the centre of a great circular room, carpeted with green and hung about with curtains of crimson and gold. What made the difference? What magic power changed the valley of darkness into the valley of beauty? It was the touch of God's artist, the light. The Apostle Paul, as the persecutor, was in his massive proportions just as majestic as the mountain, but covered with clouds and darkness. The Apostle Paul with Christ filling his soul was like that mountain, lighted up by the glory of heaven. Whatever there is beautiful in you will be made more beautiful by the light. And this light adds new beauties. The beauty of unselfish love, of ministering to others, of humility, of hope and of holiness is added by the light, Christ Jesus. No skill of ancient master, seen in painting or sculpture, can compare with the moral beauty of the character made by Jesus Christ.

A LIGHT WHICH REVEALS. Christ on the cross reveals to us our condition as sinners. No where else can we see what sin is; how God hates it. And through Christ on Calvary shines mercy. It is the only place in all God's universe, of which I know, where mercy shines at all. Nature is the administrator of justice; keep her laws, and you are rewarded. Break her laws, and you are punished. He reveals to us our own character. Comparing ourselves with ourselves, we may be easily satisfied; but, when we compare ourselves with Christ, we see how far short we have come.

Our pollution is thus made manifest, as we bring it into the light. The housemaid may complain of the sun shining into the room, because it reveals the dust on the carpet, and the mistress may prefer that the sun shall not fill the parlor, lest the shoddiness of the furniture be seen; but it is not the sun's fault; it is the fault of the housemaid and the furniture. Let the sun reveal the dust, that we may get rid of it. Let it show our shoddiness, that we may cast out all sham and take in only the real.

A LIGHT WHICH GIVES LIFE. "He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." Darkness and death are twin sisters. I have read of a cruel experiment made by some German philosophers, who put a poor child into a dark room and kept it there for twenty years, giving it food and water and clothing, but keeping out the light, to see what effect darkness would have upon the body. The child came out blind, tremulous and idiotic. Whether this is true or not, it might be true. Darkness withers. The "bottomless pit" of the Bible, a place in which there is eternal withering, falling, degeneration, without ever touching bottom. You have read of Dr. Kane's experience in the long Arctic night, when his crew went blind, his dogs died, and he and they suffered such depression as he could not describe. A world without Christ is, indeed,

"A dungeon horrible on all sides round
As one great furnace flamed,
Yet from those flames no light,
But rather darkness visible."

The presence of Christ accepted and loved can change this hell of death into a heaven of life.

A LIGHT WHICH NOTHING CAN PUT OUT. A taper of money you may follow very well for a while. Culture will light a man when there are no intricacies and little danger of losing his way. Friendship may satisfy, while friends are true. Almost anything can help us through a bright experience, but to everyone there will come a time of darkness and dampness when the taper of money and friendship and culture will flicker out, and it is then that the light, Christ Jesus, shines the brightest. The last words of Rutherford, as he passed through the valley of the shadow of death, were: "I feed on manna; Oh, for arms to embrace him;

Oh, for a well-tuned harp." Dr. Payson's shout of victory in this hour of trial was: "The battle is fought, the victory is won; I am going to bathe in an ocean of purity and benevolence and happiness through all eternity." Richard Baxter, when dying, said to his friends: "I have pain; there is no arguing against sense, but I have peace, I have peace." Robert Bruce, taken suddenly ill at the breakfast table, a few hours afterwards called his children to him and calmly said: "Now God be with you, my dear children; I have breakfasted with you, and shall sup with my Lord Jesus this night." An old Christian man in the South was told by his physician that he would soon die. "You are mistaken," said the Christian, "I am not dying." The next day the doctor insisted that he would live but a few hours. "You are mistaken," replied the Christian, with a smile, "I do not intend to die." He came back to see him in the evening, when the death-rattle was in his throat and the death-stare in his eye, and he said: "I told you the truth; I was faithful to you; you are dying this moment." "Oh, no," replied the man of God, the light gleaming for a moment through his eye of death, "I am almost well; a few more breaths and I shall be perfectly well." And that old dying Christian told the truth. He was getting well while dying; he was passing through the darkness of suffering and sin and struggle into the light of perfect health and righteousness and rest. The heathen priest used to light his lamp and leave it float out upon the Ganges; if it buffeted the waves and continued to flicker, it was an evidence that the departed soul had gone safely over. We put out all flickering lamps and candles, in the presence of death, because we walk in the sunlight along the path which shines brighter and brighter unto the perfect day. How different the experience of those who will not open their minds and hearts to the light! Hobbes, the Infidel, who spent his life following the light of reason, had to say, as he came to death, "I am taking a fearful leap in the dark." Goethe, the poet, whose praises have been upon the lips of all lovers of good literature, as his eyes grew misty, reached out his hand and said: "Open the shutter, and let in the light." The men of unbelief are the men about whom the darkness thickens as age comes and death threatens. The men of faith are the men about whom the light brightens as age comes and death promises relief.

REFLECTIONS. What is the use of light without eyes? Men are blind in sin, and though Christ, the light, has flooded all history and shines with noonday splendor at this moment, they do not see it. He not only gives light, but sight. He opened the eyes of the blind, and he has power to-day to give all who wish it that spiritual discernment which will enable them to behold him. Do you fail to enjoy the light from a lack of vision? Come to the great physician, and have the eye salve of truth applied, and then you will see clearly.

What a little thing can keep out the light. With my little finger I can shut out from my eye all the sun. And so little sins may shut out forever the light of life from our souls. Let us absorb and conserve this light. We are not to be simply reflectors. Reflection is a cold process. Better reflect light than not shine at all, but we are to be ourselves the light of the world. Our streets are lighted by the gas which was made from the coal that had been buried for centuries beneath the surface; the coal that had gathered up in the growing vegetation the beams of the sun and locked them in its prison house. And now that light, so long locked up, is let loose upon our streets, and we walk in its rays. We should absorb the very nature of Christ. As we study his words, as we worship him, striving to be like him day by day, we absorb the light, then by a process of combustion, self-sacrifice, the zeal of God's house consuming us, may we be enabled to give forth this light unto the world, so that, as they walk in the light that we make, they shall be walking toward the light eternal; and bye and bye, you and I having been buried, and our lives forgotten, yet all that light that we have made will be conserved in the work of our lives, and when he shall come the second time without sin unto salvation, the light from heaven will be met by the light from earth, and that united light will be the glory of the throne.

VIII.

CHRIST THE WAY.

"I am the way."—John 14: 6.

WE are all on a journey, not so much responsible for the manner in which we started, as for our destination. Where are you going? Is it the part of the wise man to say, "I don't know?" Decide at once as to which road you are traveling toward eternity.

I. A PLAIN WAY.

There is much mystery about Christ. So is there about yourself. We are all "fearfully and wonderfully made." But, as the Way of Life, Christ is not mysterious. The child can have faith; the philosopher can do more. If salvation depended upon feats of memory, upon mathematical talent, upon imagination, many could not be saved; but faith is co-extensive with humanity. The ignorant and the weak-minded can have faith. We have it at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of life. While memory grows weaker, faith may grow stronger; while the judgment become unreliable, faith may become more steady; while imagination grows dim and confused, faith may be brighter and clearer. We do almost everything by faith. It is faith in the ticket which represents the Railroad Corporation, that induces us to take the train. It is faith in the cars, in the conductor, in the engineer, in the track, that leads us to continue our journey. God has taken this common possession of all human beings and made it the means by which we are to walk in the way to Heaven. "The wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein."

II. A PUBLIC WAY.

There are many who seem to desire a back-door into the king-

dem; who admire Christ, his doctrines, believe in him, and yet do not wish to confess him before men. "If any man would be my disciple, let him deny himself, take up his cross, and follow me." "Come out from among them and be separate, saith the Lord." Christ was a public man. He did not parade his good deeds before the public, but he suffered publicly. That crown of thorns, that mocking purple, that reed sceptre, that scorning and buffeting and spitting were under the vulgar eye. Now is it just that Christ should suffer shame for us publicly, and we should go to heaven privately? He bore our sins, a spectacle for men and angels. Shall we accept his righteousness without acknowledging him before his enemies? Do you love the Saviour? Your next duty is to confess him. I say emphatically, your salvation depends upon it. "If we confess him not before men, he will not confess us before his Father and the holy angels."

III. A HIGHWAY.

"A highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called the way of holiness, and the unclean shall not pass over it." Not a way for the high people, but a highway for the lowly. A way lifted up above the world. And who dare say that Christ, in character, in aim, in aspiration, was not the highest and best of men?

There are swine wallowing in the mud alongside this way, but on the way are no swine. God proposes to lift us up in character, that we may willingly walk the highway of purity. Christ was high in doctrine. Some have complained that we preach too high a standard. The standard of Jesus was perfection. "Be ye perfect, as I am perfect." He was high, too, in practice. High doctrine and low life do not go well together. Let your standard be high, and let your life be always rising towards it. Low doctrine insures low living. A high standard inspires. There is something in it which lifts one up and urges forward to deeds of self-sacrifice.

IV. A PLEASANT WAY.

"Her ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace." The goal to be reached is enough to make us willing to go through rough paths. The darkness of the night makes the following day the brighter, and we may well pass through the

darkness that we may behold the glory of the rising sun ; but all along the way there is pleasantness and peace.

Some ways are pleasant from association. The traveler delights to pass through the village or the farm-yard, consecrated by the birth or the life of one of earth's heroes. He stands amid the ruins of ancient castles and cathedrals hallowed by associations. On the battle-field he calls up the clash of arms, the smoke and din and turmoil, and at last victory on the side of truth and liberty. Along this way to heaven there are delightful associations. We stand amid the ruins of castles of sin, taken and demolished by our victorious commander. Many battle-fields are hallowed by a thousand spiritual victories. On them Paul fought and conquered ; on them the martyrs fell. We see the foot-prints of the great, the brave and the good. What way through earth is so hallowed by pleasant associations as this way to heaven?

Another attraction of the way is its scenery. We change our routes of travel, that we may behold the beautiful landscapes, the sparkling fountains, the grand cataracts along the road. Moral beauty is higher and better than physical. Beauty of character excels all beauty of flower, of leaf, of running stream and forest ; and just in so far as this moral beauty excels all physical beauty, this way to heaven is the most beautiful for its scenery. Along it there are fruit trees laden with deeds of sacrifice and love ; along it are fountains of joy and peace "springing up into everlasting life ;" along it, too, are some glorious sunsets. Not long ago I saw in Asheville, N. C., one of God's afflicted children going down amid clouds of affliction, of physical agony ; but those clouds were like the clouds of evening about the setting sun. "He maketh the clouds his chariots."

Along this way is the most pleasant company. Do you love the good ? Then, here are the best of all ages. The infidel charges Christianity with offering heaven to the thief and murderer, and such is the boast of our religion ; but it comes to change the thief into an honest man, the murderer into a peaceful citizen. Along the "broad way" there is not the best of company. Our jail convicts, our free-thought sensualists, earth's debauchees crowd that way. A few months ago in Chicago a modern free-thought apostle died. His boast was that he worshipped no god but reason and philosophy. His companions, kindred spirits, followed

him to the grave, and there over his corpse, instead of prayer and requiem, they drank his health and threw the bottles into the grave. I am sure you are not sorry that their way is different from yours.

It is pleasant to notice the provision for our wants. The manna of heaven is scattered along this way. Daily supplies come from him who meets all the demands of our higher nature.

V. AN UPWARD WAY.

We do not with a leap and a bound go to heaven, but step by step, day by day, we climb in the Divine life higher and higher, until, after while, we shall step into the heights, the perfect likeness of our Master. Jesus was developed gradually. He was a babe, then a child, then a youth, then a man of sturdy vigor: "He grew in stature and in wisdom." Babes at first, we are to grow stronger by feeding upon the word.

As we go westward from Salisbury to Asheville, we come suddenly to the Blue Ridge chain. The traveler wonders, as he looks upon the pile of granite, how he is to cross it; but if he will follow the railroad track he will see that it is done by constant windings and gradual risings. He goes first about a mile and a half circling around the mountain peak, and comes suddenly near the track beneath him over which he has passed. He can look down and measure the height which he has attained, and then looking up at the road above him can see the point to be reached by this gradual rising. Now into a deep cut, where he can see the light only by looking upward; out from this cut into a beautiful landscape, and suddenly from this into a dark tunnel, and just as suddenly out of the tunnel into another beautiful prospect; now into the cloud that hovers over the mountain, then into the sunlight that has broken through it, into the tunnel again, and finally near the top into the last dark damp tunnel of 1800 feet, and he is out into the beauties of the regions beyond. This fittingly represents the Christian walk, as he follows the line that Christ, the great Spiritual Engineer, has marked out in his own person and character; at one time looking down upon his past experience and seeing the progress made; at another looking up at the high perfect model to which he is to attain; to-day passing through the deep cut of financial embarrassment, of trouble, of pressure, and only

seeing the light by looking upward to God, and just as suddenly out of this into the beautiful landscape of promise and hope; then into the dark tunnel of affliction and sore bereavement and suddenly out of that into the sunlight; higher and higher into the likeness of Christ, nearer and nearer to the Divine model, until, after a while, the last tunnel of death is reached, and he passes through into the paradise of God. "Forgetting the things which are behind," let us press forward and upward.

IX.

WHAT SHALL I DO WITH JESUS?

(Matt. xxvii. 22.)

PILATE had Jesus on his hands, and he must do something with Him. So must you. He has been offered to you, and you must accept or reject Him. Now which will you do?

Will you take sides with His enemies? Pilate was not base enough to do that, and surely you shrink in horror from the bare suggestion. Will you treat Him with silent neglect? Then answer this question: "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" To neglect Him is to die.

Do you answer, "I have not time to settle this question now?" What occupies your time more important than the salvation of your soul? Is it taken up with making money or seeking pleasure? If so, please solve this problem before you go a step further: "What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul; or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" How much do you suppose the rich man in hell would give for three minutes on earth, in which to prepare for the beyond? Would he let his purple robes and sumptuous feasts weigh a moment against the value of his soul, which he has found to be so infinitely capable of misery?

Are you waiting for a more convenient season? It will never come, for God has said: "Now is the accepted time: now is the day of salvation." To-morrow is Satan's time. Now is God's time. To-morrow is a thief; it has stolen many golden opportunities. To-morrow is a liar; it has deceived thousands. To-morrow is a murderer; it has killed more immortal souls than all other agencies combined. Will you trust a thief, a liar, a murderer?

In a quaint old book Satan is represented as calling around him his advisers of the pit, to consult with them as to the best means for preventing men from turning to God. One suggested intemperance as the thing to use. Another pride, another lust. After listening to their views, Satan rose and said: 'You are all mistaken. The thing to do is to go to the earth, and persuade men to put off repentance just one day longer;' and all the fiends shouted approval. This myth has in it a fearful truth. Most men expect to be saved some time. We entreat you, reader, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ" now, "and thou shalt be saved." The thing to do with Jesus is to accept him as Saviour; then obey him as King, and follow him as guide. "He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life."

Another question worth considering is, "What will Christ do with me if I come to him?" He will forgive me. "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins." He will cleanse me. "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." He will keep me. "Him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast him out." "The Lord is my keeper." He will deliver me in temptation. He "will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will, with the temptation, also make a way to escape." He will, in his own time, take me to heaven. "I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may be also." He will make me like himself. "Now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is."

X.

THE CHRIST OF THE BIBLE

AND THE CHRIST OF ROMANISM.

“Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me.”—John 5: 39.

“There shall arise false Christs.”—Matt. 24: 24.

IN the New Testament church Christ is the head, and his people, without regard to official position, are the members. Their place is determined, not by their office, but by their faithfulness. “Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular.” 1 Cor. 12: 27. The Papacy of to-day is the monstrosity which Paul pictures to the imagination of the Corinthians, when he said: “The body is not one member, but many. . . . If the whole were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where were the smelling? . . . And if they were all one member, where were the body?” 1 Cor. 12: 14–20. The Pope, one member, has become the whole body, head and all. No Roman Catholic in religious matters can see, hear or smell for himself. The Pope is his eyes, ears and nose. Now God himself did not try to make one organ serve these three purposes, because he has, as we see in nature, no taste for monstrosities. They are made by the violation of his laws, and on no other ground can we account for the existence in the world to-day of this monstrous thing, a body with only one member.

“Our Lord Jesus Christ,” said Paul, “of whom the whole family in heaven and earth are named.” (Eph. 3 : 15.) That’s it. To God’s church, militant and triumphant, we bear the relation of children to a family. We are a part of it. Not so the Roman Catholic people. To the Papacy they bear the relation of slave to master. What the Pope says they must do, not because they bear a tender, loving, filial relation to him, but because he has all authority, and they have no right to think for themselves. Of the church said to have been founded by Peter, the Pope is the tall spire, his cardinals the little turrets standing about him, his bishops are the arches and domes, while his priests are the stones which hold the structure together. The people pay for its erection, keep it in repairs, and bear its running expenses.

What we have to say against the Papacy, therefore, in these sermons does not refer to the Roman Catholic people, only in so far as they are morally responsible for the support they give such an institution. The crimes of the Papacy are not theirs, except as they choose to claim them by their allegiance. In Italy the intelligent people, not connected with it by blood or interest, hate the Papacy. When in 1870 it was submitted to the popular vote in Rome as to whether or not the Pope should be their ruler, the old man received 46 votes to 40,805 against him, and the lapse of years has not increased his popularity a whit among the Italians. And if the people in these United States could only be allowed to think and speak for themselves, they would declare independence of the Vatican and allow only Americans, native born or adopted, to rule their church in America. If next month it should be submitted to the vote of American Roman Catholics as to whether Leo XIII. on the Tiber, or James Gibbons in Baltimore should rule the church in America, does any one doubt the result? In the name of these millions of Catholic citizens who do not believe in being ruled by a foreign autocrat, I nominate Cardinal Gibbons as the first American Pope.

We now ask you to view with us to-day the Christ of the Bible in contrast with the Christ of the Papacy. Christ, as portrayed in the Scriptures, is the true Christ. “Search the Scriptures, for they are they which testify of me.” We find in this Book the only perfect picture of Jesus. I believe that the Christ of the Papacy is a false Christ, and before allowing yourself to be unduly shocked by

that utterance, I beg you to hear the proof. Many Roman Catholics, I hope, worship the true Christ, but if they do, it is because they have turned from the Christ of Popery to the Christ of the Bible. We pray God that all may.

1. The Christ of the Bible is perfect; the Christ of the Papacy is imperfect. Peter says of his Lord that he did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth. 1 Peter 2: 21. Again in Heb. 7: 36, "And such an high priest became us who was holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners." John says, "In him was no sin," and earth, hell and heaven have echoed the same testimony. Even the devils called him the "Holy One of Israel." His enemies among whom he lived could find no flaw in his character, and the microscopic scrutiny of the ages has not assisted them a particle. To Pilate's question, "What evil hath he done?" the answer has uniformly been "None." No sin, no blemish. "The Lamb without spot." He who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity looked upon him and said, "I am well pleased." In Him is the absence of all that is bad, and the presence of all that is good. "He is altogether lovely."

Let us now turn to the Christ of the Papacy, as represented by the line of Popes. Though the Pope claims that he is the successor of Peter, he does not represent Peter on earth, but Christ. His voice, when he speaks, is not the voice of Peter, but of Christ. So that the official acts and sayings of every Pope, from the first one to Leo XIII., according to the Papacy of to-day, are the acts and saying of Christ. When the dissenting Cardinals and bishops in 1870 came before Pius IX. with their protest against the dogma of infallibility, they were coolly informed by his "holiness" that it was no new doctrine, but that the church had always believed and taught it." The Roman Catholic is, therefore, compelled to believe that the official utterances of every Pope in the whole Papal line is the very voice of Christ, and Christ is of course responsible for it. The dogma of Papal infallibility makes the official history of the Popes a continuation of the life of Christ. The Christ of the Papacy, then, is just what the official lives of the Popes present to the world. We will examine a short chapter in this history, that we may see the kind of Christ Popery calls on us to respect and adore.

Silverius and Vigilius, who were Popes in 536 and 537, both

bought their Popedoms, and were elected by order of the military authorities from whom they had made the purchase. This same Vigilius was summoned by Justinian to Constantinople to help him settle a theological dispute. A council was called for the purpose, and Vigilius took oath to further the emperor's interests, but when he saw that the council was against him, he violated his oath by taking sides against the emperor. Justinian seized him, though he had fled to a church for protection, and kept him a prisoner until he consented to do his will. Here I am called upon to believe that Christ (can I utter the blasphemy?) could vacillate and violate his oath, for, remember, Justinian was dealing with Vigilius as Pope, and not as a mere man. We are told by our Romanist friends, who cannot deny these facts, that the private character of the Pope has nothing to do with his infallibility. He, as a man, can err and sin like other men; it is only when he speaks as Pope that his is the voice of God. But that view does not help the case much, for we find that bad men are bad Popes. A bad man in the papal chair does not hesitate to use his official position to further his bad designs.

- Liberius and Felix II., claimed as Popes by our Roman Catholic friends, gave their signatures to the Arian heresy, Felix willingly, Liberius after a series of persecutions by the emperor Constantius. The Arian heresy denied the divinity of Christ. So that I am called upon, if I would be a good Romanist, to believe that Christ willingly and by compulsion denied his own divinity.

Honorius I., who was made Pope in 625, was anathematized for heresy by the General Council of Constantinople in A.D. 680. At that time the council was considered the more fallible of the two. But that anathema amounts to nothing, now that Popes are infallible, independently of Councils. But in 682 Pope Leo II. denounced Honorius as a heretic, and we behold the strange spectacle of one infallible Pope cursing another infallible Pope, which, being interpreted in the light of the claim that all Popes represent Christ upon earth, means that Christ in 682 denounced himself as he was in 625. He who is "the same yesterday, to-day and forever," has completely changed in fifty-seven years. I shrink from the bare mention of such blasphemy.

When Stephen VII. came to the papal throne in 897, he had the body of Pope Formosus, one of his predecessors taken from its grave.

This lifeless corpse was brought into the presence of the council of Italian bishops, arrayed in the insignia of office it used to wear, and placed on the papal throne. Then Stephen stood before it and uttered these words: "Wherefore, O Bishop of Porto, hast thou carried thy ambition so far as to usurp the see of Rome?" On receiving no reply the dead Formosus was by vote of the council deposed from his office, his robes torn from him, his body horribly mutilated and thrown into the Tiber. Then Stephen issued his edict that Formosus was a usurper, and all his acts and decrees formally annulled. The friends of Formosus could not stand these proceedings; they rose in their indignation, broke into the Pope's palace, hurried him to a dungeon and strangled him without a trial. Baronius, a church historian high in authority among the Romanists, says of Stephen that "he entered like a thief, and died as he deserved, by the rope." In these transactions Stephen acted as Pope. He spoke *ex cathedra*, so that I am called on to believe that the meek and gentle Jesus, who loved and died for his enemies, could be guilty of such meaningless brutality. Nay, worse, that the Christ of 897 could treat himself, the Christ of 891, in this barbarous fashion.

We pass over Benedict IX., who was elected Pope in 1033, at the age of twelve years, and so disgraced himself and prostituted his office, that the citizens of Rome met and elected another Pope as a protest against his crimes. We pass also Alexander VI., the infamous Roderic Borgia of the fifteenth century, who, a writer in "Johnson's Cyclopaedia" says "was a compound of cruelty, treachery, licentiousness and other vices." Their characters, personal and official, are almost too bad for the public gaze. The predecessor of Alexander, Innocent VIII., deserves a passing notice, for in his bull of excommunication against the Waldenses, whose crime was that they believed and preached justification by faith, he "exhorts all bishops together with the princes of France to tread them under foot as venomous adders." No one will claim that he decreed this as man and not as Pope, for when a papal bull bellows, it is accepted by all good Romanists as the very voice of God. Am I to believe that the Christ of Calvary turned those hounds of hell upon his own faithful people? Such, blessed be God, is not the Christ revealed in the Scriptures. The Christ of the Bible is pure, meek, gentle, forgiving, loving and

unselfish. This false Christ is often impure, never meek, frequently cruel, very unforgiving toward his enemies, and always selfish. It is clear as day that this Christ of the Papacy is an anti-Christ. May God turn the faith of all the world from him to the true Christ of the Bible and of history.

II. The Christ of the Bible is a living Christ; the Christ of the Papacy is dead. The death of Christ is one thing; the dead Christ is quite another. By the death of Christ we are reconciled to God; by the dead Christ we get neither hope nor help. "If, while we were enemies," says Paul, "we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." (Rom. 5: 10.) "Because I live," said Jesus, "ye shall live also." "Wherefore he is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them."

The dying Christ, symbolized in the Lord's supper, is an object of faith; the living Christ is an object of worship. Nowhere are we taught by precept or example to adore or worship the dead Christ. That effigy made of wax, hanging on a cross, with clot- ted blood on its forehead, hands, feet and side, is not the Christ who is present with his people to-day and demands their adora- tion. That's the Christ, three days dead in the sepulchre, guarded by Roman soldiers. And the Roman Church is the sepulchre in which a dead Christ is buried, and guarded by Pope, cardinals, bishops and priests. Now and then the living Christ appears among them, as in the days of Savonarola in Italy, Huss in Bo- hemia and Luther in Germany, but his appearance is as frightful to them as was the rising Christ to the Roman soldiers. Fearing and quaking they fled to the secular Pilates and Herods of their day, to get their assistance in putting him to death. Few things so frighten the dignitaries of Rome as the appearance of this liv- ing Christ. An immoral priest may confess to his brother priest and be absolved any number of times without losing his position, but let him preach a living Christ, mighty to save, without sacra- ment or saint, and he is hurled from his priestly office amid the thunders and lightnings of papal anathema.

For Mary and the Apostles to have worshipped the dead body of Christ on or off the cross would have been gross idolatry. That was not Christ. He had gone with the converted thief to

Paradise. It was but dead matter, his outer human clothing, laid aside for a time. Granted, then, that the devout Romanist does not worship the wax effigy but what it represents, the dead Christ, he is none the less an idolator. Even if, by a stretch of his imagination, he worships the dying rather than the dead Christ, he is worshipping what does not now exist. The dying Christ was; the living Christ is. He dies no more. To worship now the dying Christ is to worship an historical fact over eighteen hundred years old. We accept the death of Christ as our full atonement for sin. It is a finished fact, never to be added to nor taken from. We love the living Christ because he died for us, and his death we will not forget in earth or heaven. But the Christ of the cold clammy hand and heart is not the Christ we worship and to whom we come for sympathy and strength. The disciples tenderly buried that body, the women brought their spices to it, but not one of them worshipped it. Before the living feet of Christ Mary fell, but never before the lifeless body. No wonder, therefore, the Roman Catholic Church is spiritually dead. It worships death, and worshippers are always assimilated to the nature of the object they worship. If it had been possible for the disciples to have stolen the body of Christ, as the soldiers falsely reported, and the living Christ could have done without it, it would have served no good purpose. All the worship bestowed upon it had been mere idol worship. And yet the Roman Church has as near as possible done that very thing. The dead or dying Christ is everywhere worshipped, while between the living Christ and the people, even on Easter morning, there are so many saints and priests that he can hardly be seen by the eye of faith. If they will have an effigy of Christ, why do they not represent him as he is, the living one, mediator between God and man? Can it be for the reason that then priests and Mary and all saints, whose business it is to take his place would be thrown out of employment?

The whole system of the Papacy accords with the idea that Christ is dead and cannot take care of his own. He must have a vicegerent on earth to take his place, implying, of course, that he is absent. Mary, Joseph, Patrick and a host of others must look after his interests. The priest must speak the word of pardon. The Christ of the Bible is the shepherd that goes with his flock, feeding and leading. No one shall pluck them out of his hand.

The work of the Church is not that of a May day celebration, on which we meet to strew flowers on the grave of our departed leader, honored but dead. The business of the church is to follow their living leader, knowing that he who said, "Lo I am with you always," goes before us to the hottest of the fray.

"Gird thy sword on, mighty Saviour,
 Make the word of truth thy car;
 Prosper in thy course triumphant
 All success attend thy war;
 Gracious Victor,
 Bring thy trophies from afar."

"Majesty combined with meekness,
 Righteousness with peace unite
 To insure thy blessed conquests,
 Take possession of the right:
 Ride triumphant
 Decked in robes of purest white."

"Blest are they that touch thy sceptre
 Blest are all that own thy reign;
 Freed from sin the worst of tyrants,
 Rescued from its galling chain.
 Saints and angels,
 All who know thee bless thy reign."

III. The Christ of the Bible is an all-sufficient Saviour and Mediator; the Christ of the Papacy must be supplemented by the merits and mediation of Mary and Saints. The angel said to Mary, "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins." He does not help save them; he does it completely. "Behold the Lamb of God," echoed John the Baptist, "which taketh away the sin of the world." You who honor Peter so highly, listen to these words of his: "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved" (Acts 4: 12). Shall we add the name of Mary or saints, and thus say to Peter and the Holy Spirit that they are mistaken about the name of Christ being the only name? Shall we indeed add our own name and strive by sacraments and penance to add to the merit of

this only name? That is just what our Roman Catholic friends are taught to do. May God save them from so fatal an error. Now listen to Peter again: "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance unto Israel and forgiveness of sins" (Acts 5: 31). And Paul echoes the same blessed truth: "The gift of God is eternal life through our Lord Jesus Christ." "If salvation is God's gift through Christ, no penance or merit of saint is needed to pay him for it.

"Our Saviour Jesus Christ who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity" (Titus 2: 13). Hear that, you who are trying to save yourselves from some of your sins by penance and the merit of Mary. Christ hath redeemed us "from all iniquity." "He who knew no sin was made sin for us that we might be made the righteousness of God in him" (2 Cor. 5: 21). Can you improve upon the righteousness of God? No more can you improve upon the righteousness of Christ, imputed unto us through faith.

To add to the merit of Christ is to subtract. Worse indeed, it is to nullify his merit altogether. "Our righteousness is filthy rags." We cannot wear his spotless robe with these filthy rags. Some harmless, even helpful liquids, when mixed, become deadly poisons. Poison not the merit of Christ with your self-righteousness. Keep your good works in their proper relation as the fruits of faith and they are scriptural and wholesome. Add them to the merit of Christ and what would be the elixir of life becomes the hemlock of death. The Lord of the feast furnishes the wedding garment. To press your way in without it, thinking that your own clothes are good enough, or need only a slight addition, is to be cast into outer darkness. Better never be baptized than to do so believing that the act saves or helps to save your soul. Better never fast or pray than to think that by either or by both you can atone for your sins. Better forget that Jesus ever had a mother or that there is a saint in heaven than to trust their merit to supplement the merit of Christ.

But do we fairly represent our Roman Catholic friends, when we intimate that they depend upon the merits of Mary and saints to supplement the merit of Christ? Why, the Pope claims that he holds the keys to a treasury of merit, called works of supererogation, which he can unlock at will and transfer to the account of

any one who will pay enough for it. That is, a man may by his good deeds on earth do enough to save himself and have enough over to help out other men.

To say that we need Mary to sympathize with us and hear our prayers because she has a woman's heart, greatly dishonors him who has in himself all that's womanly and all that's manly. To say that Jesus will listen to his mother more readily than he will to a poor penitent sinner contradicts Scripture and does indeed the greatest violence to the character of the Christ given us in the inspired word. "For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with a feeling of our infirmities, but was in all points tempted as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly,"—stand aside Mary, saints and angels—"let us come boldly unto a throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy and find grace to help in time of need" (Heb. 4: 15-16).

"He ever lives above
 For me to intercede,
 His all-redeeming love
 His precious blood to plead;
 His blood atones for all our race
 And sprinkles now the throne of grace."

"My God is reconciled,
 His pardoning voice I hear;
 He owns me for his child,
 I can do longer fear.
 With confidence I now draw nigh
 And Father, Abba, Father cry."

From a false Christ and half Christ I turn to him who in the Bible and in all history is pure and gentle and self-sacrificing; to him who died, but now lives and loves, and lightens our burdens; to him who, as Saviour and Mediator, is all-sufficient for earth and heaven. To him be glory now and forever. Amen.

XI.

MARY AND "MARY."

"Mary, the mother of Jesus."—Acts 1: 14.

All we know about Mary is found in the Bible. "The so-called manuals about the Blessed Virgin Mary," says John A. Broadus, "are all pure fiction, and without the advantage of being well invented." The real historical Mary we find portrayed in the New Testament. If the Mary of Roman Catholic theology and tradition does not give us the same kind of Mary, it is because somebody has drawn upon the imagination, and made a fictitious character. Let us now in all fairness examine the Mary of the Bible and compare her with the Mary held in such high honor among our Roman Catholic friends.

I. THE MARY OF THE BIBLE WAS A WOMAN AND ONLY A WOMAN; THE MARY OF THE PAPACY, TO DO WHAT IS CLAIMED FOR HER, MUST BE A GODDESS WITH DIVINE ATTRIBUTES. The real Mary was and is neither omnipresent, omniscient, nor omnipotent. Millions of Roman Catholics, scattered all over the earth, pray to her at the same time. How can she hear them, unless she can be everywhere at once? But we know that Mary while on earth was not omnipresent. She could not be with Joseph on their way from Jerusalem, and at the same time with her twelve-year-old boy who tarried behind. (Luke 2:45.) She must wend her weary way back to look for him. And if Mary could not be with Joseph and Jesus at the same time, how can she be with the millions who call upon her at the same moment? If she is omnipresent, she must be divine, for omnipresence is an attribute only of deity. But our Roman Catholic

friends deny that they claim she is divine. Then she is not omnipresent, and praying to her is time lost. To say that God carries the prayers of his people and presents them to Mary is to make him her petitioner, and put him in a subordinate position. The fact is, friend, you might as well kneel down in the streets of Baltimore and pray to Queen Victoria in Windsor Palace as to pray to Mary, Joseph, Paul, Peter, or any Saint in the Calendar. Going to heaven did not make them omnipresent. If you feel that you want a saint to pray for you, go to some saint yet alive whom you can approach, and who can hear you, and ask him to pray for you. Better still, go to the one omnipresent Mediator and ask his intercession. You need no other, if you will accept that.

Neither is Mary omniscient. While Jesus tarried in Jerusalem, Joseph and his mother, we are told, "knew not of it" (Luke 2:43). "They supposing him to be in the company went a day's journey (v. 44)." A mistake made on account of ignorance. Now, if she could lose her son in a crowd, may she not also lose me, one among so many, and so far away? And she cannot know all the needs of earth's millions unless she is omniscient.

And to do what is claimed for her, she must be omnipotent. The Mary of the Bible was neither omnipresent, omniscient nor omnipotent. The Apostles did not think of praying to her. In that upper room before Pentecost she continued with them "in prayer and supplication" (Acts 1:14). She was simply a suppliant with the rest, each one of them having as easy access to Christ's presence as she had. Now if that upper room had been a Roman Catholic church, Mary would have been put on a pedestal, while the disciples knelt at her feet and implored her to intercede for them. The real Mary would not have consented to such a distinction.

The process by which the true human Mary has been transformed unto the unreal, imaginary Mary of the Papacy was natural enough. John A. Broadus traces this process step by step, and I quote his words: "The interest connected with

those who associated with Jesus would naturally have caused the early Christians to feel a peculiar interest in her, as they ought to have done. And then the feeling which rapidly grew up of a desire for human meditation between us and God—between us and the Saviour himself—and which led in the course of the centuries to praying to the saints for their mediation, would naturally cause the mother of Jesus to be regarded as the most influential of all of those interceding saints. Moreover, the Roman Church, with that talent for governing which has characterized the Roman people through all their history, rapidly adapted itself to the tastes of mankind, to the tendencies of human nature in general, and to the special usages of the old Pagan Romans, introducing, for example, a number of festivals, so that there would be something corresponding to the ancient festivals, to please the people. And as all Pagan nations had their female deities, there naturally arose a feeling which made the mother of Jesus a female divinity. Then, when art came into use in the churches, when they introduced image worship, there was nothing more natural than that the mother and the babe in her arms should be the chosen subject of artistic representation in places of worship; that the great artists of Italy should not only find this most popular and remunerative for their pencil, but most pleasing to themselves. So galleries were filled with charming delineations of the Virgin and the Child. I suppose also that the spirit of chivalry in the Middle Ages may have had something to do with this. There was then a high, romantic sentiment towards woman as such, and this may have caused Mary to be regarded as the representative woman, so that romance added itself to devotion. For these and other causes, it has come to pass that not only in the Roman church, but in the Greek and Armenian and Coptic churches, and all through the East they talk a great deal more about Mary than about her Son." (Sermons and Addresses, p. 125.)

The Latin hymns of the Middle Ages have three times as much about Mary as about Jesus and all the Apostles put together.

II. THE MARY OF THE BIBLE WAS A WOMAN SAVED BY GRACE; THE MARY OF THE PAPACY IS DECLARED TO HAVE NEVER NEEDED GRACE, BECAUSE SHE WAS CONCEIVED, BORN, AND LIVED WITHOUT ORIGINAL OR ACTUAL SIN. The claim at first was that she was sinless from the birth of Christ; then from her own birth, and finally that she had in her soul and body no taint of sin. The miracle is applied to Mary. She was miraculously preserved from sin, so that the birth of the sinless Jesus was a mere natural result. This dogma of the "Immaculate Conception" was officially proclaimed by Pius IX, in 1854. The Council of Trent refused to pass upon it because of the great division of sentiment on the subject. The fierce war of words waged for years between the Dominicans and Franciscans, the former against, and the latter in favor of, the dogma, shows the sad lack of unity which existed at that time in the ranks of those who put forward their perfect and continual unity as a proof of their being the only church.

Now the Bible nowhere claims absolute sinlessness for Mary, but clearly intimates the contrary. The angel said to her; "Fear not, Mary, for thou hast found favor with God." (Luke 1:30.) The Greek word for "favor" is usually translated "grace," and grace, as it is most frequently used in the New Testament, implies sin. "Where sin abounded," says Paul, "grace did much more abound." (Rom. 5:20.) "Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord," (Gen. 6:8) and no one ever thought of placing him for that reason among the sinless ones. Admit, if you please, that the Douay Bible is right in translating the phrase "highly favored" as "full of grace," it does not prove at all that Mary was sinless. The same Greek verb is used in Eph. 1:6 in reference to Christians: "To the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted (filled us with grace) in the beloved." So that any one who believes in Christ and appropriates all his merit may be full of grace, though his former life, like Paul's, had been full of sin. The angel said again to Mary: "Thou shalt call his name Jesus." (Luke. 1:31.) And in her Magnificat Mary shows plainly that she knows what the word Jesus means, when she says, "My

Spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour." (Luke 1:47.) This personal appropriation of God as her Saviour shows that she felt the need of such a Saviour, and trusted him for salvation. Saviour implies sin, as is seen in the angel's word to Joseph: "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins." (Matt. 1:21.) Mary exults in the mercy of God: "His mercy is on them that fear Him from generation to generation," (Luke 1:50) and from the context it is evident that she intends to include herself among the recipients of this mercy. Mercy implies sin; when there is no sin there can be no mercy. Mary was a good Christian woman, but not sinless. "All have sinned," says the Bible, and it makes only one exception to this sweeping charge, the spotless Son of God. The miracle of his birth was in keeping him, not his mother, from taint of sin. He was "made of a woman." Why did not Paul say of a sinless woman? For the reason that the sinlessness of Mary was never dreamed of until men began to exalt her above her true position.

When the angel said to Mary: "Blessed art thou among women," he said no more than had been said of many another. It is written of her who killed Sisera: "Blessed above women shall Jael the wife of Heber the Kenite be" (Judges 5:24.) Mary is declared to be blessed **AMONG** women, while Jael is made pre-eminent **ABOVE** women. There is, therefore, more reason for declaring the immaculate conception of Jael than of Mary. The same word is applied to others forty-one times in the New Testament, and often in the Old. "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered." (Ps. 32:1.) "Blessed is he that considereth the poor." (Ps. 41:1.) "Blessed are the poor in spirit." (Matt. 5:3.) "Blessed are the pure in heart." (Matt. 5:8.) and so on to the end. The word "blessed" simply means "happy." Mary was happy in being chosen as the mother of her Saviour, and she naturally exulted in the thought that all generations would call her happy. Her cousin Elizabeth gives the true secret of Mary's happiness in the words "Blessed is she that believeth, for there shall be a performance of those things which were told her from the Lord." (Luke 1:45.) A happiness,

indeed, which all true believers may share. The sweet acquiescence of Mary in the will of God, expressed by the words, "Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy will," added to her happiness, and such joyful acquiescence in God's will makes any one happy.

There is not a vestige of proof in the Bible of the sinlessness of Mary, while these several things make against it. So Mary's own testimony, like Peter's, is against the claims of the Papacy.

III. THE MARY OF THE BIBLE WAS A REAL MOTHER; THE MARY OF THE PAPACY IS CLAIMED TO HAVE BEEN "EVER A VIRGIN." After the birth of Jesus Mary is never called a virgin. The term "virgin mother" is unscriptural and absurd, and if strong proof is to be accepted, it is used in some quarters to excuse, even to justify and hallow the most heinous sins. The decencies of public speech cause me to refrain. * * * * * When Jesus was born, Mary became a real mother, having known only God the Spirit, and motherhood was sanctified as it had never been before. The conception of Jesus was miraculous, but his development and birth were natural. He was a real man, "made of a woman." After his birth he grew in stature and wisdom. To claim that Mary was not a real mother is to rob Jesus of his humanity and motherhood of its glory.

But by the term "ever a virgin" Roman Catholics really mean that Mary had no other children than Jesus; that Joseph was only her nominal husband; and a silly legend of comparatively late invention goes so far as to say that Mary lived in a convent near Jerusalem, and Joseph was an old man, not really her husband at all, but a sort of guardian. All of which the whole trend of the New Testament squarely contradicts.

The perpetual virginity of Mary grew out of the sickly sentiment that the married relation is not so pure as the single. Peter strikes this error a blow, and his ardent admirers ought to heed it, when he selected as the model woman "Sarah who obeyed Abraham, whose daughters ye are, if ye do well." (1 Pet. 3:6.)

The brothers of Jesus are mentioned nine times and his sisters twice. The people of Nazareth, where Jesus was raised, bear testimony to their existence and give us four of their names: "Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary? (Joseph had doubtless died in the meantime.) And his brethren James, and Joses, and Simeon and Judas? And his sisters, are they not all with us?" (Matt. 13:55.) Nobody claims that they are referring to spiritual relationship. To say that the word brother means a mere relative is far-fetched. When the same word is used in describing the relation between Lazarus and Mary and Martha, no one questions its meaning. There is not a particle of proof that they were the children of Joseph by a former wife, or the children of Mary's sister, and, therefore, his cousins. If they were the children of Joseph's first wife, and older than Jesus, that gives them the precedence over Jesus, so that he is no longer, as claimed all through the Scriptures, the heir to David's throne. Paul speaks of "James the Lord's brother" (Gal. 1:19), and intimates to us in another place that some of his brethren were married (1 Cor. 9:5.) We are told in Matt. 1:25 that Joseph "knew her not till she had brought forth her first-born son," which implies that Mary had other children afterwards. The most natural, common-sense interpretation of the saying of the neighbors in Nazareth, Mary's constant company with these brothers, and of this word "first-born," is to accept the fact that Jesus was the eldest of a family of children. So that the dogma of the perpetual virginity, which occurs so often in prayers, is a clever fiction, the child of mistaken views as to the sanctity of motherhood, and the idolatrous adoration of Mary.

IV. THE MARY OF THE BIBLE, AFTER CHRIST ENTERED UPON HIS PUBLIC WORK, NEVER HAD ANY INFLUENCE WITH HER SON ON THE GROUND OF HER BEING HIS MOTHER; THE MARY OF THE PAPACY IS CLAIMED TO HAVE INFLUENCE WITH JESUS TO-DAY ALMOST SOLELY UPON THAT GROUND. While he was a child, he was subject to his parents, and thus teaches us the lesson of filial obedience; but as soon as he began his public ministry, and all through it to the last scene

on the cross, Jesus gave Mary to understand that she could no longer influence him as mother, but must take her place, like any other man or woman, in the spiritual kingdom.

At the marriage feast in Cana, when Mary suggested to Jesus that the wine was out, he replied: "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" (John 2:4.) A better translation of which is: "What have we to do with each other?" and though he made wine, as Mary seems to have suggested, he did not do it until he had informed her that it was no longer in obedience to her commands that he acted. Roman Catholics quote Origen and Chrysostom as giving high honor to Mary, and yet both of them are honest enough to admit that at this marriage feast Jesus gave her a gentle rebuke for her unseasonable haste and immoderate ambition. The word "woman" implies no disrespect, but on the other hand it implies no special deference to her as his mother.

On another occasion Mary, influenced doubtless by the brothers of Jesus, who did not believe in him at first, came with them for the purpose of laying hold on him and compelling him to desist from his unremitting toil. But Jesus is in the house, and the way to him is crowded. The best they can do is to send word over the heads of the people. Some one standing near reports to him the message: "Behold, thy mother and thy brethren without seek for thee." Let every adorer of Mary hear his answer: "Who is my mother or my brethren?" Looking around on those who sat about him he said, "Behold my mother and my brethren. For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother and my sister and mother." (Mark 3:31-35.) In these words Jesus disclaims all natural relationship, and teaches that all, even his own family with his mother, must now bear a spiritual relation to him, if they would approach or influence him by their petitions. Doing the will of God puts any one in a closer relation to Jesus than Mary bore by virtue of her being his mother in the flesh.

On still another occasion a certain woman of the company lifted up her voice and said unto him, "Blessed is the womb that

bare thee and the paps which thou hast sucked." (Luke 11:27.) These words were about equal to the "Hail Marys" of the later days, and then, if ever, was the time for Jesus to approve of the high honor given his mother, and encourage others to give it. Hear his reply to this ascription of praise to Mary, and speak it to every adorer she has in the world: "Yea, **RATHER**, blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it." (Luke 11:27-28.) When a pious Roman Catholic kneels and says "Blessed Mother of God," these words are for him "Yea, **RATHER**, blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it." Mary was happy because she heard the word of God and kept it; and by the same means you may be made happy. Ascriptions of praise to Mary, because she was the natural mother of our Saviour, Jesus himself in these words pronounces out of place.

While Jesus was on the cross, he said to Mary, doubtless looking to John, "Woman, behold thy son." Now, again, if ever, he ought to claim his natural relationship and address her as mother, but he does not. Indeed, nowhere in the Bible does Jesus address Mary as mother. "Woman, behold thy son." Then turning to John he says, "Behold thy mother." (John 19:26-27.) Now that he is dying and will soon depart from earth, he makes provision for Mary by committing her to John with the request that he treat her as if she were his own mother. He did not say to John "Behold **MY** mother," and thus call him to honor her as the mother of his Lord. "Behold **THY** mother." From that hour John "took her unto his own home." If Mary were all that our Roman Catholic friends claim for her, she did not need the care or sympathy of John, and Jesus ought to have committed John to her rather than her to John. All of which continues to prove that the real Mary at the cross and the imaginary Mary of to-day are very different beings.

V. THE POSITION OF THE MARY OF THE BIBLE GREATLY HONORS CHRIST; THE POSITION OF THE MARY OF THE PAPACY DOES HIM GREAT DISHONOR BY CLAIMING FOR HER WHAT BELONGS ALONE TO HIM.

"My soul doth magnify the Lord," she exclaimed, and all through her inspired magnificat she calls attention from herself to Him.

In Roman Catholic theology and worship, Mary is made to a large extent to usurp the place of Christ. Liguori, a theologian high in authority among Roman Catholics, says that "all the tongues of men would not be sufficient to praise her as she deserves." St. Bonaventure says that "those who are devoted to publishing 'The Glories of Mary' are sure of Paradise." This same saint, Bonaventure, in translating the Psalms, displaces the name of God with that of Mary, so that a verse in Ps. 110, reads: "The Lord said unto our Lady, sit thou on my right hand." Another verse in Ps. 26, reads: "Unto thee, O blessed Virgin, do I lift up my soul." And still another in Ps. 31, "In thee, O Lady, do I put my trust."

Here are some more quotations from Liguori. "In Mary we shall find every hope. In a word, we shall find in Mary life and eternal salvation." (pp. 173-174.)

"St. Richard of St. Lawrence says our salvation is in the hands of Mary. Cassian absolutely affirms that the salvation of the whole world depends upon the favor and protection of Mary." (pp. 109.)

Speaking to Mary, Liguori says "Do not say that thou canst not aid me, for I know that thou art omnipotent and dost obtain whatsoever thou desirest from God." (p. 78.) Says St. Peter Damian, "The Virgin has all power in heaven and on earth." (p. 201.) "Yes, Mary is omnipotent," adds Richard of St. Lawrence, "since the queen by every law must enjoy the same privileges as the king. And St. Antoninus says: God has placed the whole church, not only under the patronage, but also under the dominion of Mary." (p. 203.)

And worse still, can I repeat the blasphemy? Liguori declares that God the Father is under obligation to Mary and cheerfully obeys her commands. "St. Bernardine of Sienna says he does not hesitate to say that all obey the commands of Mary, even God himself." (p. 202.) "Rejoice, O mother and

handmaid of God! rejoice; rejoice; we are all debtors to God, but God is debtor to thee." (p. 327.) (Van Dyke's Popery, pages 183-184.)

But may we not class Liguori with the radicals, and blame his age and education with his errors and follies? Do our Catholic fellow citizens of to-day ascribe to Mary what belongs to God? They, of course, pray to her in asking her to pray for them, and we are sorry that, being merely finite and human, she cannot hear their prayers. But do they put her on an equality with Christ and depend upon her at all for salvation?

I hold in my hand a little book, entitled "Miniature Key to Heaven," published in Baltimore, 1885, approved and recommended by James Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore.

On page 211 is this prayer: "Sweetest heart of Mary be my salvation." "Jesus, Mary, Joseph, I give you my heart, my soul and my life." In the first prayer Mary takes the entire place of Jesus; in the second she shares the honor of saving us with Him and Joseph. On page 48 are the words, "Blessed be God and His holy mother," when the intention plainly is to put the "holy mother" on an equality with God and bless both alike. Page 226 gives us this remarkable prayer: "Hail, holy queen, mother of mercy, our life, our sweetness and our hope. * * * Turn, thou most glorious advocate, thy eyes of mercy towards us, and after our exile is ended, show unto us the blessed fruit of thy womb, Jesus." It is not desired that she show us Jesus now as the object of faith. It seems she is sufficient for all emergencies in this life, but after life is over, show us Jesus. In this little book is the couplet:

"Mother of Jesus, Heaven's open gate,
Star of the sea, support the falling state."

These words are but the echo of Liguori's claim that Mary is equal, if not superior to God himself in the practical working of affairs in this world. And we should not be accused of blindness because we see in it idolatry, pure and simple. However the theologians may, by splitting hairs, explain it away, it re-

mains true that to the mass of the people who pray to Mary she is a goddess with divine attributes and is reverently worshiped.

When Cornelius fell at the feet of Peter, he took hold of him and lifted him up, saying, "I myself am a man." Could the real Mary's voice be heard, she would say, "I myself am but a woman." And the angel before whose glorious presence John on Patmos fell, as he points from all creatures up to the throne, continues to say "Worship God." And louder than the voice of Peter or Angel, I hear the voice of God himself, as he thunders from Sinai, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." And the same voice, mellowed by its human tones, comes sounding down the centuries: "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve."

Luther tells us that when he was a boy, he had the most horrible thought of Christ. He looked upon Him as a furious avenging Deity, with the sword of justice uplifted every moment, and Mary coming in, with her sweet gentleness, persuasion and prayer, to keep Him from plunging the sword into his little heart, and the heart of everybody else on earth. Friends, I dislike controversy, but it seems to me that when so much dishonor is done to the Christ we worship and serve, no effort or sacrifice should be spared to vindicate his honor.

But as we look at the real Christ, weeping with those that wept; moved with compassion for the multitude; who had a word of gentleness and pity for the poor woman in the Pharisee's house, when he would have repulsed her; He to whom the very children were drawn and won, in spite of the harshness of the disciples who would have driven them away: it is horrible to think that men should seek to put Mary in the place of such a Christ. I ask every man, woman and child to turn to the true Christ, who will give you human sympathy and divine help; to the Christ who in life and death and judgment to come is all you need.

XII.

THE MIRACLES OF THE BIBLE

AND THE "MIRACLES" OF THE PAPACY.

"Whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved."
—2 Thess. 2: 9-10.

It is plain, as will appear farther on (page 123), that this entire passage describes the Papacy, which is the great apostasy with its "man of sin sitting in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God," its "mystery of iniquity" and "son of perdition, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth and destroy with the brightness of his coming." The text to-day is another dark shade in the picture. Satan is declared to be intimately associated with this great apostasy. The power of Satan is not to be despised. He has been permitted, as in the case of Job, to control the elements and afflict the body. He tempts Christians, leads captive the wicked, hinders the gospel; but his greatest work is in the realm of deception. He "deceiveth the whole world" (Rev. 12: 9). Though he goes about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour, he seems to prefer to clothe himself as an angel of light. He can do most harm by imitating the good. "There shall be false Christs," said Jesus, "and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they might deceive even the very elect" (Matt. 24: 24). God performed through Moses real miracles, but the magicians, up to a certain point, "did so with their enchantments." The great false Christ of the ages, claiming indeed that he is

Christ on earth, is beyond doubt the Pope of Rome, and the false prophets who come so near deceiving the very elect are those who stand about him and defend his assumptions. There is no lack of charity in this assertion. True charity "rejoiceth in the truth." There is no charity in refusing to speak the truth of God's word, because its lightning may strike some tall Roman trees in our midst. Our Roman Catholic people are not the deceivers, but the deceived. Some strange illusion has led them to commit their conscience to those whose interest it is to keep them from investigating for themselves. A young priest told a friend of mine last week that every priest in this city was praying that this pulpit might be silenced by the pastor's removal to some other place. Why don't they pray that their people may search the Scriptures, to see whether these things are so? Simply because they know that a conscientious reading of this Book of God is death to all their claims. The work of Satan, the text tells us, is carried on with "all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because"—hear it, ye who have so much to say against the Bible—"they received not the truth, that they might be saved." Men are saved by receiving the truth as it is in Jesus. And now here is the explanation of the fact that men, who seem to be so intelligent about other things, can be so terribly deceived in the most important thing that concerns them in this life. "For this cause (that is because they will not receive the love of the truth) God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie, that they all might be damned, who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness" (2 Thess. 2: 11). Terrible words, because they describe a terrible condition. They are God's sentence of doom upon all who are willingly deceived, who love not the word of God, refusing to read it for themselves. My appeal is from the Papacy to the Roman Catholic people. All I ask is that you read the Bible without confessing it as a sin to the priest, asking the Holy Spirit who moved men to write it, and who has promised to guide us into all truth, to open to you its precious treasures.

I believe in miracles. Every miracle recorded in the Bible I accept as genuine. The supernatural is not the unreasonable. Given an Almighty God, and it is reasonable to believe he can do what he pleases, whether according to natural law or above it.

The rationalism which rejects the miracles of the Bible, with all the proofs in favor of them, is irrationalism, pure and simple. And we do not deny that God, if he chooses, can work miracles to-day. He has not made this world, wound it up like a clock, and left it to run down without any further notice from him. In every true conversion there is an element of the supernatural. The man who will not accept a miracle, simply because he cannot understand how it is done, is unreasonable, because he must accept hundreds of facts in nature, the how of which he cannot comprehend. The miraculous does not contradict the natural; it simply rises above it. The same God works in the natural, supernatural and spiritual world.

Now good coin always invites counterfeiting. But for the real there would be no imitation, and the imitation, if undetected, is valuable in proportion to the value of the real. It is to be expected, therefore, that any false system should use the same means to establish itself by which the true system succeeded; so that we are not surprised to find miracles innumerable used as arguments to support the claims of saints, sacred shrines, and sacred errors of the Papacy. But we have only to compare these counterfeit coins with the genuine, in order to detect their spuriousness.

We will consider to-day four points of contrast :

I. ALL THE MIRACLES OF THE BIBLE WERE PERFORMED SOLELY FOR THE GLORY OF GOD AND THE GOOD OF THE PEOPLE; the miracles of the Papacy have been performed for money, or with the view of making money. "This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth his glory" (John 2 : 11). Such was the uniform motive of the apostles. There is no record that they ever received a cent for performing a miracle, or in consequence of one's having been performed. After Peter had healed the impotent man, he said to the gazing crowd: "Why look ye upon us, as if by our own power or holiness we had made this man to walk? The God of Abraham hath glorified his Son Jesus" (Acts 3 : 12). And, though working miracles constantly, this same Peter had to say, "Silver and gold have I none." One Simon Magus offered money for this gift, that he might make more money out of it. "Thy money perish with thee," was the indignant reply. The gift was not for sale, neither did they charge for its exercise.

On the other hand, this miracle-working power in the Papacy

has been one of its sources of great revenue. Around its sacred wells or sacred shrines, made sacred by the exercise of some miracle of the past or present, the clinking of the money changers may be heard. For so many dollars the priest will have a special service, in which he will perform the miracle of changing the wafer into the "body, blood, soul and divinity of Christ," for the repose of some soul. Churches have their miracle-working saints and relics, by which their running expenses, with a surplus for the Pope, are handsomely paid. In the church of Ara Cœli of Rome is a doll, made of olive wood, and decked with costly jewels, called the Bambino. This doll, which represents the infant Jesus, has power to heal all kinds of disease, and the revenue which comes through this power supports a large number of priests. Its history is, of course, filled with the miraculous. After a Franciscan monk had carved it from an olive tree in Jerusalem, he had no paint with which to adorn it. He sought paint by prayer and fasting. One day, while he slept, St. Luke painted it for him, so that, when he awoke, there it was, looking just like flesh. On its way to Rome the doll was lost in a wreck at sea, but it suddenly and miraculously appeared in a few days at Leghorn. On one occasion a devout lady took this wonderful doll to her house, but it did not seem to like its new surroundings, for it miraculously returned to its chapel, ringing the church bells and startling the priests as it went. The people gathered in the chapel, to find the Bambino seated miraculously on the altar. When doctors fail, this doll is sent for, and the priests charge an enormous price for its services.

In the church of Santa Chiara in Naples are kept two vials of the coagulated blood of St. Januarius. On special occasions this blood liquefies and boils. Now St. Januarius, after many miracles, was martyred in the beginning of the fourth century, and his bones were not discovered and exhumed till three hundred years afterwards. The presence of his head in the church at Naples is the power that liquefies his blood. The blood was, of course, miraculously obtained and preserved, as is the case with most of their sacred relics. A missionary in Rome gave me the process by which this liquefaction takes place. The church is crowded almost to suffocation; the space around the altar is well heated by gas lights; the priest goes through his movements before the skull

of the saint, with his warm hands clasped on the vials, held all the time close enough to his mouth to get the benefit of his warm breath, till the substance in the sacred vials begins to melt and effervesce. Then the people crowd around him, to receive its holy touch. While Napoleon's troops occupied Naples, the priests gave out that St. Januarius was angry at the presence of the intruders, and would not allow his blood to liquefy. Whereupon the French general wheeled some cannon in front of the church, and informed the priests that, unless the blood liquefied in a short time, he would blow their building to pieces. The saint at once came to terms, and the blood liquefied in a few minutes!

Cases like these might be multiplied, but time and inclination fail me. Relics, images, saints, wells, shrines and priests, that work miracles, bring large revenues into the coffers of the church. So that the descendants of Peter need no longer say "Silver and gold have I none," though they have really lost the power to say, "Arise and walk." It is a little surprising to a heretic to learn that many miracles have been wrought in favor of a certain doctrine, and as many in opposition to it. The Franciscans worked numerous miracles in support of the "Immaculate Conception," while the Dominicans worked as many or more in opposition to it. After we have read the text, however, we need not be surprised to learn that the powers of Rome, in order to retain the good will of these contending parties, confirmed both sets of miracles as equally genuine. Until Rome shall cease to use her miracles as a means to enrich herself, they can claim no kinship with the miracles of the Bible.

II. THE MIRACLES OF THE BIBLE WERE NECESSARY AND USEFUL; the miracles of the Papacy, many of them, were unnecessary and silly. Jesus and his Apostles did not perform miracles, just to make a crowd gape. When natural means could accomplish a thing, they did not resort to the miraculous; there was no waste of power. But thousands of the so-called miracles of the Papacy served simply to excite wonder and did no good, except in helping "mother church" to pay her bills. We must try to be serious while we look at some of the relics of Rome, most of them miraculously found, miraculously preserved, and performing miracles themselves. Helena, the mother of Constantine, in the fourth century was miraculously directed to the place where the crosses of Christ

and the two thieves were buried. The cross of Christ was known, because, when it touched a sick person, he was healed, while the other two crosses had no such power. It is a modest estimate to say that there are enough pieces of this true cross in the world to-day, if they were put together, to build two vessels as large as the Great Eastern. The Board with the Greek, Latin and Hebrew inscription on it, was also found, and you can see it for a few cents in the church of Santa Croce, Rome. In this church they will also show you one of the nails used in the crucifixion, two thorns from the crown of thorns, the finger of St. Thomas, with which he touched the holy rib of the risen Lord, a piece of the money Judas received for betraying his Master, a piece of the coat of Christ, a piece of the vail and hair of the Virgin Mary, pieces of the arms of Peter and Paul, a vial full of the blood of Christ, a vial full of the milk of Mary, some of the manna which fell in the wilderness, a piece of Aaron's rod that budded, a part of the head of John the Baptist, and a tooth of Peter.

In the church of St. Praxede is the whole seamless robe of Christ, a piece of which we have just seen in Santa Croce! In the Mamertine prison you are shown a curious stone with a deep hollow in it, and you are seriously told that this hollow was made by the head of the Apostle Peter, which fell upon it, when Peter was knocked down by a Roman soldier. You are not expected to believe that the vacillating Peter had a head as hard as that, but that it was a miracle. In another church you look upon the chain which was broken by the angel the night Peter was delivered from prison, filings from which have been presented to princes, and a few filings from which any traveler can obtain for a trifle. In St. Peter's of Rome is the head of St. Denis, which he is said to have taken up and carried two miles, after it was cut off. In France are four heads of John the Baptist. A facetious priest explained this by saying that each one was the head of John at different ages. Spain, France and Flanders can boast eight arms of St. Matthew and three of St. Luke. In the Lateran church, Rome, are the entire heads of Peter and Paul, but that does not hinder the monks of St. Augustine from having a large part of Peter's head to exhibit for a trifle, while their brother Franciscans enjoy the possession of a large part of Paul's skull. At Aix la Chapelle they show you some oil from the bones of St. Elizabeth. In Rome, so rich in

relics, you can find the very ark made for Moses and the rod by which he worked his miracles. At Glastonbury are the identical stones, sacredly held, which our Lord did not turn to bread !

In the Spanish church of the Escorial are 11,000 relics, among which is a piece of the very handkerchief with which Mary wiped her eyes, while she stood by the cross.

Among these relics, so miraculously found and preserved, are some I shrink from mentioning, but I must do it in order to faithfully illustrate my subject. In one place is St. Anthony's millstone, on which he crossed the sea ; St. Joseph's breeches, St. Mark's boots, a piece of the Virgin's green petticoat, "St. Anthony's toe-nails and some parings from St. Edmund's toes." In a certain convent is kept a vial of St. Joseph's breath, which was caught as he was exercising with his axe, and a little roll of butter made from the milk of the Virgin. "In another place you are shown," says Mr. Van Dyke, "the nose of an angel, a rib of the Word made flesh, a bit of the finger of the Holy Ghost, a quantity of the identical rays of the star which led the wise men of the East, a wing of the angel Gabriel, a feather from which you can buy for the reasonable sum of twenty-five cents ; the beard of Noah, a vial of the Virgin's tears, some of the water which flowed from the side of Christ, and one of the steps of the ladder on which Jacob saw the angels ascending and descending." In order to carry all these sacred relics, as some one has suggested, there are in the city of Rome five legs of the ass on which Jesus rode into Jerusalem. We defy the world to find more superstition, nonsense and fraud than is connected with the miracle-working relics of the Papacy. When you look an intelligent priest, bishop or cardinal in the face and ask him if he believes that these relics which their people adore are real, they coolly inform you that it makes not a whit of difference whether they are real or not, provided only the worshipper thinks they are real. If the finger of St. Thomas happens to be the finger of Judas Iscariot, no matter, provided the worshipper thinks it is the finger of St. Thomas. And thus the moral tone of the people is lowered by being taught that there is no difference between a genuine thing and a fraud ; and the flood-gates of fraud are opened and defended.

The silly wonders of miracle-working saints are in striking contrast with the serious miracles of the Bible. Liguori tells us, for

example, that by the assistance of Mary, an ape became the devil, and, at the command of a priest, went through a hole in the wall, which no skill has been able to fill up. And through that hole comes many a dollar into the treasury. St. Francis Xavier loses his crucifix at sea; when he reaches the land, behold, a crab appears with the crucifix, and hands it to the delighted saint. St. Patrick, for some unaccountable reason, wants to take a loathsome leper with him from Rome, but the owner of the vessel will not consent, whereupon the leper gets on a huge stone and sails after the vessel, reaching port on the same day with it. This same St. Patrick, while a boy, brought some ice into the house. His nurse scolded him, and told him that he ought to have brought dry wood for the fire. The boy prays over the ice, and in a moment it is blazing like tinder. A fair mind has only to read the miracles of the Bible, and these wonders of the Papacy on the same day, to be convinced that the former, in their simple, unadorned statements, bear the marks of genuineness, while the latter, with their sudden surprises and their romantic coloring, have the proofs of spuriousness on their face.

III. SOME MIRACLES OF THE PAPACY FLATLY CONTRADICT THE BIBLE. Luke tells us that, after Pentecost, the Apostles tarried in Jerusalem. A Romish legend, intimately connected with a great miracle, informs us that they worshipped in a little house in Nazareth—the house in which Mary was born. In the year 1291, this house was carried by the angels through the air to Dalmatia; and, after a few more removals, each time through the air, it was located at Loretto, a village near the coast of Italy. In this “Holy House of Loretto” is an image of the Virgin, carved, we are seriously told, by the Evangelist Luke. At least 50,000 pilgrims visit this house every year, and leave their offerings. A little mouse happened to crawl out of his hiding-place within its sacred walls, and was killed in the act. Its remains, artistically preserved, now have the power to ward off diseases of all kinds. But do sensible people in this nineteenth century believe these medieval myths? Why, an Archbishop in America has written a book, entitled “The Holy House of Loretto,” in which these very legends are given with the air of an historian as sober facts. And I am sure that all people, who do not surrender to others the right to think, will agree with another who declares that a man who can

write such a book in such an age and country as this "deserves to wear a pallium made of the wool of sacred sheep or the down of a goose." The only reason I can think of in explanation of such folly is that it widely advertises the sacred shrine which brings more money, perhaps, than any other into the coffers of the church, and of course thus does good.

We read in 2 Kings, 18: 4, that the Israelites, responding to the very sentiment that leads Romanists to adore relics, began to burn incense to the brazen serpent which Moses lifted in the camp, and which they had preserved. Hezekiah, we are plainly told, called it "Nehushtan," "a piece of brass," and broke it in pieces. And yet in the city of Milan we are shown to-day what they declare is that identical brazen serpent, without the mark of Hezekiah's hammer upon it.

IV. THE MIRACLES OF THE BIBLE WERE PERFORMED BY THE POWER OF GOD THROUGH FAITH; the miracles of the Papacy have been performed by the power of saints, images and relics. There is one account in the Bible of a man's being raised from the dead by the touch of the dead prophet's bones, but these bones were not preserved for the purpose of working more miracles at so much a piece. The people knew that God worked the miracle for a special purpose, doubtless to encourage them in one of the darkest periods of their history. The sick were, on one occasion, brought and laid in the streets, so that the shadow of Peter might fall upon them, though we are not told that any of them were cured. It is a wonder that Rome has not thought to bottle up some of that shadow, and let it continue to work. "God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul, so that from his body were brought to the sick handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them" (Acts 19: 11-12). Mark the expression: "God wrought special miracles." God was working in answer to the faith of Paul, and, the crowd being so great that the people could not get their sick friends to him, that he might lay his hands on them, God healed those who were touched by handkerchiefs and aprons taken from Paul to them. There is a world of difference between these miracles and the miracles of the Papacy performed by men. 1. God gets all the glory, whereas, in most Papal miracles, some saint does the work by his own merit, and usually gets all the glory himself. 2. We hear no more of these hand-

kerchiefs and aprons in the Bible. If Luke had been a Roman Catholic writer, he would have been careful to tell us just where they were kept, and how many miracles they continued to perform after Paul had gone to heaven. 3. There is no romantic coloring in this Bible picture, while the recital of Papal miracles reminds one of the Arabian Nights Entertainment.

It is difficult for me to speak coolly. These things ought to be spoken with the deliberation of a historian, and yet I confess, when I think of the seven millions of Catholics in this country, not all of whom, but many of whom, are led from faith in Christ to put faith in baptism, faith in penance, in purgatory, in holy shrines and wells, in relics and in saints, my soul is stirred within me.

I plead for the honor of the Holy Spirit, who is fearfully dishonored by all this pretended wonder-working power in bones and hairs, and pieces of garments. Jesus said: "Greater things than these shall ye do, because I go to my Father." The spiritual works are to be greater. Ye shall do these greater things because I go, and the Spirit will come, but you know that in all these "miracles" the Spirit is ignored. Scenes like that at Pentecost, when 3000 were saved in one day, sudden conversions like the woman at the well and the jailer at midnight are denounced as fanatical by the believers in these sacred relics and shrines.

Let us, in closing turn from our subject to something better.

A prince who worshipped the sun decided that he would build a temple of glass to his god, that his light might fill every corner of the temple. He built it, and his god filled it with his light; but, by and by, he thought he would hang up some mottoes suggestive of his religion, until at last the glass temple was so covered with these things that his god was entirely shut out. And so Jesus, the light of the world, is shut out of the temple he would fill.

A blind man stood on London Bridge and read the Bible to the people as they passed. He came to the verse, "there is none other name." His fingers lost the place, and he kept repeating, "there is none other name." A man passing by heard him, and he felt curious to hear the conclusion of the sentence. He stopped and waited till the blind man found the place, and heard him repeat: "There is none other name under heaven given, among men,

whereby we must be saved." It was a revelation to him. He came to the Bible reader and said, "Repeat that again about 'none other name.'" The blind man repeated it, until he accepted salvation by the one name of Christ. On the wayside in India stood another man teaching a crowd, and there came along a man with spikes upon his knees, going to some sacred shrine. The missionary read: "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." "God loves," said the man on the spikes, "I thought he hated, I thought he delighted to punish!" Before the sun went down he had thrown away the spikes, stood erect and walked, a free man in Christ Jesus our Lord! An Italian lady lay on her death-bed; she said her hands, her feet were touching purgatory; the fires were scorching her. The priests came with their Latin, but they could give her no comfort. She said: "I am dying, and falling, and I burn as I fall." The Pope pardoned her sins, but when they brought the pardon, she said, "I burn still." A friend who knew the Lord Jesus Christ went into her room in spite of priestly remonstrance, and read to her: "The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin." "Read it again," she said; "is that God's book? Let me look at it." And she repeated it, with the guttural sound of death in her throat, "The blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanses from all sin." "Oh," she said, "that's it, the fires are out now, and I am saved by Christ."

Turn, I beg you, from all other names; cast away the spikes of penance. God loves you. Believe it, and be saved forever through Jesus Christ our Lord.

XIII.

THE LORD'S SUPPER *versus* THE MASS.

"As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come."—1 Cor. 11: 26.

THE text tells us the object of the Lord's Supper is to proclaim the death of Christ. In contrast with this scriptural meaning is the Roman Catholic Mass, and the purpose of this sermon is to show the difference between the two, and how the Mass has virtually destroyed the Lord's Supper as instituted by Jesus Christ.

I. IN THE LORD'S SUPPER OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, THE BREAD AND WINE REPRESENT THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST. In the Mass the bread and the wine, each and every part of it becomes, by the consecration of the priest, the real "body, blood, soul and divinity of Christ." Any part of the wafer is the whole of Christ. Every drop of the wine is the whole of Christ. The part equals the whole, and we have the spectacle of the real Christ, human and Divine, multiplied into more than 10,000 Christs, in the shape of a round wafer, or a drop of wine! All of this is drawn from the passage, "This is my body." They tell us it means what it says, and then go on to make it mean more than it says. The wafer is not the body only, but the "body, blood, soul and divinity of Christ." The wine is not the blood only, but the "blood, body, soul and divinity of Christ;" so that, while they claim to interpret the words literally, they add to them as much as they please. The Catechism of the Council of Trent has these words: "Whosoever shall deny that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist there are truly, really and substantially contained the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, together with his soul and divinity, and, consequently, Christ entirely, let him be accursed." There are

several things which make this interpretation untenable and absurd. 1. Jesus had not died, when he established the Lord's Supper. When he took the bread in his hand and blessed it, and then the cup, his body had not yet been broken on the cross, nor his blood shed. Shall we say that the bread which Jesus held in his hand was the "body, blood, soul and divinity" of the Christ that held it? that the elements which typified his broken body was the body itself, while the living body held these elements in its hand? Shall we say that the wine in the cup, which he blessed and gave to his disciples, was literally the blood that was then coursing through his veins? Was he breaking his own body, and pouring his own blood, by means of his own hands, and handing them to his disciples? Nothing is more absurd.

2. The only word in the Aramaic language—the language Jesus spoke in conversation—that means "to represent" is the word here used. In Aramaic the verb "to be" was frequently used in the sense of "to represent;" so that, when he said, "This is my body," he said, "This represents my body," according to the custom of the language he spoke.

3. Such is the Biblical sense of the word. Go back to Genesis 41: 26: "The seven good kine are seven years." Will any one say that the seven good cattle which Joseph saw were literally seven years of 365 days, which had not yet come? All admit that the seven good cattle simply represented seven years.

Daniel said to Nebuchadnezzar: "Thou art this head of gold." Dan. 2: 38. Did Daniel mean to say that the king, standing before him, was really gold—that he was flesh and bones and hair in appearance, but really gold? All admit that he meant to say, "Thou art represented by the head of gold in the image."

In Revelation 1: 20 are the words: "The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches, and the seven candlesticks which thou sawest are the seven churches." Has a commentator ever risen to claim that the seven stars of the vision were really seven angels of the churches, and that the seven candlesticks, with their prongs and oil, were literally seven churches?

"They drank of that spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ." 1 Cor. 10: 4. That rock represented Christ. Jesus said, "I am the bread of life." Now to follow the Roman literalism, we must declare that Jesus, who said this, was, in flesh

and bone and muscle and nerve and hair, literally bread—that he was a walking loaf in the shape of a man—that his body deceived by its appearance; it had the feeling and flesh of a man, but was really bread!

In Luke 27: 20 “This cup is the New Testament in my blood.” Now to interpret that literally, we must say that the cup which Jesus held was of parchment, as then, or paper, as now, because wills or testaments were then written on parchment, now upon paper. Why not claim that the cup *is* the New Testament, rather than the “body, blood, soul and divinity of Christ?” There would be less blasphemy in that. The New Testament would, at least, not be so lowered in the estimation of the people, because it, though full of living truth, is a dead, lifeless thing. The fact is, the cup itself here cannot be taken literally. “As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup.” Did he mean to say that we should drink the literal cup, made of clay, or tin, or silver? Did he not rather mean to say that the cup represents what is in it? So that the “seven stars” represent the angels of the churches; the “seven candiesticks” represent the churches; the “rock” represented Christ; Jesus represented the “bread of life,” and the “cup” represents the testament of his blood, and the blood itself.

There is one passage greatly relied upon by some to establish this doctrine of transubstantiation—John 6: 51-57: “I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever, and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.” There is absolutely no reference to the Lord's Supper in these words. Jesus had not yet instituted the Lord's Supper, and, if he had referred to it, no one could have understood him. And the words were spoken to the unbelieving Jews, whom Christ was striving to induce to repent and believe

on him, not seeking to instruct them as to the nature of a certain ordinance.

He declares that his words have a spiritual reference: "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." John 6: 63. That is, you are not to accept what I say about eating my flesh and drinking my blood as literally eating flesh and drinking blood, but give them a spiritual meaning. And you will notice that in the 47th verse he tells us what he means by eating and drinking the flesh and blood: "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." The spiritual meaning of all this is that you appropriate me, the Bread of Life, by believing on me as the Son of God and Saviour of sinners.

If these words refer to the Lord's Supper at all, they completely destroy two dogmas of the Papacy. This church teaches that men are saved through baptism. Christ said here, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." That is, if he is talking about the Lord's Supper, "Except ye partake of this ordinance, ye cannot be saved." The Romanists, on the contrary, do not contend that a man is lost, because he will not partake of the Mass. And, further, Jesus says, "Whosoever eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day." So that eternal life, if these words refer to the Eucharist, is based upon our partaking of it; and, if any man once eats the bread, which is the body, and drinks the wine, which is the blood of Christ, he has eternal life. The Papacy has long ago consigned Luther and other heretics to perdition. They have done wrong on this interpretation, because Luther and many other heretics certainly did partake of the Eucharist, and Luther even believed in transubstantiation until the day of his death.

We are told, again, that we cannot be certain we are saved, but these words tell us, that, if we eat the flesh and drink the blood, we have eternal life—not *will* have it in the future, but, we have it now; and such, really, is the teaching of the Bible. He that believeth on the Son, and by believing on the Son spiritually eats his flesh and drinks his blood, appropriates to himself that which gives life. "He that believeth on the Son hath (already) everlasting life."

The first appearance of this doctrine of transubstantiation was

in the beginning of the 8th century. Not until 700 years after Christ do we find the least semblance of belief in the real presence in the wafer and wine. In 1416 the Council of Constance dignified it into a dogma. Justin Martyr, in 140 A. D., describes the Lord's Supper, and we see from his description that it was the simple thing that Jesus made it, breaking the bread, pouring the wine, and distributing it to the people. The only difference was in "the kiss of peace" which preceded the ordinance.

St. Cyril's description of it, in 347, shows the beginnings of corruption. The elements, it seems, were supposed to have some mystic power, so that they were applied to the eyes, ears, nose and other parts of the body.

Now, if the priest has not power to change the wafer into the whole of the Divine Christ, our Roman Catholic friends are idolators, because they bow before this host and worship it. If, on the other hand, the priest has power to change the wafer into the real Christ, our Roman Catholic friends, when they celebrate the Mass, eat their God and Saviour.

In the Missal, used every day by the Catholics, page 43, is this prayer: "May thy body, O Lord, which I have received, and thy blood, which I have drunk, cleave to my bowels; and grant that no stain of sin may remain in me, who have been fed with this pure and holy sacrament."

The wafer, even after it has been turned into a God, is not beyond the power of corruption. It may corrupt, and even breed worms, so that, in the summer time, the wafer is consecrated once a week, to avoid this corruption, though, in the winter, only twice a month. And yet, even after it has corrupted, breeding worms, the claim is that it is still the literal "body, blood, soul and Divinity of Christ," and must be eaten.

We find in one of the Missals some directions about defects in administering the Mass. We are told that, "if, in winter, the blood be frozen in the cup, put warm cloths about the cup, and if that will not do, let it be put into boiling water, near the altar, till it be melted, taking care it does not get into the cup." "What a spectacle!" as Mr. Van Dyke exclaims, "A God frozen and warmed with bandages, or boiling water!"

Again, "If any of the blood of Christ fall upon the ground by negligence, it must be licked up with the tongue, the place be

sufficiently scraped, and the scrapings burned ; but the ashes must be buried in holy grounds." . . . " If, after consecration, a gnat, or spider, or any such thing fall into the chalice, let the priest swallow it with the blood, if he can ; but, if he fear danger, and have a loathing, let him take it out, and wash it in the wine, and when mass is ended, burn it, and cast it and the washings into holy ground."

God said of Christ that his Holy One should not see corruption, Acts 2 : 27.

II. IN THE LORD'S SUPPER THERE IS A SIMPLE MEMORIAL OF THE DEATH OF CHRIST ; in the Mass it is claimed that there is " a true propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead." Christ's " body, blood, soul and divinity " is offered up every time the Mass is celebrated, just as it was offered up on the cross. It is called in the Rituals the " Sacrifice of the Cross." And the object of having the Mass is, we are plainly told, " to continue the sacrifice of Christ in his church."

To one clause of the Catechism, on page 46, we desire to call the attention of every devout Roman Catholic. It is a concession to the common sense and scriptural knowledge of the age. After asserting several times that the wafer and the wine are the literal " body, blood, soul and divinity of Christ," and that the Mass is a real sacrifice for the sin of the living and the dead, we are told that " in the Mass there is no real shedding of blood nor death, because Christ can die no more ; but the sacrifice of the Mass, through the separate consecration of the bread and the wine, represents his death on the cross." We call upon all good Catholics to believe that statement, and reject all the rest in the Catechism which contradicts it. The broken bread and poured wine represent the broken body and spilt blood of Christ, and that is the whole of it. The dogma that Christ is continually offered in the Mass flatly contradicts the following Scripture : " For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens. Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's : for this he did once when he offered up himself " (Heb. 7 : 26-27).

Notice the expression, " who needeth not daily " (the Mass is celebrated daily), " for this he did once," implying that it is to be done no more.

Again: "Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others. 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" (Heb. 9: 25-28).

Not offering himself often: then he must have been offered continually, as in the mass; "but now once in the end of the age" has the sacrifice been made.

Several chapters in this Book of Hebrews, one would think, have for their purpose the refuting of this error of the continual sacrifice of Christ.

"And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment: so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many" (Heb. 9: 27, 28).

One death for the body: one offering of Christ! And "By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ ONCE FOR ALL" (Heb. 10: 10).

And in this 12th verse: "But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God." "One sacrifice for sins forever" certainly precludes any other sacrifice of Christ, bloody or bloodless.

The same thought is repeated in the 14th verse: "For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." Even for the purposes of sanctification, only the one offering on Calvary is needed.

Again in verse 18: "Now where remission of these is there is no more offering for sin." Through the sacrifice of Jesus on the cross our sins are forgiven, and God tells us he will remember them no more forever. In these verses it is plainly taught that Christ should be offered but once, and that the sacrifice of the cross should not continue.

III. IN THE LORD'S SUPPER BOTH BREAD AND WINE WERE GIVEN TO THE COMMUNICANTS: in the mass only the bread is given to the people, while the priests drink the wine. It is not even claimed, by intelligent Roman Catholics, that this was the primitive and Apostolic practice. The words of Jesus are too plain to be misconstrued. Read them in Mark 14: 23: "And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, and they all drank of it;"—repeated in substance by Paul, in 1 Cor. 11: 28:

“Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup.” After examination, he must eat of the bread, and drink of the cup.

The reasons given by the Council of Trent for taking the wine from the laity are worthy of study.

1. “The holy Eucharist should at all times be in readiness for the sick ; and, if the species of wine remain long standing unconsumed, it were to be apprehended that it may become vapid.”

And because wine may become vapid, therefore it should not be given to the laity ; or, because wine may not be handy to administer to the sick, it should be withheld from all ! As if it were not about as easy to get the fruit of the vine for the sick, as to get the wafer !

2. “The greatest caution is necessary to avoid accident or indignity, which must come almost inevitably, if the chalice were administered in crowded assemblies.” And, to prevent accident or indignity, *i.e.*, lest a little drop of the wine should be spilled, or get upon the beards of the people, it should not be given to them at all ; let the priest, who wears no beard, be the only one to drink it !

3. “There are many who cannot bear the taste or smell of wine.” And, for the sake of the few, it may be one in a million, who cannot bear the taste or the smell of wine, it is to be withheld from the laity entirely ; to be sure, they were pressed for a reason !

4. Finally : “A circumstance which principally influenced the church in establishing this practice ; means were to be devised to crush the heresy which denied that Christ, whole and entire, is contained under either species (that is, of bread and wine), and asserted that the body is contained under the species of bread without the wine, and the blood under the species of the wine without the bread. The object was attained by communion under the species of bread alone, which places, as it were, sensibly before our eyes, the truth of the Catholic faith.”

In other words, in order to crush the heresy which contended that the bread represented the body of Christ, and the wine represented the blood of Christ, the one is taken away, and the people, on the authority of the church, compelled to believe that both body and blood is in the bread alone !

One of the evils of keeping the wine from the people, is the fact that it is all given to the priests: and the result is to a large extent, a wine-drinking priesthood. There need be no surprise. A man who is compelled early in the morning, before breakfast, to drink a glass of wine, and then, perhaps, another glass; and, after breakfast, repeat it two or three times a day, will, in the very nature of the case, acquire a taste and then the raving appetite for drink, which demands more drink to quench it, and continues to burn like a fire, till body and soul are consumed.

IV. In the Lord's Supper the bread is broken. In the Mass it is given entire. "This is my body," said Jesus, "which was broken for you." The priest makes the bread into a little circular wafer, and it is put entire upon the tongue of the communicant—no breaking. The whole of Christ is taken! and the true meaning of the ordinance destroyed. This broken body, set before us on the cross in the words of Scripture, and before our eyes in the Lord's Supper, is your redemption and mine. Let the breaking of that body break our hearts! Let the spilling of that blood make us willing to spill our blood for him. Let our gratitude go forth to the Christ of the broken body and the broken heart. "And I, if I be lifted up," said Jesus, "will draw all men unto me." Have we been drawn by that uplifted Jesus? Yield to the drawings of the love there shown forth, and become his servant and brother for ever!

XIV.

THE PAPACY DEFINED.

"Christ loved the Church and gave himself for it."—Eph. 5: 25.

"The beast that was, and is not, and yet is."—Rev. 17: 8.

THE first text brings before us the true Catholic or Universal Church, whose members are all those for whom Jesus died, and who have become, through faith, partakers of the Divine nature. No visible line marks its boundary. Jesus Christ is its Head, to whose will all the members yield obedience. Let them bear the name of Protestant or Roman Catholic, they belong to this true Catholic Church, if they are united to Christ, the Head, by living faith. And without such faith they do not belong to it, bear what name they may.

There is such a thing as a local church defined in the New Testament, composed of converted members, with its officers and ordinances. Our business, however, to-day is not with the local church, but with the Church universal.

The Papacy claims that it is the only Catholic or universal church, and that all out of its communion do not belong to the Church at all.

Let us try this claim by its own definition of a church.

The authorized Catechism says: "The church has four marks

by which it may be known: It is one; it is holy; it is catholic; it is Apostolic."

Now, is the Roman Church one in faith? Has it always been one? For, bear in mind, it is claimed that this unity covers all time and space. Does history support the claim that its creeds, as announced by councils and Popes, have always been the same? On the contrary, creed has contradicted creed. Popes, now declared infallible, as we have seen, have denounced the teachings of other Popes, whom good Romanists are also called upon to believe infallible. The Roman Catholic world are to-day divided in their belief as to the dogma of Infallibility.

In the Vatican Council of 1870 were men, many and strong, who did not believe in the infallibility of the Pope. Eighty-eight voted flatly against it, and thousands to-day in Roman Catholic ranks agree with them.

Pope Honorius I. was condemned by the Council of Constantinople as a heretic, "who, with the help of the Old Serpent doth scatter deadly error."

Pope John XXIII. was convicted by the Council of Constance of denying the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body.

Pope Leo X. denied almost every Christian doctrine, and called Christianity a "lucrative fiction."

Who does not know of the fierce conflict between the Franciscans and the Dominicans—between the Scotists and the Thomists, while both sides were claimed as true sons of Mother Church?

For fifty years there were two Popes—one at Avignon, the other at Rome. And, after these, there were for a while three claimants to the Papal throne.

In the seventeenth century it was solemnly affirmed by a Pope that "the proposition that 'the earth moves' is absurd—philosophically false, and, theologically considered, at least, erroneous in faith." Galileo declared the earth did move; but they insisted on uniformity of faith by making him again declare against his convictions.

The so-called unity of Romanism is merely a forced uniformity.

There is a unity of spirit among all those who truly love the Lord Jesus Christ, and such unity prevails, whatever be the relation of such persons to different organizations.

Second : As to holiness. It cannot be proved that the Roman Catholic Church whether you mean by that the Pope, the Councils, or the people are more holy than thousands who have never bowed to the Papal yoke. We are glad to pay tribute to the piety of many Roman Catholics, but they are not a whit holier than many Protestants.

The claim that the Roman Church, represented by Popes and Councils, have always been holy, is so ridiculously false that no man who prizes a reputation for sound mind ought to advance it.

Pope John XII. was guilty of perjury and murder. Of Alexander VI. it was said that "his debauchery, perfidy, ambition, inhumanity and irreligion made him the execration of all Europe." His successor, Julius II., was declared to be a scandal to the whole Church. "Popes Paul II. and Julius III. were such licentious characters," says a historian, "that no modest man can read their lives without blushing." Guicciardini, a Roman Catholic writer, says of the sixteenth century: "He was esteemed a good Pope in those days who did not exceed in wickedness the worst of mankind." The Council of Constantinople was declared by Nizansen to have been "a cabal of wretchedness fit for the House of Correction." An extract from the farewell address of Cardinal Hugo to Pope Innocent, at the Council of Lyons, I shrink from quoting, and yet it is needful to show how utterly absurd is the claim of Roman Catholics to being the only church, on the ground of holiness always and everywhere. "Friends," said he, "we have effected a work of great utility and charity in this city. When we came to Lyons, we found three or four brothels in the city, and we have left, at our departure, only one, but this extends, without interruption, from the eastern to the western gate of the city."

Baronius, a Roman Catholic historian, exclaimed: "What is the face of the Holy Mother Church! How exceedingly foul it is!"

Roman Catholic countries, like Spain, Italy, Mexico and France are not noted for their morality. It is not slander to say what every traveller, from Luther's time to the present, knows full well, that the city of Rome itself is one of the wickedest places in Christendom. I regret beyond measure the necessity of referring to these things, but when an organization consigns everybody to

hell but themselves, and bases its claim of so doing upon their exceeding holiness, as exhibited in all time, it is fair and just to show the falsity and absurdity of such a claim.

Third: As to Catholicity. The Roman Catholic Church has, of all others, the least right to this claim. "It is Catholic," we are told, "because it has existed in all ages, teaches all nations, and maintains all truth."

The Papacy has not existed in all ages, for it did not come into existence until after the time of Constantine. It no more "teaches all nations" than do Protestants, for in these United States alone at least 45,000,000 of people do not listen to its voice.

It does not maintain all truth, for its very Popes and Councils have been convicted of heresy by other Popes and Councils, and it allows traditions of men to displace the Word of God. Strange Catholicity that, which consigns to hell men like Moody, Spurgeon and John Hall, who devoutly love Jesus Christ, and live daily to his glory—simply because they refuse to acknowledge that Leo XIII. is the vicegerent of God on earth!

A recent writer in the *Catholic World* admits that a heathen, who has never heard of the Roman Catholic Church, may be saved, but there is no hope at all for the poor Protestant heretic, who has had an opportunity of joining the church, but will not do it!

When narrowness becomes Catholicity, then the Papacy will be Catholic. We believe there are many Roman Catholics, who, in spite of their creed, trust Jesus Christ alone for salvation, and we expect to meet them in heaven. To all such we extend the hand of Christian fellowship, but the Papacy that rules them will not allow them to fellowship any one who does not move in its own prescribed circle.

If Paul should return to earth, and preach salvation by grace, as he once did in Rome, he would be pronounced a heretic, and consigned to hell, unless he recanted. The Apostle Peter, preaching to-day as he preached and wrote while in the flesh, would be anathematized by the Papacy. It is a noted fact that Catholic priests are not deposed for immorality, but let them preach salvation by grace through faith, or in any way refuse to show the spirit of the serf in their relation to the Papacy, and off

go their heads—ecclesiastical heads, I mean, for the power of cutting off the literal head has, thank God, passed away.

Fourth: As to the claim that the Papacy is Apostolic in religion, faith and practice.

The Roman Catholic Church has in it converted men and women, who, by reason of their personal relation to Christ, are members of the true Church Catholic. But, tried by its own definition, the Papacy is not a church of Christ, for it has neither unity, holiness above the others, nor Catholicity. What then is it? In a word, it is Pagan Rome perpetuated. The new Rome of the Popes is the old Rome of the Cæsars, with a few additions, but with little change. Papal Rome is Pagan Rome baptized, without being converted.

The "beast" referred to in the 2d text, "which was, and is not, and yet is," is, beyond doubt, the Roman Empire. "The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth" (verse 9).

The text teaches that this Roman empire was to undergo such a change as that it may be said not to exist as an empire, and yet to be substantially preserved in another form. It "was, and is not, and yet is." The facts of the case compel us to admit that the Papacy of to-day is the continuation of the old Roman empire in a slightly different form, but with the same thirst for dominion. The holy Roman church has been aptly termed "the holy Roman Empire." It is more of an empire than a Church. It is more Roman than Christian, as will appear from a statement of the following facts:

Its language is the language of Pagan Rome. Peter, so far as we are informed, did not know the Latin tongue. Why was it that Greek, the language our Lord and his apostles spoke, and in which the New Testament was written, was not adopted as the uniform language of the church, if, indeed, it must have a common language for its services? Or, the Hebrew, made sacred by the tenderest and most stirring religious associations? The answer is easy. The Church, when she married the State, was compelled to take the name and language of her proud husband. The priests of Pagan Rome repeated their incantations in the Latin tongue, and you have only to enter a cathedral in America to hear the language of the ancient Roman temple breaking the

stillness. And all this, too, in opposition to Paul's plain admonition against praying, speaking or singing in "unknown tongues."

The supreme Pontiff of the Roman church is to-day, in name and claim, the successor of the Pontifex Maximus of Pagan Rome. The old Pontifex Maximus claimed that in him was vested all religious, civil and political authority, the identical claim made by his successor, the Pope. Cæsar, in order to centre all authority in himself, was elected to the position of Pontifex Maximus, and the Roman Emperor retained the title it conferred to the time of Gratian, A.D. 382, and thus, for more than 300 years, there was in Pagan Rome just what Gregory VII. brought about in Papal Rome, supreme authority of church and state vested in one person; with this difference, however, that, in Pagan Rome the State absorbed the church, while, in Papal Rome, the church absorbed the State. In Pagan Rome Cæsar became Pontifex Maximus; in Papal Rome the Pontifex Maximus, or Supreme Pontiff, became Cæsar.

The claim that the lordly Pope, with his costly attire, fine palace and millions of money, is the successor of Peter, the poor, humble fisherman of Galilee, is the climax of absurdity; but to say that he is the successor of the rich Roman Pontiff, who was head of both church and State, accords with the fitness of things. And Papal Rome has borrowed her orders from Pagan Rome. Under the Pontifex Maximus were the Pontifices, his councillors and helpers, and under them were the Flamines, with other orders of priests. Now, under the Roman Pontiff to-day, are the Cardinals, who answer to the Pontifices; the archbishops and bishops, who answer to the Flamines, with numerous priests under them; the whole system modeled after the system of Pagan Rome.

The order of celibates is no where enjoined or recommended in the Bible. The Old Testament priests were married. The Apostle Peter, so earnestly claimed as the first Pope, was a married man; for Jesus healed his wife's mother (Matt. 8: 14). "Marriage," says the writer to the Hebrews, "is honorable in all" (Heb. 13: 4). "I will, therefore," says Paul, "that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house" (1 Tim. 5: 14). Paul declared that, on account of the present distress, it was good not to marry, lest they might be too much encumbered; yet, if they chose to marry even then, they did not sin, though they might expect

trouble. We have nothing but words of praise for the men and women who, to be without carefulness, sacrifice the pleasures of domestic life, that they may give themselves to the work of the Lord. That is one thing. But, separating from association with others, with a peculiar garb, and special claim of sanctity, is quite another thing, the spirit of which is neither recognized nor commended in Scripture. Peter holds forth Sarah, a married woman, as a model for women. The Papacy of to-day forbids its ecclesiastics to marry, though Paul said the bishop should be the husband of one wife. The Romish Church tries to impress young women with the thought that their mothers are not as holy as the white-bonneted celibates we see on our streets. The Bible, on the other hand, honors marriage and motherhood; there is nothing in the New Testament resembling the celibate sisterhoods of to-day. But in Pagan Rome we find their prototype in the college of Vestal Virgins. Every Roman town had its altar to Vesta. In the Roman Forum stood a temple, honored above all others, in which the six Vestal Virgins kept the altar fires continually burning. Consuls bowed humbly before them in the streets; and, if one of them should meet a convict, he was released at her command.

Now, worldly wisdom could see great power in such an institution devoted to the interests of the church, and the Roman mind was ready to accept and honor their own sacred institution, though under a Christian name. There were persons, of course, during the first three centuries, before the Papacy had an existence, who, misinterpreting Paul's words, and considering the single state more holy than the married state, refused to marry, and separated themselves from society; but Clement, of Alexandria, in the 2d century cried out against the evils of such an error, and denounced it as one of the signs of the great apostasy, predicted by Paul, "forbidding to marry" (1 Tim. 4: 2). What I insist upon is that the orders of Nuns of to-day are more nearly successors of the Vestal Virgins of Rome, than of anything in the Scriptures, or Apostolic times.

The Virgin Mary of the Papacy is a continuation of the idea of a Pagan Goddess.

The Pagans would not have a religion without a goddess. To induce them to surrender their Minerva, their Ceres, Juno and

Venus, it was natural that a compromise should be made in favor of the mother of Jesus.

Nowhere in the New Testament is Mary adored. She is simply the honored mother of our Lord, rejoicing in him as her Saviour. But among the Pagan Romans great honor was paid to female divinities. Worshippers bowed before their images; and Mary is called to-day, in Roman Catholic Ritual, the "Queen of Heaven," the very name given by Jeremiah to the false goddess whom the Israelites worshipped in the days of their backslidings. (Jer. 44; 17.)

The canonization of saints and their invocation find no warrant in the inspired word of God. And yet the Pope assumes the authority to exalt a saint fifty years after his death, to such a position in heaven, that he may be invoked and adored. "It seems," says Lyman Abbott, "to be somewhat analogous to the ancient ceremony called Apotheosis, and was perhaps derived from it, by which the kings converted the heroes and other distinguished men into gods." Romulus, after his death, was worshipped as a god by the Roman people; so was Julius Cæsar. Alexander, before his death, ordered his own deification. The Pagan mind, thus imbued with the idea of hero-worship, took readily to the worship of saints. Every Roman family had its Penates, or household gods who looked after its interests, and answered its prayers; and our Roman Catholic friends have their patron saints, whose images they keep in their houses, and bow before them. These patron saints are the successors of the Penates of Rome.

It is interesting to see how Cardinal Gibbons, in his book, tries to pump into the Scriptures some reference to the invocation of saints. To do so, he must quote passages which refer to angels, and the prayers of saints on earth. If the Cardinal had simply shut his Bible, and opened a book of Roman history, he would not have been so perplexed to find a reference to prayers to the spirits of the dead. The Roman soldier, in the heat of battle, and the Roman matron, in the quiet of her home, invoked the prayers of their departed dead, and that, Reverend Sir, is the mother of saint invocation, as it exists to-day.

It is the simple truth to say that many of the ceremonies of the Roman Catholic Church are Pagan, rather than Christian, in

their origin. Look the Bible through, and you find no reference to holy water; and yet, when you enter a Catholic cathedral, the first thing you see is a vessel containing holy water, into which the faithful dip their fingers, and cross themselves. "The Amula," says Montfaucon, an eminent Roman Catholic writer, "was a vase of holy water, placed by the heathens at the door of their temple, with which to sprinkle themselves." In some churches of Rome, the very vases, now containing the holy water, were once used for the same purpose in the heathen temple. The holy water of the Roman Pagan and the Roman Catholic has the same composition—simple salt and water. The heathen's object in sprinkling it upon himself and his horses was to guard against the power of evil spirits, and such is the avowed object of the Romanist in the use of his holy water to-day. There is a passage in Virgil which refers to the use of holy water in Pagan worship, and La Cerda a Jesuit writer, in his notes on the passage, says: "Hence was derived the custom of the Holy Church to provide purifying or holy water at the entrance to their churches." The ancient Romans were accustomed to sprinkle their horses with it at the Circensian games, as a safe-guard against evil spirits, and every year, on the 17th of January, in the city of Rome, you may see this ceremony of sprinkling horses and mules performed in the name of St. Anthony and the Holy Catholic Church. Over the vessel of holy water in the church of St. Carlo Borromeo, at Rome, is a list of its uses:

1. "It drives away devils from places and persons."

2. "It affords great assistance against fears and diabolical illusions."

3. "It cancels venial sins."

4. "It obtains the favor and presence of the Holy Ghost."

Here is claimed for salt and water, borrowed from heathendom, what God's Word tells us can be obtained only through the blood of Christ.

Papal Rome seems anxious to go beyond Pagan Rome in the absurdity of its assumptions.

The use of incense in the churches is a transportation from Pagan worship. The Apostles and early Christians certainly did not use incense in their worship. Under the Pagan emperors, so much opposed was Christianity to the heathen custom of burning

incense that it was made a test in the trials of Christians. If they would throw the least particle of incense into the censer, they were considered good enough Pagans, and released. If they refused to throw on the incense, they were deemed to be Christians, and many a martyr forfeited his life by such refusal. And under the Christian emperors, at first, burning incense was regarded as so distinctly Pagan that, by a law of Theodosius, every place and house, where it was proved to have been burned, was confiscated to the government. The fumes which salute your nostrils as you enter a cathedral during some solemn service, is another proof of the Pagan origin of the Papacy, and carries us back to the time when Virgil wrote :

“Her hundred altars then, with garlands crowned,
And richest incense, smoking, breathe around
Sweet odors.”—*Æn.* I. : 429.

On the old Pagan bas-reliefs are represented Pagan priests performing their sacrifices. You see the censer, and the boy in white attending him. You have but to peep into a cathedral on any great day to see the bas-reliefs, priest, boy and censer, taken from the marble and paraded before you in living forms.

The candles which burn before altars and shrines are also borrowed directly from the Pagans. Nothing like it in the New Testament; and the early Christians condemned in strong terms the Pagan customs around them. “They light up candles to God,” said Lactantius, in the third century, “as if he lived in the dark; and do they not deserve to pass for madmen who offer lamps to the giver and author of light?”

The Pagan Romans had a custom of bringing votive offerings to the shrines of their special divinities, in recognition of some prayer answered, or benefit conferred. The altars of their temples were surrounded by gifts of silver and gold. The temple of *Æsculapius* was rich in offerings from those who were healed by his miraculous power. This custom passed over from Pagan to Papal Rome. The House of Loretto in Italy and the Shrine of Bambino in Rome are just as rich to-day in such offerings. The Pagan priests encouraged it because it paid; and the Papal priests were not slow to see its value. The Romanist, Montfaucon, ac-

knowledges that this custom was borrowed from Rome, and emphatically condemns it.

Purgatory, that mine of gold to the Papacy, is an importation from Paganism. "Unknown to the Christian Church," says Mr. Van Dyke, "it was well known to the heathen world, even so early as Homer's time. It is the old fire purification of souls, and the ceremonies, now employed for the relief of those suffering the tormenting flames, are remarkably similar to those anciently employed by Pagan priests. In fact, the doctrine was so purely heathen, that not even Popish ingenuity could invent an argument in its favor. It is said that Cottonus, failing to find a passage in Scripture that would infallibly confirm it, invoked the devil to assist him; but, for once, even Satan himself was unable to wrest Scripture to his purpose. But, notwithstanding the exceedingly unimportant consideration that no proof except visions and dreams and assertion was found, the Popes were able, in the end, to establish infallibly everything connected with purgatorial fires, and located them at the earth's centre—18,300½ miles below the surface!"

The statue of St. Peter, whose big toe has been worn off by the kisses of pilgrims, was a statue of Jupiter, taken by Papal from Pagan Rome, and dedicated to this new purpose.

It is interesting to know that the tyrant Caligula, the Roman Emperor, was the first to require those who approached him to kiss his embroidered slipper, so that the Papal custom descends from this Roman Emperor. The Pantheon, "Temple of all Gods," has simply been dedicated to the "Virgin, and all the saints;" so that the modern Roman goes there to invoke any saint he likes, just as the ancient Roman went there to invoke any hero-god in whom he delighted.

Penance is not New Testament repentance, which leads a man, in godly sorrow, to turn from sin to Christ, the sin-bearer, but is a child of the scourgings and starvings of Paganism, by which they hoped to atone for their sins and gain heaven; and you have but to read a description of the Pagan processions, with candles, images and shrines, to see an exact picture of the Roman Catholic processions in Italy and Spain. The images and shrines along the roads of Europe are the children of the old Roman *Viales* and *Sennitales*—Gods which preside over the roads and streets,

Max Müller, the distinguished philologist, declares that the people of Rome, Greece and India are descended from the same stock, speaking cognate languages, and having substantially the same religion. An examination into Buddhism, the religion of India, shows a remarkable similarity to Roman Catholicism. Buddhism has its relics and images, venerated and worshipped; its canonized saints; its wax candles, burning night and day; its penances and self-inflicted tortures; its priests, with shaven heads and vows of chastity, purity and obedience; its endless traditions; its rosary; its confessional, and even Pope at Dhassa, whom all the faithful declare to be infallible, when he speaks *ex cathedra*. Romanism, in its rites and ceremonies, is more like Buddhism than it is like Apostolic Christianity, and for the plain reason that it descends with Buddhism from the same ancient stock through the Roman Empire.

In saying that modern Rome is ancient Rome perpetuated, I am but repeating what has been acknowledged by some Roman Catholic writers. Aringhus defends it in the following words:

“The Popes found it necessary, in the conversion of the Gentiles, to dissemble and wink at many things, and yield to the times, and not to use force against customs which the people are so obstinately fond of, nor to think of extirpating everything that had the appearance of profane.”

From all this we must conclude that, so far from being the only Church, the Papacy is no church of Christ at all, and does not deserve to be classed among the Christian denominations. There are Christians in her communion, but the Bible urges all such to come out of her, that they may not be partakers of her sins and receive not her plagues (Rev. 18: 4).

XV.

A FALLEN CHURCH.

ROMAN CATHOLICS claim that Jesus Christ founded his church upon the Apostle Peter and his successors; and they base their claim upon Matthew 16: 15-19. Let us, in a spirit of fairness, examine the passage; and, if it sustains this view, we should accept it. Jesus says to the disciples: "Whom say ye (not thou) that I am?" The question is put to all of them, but Peter, ever forward to speak, replied: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Jesus answered: "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." This answer makes Peter for the time being the living embodiment of revealed truth. The confession Peter made was that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God. Christ says, "The Father hath revealed this unto thee, Peter, so that, while you stand before me making that confession, you are the embodiment of this revealed truth. And thou art Peter," he continues, "and upon this rock"—the rock of revealed truth, of which his confession makes him the living embodiment—"I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." The revealed truth of God's word, embodied in living witnesses, is to-day the foundation of the Church of Christ, and thus, in turn, the church, whose members embody the revealed word, the "Word" made flesh a second time, is "the pillar

and ground of the truth" (1 Tim. 3: 15). So Paul wrote to the Ephesians. "Ye are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner-stone." (Eph. 2: 20). Why didn't he tell them they were built upon Peter? For the very good reason that, if he had, he would have taught them error.

The Apostles never regarded Peter as superior to them. In the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15: 6-21) he talked as usual—he was always ready to talk—but James presided and announced the decision, showing that James was officially above Peter in that meeting.

Paul says (Gal. 2: 11) "When Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed." The fact is that Peter, in his personal character, as Mr. Schaff says, was not rock-like, but the most impulsive and unstable of all the Apostles. The "gates of hell" did prevail against him, when he denied his Lord with cursing; and, if Paul is a good witness, they prevailed against him again at Antioch, when he was led by the Judaism still in him to teach false doctrine. It is plain, also, to one familiar with the teachings of Scripture, that the keys which Christ gave to Peter were not authority for him and his successors to lord it over God's heritage. The Holy Spirit, whose mission it is to unlock the truth, for Jesus, says, "He will guide you into all truth," and the truth which he reveals to his people, are the two keys which bind and loose upon earth. But the keys are no more for Peter than any other Apostle or humble child of God who embodies the truth, and is filled with the Spirit: for whatever the Word of God, embodied in human character and wielded by the Spirit, binds or looses upon earth, shall be bound or loosed in heaven. God in heaven is, of course, in harmony with God on earth; and the God on earth, whom Jesus said the Father would send into the world, is the Holy Spirit, and not the Pope of Rome.

I wonder our Roman Catholic friends do not read on just four verses further, where Jesus says, "Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offense unto me, for thou savorest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." Their foundation stone has become in a very short time a rock of offence. Jesus calls Peter "Satan," and says he embodies the spirit of the world, of whom Satan is the Prince, and, if the Pope is the personal succes-

son of Peter, I may claim that he is the representative of Satan on earth with more reason, indeed, than Catholics have for claiming him to be the representative of Christ, for Peter was never called "Christ;" Jesus did call him "Satan." If they reply that Jesus called Peter "Satan," because by his opposition to him at the time, he represented Satan, we agree; but then they must admit that Jesus called Peter a "rock" of foundation, because at the time, by his confession, he represented the revealed embodied truth on which the Church of God is founded. If, however, they persist in saying that Jesus meant to call the person of Peter the foundation of his church, they are driven by the same law of exegesis to admit that he called the person of Peter "Satan," and they are in the predicament of having the Pope a vicegerent of the Devil on earth, and a living embodiment of the spirit of the world.

There is a passage, however, which gives a full photograph of the Papacy, revealing every feature so clearly that there is no mistaking it. "Let no man deceive you by any means, for that day (the coming of the Lord) shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that Man of Sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the Temple of God, showing himself that he is God. . . . For the mystery of iniquity doth already work, only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the Spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming" (2 Thess. 2: 3-8).

Four things are here affirmed:

1st.—That there would come a great apostasy.

2d.—That somebody in this apostasy would claim that he was God, and try to rule on earth as God.

3d.—That this apostasy had in it the "man of sin," the "son of perdition," "the lawless one," and that as "the mystery of iniquity," it was already working in embryo.

4th.—That it was to be consumed by the Spirit of God's mouth, and destroyed by the brightness of his coming.

Some commentators, with strong English prejudices, have thought that Napoleon Bonaparte was this "man of sin," and they

think that a Bonaparte, or some one else, will get hold of the kingdoms of this world, and end things in chaotic ruin. Two things make fatally against this: (1.) It is an apostasy not yet fully revealed. The mystery had already begun its embryonic work in Paul's day. (2.) No Bonaparte ever claimed that he was God. But the most fatal objection to it is that these words describe the Papacy as correctly as if they had been written with the light of history before the writer.

I. My first proposition, then, is that this Apostasy is the Roman Church. The Roman Church is an Apostate Church. Jesus said, "My kingdom is not of this world," and when Satan offered him the kingdoms of this world, and the glory of them, he indignantly refused them. But when Satan offered glory to the church through Constantine, she accepted it, and her fall by that acceptance was as great as the fall of Jesus had been, if he had accepted Satan's offer. The second Adam resisted the same temptations by which the first Adam fell; but the second Eve, bride of the second Adam, fell, as the first Eve did; and the words of Revelation describe her fallen as "the adulteress." In Rev. 17, the woman "arrayed in purple and scarlet," sitting on "the beast with seven heads and ten horns, and drunk with the blood of saints," is beyond doubt the Papacy. In verse 9, the "seven heads" are said to be the "seven mountains on which she sits." Everybody knows that in all literature Rome is known as the "Seven-hilled City." Purple and scarlet are the favorite colors of Popery. That she has been drunk with the blood of saints, no one will deny who knows her record. A careful estimate has revealed the fact that about 50 millions of people—some claim 70 millions—almost as many as there are people in the United States—have fallen under her bloody hand. Others, beside her, to be sure, with the spirit in them which they imbibed before they came out of her communion, or taught by her example, have persecuted and killed a few, but they have repented of it, and confessed their sin, but never has the miserere been sung by the Papacy over the slaughter of heretics. If we could find any evidence of contrition, as A. J. Gordon says, we would gladly forget the past; but those in authority are still drunk enough with the blood of the saints to contend that Father Pope and Mother Church never did wrong. There are noble examples in the

Roman Church of those who, themselves suffering persecution, were willing to claim toleration for all creeds and sects, but such toleration was ever contrary to the genius of the Papacy. Many Catholics in this country, thank God, have imbibed the spirit of our open Bible and free institutions, till they are out of sympathy with the spirit of the Papacy. But the Papacy, true to its claim in this particular at least, has remained ever the same. Pope Pius IX., in 1870, denounces and anathematizes the doctrines that "the Church is subject to secular domination" and that it may not exercise the power of "compelling by antecedent judgments and salutary penalties those who wander, or those who are contumacious." Such are the words of the first infallible Pope, under which the Roman Church is working to-day; and any one can see, were the power not lacking, there is authority enough in them to establish another Inquisition.

Again, this "Scarlet woman" is called "the Great Harlot." Now a harlot was once pure. No one was ever born such, and the Church of Rome, as described by Paul, was pure and spiritual; he boasts of her faith and her good works. But she took three unlawful husbands. Contrary to her Lord's wish, she married the State, and the child of that union was the Inquisition and its horrors. She married Judaism, which her Lord had pronounced dead. The fruit of that union was that child of death, formalism. She married Paganism, and the progeny of that union are superstitions innumerable, with the worship of Saints and of Mary. The Papacy of to-day is comparatively young. Not until the 6th century did a Pope dare to assume the title of universal Bishop. Not until the 7th century did the Roman Emperor confer such a title on Boniface III., and not until A. D. 1215 did the Lateran Council consent to agree to the claim of the Pope's supremacy. The climax of these assumptions was reached in 1870, when the Council at Rome declared the Pope not only supreme, but infallible. So that Popery, as it now exists, is just twenty years old.

"The early churches," says G. P. Fisher, of Yale College, in his "Outlines of Universal History," "were little republics, at first under the supervision of the Apostles." After a while, the large city churches began to assume watch-care and jurisdiction over the weaker churches, who applied to them for advice in emergencies. For some time this claim of supremacy was made

by the church in Rome, not by its bishop or pastor. Clemens Romanus, who lived about A. D. 100, and who is said by Catholics to have been the fourth Pope from Peter, simply because he was Bishop or pastor of the Church in Rome, writes a letter from the church (not Bishop of Rome) to the Church in Corinth—a church letter, written to another church.

Ignatius, who was Bishop of the Church at Antioch in A. D. 109, while on his way to Rome at the command of Trajan to suffer martyrdom, wrote a letter to the church of Rome, addressing it as “She who has the presidency in the place of the regions of the Romans;” but he defines even this church supremacy as founded “upon sentiment of church fellowship, with the additional consideration attaching to the dignity and superior advantages belonging to the Church of the Capital.”

When Constantine professed conversion, in the beginning of the fourth century, he poured wealth and power into the lap of the Roman Church, making a union of Church and State. Then began, and not till then, the embryonic organization which, after hundreds of years of development, is the Papacy of to-day. The churches of the large cities began to have influence over surrounding churches. After a while, the strong city church claimed supremacy over the other churches, and by and by the pastor of the city churches claimed supremacy over the other pastors; and when Constantine conferred the wealth and power of the Roman Government on the church at Rome, then the Bishop of that church began to think of the supremacy to which claim has been made in later years. The expression “Son of Perdition” is suggestive. It was first applied to Judas Iscariot, because he was an apostate Apostle. Now it is applied by Paul to the Papacy, because it is an apostate church, so that a recent writer had more than prejudice on his side when he declared that “the Pope of Rome is the Vicar of Judas Iscariot.”

II. My second proposition is that the Pope of Rome is referred to in the text as the one that “exalteth himself above all that is called God, and, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.”

Now, has the Pope of Rome ever claimed that he is God? Listen! Marcellus, in an address to Leo X., said: “I come to thee as my true Lord and Husband.” . . . “For thou art our Shep-

herd, our Physician, our Governor—in fine, a second God on earth.” Leo received the blasphemy without remonstrance.

On the triumphal arch, under which Pope Alexander VI. passed, was written: “Cæsar was a man; Alexander is a God.” Listen to the boast of Gregory II. to the Greek Emperor: “All the kings of the west reverence the Pope as a God on earth.” And Pope Nicholas caps the climax in these words: “If these things be said to be done not of man, but of God, what can you make me but God! And if the prelates of the church be called and counted of Constantine for Gods, I then, being above all prelates, seem by this reason to be above all Gods.” Could the words of the text, “Who opposeth himself and exalteth himself above all that is called God,” be more literally fulfilled?

The phrase, “Temple of God,” refers, in the New Testament, to the place of God’s spiritual abode on earth. “Ye are the temple of the living God.” (2 Cor. 6: 16). Again—“Ye are built up a spiritual house.” (1 Peter 2: 5). The Pope has taken his seat in this spiritual temple, boldly asserting that he is on the very throne of God. The Holy Spirit, whose right it is to occupy the temple (for Paul said—“Ye are the temples of the Holy Ghost”) wherever this claim is admitted, is driven out, “for what agreement hath the temple of God with idols?”

But is not this claim a thing of the past, a child of the dark ages? Let us see! “In the person of Pius IX.,” said Cardinal Manning, while Pius was still alive, “Jesus reigns on earth, and he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet!” And Cardinal Manning lives to-day, and holds the same sentiments concerning Leo XIII. So does Cardinal Gibbons, who represents Jesus as saying to Peter: “Thou and thy successors shall be my visible representatives to the end of time.”

We are reminded of two scenes in the New Testament. On one occasion, Cornelius fell at the feet of Peter, and worshipped him. Did Peter receive the homage of Cornelius? Not a bit of it. He was so horror-stricken that he “took him up, saying, Stand up, I myself also am a man.” (Acts 10: 26). The other scene is in contrast with this. Herod made a speech to the people, and they shouted: “It is the voice of a God, and not of a man.” (Acts 12: 22). Herod received the homage, and the record says: “The angel of God immediately smote him, because he gave not God the

glory, and he was eaten of worms." (Acts 12: 23). I ask, which most resembles the Pope of Rome? Peter, who refused to be put in the place of God, or Herod, who accepted the blasphemy?

We are told that the Pope, as a man, may commit sin, and make mistakes; it is only when he speaks to us in his official capacity that his voice must be to us the voice of God! The opposite is true. However moral the private life of the Pope, when he speaks as God on earth, he becomes "the man of sin"—"the son of perdition," "who shows himself that he is God."

III. My third proposition is that "the lawless one" of the text is the Pope of Rome, and that the Papacy is "the mystery of iniquity," whose embryonic working had begun in Paul's day.

"Sin is the transgression of the law," and when a man declares himself independent of all law, he breaks all law, and becomes an outlaw. And the Pope of Rome, in claiming that he is God, subject to no human law, becomes the man of transgression, the outlaw of the ages. "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the king as supreme, or unto governors." (1 Pet. 2: 13.) Why did not Peter say "Pope" instead of "King," as being of supreme authority? The Pope can find no warrant in Peter's life or words for his outlawry.

Need we try to prove that the Papacy, wherever it has had full sway, has shown itself "the mystery of iniquity?" How mysteriously the Massacre of St. Bartholomew took place on that 24th of August, 1572! After the Huguenots had been invited to attend the marriage festivities of Marguerite de Medici and Henry of Navarre, the plot was laid, and for ten days it seems to have been maturing; and at night the Romanists lighted their windows, so that the soldiers could see to stab and shoot on the streets. On that day began the slaughter of 100,000 Huguenots, whose greatest crime was that they believed and preached justification by faith, and one mediator between God and man. And the Pope at Rome received this news with "unbounded joy." Rome was illuminated in honor of the event, and Philip II. of Spain, was Romanist enough to smile, we are told, for the first time in his life. We come just thirty-two years afterwards, to the "Gunpowder Plot" of London (November 5, 1604). In a dark room, after the plot had been laid by Guy Fawkes and his Catholic confederates, one of their number, a Catholic priest named Gerard,

pronounced absolution, and administered the sacrament to the conspirators. And those thirty-six kegs of gunpowder were stealthily packed beneath the building in order to blow up James II. his Lords and Parliament. The Roman Catholic Church of to-day is in the hands of the Jesuits, and the whole Jesuit order is a history of mysterious plots for the subversion of civil liberty, and the subjugation of the world to the Papacy. If one-half the things told by converted Catholic priests and escaped nuns are true, the "mystery of iniquity" still works in our very midst, behind convent walls and the secrets of the confessional. Whether true or false, the spirit of the institutions of this country, the spirit of humanity, which is the spirit of the Bible, demands that our legislators should open these jails and living tombs to inspection. If they have good in them, good can stand the light. If they have bad in them, let the iniquity be uncovered.

IV. My fourth proposition is the last:—The way to deal with the Papacy is to consume it with the spirit of God's mouth, and wait, for its complete destruction, till the "brightness of his coming." The Bible, God's word, is the "breath of his mouth." This "breath" shall consume the Papacy. "Is not my word like a fire? saith the Lord." We may well lay aside the torches of prejudice, and simply apply the fire of truth. For centuries it has been consuming Popery. The martyrs she burned at the stake never failed to apply the torch of truth, more consuming, though it may burn more slowly, than the fires which turned their bodies to ashes. When the art of printing was discovered, these torches were multiplied a thousand-fold by the multiplication of Bibles, until through Luther in Germany, Tyndale in England, the English translators under King James, Cary in Burmah, and hundreds of others, the fires now burn in every language and in millions of homes. Papal supremacy has already been consumed, and not a few Papal errors, even in the minds of Catholics, are more ashes than wood. The flames of truth are gathering about the Vatican itself; and on those streets where Paul once preached salvation by grace, but could not have preached for centuries on pain of death, are now proclaimed the unsearchable riches of Christ; and churches, whose members have allowed their bonds to be burnt off by the fires of God's truth, are now praising God in sight of St. Peter's under their

own "vine and fig tree," none daring to molest or make them afraid. You and I are the torch-bearers of this truth, not creating, but "holding forth the word of life." Break the pitchers of cowardice and policy, and let the light shine forth. Those, of course, whose eyes are used to the dark, and cannot stand the glare of God's truth, will not like it, but after the Holy Spirit shall have adjusted their spiritual vision to the light, they will then rejoice as thousands do to-day. God's word as a fire will burn. Torch-bearers, hide it "under a bushel" at your peril!

I close with a quotation from the fourteenth verse of the seventeenth chapter of Revelation: "And these (the 'scarlet woman,' 'the beast' and their sympathizers) shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them, for he is Lord of lords and King of kings: and they that are with him are called, and chosen, and faithful." True believers are the called and chosen. Have we been the faithful? While others exalt Pope, and church, and ordinances, it is ours to exalt the "Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world." "Him hath God exalted to be Prince and Saviour."

"Sinners, whose love can ne'er forget
The wormwood and the gall,
Go spread your trophies at his feet,
And crown him Lord of all!

"Let every kindred, every tribe,
On this terrestrial ball,
To him all majesty ascribe,
And crown him Lord of all!"

"And yonder with that sacred throng,
We at his feet shall fall;
We'll join the everlasting song;
And crown him Lord of all!"

XVI.

PETER VERSUS THE POPE.

“And we have the more firm prophetic word; whereunto you do well to attend, as to a light that shineth in a dark place.”—2 Peter 1 : 19.

The Douay Bible is the version accepted by Roman Catholics. It is a very imperfect translation of the Scriptures. Near the close of the fourth century, now that the Church at Rome had become so intimately connected with the Latin people, Damascus, Bishop of Rome, thought the time had arrived when the Bible should be translated into the Latin tongue; and he induced Jerome, a learned scholar, to undertake the work. Some one in North Africa, during the second century, had translated it into Latin. This was taken by Jerome as the basis of his translation, and, by comparing it with other manuscripts, he made what is known as the Latin Vulgate. The Douay Bible (so called because the Old Testament was first issued from Douay in France) is a translation of this Latin translation, and is not so near the truth as later translations from the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts—the languages in which the Bible was written. But at the Council of Trent, in the 16th century, this version was approved, and for this reason—not because it is the best—it is to-day the Catholic Bible. But, imperfect as it is, if our Catholic friends will only read it without the fetters of priestly interpretation, it will give them very clear ideas as to the doctrines of grace. And we shall quote from it in this study of Peter's teaching in comparison with the dogmas of the church he is said to have founded.

One of the first things which strikes me as I open this Douay Bible is the "Admonition," in which the readers are urged to accept without questioning the teaching of the church; and that it should not be read at all "without the advice and permission of the pastors and spiritual guides whom God has appointed to govern his church." And yet, Cardinal Gibbons, in his little book, grows horrified at the charge that the Roman Catholic Church is opposed to reading the Scriptures, and is the enemy of the Bible,—so horrified, indeed, that he is almost profane. "Good God!" he exclaims, "what monstrous ingratitude, what base calumny!" But, like everything that savors of profanity, these exclamations add no force to his words, but rather weaken them. And they are made to appear more profane, after we have read the 15 pages in which he tries to prove that the Bible should not be generally circulated, and that no man has the right to interpret the Scriptures for himself. This "admonition," however, does not deter us, for when we turn to the words of our text, we see that Peter gives very different advice:

"And we have the more firm prophetic word, whereunto ye do well to attend, as to a light which shineth in a dark place."

Peter is writing this epistle, not for Priests and Bishops but for the people, and he tells them they will do well to attend to the word of Prophecy. He refers to the Scriptures, and the most difficult parts of them at that. When he says (verse 20): "No prophecy of Scripture is made by private interpretation," he certainly does not mean to contradict what he has just said in advising them to attend to their meaning. The Apostle refers not to the explanation of Scripture, but to the making of it at first: "For prophecy came, not by the will of man at any time, but the holy men of God spoke inspired by the Holy Ghost." Men did not make this Bible of themselves, but were moved to write by the Holy Spirit. So men can interpret the Scriptures, only as they are filled with the Holy Spirit, who has been promised to guide us into all truth; and, as the gift of the Spirit is not for any class, but for all who believe and obey, so the interpretation of Scripture is not for any class, but for all who will trust the Spirit to guide them.

Difficult passages do not explain themselves, any more than they wrote themselves, but God, who moved men to write them, can explain them unto men; and it is the Apostle Peter's teaching in this passage, that we are to read them simply under God's guidance.

The passage, therefore, really means that no scripture is of private, but of public interpretation—open to everybody who is under the influence of the Spirit.

Here is a note to Peter's first Epistle in the Douay Bible: "This epistle is written with such Apostolic dignity as to manifest the supreme authority with which its writer—the prince of the Apostles—has been vested by his Lord and Master, Jesus Christ." To those who love the Bible, while they accept the supremacy of Peter, it must be comforting to find that he urges his readers to attend to its words, and for once they will do well to consider Peter as supreme, and ask the priest to stand aside.

We will now, as fairly and fully as we can, state the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church, and compare them with the teachings of the Apostle Peter:

I. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH TEACHES THAT GRACE IS GIVEN TO THE SOUL BY AN OUTWARD ORDINANCE, CALLED A "SACRAMENT." "A Sacrament is an outward sign, instituted by Christ to give grace." (Catechism.) Now hear the Apostle Peter: "Grace to you, and peace be accomplished in the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ our Lord." (2 Pet. 1:2.) Here it is asserted that grace is in the knowledge of Christ. To know God, in Christ, is to be a partaker of grace, without external ordinance. Again Peter says: "All things of his Divine power, which appertain to life and godliness, are given us through the knowledge of Him who hath called us by his own proper glory and virtue." (2 Pet. 1:3.) In this passage all things which God's power can give us, including all grace and all graces, come through our knowing Christ. To know him is to be saved. To know him is to have all things that pertain to life and godliness. Not to know him is to be lost, though every ordinance instituted by God

and man has been applied to you. If, therefore, we take Peter's teaching as final, we must reject the Pope's assumption of grace through the Sacraments.

II. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH TEACHES THAT BAPTISM IS THE SACRAMENT WHICH "CLEANSES US FROM ORIGINAL SIN, MAKES US CHRISTIANS, CHILDREN OF GOD, AND HEIRS OF HEAVEN," AND THAT "BAPTISM IS NECESSARY TO SALVATION." It is clear as light that Peter flatly contradicts these statements. In his sermon on the Day of Pentecost he exalted Christ, and said: "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved (Acts 2:21)." Salvation for the asking!

In reply to their question, "What must we do, men and brethren?" the Douay version makes Peter say: "Do penance, and be baptized everyone of you, in the name of Jesus, for the remission of sins." The word rendered "do penance" is correctly translated "repent" in the 19th verse of the following chapter: "Repent, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out." It means simply to change one's mind—to turn from sin to Christ, the sin-bearer. Here is God's definition of repentance: "Let the wicked forsake his way, and let the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." (Isa. 55:7.) No penance here. Free mercy through Jesus Christ.

But according to their own version Peter puts "penance" before baptism, an order the Roman Church will by no means allow. Their command is "be baptized," and then "do penance."

Taken in the light of other scriptures, the expression "baptized for the remission of sins" cannot mean that baptism itself cleanses from sin. Blood, not water, cleanses the soul! "The blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanseth us from all sin."

The Devil said to Jesus: "It is written." Jesus did not deny it, but replied, "It is written again!" And, if we are to know what the Bible teaches on any subject, we must take account of the "agains."

Let us not follow the Satanic method of taking a passage from its surroundings, and building a dogma upon it. The worst errors in the world have arisen from this very practice.

The fact is, remission of sins comes through repentance and faith, and baptism is a symbolic expression of that remission. Peter puts this question beyond doubt in the following words, which seem to have been written just for this error: "Whereunto baptism, being of the like form, now saveth you also, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the examination of a good conscience towards God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." (1 Pet. 3:21). Whatever else baptism may do, it does not put away the "filth of the flesh," and this "filth" of the flesh surely includes original sin, which the Catechism of the Roman Catholic Church says is washed away in baptism.

We are here driven to choose between the teachings of the Catechism and the teachings of the Apostle Peter. The Catechism was made by fallible men. Peter wrote as "moved by the Holy Ghost;" and they who regard him as the foundation of their church should accept his word; but it is evident that if they wish to have only the stones in their foundation which Peter took from the quarry of truth, they must dig up, and cast aside salvation by baptism. Peter reiterates his opposition to this error so frequently and clearly, that "a wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err," if he will but read. Listen to his words before the council at Jerusalem (Acts 15:7-11): "Men, brethren, you know that in former days God made choice among us, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And God, who knoweth the hearts, gave testimony, giving unto them the Holy Ghost, as well as to us; and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith. Now therefore, why tempt you God to put a yoke upon the necks of the disciples which neither our fathers, nor we have been able to bear? But, by the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, we believe to be saved." "These Gentiles," Peter tells us, "hear the word of the gospel, and believe." Their hearts are "purified by faith," not by baptism. They were saved by

grace, applied through faith: "By the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, we believe to be saved." Paul does not withstand, but stands with Peter in this, when he says, in that midnight scene, to the jailer, "Believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved."

Cardinal Gibbons, trying to prove the primacy of Peter, says again in his little book: "In the apostolic council of Jerusalem Peter is the first whose sentiments are recorded. Before his discourse, there was much disputing. But when he had ceased to speak, all the multitude held their peace." They held their peace because they knew that Peter was right in declaring that the Gentiles were saved by simple faith in Christ, without circumcision—which they had met in that council to discuss—or any other ordinance being made the channel. Now if the Cardinal will only be as good as the brethren of that council, who held their peace, he will forever keep quiet about salvation through baptism; and he may appropriately take the words of Peter as addressed to him and his brethren in error:—"Now, therefore, why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the necks of the people, which neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear? But, by the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, we believe to be saved." This yoke of ritualism was not put upon us by Peter. Let us throw it off, and be free through the abounding grace of God.

The same thought is repeated by Peter in his sermon to Cornelius; (Acts 10:36). "God sent the word to the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ (He is Lord of all);" and, in the 43rd verse,—“To him all the prophets give testimony, that by his name, all receive remission of sins who believe in him.” There is no baptismal salvation here! “By his name all received remission of sins;”—all who are baptized? Not a word of it; but “all who believe in him!”

After the household of Cornelius believed and were saved, Peter commanded them to be baptized as a confession of their faith. This agrees with our Lord's treatment of Nicodemus. Jesus is telling the Jewish ruler about the divine part in the new

birth, when he says, "unless a man be born again of water and of the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." (John 3:5.) The water in this text refers to the cleansing power of the Spirit through the truth. But, in the verses that follow, where he speaks of the human element in the process of salvation, it is—believe! believe! believe! from beginning to end; not a word about baptism! Read the 16th verse: "For God so loved the world, as to give his only begotten Son, that whosoever BELIEVETH IN HIM may not perish, but may have life everlasting." In the 18th verse—"He that believeth in Him is not judged, but he that doth not believe is judged already." Again, in the last verse of the chapter—"He that believeth in the Son hath life everlasting, but he that believeth not the Son shall not see life but the wrath of God abideth on him." So, you see, a greater than Peter, Peter's master, teaches that salvation is by simple faith in Christ. And we are not left in the dark as to the instrument which God uses to produce this new light in the soul. Peter tells us of the precious promises, by which we are made partakers of the divine nature. "Thy word," says David, "is light." Jesus, the light of the world, shines through his revealed truth; and the Roman Catholic Church has as much right to shut up the sun-light in the houses of the priests, and tell the people the only way to get day-light is to come to the priests for it, as it has to shut up this light in the minds of the priests, and tell the people they must come for it.

Turn now to 1 Peter 1:23, and we shall see the part God's word has in the new birth. "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but incorruptible, by the Word of God, who liveth and remaineth forever." And in the 25th verse—"This is the Word which by the Gospel hath been preached unto you." These words need no priestly interpretation; their meaning is on the surface. "The incorruptible seed" is planted in the heart—not by baptism, but "by the Word of God." And this word which "by the Gospel is preached unto us," is recorded in the Bible. To attempt to put a priestly lock upon it is worse than the attempt to take out a patent on air and sun-light! It

•

is like laying the hand of blight on the life germs of nature, and saying that the grass shall grow, and flowers bloom, only by the will of a class! Such a course, if possible, might turn our hillsides and gardens into barren wastes; and such a policy, in reference to the Word of God, has once turned this world into worse than a moral wilderness, a very charnel-house of spiritual death, of which Italy, Mexico and Spain are examples of to-day.

Paul asks the Thessalonian Christians to "pray for us that the Word of God may run and may be glorified," (2 Thess. 3:1.) Though he was in chains, he wrote to Timothy—"But the Word of God is not bound." It has been bound and burnt by those who would keep its plain teachings from the people, but, thank God! it never ran so fast or so far as it does to-day. The leaves of this "tree of life," scattered by God's providence, are everywhere healing the nations. The angel, flying through the heavens with the everlasting Gospel, has become a host filling the air and brightening the sky of every clime!

If Peter, now amid brighter glories than he beheld on the Mount, can look down upon this earth, we believe that nothing gives him greater pleasure than this universal diffusion of the truth which exalts, not him, but the Lord, at whose pierced feet he lays his crown! And could he return to earth, he would still exalt Jesus, as "He who bore our sins in his body on the tree," "by whose stripes we are healed."

In all his sermons and writings Peter mentions the word "church" but once, and then only in sending greeting, but he is never tired of speaking of Him, who is the "Shepherd and Bishop of our souls." Not a whit would he change his confession of faith: "Trust perfectly in the grace which is offered you in the revelation of Jesus Christ." (Pet. 1:13.) Not partially, but "perfectly trust" in this grace.

As he saw "Jesus only" on the Mount of Transfiguration, he would have us to see Jesus only as the object of faith.

And now, you who put such honor on Peter, will you believe his words, and simply look to Christ for salvation from sin?

III. ANOTHER DOGMA OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THAT THOSE WHO ARE CLEANSED IN BAPTISM RECEIVE THE HOLY GHOST AND A SORT OF SANCTIFICATION IN THE SACRAMENT OF CONFIRMATION. All of which Peter flatly denies. The household of Cornelius received the Holy Ghost before they were baptized: "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost, as well as we?" (Acts 10:47.) And we are not left in ignorance as to the channel through which the Holy Ghost came to them. "While Peter was yet speaking, the Holy Ghost fell on all that heard the word." Those who hear the Word of God, and obey it, have the promise of the Holy Ghost. (Acts 5: 32.) But, are we not commanded to be confirmed? As a sacrament conferring grace, nowhere in the New Testament. Confirmation is a work which God has delegated to no one on earth. Read what Peter says as to this: "But the God of all grace who hath called us unto his eternal glory in Christ Jesus, after you have suffered a little, will himself perfect you, and confirm and establish you." (1 Peter 5:10.) This agrees with the prayer of Jesus to the Father: "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth." Paul says: "Our Lord Jesus Christ who also will confirm you unto the end." (1 Cor. 1:8.)

Paul confirmed the churches in Asia by preaching the word to them, and that is the confirmation mentioned in the New Testament. Scriptural confirmation is a work of God, done in our hearts, through the truths revealed in the Book.

IV. ANOTHER DOGMA OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THAT ALL SINS COMMITTED AFTER BAPTISM ARE PUT AWAY BY THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE, WITH CONFESSION AND ABSOLUTION. Peter meets this, too, with a flat denial. He declares that "you were redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb unspotted and undefiled;" needing no addition from us, "who through him" (not through penance) "are faithful in God who raised him up from the dead, and hath given him glory that your faith and hope might be"—in penance? No—"in God; purifying your souls (not by pen-

ance, but) in the obedience of charity." (1 Peter 1:18-22.) There is no joy in a religion of penance. Catholic theologians hate and berate the claim that any Christian can be sure of heaven. The nearest they come to it is when they teach that there is salvation inside of their church, and only damnation out of it. Those inside, who have been well taught in this, feel complacently safe, whatever be their character. The man who has no conscience, because he has surrendered it to the priest, is, of course, at ease, but it is a rest which, like the sleepy disease of Africa, is a symptom of death. The truly devout among Catholics, so far as I have been able to learn, know nothing of the joys of Paul, when he says: "Rejoice in the Lord always, and again I say rejoice."

Clouds of penance give no refreshing showers, while they obscure the sun, and shut off its joyful rays. Even self-denial, for its own sake, and not for the sake of Jesus Christ, loses its blessing. All religious duties have a black pall thrown over them, the blackness of which enters the very soul. Spiritual exercises are prescribed as penances, and thus the things which God has ordained should be wings on which we mount up as eagles are made weights which we must drag like criminals in a chain-gang.

It is refreshing to turn from this appalling gloom and blackness to the radiant religion of the Apostle Peter. Listen! "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his great mercy hath regenerated us unto a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, unto an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that cannot fade, reserved in heaven for you who by the power of God are kept by faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time, wherein you shall greatly rejoice, if you must for a little time be made sorrowful in divers temptations, * * * * whom having not seen you love; in whom also, now, though you see him not, you believe, and believing shall rejoice with joy unspeakable, and glorified." (1 Peter 1:3-9.)

Here is salvation not measured by penance or merit, but by the great mercy of God, as "the Father of the Lord Jesus

Christ!" Here is a religion not fearing the torments of purgatory, but cherishing a lively hope through a living Christ. Here is assurance of salvation not based on my ability to say so many prayers, or do so many disagreeable things, but upon the power of God, which keeps me through faith unto salvation. Here is an inheritance for me that cannot be reached by its enemies, for it is reserved in heaven—God's power keeping the inheritance for me, and keeping me for the inheritance. No wonder that Peter declares we have a "joy unspeakable." Unspeakable suffering purchased an unspeakable inheritance, and left us not a farthing to add.

"Oh, for such joy let rocks and hills
 Their lasting silence break;
 And all harmonious human tongues
 The Saviour's praises speak."

Now to you who are trying to get forgiveness by penance the Apostle Peter offers a better way. Your sins, all of them, have been borne by Christ. "If the Son shall make you free, you shall be free indeed." He does not break a few shackles, and leave us to wear off the rest by penance, but the hammer of his merit shatters every shackle, and lets fall their pieces at his pierced feet. Leave them there, and rejoice that you are free through the grace of God.

V. ANOTHER DOGMA TAUGHT BY THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THAT PENANCE, OR THE TEMPORAL PUNISHMENT DUE TO SIN, MAY BE REMITTED BY INDULGENCE. We are told that an indulgence does not mean a license to sin, but only a remission of the temporal punishment due to sin. But since it is indulgence for sins past, present or future, it is evident that in the minds of the people who get indulgences they are little less than permission to sin. I quote the words of the Church Catechism :

"To gain an indulgence, we must be in a state of grace, and perform the works enjoined." In other words, we must be baptized and confess to the priest, and do such things as please the dignitaries whose right it is to grant indulgences. At first the

Pope kept this privilege as his own, and for several centuries a thriving business was carried on for the benefit of the Papacy. St. Peter's Cathedral was built, to a large extent, by the sale of indulgences. Tetzels hawking them for sale on the streets of Germany hastened the Reformation. They are granted to-day in Baltimore, whether for money or for good things done to the church depends upon the wish of him who grants them. Recent Catholic writers, indeed, say that there is more reason now than formerly for granting indulgences, for penances are not so heavy as they used to be, and to meet the demands of justice for sins committed, persons should give or do what may be required to secure an indulgence. The words of Peter will force themselves upon me: "And many shall follow their riotousness, through whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of, and through covetousness shall they, with feigned words, make merchandise of you." (2 Peter 2:2.) There was a time when this applied to the traffic in indulgences with terrific force, but an open Bible, the breath of God's mouth, has consumed the evil in its worst form. And yet the custom of charging so much for so many prayers for the living or the dead is as bad. The mission of Jesus Christ was to minister, and not to be ministered unto, and the church, Protestant or Roman, that has resolved itself into a society for forcing money out of people has sadly fallen.

VI. THE LAST DOGMA OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH, ON WHICH WE WILL HEAR THE OPINION OF PETER, IS THAT EVEN THE SAVED, AFTER BAPTISM, CONFIRMATION, PENANCE AND INDULGENCE, MUST GO THROUGH PURGATORY BEFORE THEY CAN BE FITTED FOR HEAVEN. And purgatory is a place of some kind of fire, for that passage of Paul, in which he says that some will "be saved so as by fire," is taken out of its connection and made to sustain this dogma. We are told that Jesus went and preached to the spirits in prison, and this is interpreted as referring to Purgatory, whereas the context shows that "the spirits in prison" were only those who "waited for the patience of God in the time of Noah, when the Ark was a-building," which may mean that Jesus preached

through Noah to "the incredulous," and that their spirits were so bound by prejudice, unbelief and sin that they could be said to be in prison. The mission of Christ was to "preach a release to the captives, and deliverance to them that are shut up." (Isa. 61:1.) Because Peter tells us that the gospel was preached to the dead, we are not to infer that some one went to Purgatory to preach it, for the lost, all through the Scriptures, are called "dead in sin."

So far as I can ascertain, the best of Catholics are expected to go through Purgatory. Even for Popes and Bishops prayers are offered year after year—many years after their deaths—that their souls may repose. Penance here and Purgatory hereafter is the poor Roman Catholic's experience. A nun, of whom we have read, had spent most of her time in torturing penance, even walking on cut glass; and when she came to die, she said that her feet were already burning in the fires of Purgatory. This is the experience of thousands to-day. Penance and gloom here, and death is an entrance into a darker valley, with fire on the other side between us and the Father's house. But such was not Peter's expectation: "Wherefore, brethren," he says, "labor the more that by good works you may make sure your calling and election." Do not labor to be saved, but that you may prove that you are saved. "Faith without works is dead." "For doing these things," he continues, in practicing the virtues just mentioned, "you shall not sin at any time"—and now comes the bright prospect—"for so an entrance shall be ministered to you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." (2 Peter 1:10-11.)

I can imagine nothing more horrible than the deaths of our Catholic friends. You have been in the death room, where the candles are burning. This means that it is dark! Blow out the candles, friend, and let in the sun. "The path of the righteous shineth more and more unto the perfect day."

Note the contrast between this and the experience of Christians who have died with faith in a personal Christ. Thrilled with a hope like Peter's, only this "abundant entrance"

is before them. Mr. Payson, while dying, said: "I am going to bathe in an ocean of purity and benevolence and happiness to all eternity." "Oh for arms to embrace him and for a well tuned harp," said good old Samuel Rutherford as he passed into the brighter light. "Glory to God!" said Mr. Abbott, "I see Heaven sweetly opening before me!" And he entered it with the angels that came to lead the way! Paul did not feel that he was slipping into Purgatory, when he said: "I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness!" Not crowns of flame, but crowns of righteousness! That same Paul said: "To be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord." Lazarus was carried by the angels unto Abraham's bosom. The thief on the cross went with Christ straight to Paradise.

And after a while, when your time and mine comes, we can say with Pope:

"The world recedes; it disappears;
 Heaven opens on my eyes, my ears
 With sounds seraphic ring—
 Lend, lend your wings!
 I mount! I fly!
 O grave! where is thy victory?
 O death! where is thy sting?"

Listen! I can hear the words of that redeemed soul just entered into the Heavenly City: "The Lamb that was slain is worthy to receive power and divinity, and wisdom and strength, and honor and glory, and benediction." (Rev. 5:12.) Listen again. The voice of the Apostle Peter rings out above the rest as he repeats a verse in that same chapter of Revelation: "To Him that sitteth on the throne, and to the Lamb, benediction and honor, and glory and power, for ever and ever." Not glory to church; not glory for merit or for work, for suffering in penance or Purgatory, but unto the Lamb shall be the glory, now and forever.

XVII.

CIVIL LIBERTY AND THE PAPACY.

“Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar’s, and unto God the things that are God’s.”—Matt. 22 : 21.

THIS text clearly defines the proper relation between the church and the state, between things political and things spiritual. “My kingdom,” said Jesus, “is not of this world.” Cæsar represents all government. His kingdom is of this world, and deals only with things seen and temporal. The kingdom of Christ, being not of this world, deals with things unseen and eternal. The two kingdoms are organically separate and distinct. Cæsar in his realm has a right to tribute and all other dues; Jesus in his realm has a right to all our love and loyalty. “The powers that be are ordained of God.” (Rom. 13 : 1.) “Rulers are not a terror to good works, but to evil.” (Rom. 13 : 3). “He is the minister of God to thee for good.” (Rom. 13 : 4). God does not usurp the place of Cæsar by investing his church or minister with political power; and Cæsar has no right to usurp the place of God by putting himself up as the ruler of men’s consciences. Every man has a God-given right to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience. “To his own master he standeth or falleth.” (Rom. 14 : 4.) “Every one shall give account of himself to God.” God deals with the individual face to face, and not with individuals through the organization, be that organization church or state. He saves the individual, not the organization as such, and no man or body of men has a right to come between the individual and his God. It ought to go without saying that no man or body of men has a right to take the place of God, and treat with men as God. And yet the Papacy does that very thing. It has

virtually dethroned both God and Cæsar by declaring that it is both church and state, and that no one has a right to think or act. without its permission. Bear in mind, please, what I mean by the Papacy. Not the Roman Catholic people, who are as distinct from the Papacy as the slave is from his master. The Papacy is that organization whose head is at Rome, and whose thousand arms reach everywhere. It is composed, not of the people—they form no part of it—but of officials, called Pope, cardinal, bishop, priest, etc. Until 1870 the seat of power was in the Pope and the Councils, but since that date all power and authority are vested in the Pope himself, so that the Papacy of to-day is really the Pope. What he says is law; what he commands must be obeyed on pain of eternal damnation. No one can call him to account. The claim of the Papacy is that this one man, and he an old man approaching his dotage, is both church and State, both God and Cæsar, that he is both spiritual and temporal ruler of all men, that he is subject to no government on earth, but all governments are by divine right subject to him. Nay, more; the tiara or triple crown, which the Pope wears, symbolizes that he is ruler of earth, heaven, and hell. He claims authority to bind and loose on earth and in heaven, to consign to hell all who refuse to acknowledge his authority. A more unlimited monarchy, a more perfect despotism never existed. Now the question for us to settle is not whether the Catholic people of this country believe in civil and religious liberty, but does the Papacy, of which the people form no part, and in which they have no voice but the voice of unquestioning obedience—does this Papacy believe in civil and religious liberty? And if it does not, what attitude does it bear to this government and our republican institutions?

Since the days of Gregory VII., in the eleventh century, the Papacy has been unchangeable in one respect, and that is in the claim that the Pope is the temporal and spiritual ruler of this world. Her methods for the realization of this ideal have changed a hundred times, but her purpose has been uniformly the same. Her ideal was reached when Henry IV. stood three days barefoot in the snow begging an audience of his holy majesty the Pope. To retain when held, and to regain when lost, this supreme power, has been the unchanging policy of the Papacy for seven hundred years. Has she changed? Is the Papacy in America different

from the Papacy of history and of Europe? Has the lion been transformed into a lamb? Has despotism been converted into liberty-loving republicanism? We wish the facts warranted an affirmative answer; but they do not. The Papacy in its attitude toward civil and religious liberty is the same now that it was then. We are compelled by the facts in the case to believe that the Papacy of to-day and in this country is the enemy of religious liberty, civil liberty, mental liberty, and soul liberty. We beg you to hear in all coolness the proof of this assertion.

I. First, as to religious liberty. The Bible gives to every one the right to "search the Scriptures," and decide for himself his relation to God, and God's relation to him. Paul wrote to the Thessalonians: "I charge you, by the Lord, that this epistle be read to *all* the holy brethren." (1 Thess. 5: 27.) And again to the Ephesians: "Take the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God." (Eph. 6: 17). Several of his Epistles are addressed "to all that call on the name of our Lord Jesus Christ." Even the Jew was commanded to keep the law in his house, and read it to his children. Nowhere are the Scriptures committed to a special class for interpretation to others. All people have a right, not only to read, but to interpret it for themselves. Indeed it is more than a right, it is a duty which we cannot neglect without sin. "I speak as unto wise men," says Paul, "Judge ye what I say." (1 Cor. 10: 15.) "I speak unto you," says Rome, "and you have no right to have any judgment of your own." "Be ye ready," says Peter, "to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you." (1 Peter 3: 15.) Rome says: "Give your conscience over to the priest, and have no more concern about it." The Bible not only gives authority to search its pages for the truth, but goes further, and commands us to try the teachers who come to us with a message, real or pretended, from God. "Beloved, believe not every spirit (referring to teachers) but try the spirits, whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world." (1 John 4: 1.) It is plain that the meaning is, we are to try these teachers by the revealed word of God. And Paul says: "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel to you than that you have received, let him be accursed." (Gal. 1: 8). Here the word of God is put above the teacher, though that teacher be an angel from heaven. To pro-

hibit men from interpreting the Bible, or to compel them to receive the decision of councils rather than the Bible, is an infringement of religious liberty. Now, every Catholic must subscribe to the following: "I also receive the Holy Scriptures according to that sense which the holy mother church—to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scripture—did and doth hold. Nor will I ever take and interpret it otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers." "The Holy Mother Church," since 1870, simply means the Pope, and there is scarcely a text in the interpretation of which all "the fathers" are agreed.

From compelling men to interpret the Scriptures as we please, there is but a step to compelling them to worship as we please. Full religious liberty means perfect liberty in our relation to God, to believe or not to believe, to worship or not to worship, or to worship in any form our conscience approves. In the realm of religious liberty suasion is the only weapon to be used. "God alone is Lord of the Conscience." The Christian has no more right to persecute the infidel than the infidel has to persecute the Christian.

This religious liberty is opposed by the Papacy with might and main. Pope Pius IX., in his encyclical letter of 1854, states clearly the Roman Catholic position: "The absurd and erroneous doctrine or ravings in defense of liberty of conscience are a most pestilential error—a pest of all others most to be dreaded in the State." This same Pope in 1864 anathematized "those who assert liberty of conscience and religious worship," and "all such as maintain that the church may not employ force." The present Pope, Leo XIII., in his encyclical of 1888, echoes the same sentiment: "From this it follows, that greatly opposed to reason, and tending absolutely to pervert men's minds, is that liberty of which we speak, in so far as it claims for itself the right of teaching what it pleases—a liberty which cannot be granted by the State without failing in its duty. And the more so, because the authority of the teacher has great weight with his hearers, who can rarely decide for themselves as to the truth or falsehood of the instruction given to them." . . . "To this society, the church, he intrusted all the truths which he had taught, that it might keep and guard them, and with lawful authority explain them; and at

the same time he commanded all nations to hear the voice of the church, as if it were his own, threatening those who would not with everlasting perdition." . . . "In faith, and in the teaching of morality, God made the church a partaker of his divine authority, and, through his divine help, she cannot be deceived. She is therefore the greatest and most safe teacher of mankind, with inviolable right to teach them."

How does that accord with the Constitution of the United States which says: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof?" The two are as much opposed as light and darkness. The Constitution puts Cæsar in his proper position. Government rules in matters of State, while the domain of conscience in the matters of religion is left entirely to God and the individual. The Papacy, on the other hand, declares through its first infallible Pope that such liberty of conscience is "a most pestilential error—a pest of all others to be dreaded in the State." We do not believe that the Papacy will ever overthrow our Constitution, and take from us religious liberty, because the Catholic people of this country are to a large extent more in sympathy with the Constitution than with the Papacy, but that does not alter the fact that the Constitution could not exist an hour, if the Papacy had the power to carry out its principles.

Cardinal Gibbons gives an interesting definition of religious liberty. "A man enjoys religious liberty," he says, "when he possesses the free right of worshipping God according to the dictates of a RIGHT conscience, and of practicing a form of religion most in accordance with his duties to God." One with half an eye can see in this definition room enough for another Inquisition with its racks and roasting, for the purpose of bringing men to a "right conscience," and inducing them to "practice a form of religion most in accordance with their duties to God." Ask the Cardinal what he means by a "right conscience," and he will say that it is a conscience which owns the authority and accepts the dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church. Ask him what is a form of religion most in accordance with the duties of men to God? And he must reply that it is the form sanctioned by the Roman Catholic Church. He dare not answer otherwise, for in the oath of allegiance which he took as Cardinal are these words: "Heretics,

schismatics and rebels to our said Lord [the Pope], or his aforesaid successors, I will to my utmost persecute and oppose." A little farther on in his book, the Cardinal again lays down the doctrine of religious liberty in its fulness, and, lest his readers should think that he has gotten it up for the occasion, he quotes it from "the great theologian Becanus." And here it is: "Religious liberty may be tolerated by a ruler, when it would do more harm to the State or to the community to repress it." In other words, religious liberty is not a right, but a thing of policy to be granted, when it might do more harm to repress it than to grant it. The history of the Roman Church proves that it always thinks it will do less harm to repress it, whenever it has the power. They evidently think that it would do more harm than good to try to repress it in America just at this time, so that their "Prince" must satisfy himself with the harmless amusement of dressing himself in his fancy robes and exhibiting himself at parties for the gratification of his society friends. In that way a few heretics may be attracted and won, while priest and nun do more serious work, till the time come, when it will do less harm to repress than to tolerate religious liberty.

Some writers of the present and recent days are not so careful in their utterances as our politic Cardinal. "Religious liberty," says Bishop O'Connor, "is merely endured until the opposite can be carried into effect without peril to the Catholic world." The Archbishop of St. Louis puts it a little stronger: "Heresy and unbelief are crimes, and in Christian countries, like Italy and Spain for instance, where all the people are Catholics, and where the Catholic religion is an essential part of the law of the land, they are punished as other crimes." The *Rambler*, a London paper, delivers itself as follows: "Religious liberty, in the sense of liberty possessed by every man to choose his religion, is one of the most wicked delusions ever foisted upon this age by the father of all deceit. The very name of liberty, except in the sense of a permission to do certain acts, ought to be banished from the domain of religion. No man has a right to choose his religion." Mr. Louis Veuillot, a writer highly approved at Rome, explains the philosophy of the Roman Catholic position: "When there is a Protestant majority," says he, "we claim religious liberty, because such is their principle; but, when we are in a majority, we refuse it, because that is our principle."

We thank God for all the men among Roman Catholic people who have advocated religious toleration, when they had power to persecute. Such were Lord Baltimore and others who have adorned the records of Maryland history. But from what has been said it is clear that they were not in accord with the spirit of the Papacy then or now. The second Lord Baltimore was doubtless not sufficiently indoctrinated in Roman Catholic faith and exclusiveness, while he was a child. His father did not join the Roman Church until the 41st year of his age, and young Cecil did not have the advantage of a parochial school, where he would have been fortified in Roman Catholic dogma. It ought to be remembered also that the Governor of Maryland in 1649, when the act of toleration was passed, was a Protestant, and the majority of the council, by the suffrage of Lord Baltimore, were also Protestant. (Brown's "Maryland," p. 66.) Be that as it may, the act of Toleration did not confer religious liberty. It merely tolerated the existence of different sects. To speak against the Trinity, the Virgin Mary, or the Apostles; to call any one by the epithet of heretic, Puritan, Jesuit, Papist, etc., was punishable by fine. A Jew could not hold office. It was the kind of toleration that would arrest me for writing this book; the kind of toleration by which a Baptist preacher lies to-day in a Cuban jail for preaching against the Confessional. Nevertheless all praise to Baltimore and his Protestant associates for such an act of toleration. And we will not excuse the Puritans for their persecuting spirit manifested afterwards, though it must be confessed that they acted upon the principle couched in the act of Toleration that the right to permit implies the right to suppress. The birthplace of true religious liberty on this continent was Rhode Island. A writer in Johnson's Cyclopaedia does not put it too strongly, when he says: "To Rhode Island belongs the pre-eminent honor of being the first state in the world to incorporate in its organic law and to practice absolute religious liberty." Full liberty to all, Jew, Infidel and Christian alike, with a prayer and an effort to bring all to a knowledge of "the truth as it is in Jesus" was the policy of Roger Williams. Cherish the memory of the founders of this commonwealth, who, in spite of the Papacy, were tolerant of the existence of others who differed from them, though they would not allow a free expression of those differences; but

thank God more for the perfect liberty of conscience we enjoy to-day.

II. We would naturally expect that the Papacy, which opposes religious liberty, would oppose with equal ardor all civil liberty. Such is the case. A distinction is made between the ecclesiastical and political power of the Papacy, in order to shield the church from the odium of butchering heretics. We are gravely told that the Roman Catholic Church never killed anybody. She simply condemned them, and turned them over to the secular arm for punishment. So that the secular arm, not the church, is to blame. On this principle the Roman government, not the Jews, is wholly responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus. They simply condemned him, and turned him over to the secular arm for punishment. Those who make this quibble know as well as any one that the Pope claims supremacy over all kings and rulers of the earth. Not a particle has he wavered in that claim since the eleventh century. Now the question to be answered is, Is the Papacy of to-day the enemy of civil liberty? That it has been in the past no sane man will deny. Has it changed? Can we expect better things of it now?

There are three things which mark the Papacy as the enemy of civil liberty.

1. *The Pope claims that he is the temporal as well as spiritual ruler of the world.* American Roman Catholic citizens are taught that they owe allegiance to the Pope; and, should there ever be a conflict between this government and the Papacy, that they should support the Papacy. All whom the Pope elevates to official positions take oath that they will "endeavor to preserve, defend, increase and advance the authority of the Pope." Bishop Gilmour, in his Lenten letter of 1873, declares that "we are Catholics first, and citizens next." Cardinal McCloskey, of New York, struck the same note in the words, "They (the Catholics of the United States) are as strongly devoted to the sustenance and maintenance of the temporal power of the holy Father as Catholics in any part of the world; and if it should be necessary to prove it by acts, we are ready to do so." Father Hecker said in 1870, "There is ere long to be a state religion in this country, and that religion is to be the Roman Catholic." The hope of preserving our civil liberty lies in the fact that both Cardinal McCloskey and Father

Hecker are mistaken. We believe they are, and therefore hope.

A Roman Catholic state religion means the suppression of all others. To prove that assertion, let me quote an extract from an able article in the *Forum*.

“When, in 1815, the King of Holland granted his new realm a constitution according freedom of worship, the bishops had it thrown out, because this spirit of freedom is directly opposed to the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church. When, in 1830, Belgium gave herself a constitution with modern liberties, Gregory XVI. condemned it on this account in a famous encyclical letter. In the concordat concluded with Spain by Pius IX., in 1850, one of the articles is as follows :

“‘The Catholic religion shall be maintained as the exclusive religion of the realm in such sort that the practice of all other worship shall be forbidden and prevented.’

“In the concordat with the republic of Ecuador, in 1862, there is the following stipulation :

“‘The Roman Catholic and apostolic religion is to continue to be the religion of the republic of Ecuador. Consequently no other worship may be practiced, nor any other sect tolerated in the republic.’

“When freedom of worship was proclaimed in Mexico, the encyclical letter of December 15, 1856, denounced it to the world as an abominable act, destined to corrupt men’s minds and root out the holy religion.”

In the same magazine for May is an article by a Roman Catholic bishop, in which occur the following words: “One whose lightest word is treasured up by millions of every clime, who look upon him as the guide of their conscience, must be above suspicion of any controlling influence; must be, not only in word, but in fact, supreme.” So you see the claim for the temporal supremacy of the Pope is not a dream of the past, but a reality of the present.

In a sermon, delivered not long ago, Cardinal Manning makes the Pope say: “I acknowledge no civil power; I am the subject of no prince, and I claim more than this: I claim to be the supreme judge and director of men—of the peasant that tills the field and of the prince that sits upon the throne.

I am the sole, last, supreme judge of what is right and wrong."

Lafayette, being a Roman Catholic, knew the spirit of the Papacy well enough to predict that "if the liberties of the American people are ever destroyed, they will fall by the hands of the Romish clergy." But is not the present Pope, Leo XIII., in sympathy with Republican institutions? Let him speak for himself. In his address to the pilgrims on the occasion of his jubilee, he declared that the great foe of the church to-day is universal suffrage. In his Encyclical of 1888 he uses these words: "And, first, let us examine that liberty in individuals, which is so opposed to the virtue of religion, namely, the liberty of worship, as it is called, which rests on this principle, that every man is free, to profess, as he chooses, any religion or none." . . . "Justice, therefore, forbids, and reason forbids, the State to be godless, or to adopt a line of action which would end in godlessness, namely, to treat the various religions, as they call them, alike, and to bestow upon them promiscuously equal rights and privileges. Since then the profession of one religion is necessary in the State, that one must be professed which alone is true, and which can be recognized without difficulty, especially in Catholic States, because the marks of truth are, as it were, engraven upon it. This religion, therefore the rulers of the State must preserve and protect, if they would provide, as they should do, with prudence and usefulness for the good of the community."

In this Encyclical Leo XIII. denounces "rule by the majority;" and one of the speakers in the Roman Catholic Layman's Congress, which met in Baltimore, November, 1889, emphasized the same sentiment. Rule by the majority in this country means nothing more nor less than the Ballot Box. Take that from us, at the dictate of the Pope, and what else worth the having is there left? Nothing but a mass of wreck, with "His Holiness" enthroned upon the pile.

2. *The opposition of the Papacy to a free press and free speech is another proof that it is the enemy of civil liberty.* In 1864 Pope Pius IX. anathematized "all who maintain the liberty of the press and all advocates of free speech." And he calls such liberty "the liberty of perdition." In closing his Encyclical Leo XIII.

is equally emphatic. He says: "From what has been said, it follows that it is in no way lawful to demand, to defend, or to grant unconditional freedom of thought, of speech, of writing, or of religion, as if they were so many rights which nature had given to man."

Wherever the Papacy has the power, it is a gag upon lip and pen. Without freedom of speech our free institutions could not be maintained.

There lies open before me as I write a copy of the "Summa Theologia," by Thomas Aquinas, which every Roman Catholic priest is expected to commit to memory. It is a rare book in Protestant hands, but I am fortunate enough to have it through the kindness of a friend, who was for twenty-five years a Roman Catholic priest. On page 90 are these words: "Quouquam hæretici tolerandi non sunt ipso illorum demerito, usque tamen ad secundam correptionem expectandi sunt, ut ad sanam sedeant Ecclesiæ fidem; qui vero post secundam correptionem in suo errore obstinati permanent, non modo excommunicationis sententia, sed iliam sæculoribus principibus exterminandi, tradenti sunt." "Though heretics must not be tolerated because they deserve it, we must wait till they are twice admonished to come back and repent. But if, after a second admonition, they remain obstinate in their errors, they must not only be excommunicated, but they must be delivered to the secular power to be exterminated."

Such is the spirit of the Papacy, not during the Dark Ages, but to-day, under the blaze of light in this nineteenth century. The claws and teeth have been extracted, but the tiger's nature is there.

3. *A third strong proof that the Papacy is the enemy of civil liberty is its determined and persistent opposition to our public schools.* "It will be a glorious day for the Catholics of this country," said the *Catholic Telegram*, of Cincinnati, "when, under the blows of justice and morality, our school system will be shivered to pieces." With which sentiment we entirely agree. Such would be a glorious day for Romanism, but a dark day for our Republican institutions. The Papacy has believed in the education of her clergy, but never in the education of the masses. The golden age of her history was during the Dark Ages, when princes, unable to write their names, had to make their mark.

Rev. Josiah Strong truly says: "In her relation to the masses she has adhered to her own proverb—'Ignorance is the mother of devotion.' In Protestant countries, like Germany and the United States, where there is strong sentiment in favor of popular education, she has been compelled in self-defense to open schools of her own. But her real attitude toward the education of the masses should be inferred from her course in those countries where she has or has had undisputed sway; and there she has kept the people in besotted ignorance. Instance her own Italy, where seventy-two per cent. of the population are illiterate, or Spain, where we find eighty per cent., or Mexico, where ninety-three per cent. belong to this class."

And even in America her parochial schools are more assiduous in teaching the value of relics, images, penance, invocation of saints and the doom of heretics, than they are in teaching science and history. Joseph Cook's words as reported in the *Boston Traveler*, are not too strong: "As to the parochial schools themselves, it is well known that the instruction that Catholic children are given there is not such as to fit them for the duties of enlightened citizenship. Then again, the system is disposed to destroy our magnificent system of unsectarian public schools, upon which the hope of the republic depends. The instruction given in parochial schools is always sectarian, greatly mutilated, and generally misleading.

"For instance, I find that in all of them the statement is made that the Roman Catholic Church had nothing to do with the Inquisition or the massacre of St. Bartholomew. 'The saddest thing I ever saw in Paris,' said Bismarck, 'was a lot of mutilated text-books, doctored by Jesuit Priests.' On the whole, the tone of these text-books is not only anti-American and anti-Protestant, but they are anti-cultured and anti-scholarly; and this is the rubbish that is crammed down the throats of Catholic children. By their own confession, the Catholic authorities have made up their minds to keep the people of this country in the same state of intellectual childhood as is found in Europe. Consider what this means to our country."

The enemy of liberty of conscience, a free press, free speech and popular education, the three pillars on which this government stands, is the enemy of civil liberty, and we do not hesitate

to say that the only way for the Catholic Church of America to prove its loyalty to this government is to declare itself independent of the old man on the Tiber, and adapt itself to the spirit of our institutions. Until then we have a despotism in a republic, a foreign power alien to our institutions, ruling and controlling millions of the people of these United States.

III. *The Roman Catholic Church is one of the worst enemies of soul liberty on earth.* The Bible teaches us that in Jesus Christ we are free from the penalty of the law. We are not under law, but under grace. Romanism keeps its devotees in bondage to the law. Jesus said: "If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." "Not so," says Romanism, "you must be made free also by penance, indulgence and purgatory." The Bible teaches a full assurance of faith. Paul could say "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day." (2 Tim. 1: 12.) The Papacy tells us that we can know no such thing, but must live in mortal dread of being lost in hell.

Christ makes us dead unto the law, and alive unto him. Our Roman Catholic friends are still under law, and we come to them, in God's name, with an emancipation proclamation for every one of them. Here it is: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus." (Rom. 8: 1.) "Being justified by faith, let us have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." (Rom. 5: 1.)

XVIII.

CONFESSION AND THE "CONFES- SIONAL."

"To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth on him shall receive remission of sins."—Acts 10 : 43.

"Confess your faults one to another."—James 5 : 16.

THE first text teaches three things: 1. That there is such a thing as remission of sins; blessed fact for those whose hearts and lives are guilt-burdened! 2. That this remission comes to us through the merit of Christ. "Through his name." 3. That we obtain this remission by faith. "Whosoever believeth on him shall receive remission of sins."

The second text teaches the duty of mutual confession. It makes no distinction. The people are no more bound by it to confess to the priest than the priest is bound to confess to the people. And yet, this is the one passage on which Romanists base their practice of auricular confession. They make it mean that the people should confess to the priest, while they excuse the priest from confessing to the people. The fact that it takes such a misinterpretation to support the "Confessional" clearly shows that such an institution is nowhere recognized in the Scriptures. We should confess our sins to God, and expect forgiveness without priestly absolution. David said: "I acknowledge my sins unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord, and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin." (Ps. 32 : 5.)

Again: "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight." (Ps. 51 : 4.)

Confession to God insures forgiveness. "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins." (1 John 1 : 9.) But such confession should be made directly to God, not through a third party. When the prodigal son returned, he went straight to his father with full confession. The Romanist plan would have

made him look up one of the servants on the plantation, and confess to him. In the Lord's prayer God is addressed: "Our Father who art in heaven . . . Forgive us our trespasses." Which, being interpreted in the light of the "Confessional," would mean, "Father, who sits in a little box with a hole in its side, forgive my trespasses." The publican in the temple did not bother about seeking a priest, but prayed directly to him who is always near enough to hear, "God be merciful to me a sinner."

The priest does not claim to *pronounce* the sins of a penitent forgiven after confession, but really, as God, to forgive sins. Hear the words of the Council of Trent, the Bible of the Papacy: "Whosoever shall affirm that the priest's sacramental absolution is not a judicial act, but only a ministry to pronounce and declare the sins of the party confessing forgiven, let him be accursed." For the Pope to claim that he is God upon earth is blasphemy indeed, but here is multiplied blasphemy. Thousands of priests, some of them bad men, take their seats in the temple of God, each of them claiming that he is as God. And, what is worse, a bad character does not affect this claim. Here is the law: "Whosoever shall affirm that priests living in mortal sin have not the power of binding and loosing; or that priests are not the only ministers of absolution, let him be accursed."

All this authority is drawn from a passage in Matt. 16: 19, which does not mention confession, and which we have already shown does not put Pope, much less priest, in the place of God.

The Bible makes no distinction between sins; the "Confessional," on the other hand, divides sins into "mortal" and "venial." And it is difficult to determine just what sins are venial, and what mortal. "Mortal sin," says the "Catechism," "is a grievous offence against the law of God." "This sin is called mortal, because it deprives us of spiritual life which is sanctifying grace, and brings everlasting death and damnation on the soul." "To make a sin mortal, three things are necessary—a grievous matter, sufficient reflection and full consent of the will." Just what a "grievous matter is" the priest must determine; and, so far as we can ascertain, such sins as attending Protestant meetings and reading the Bible without the consent of the priest are counted a more grievous matter than the breaking of some of the Ten Commandments. "Venial sin," continues the Catechism,

"is a slight offence against the law of God in matters of less importance, or in matters of great importance; it is an offence committed without sufficient reflection, or full consent of the will." These definitions give the priest wide margin in imposing penances, for it is left with him to attach to each sin its guilt and penalty. At one time a price was set upon each sin, so that the penitent, by the payment of a certain sum, might have an "indulgence." "The officers of the Roman chancery," says Mr. John Dowling, "published a book containing the exact sum to be paid for any particular sin. A deacon guilty of murder was absolved for twenty crowns. A bishop or abbot might assassinate for three hundred livres. An ecclesiastic might violate his vows of chastity, even with the most aggravating circumstances, for the third part of that sum. To these and similar items it is added: "Take notice particularly that such graces and dispensations are not granted to the poor, for, not having wherewith to pay, they cannot be comforted." And abundant proof exists that indulgences are to-day sold to the faithful in the United States. And, however strong the protest that such an "indulgence" does not give permission to commit sin, its practical workings have that effect. It goes without saying that this miserable traffic in the sins of the people has no Scripture warrant, and of the distinction between sins, which is the basis of the traffic, the Bible knows absolutely nothing. "Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." (James 2: 10.) "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." (Gal. 3: 10.) "The soul that sinneth it shall die;" and we fear that this esteeming some sins lightly has been the death of many a soul.

Confession of sins to God makes men better. "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to CLEANSE US FROM ALL UNRIGHTEOUSNESS." (1 John 1: 9.) We have reason to believe, on the other hand, that the Confessional makes priest and people worse. The following extract from Dowling's "History of Romanism" is a dark picture, but none too dark, if converted nuns and priests by the score are to be believed: "The horrible disorders, seductions, adulteries and abominations of every kind that have sprung from this practice of auricular confession, especially in Spain and other popish

countries, are familiar to all acquainted with the history of Popery for the six centuries that have transpired since the fourth council of Lateran. The details of individual facts on this subject are hardly fit to meet the public eye, though multitudes of them might easily be cited, derived not merely from the testimony of Protestants, but from the admission of Papists themselves, and from numerous, though ineffectual, laws that have been passed to restrain the practice of priestly solicitation of females at the confession. Nor can this be matter of surprise. The evil is inherent in the system. Let any person of common sense examine the list of subjects and the questions for the examination of conscience in any popish book of devotion, but more especially [if he understands Latin] the directions to young priests in Dens' and other standard works for the study of popish theology; then let him remember that the subjects of these beastly inquiries are often young, beautiful and interesting females (who are taught to believe that the priest is as God unto them), and that the questioners are men, often young and vigorous, burning with the fires of passion, in some instances almost wrought up to phrensy by a vow of celibacy which they would be glad to shake off, and then he will cease to wonder that the Confessional has so often been turned into a school of licentiousness, seduction and adultery.

"In 1560 a bull was issued by Pope Pius IV., directing the Inquisition to inquire into the prevalence of this crime, which begins as follows: 'Whereas certain ecclesiastics, in the kingdoms of Spain and in the cities and dioceses thereof, having the cure of souls, or exercising such cure for others, or otherwise deputed to hear the confessions of penitents, have broken out into such heinous acts of iniquity as to abuse the sacrament of penance in the very act of hearing the confessions, not fearing to injure the same sacrament, and him who instituted it, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by enticing and provoking, or trying to entice and provoke females to lewd actions at the very time when they were making their confessions, etc., etc.'"

"Upon the publication of this bull in Spain, the Inquisition issued an edict, requiring all females who had been thus abused by the priests at the Confessional, and all who were privy to such acts to give information within thirty days to the holy tribunal; and very heavy censures were attached to those who should neglect or

despise this injunction. When this edict was first published, such a number of females went to the palace of the Inquisition in the single city of Seville, to reveal the conduct of their infamous confessors, that twenty notaries and as many inquisitors were appointed to minute down their several informations against them; but, these being found insufficient to receive the depositions of so many witnesses, and the Inquisition being thus overwhelmed, as it were, with the pressure of such affairs, thirty days more were allowed for taking the accusations; and this lapse of time also proving inadequate, a similar period was granted, not only for a third, but a fourth time. . . . But the multitude of depositions and the odium which the discovery threw on auricular confession and the popish priesthood, caused the Inquisition to quash the prosecutions and to consign the depositions to oblivion." Such is the tendency of the "Confessional" to-day.

Thinking upon the bad will make men bad. Paul says: "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure. . . . If there be any virtue, if there be any praise, think on these things." (Phil. 4: 8.) In the Confessional the priest is compelled to sit and listen hour after hour to things which defile. No wonder a young priest in Brooklyn, as he testified after his conversion, always hastened from the confessional to the place of sin. It debauches the priesthood, and gives them every opportunity to debauch others. Not a few men have left the priesthood, because they felt that they could not remain longer in it and have self-respect. They are to be pitied, as Father Chiniquy says, rather than abused. The system is to be blamed. The Confessional is not only unscriptural and immoral in its tendencies; it is decidedly un-American. It is used as a battering ram against our system of public schools, which the Papacy has decreed shall be destroyed. The priests have the power to refuse absolution and to impose the severest penances upon those who will not take their children from the public schools, and put them in parochial schools. It is a little inquisition in our midst. With one in the family who goes to the Confessional no family secret is safe. With one in the cabinet who goes to the Confessional no State secret is safe.

Let us all confess our sins to God, and expect full forgiveness through the merit of Jesus Christ, and these dangers will be avoided.

XIX.

THE GOOD IN ROMAN CATHOLICISM:

HOW TO GET AT IT.

“ Prove all things ; hold fast that which is good.”—1 Thess. 5 : 21.

I SHALL quote to-day from a “ Catechism of Christian Doctrine,” prepared by order of the third Plenary Council of Baltimore, and signed by Archbishop Gibbons. It contains a fair summary of Roman Catholic doctrine, and in it there is much that is good, with much that is bad. The object of this sermon will be to point out, frankly, the good, and, just as frankly, the bad which counteracts the good.

On page 6 is the important question : “ What must we do to save our souls ? ” Ans.—“ To save our souls, we must worship God by faith, hope and charity ; *i. e.*, we must believe in him, hope in him, and love him with all our heart.” Good answer ; a more evangelical could hardly be found.

The effort of this pulpit is to lead men to believe in God, hope in God, and love God with all their hearts. When we have done that, we are saved and happy. But the question and answer which follow neutralize the good of this :

“ How are we to know the things which we are to believe ? ” Answer.—“ We shall know the things which we believe from the Catholic Church, through which God speaks to us.”

This shuts up the Bible, through which God really speaks to us, and commands us to listen to Popes, councils and traditions.

“ God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son.” (Heb. 1 : 1.)

“The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.” (John 1 : 17.)

“This is my beloved Son, hear ye him,” said God, on the Mount of Transfiguration, and he speaks to us to-day through the words of his Son recorded in the Bible; and to him, and not to tradition, we are to give heed.

The Church that pretends to speak, in the place of Christ and the Bible, is a usurper. When we turn to the Roman Catholic Church, we find her not only contradicting the Scriptures, but even, through some of her infallible popes, claiming the right to correct the very teachings of Christ himself. “Wherefore know, moreover,” wrote Pope Nicholas, “if it be in my power to change times and times, to alter and abrogate laws, to dispense with all things—yea, with the precepts of Christ;” and then he goes on to name five things, which Jesus Christ taught, that he chooses to set aside, and substitute other things in their place.

When we try to find exactly what the Roman Catholic Church teaches, we are at a loss, for in one age it teaches one thing, and in another age it contradicts it, all the time claiming that it is the only infallible teacher. It agrees now, however, in virtually upsetting this first good answer by declaring that men are not saved by faith, hope and charity; but, by baptism, penance and purgatory.

Let us ask, in the light of this Catechism, what is the Church through which God speaks to us?

On page 20 is the following answer: “The Church is the congregation of those who profess the faith of Christ, partake of the same Sacraments, and are governed by their lawful pastors, under one visible Head.”

According to this definition, the Roman Catholic Church which interprets God’s teachings, and which speaks from God to us, “is the congregation of those who profess the faith of Christ;” *i. e.*, the laity, composed of men, women and children; and yet everybody knows that the people have no more voice in deciding what ought to be taught and believed than the serfs of Russia have in controlling their government.

Practically the Church through whom God speaks is the Pope, and whomsoever he may appoint.

Our plea now is for the rights of the Roman Catholic laity, as conceded by this definition of the church.

If it be true, God speaks through you, my Roman Catholic brother or sister, as much as through the Pope, or the cardinal, or archbishop, or priest; and, if he speaks through you, you are bound to listen to him when he speaks to you; and the only place where you can hear his voice distinctly is in the audience chamber of his own Word, the Bible. God does speak through his church. "Faith cometh by hearing; hearing by the word of God;" (Rom. 10: 17), and he says to every one of us: "Go, disciple the nations, baptizing them; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." (Matt. 28: 18). So that, if you will enter upon the rights accorded by this definition of the church, you will study the Bible, proclaim its truth, seek the evangelization of the people, and tell them what God would have them do.

But if, on the other hand, you allow the Papacy to define the church for you as meaning simply the Pope and his officials, you destroy this definition, and put yourself in the attitude of a slave rather than a free man in Christ Jesus.

As I read on in this Catechism, I come to the "Apostles' Creed," every clause but one of which I accept. I do not believe the Bible teaches that "Christ descended into hell," but "I believe in God, the Father Almighty, Creator of Heaven and earth, and in Jesus Christ, his only Son our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified; died and was buried. The third day he arose again from the dead; he ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of God, the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the living and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and life everlasting."

If our Roman Catholic friends are allowed to interpret this Apostles' Creed in the light of the Apostles' teaching, they will be truly evangelical. They will see in it the Fatherhood of God, the Sonship of Christ our Lord, implying allegiance to him only; the suffering, death, burial, resurrection, ascension and intercession of this mighty Saviour, coming by and by to judge the world; they will see in it the Holy Ghost, the living God, ever with his people, to guide them into truth, to convert the souls of men, to comfort, strengthen, to build up a truly Catholic Church, with

Jesus Christ as its only Head; the real "communion of saints," in a sense defined by the scriptures, saved sinners, with a common Christ, a common hope, a common destiny, common joys, common struggles. And "the forgiveness of sins," full, complete—so complete that their sins are not to be mentioned to them forever. And they will see the "resurrection of the body, and life everlasting" which does not mean everlasting existence merely—that which is to begin after Purgatory has been endured, but a "life everlasting" which is to know God, to come into possession of true life by faith in Christ, who is the Life.

The teaching of Roman Catholicism as to the personality of God, is all right—Father, Son, Holy Spirit—three in one. So is the doctrine of original sin; though it has not a particle of scripture for dividing actual sins into "mortal" and "venial,"

We accept with all our heart its view of the incarnation, that Jesus Christ was human and divine, living and dying without sin within him, though our sins were upon him; but we reject, as opposed by the plain teaching of Scripture, the theory that he was kept from sin by the sinless nature of his mother. We are sorry to have to say it, but the divine nature of Jesus is obscured, and the human side degraded by other teachings of the Papacy; Mary, Joseph and scores of other human saints are called upon to intercede with Christ, as if he were hard to move—without human sympathy. The fact is, his heart is as tender as Mary's can possibly be, and is more touched "with a feeling of our infirmities." We need no woman as intercessor with him, who has, in himself, all the strength of the perfect man, which includes the womanly and the manly in equal proportion. To claim that any human being is better fitted to sympathize with us and help us does great dishonor to the perfect humanity of our Lord.

The divinity of Christ, so clearly taught in the Catechism, is dragged in the mire by the Papal dogma of transubstantiation. Tell a man that Jesus is divine, and then tell him, in the next breath, that a priest, even of immoral character, can, by an incantation, turn a little bread and water into the soul and divinity of Christ, and you have degraded the idea of that divinity. "He that created me," says a learned Cardinal, "gives me—if it be lawful to tell—to create himself;" and Pope Urban declared,

“The hands of the Pontiff are raised to an eminence, granted to none of the angels, of creating God, the Creator of all things—offering him up for the salvation of the whole world.” A real God, first created and then eaten! Omnipotent power, linked with cannibalism! Who can believe, as he ought, in the divinity of Christ, and, at the same time, believe such an absurdity?

To the question, “Why did Christ suffer and die?” the Catechism gives a scriptural answer: “Christ suffered and died for our sins.” Here is the glorious doctrine of substitution, so clearly taught in the Bible. In that one sentence there is enough truth to save every Roman Catholic in the world, and many, we believe, accept it, and are saved. But the Papacy covers this blessed truth with loads of rubbish. “Christ died for our sins,” and yet we are told that we are not completely saved by the merit of the death of Christ. We must add our penance, our good works; and, if we should die without having added enough, we must square accounts by suffering in Purgatory. More than this, we may so accumulate merit that we can turn over a surplus to be distributed among others who have not done so well; and, though we may so accumulate this surplus of merit, we are not allowed to believe that the merit of the suffering Jesus is sufficient even for us.

The saddest part of it all is, that the merit of Christ's suffering is cut off from our Roman Catholic friends. “By grace are ye saved through faith,” says the Bible, and repeats it, in substance, a thousand times. “By grace are ye saved,” through baptism and penance, says the Roman Catholic Church! “The blood of Jesus Christ cleanses from all sin,” says the Bible. “Baptism is a sacrament which cleanses us from original sin, makes us Christians, children of God, and heirs of heaven,” says the Catechism.

“Justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus,” (Rom, 3: 24), says the Bible. “Not of works, lest any man should boast.” (Eph. 2: 9). Not so, says Romanism, we are justified by the addition of our own merit, and may even lend merit to help justify others.

The teaching that Christ suffered and died for our sins is good, but the teaching that the merit of his sufferings is conveyed to us by baptism and penance is bad enough, if we believe it, to shut us out of heaven. The store-house of Christ's merit is full, but

the Papacy furnishes the wrong key with which to get at it; so that we are just as much cut off from it as if we had no key at all, or as if the store-house were empty. The pearl of salvation is there, but it is buried fathoms deep beneath the dark waves of false teaching.

It is taught in this Catechism, too, that the Holy Spirit is truly God, and imparts gifts to us, but they take out of his hand his own word, which is "the sword of the Spirit."

They shut up the channels through which these gifts flow to men. Jesus prayed: "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth." (John 17: 17). But Roman Catholicism teaches that the channel of sanctification is the sacrament of confirmation, through which come "the fear of the Lord, piety, virtue, knowledge, counsel, understanding and wisdom." The scriptural teaching, on the contrary, is that these graces come through the revealed truth, opened and applied by the Holy Spirit.

Many Roman Catholics are noted for their good works. Many of them are strong advocates of temperance and other moral reforms. The best reply to the champion blasphemer of America yet written is from the pen of a priest. Sisters of Charity are assiduous in their attentions to the sick. They are slaves of their church. They give up their comfortable homes for a life of service. From the outside, all this is beautiful and commendable; but ask the Sisters of Charity why they do this. Are they prompted only by love for Christ and suffering humanity? So far as I have been able to learn, two motives usually influence them: first, the fear of punishment; second, the hope of saving themselves by good works. To escape hell and purgatory, they think it worth while to suffer almost any torture here. To gain heaven, they are willing to endure any amount of hardships.

God tells no one to seek to escape hell by his own sufferings on earth, but to escape it by accepting the sufferings of Christ in his stead. He tells no one to seek to gain heaven by good works, but to believe on Jesus Christ as the sinner's Saviour, and then, by good works, show his gratitude.

An attempt to save one's self by good works is sure to result in destruction: "By the deeds of the law, there shall no flesh be justified." (Rom. 3: 20).

We find in this Catechism such a thing as forgiveness of sins.

That is good. But "when we are told that the way to get forgiveness is to seek it by confessing to the priest, that's bad ; and, when we are told again that the priest sits in the place of God, and, judicially forgives sins, that's worse. Peter tells us in Acts 10 : 43 how we may obtain forgiveness : "Through his name every one that believeth on him shall receive remission of sins." Here is a store-house of God's forgiveness, but Romanism furnishes the wrong key again, and thus shuts out her devotees. Faith in Christ and confession to God is the true key to forgiveness of sins.

We find in the Catechism the Ten Commandments. Unlike some others that have been published, it brings in the first commandment, which says : "Thou shalt not have strange gods before me. Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing ; nor the likeness of anything that is in heaven above or the earth beneath ; nor of those things that are in the waters under the earth. Thou shalt not adore them, nor serve them."

But the Catechism explains it away by saying that we may look upon them, and think, as we bow before them, of what they represent—the identical thing that the heathen did in Egypt at the time these commandments were given to Moses. They declared, as do all idol worshippers to-day, that they did not worship pieces of wood or stone or pictures, but simply what they represent. And this commandment was made by Jehovah against this very practice. "God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." (John 4 : 24). He intended that his worship should not be materialistic, like the worship of the heathen deities. And this commandment, enforced to-day, teaches that for us to make or to bow down before an image of wood or stone or painting, is idolatry. Crucifixes and relics and pictures are all included.

Now we are glad that so high a tone of morality is taught to parochial school children as we find in the exposition of these Ten Commandments ; but the study of theological books develops the fact that for the children under the blaze of Gospel light and public sentiment, there is one set of strict morals, while for the priest and the officials, who speak in God's name to the people, there is quite another set ; so that we find several of the commandments greatly modified in Catholic theology.

"Thou shalt not kill" is beautifully explained in the Catechism. It includes "living in peace with our neighbor, respect for his rights, to seek his spiritual and bodily welfare, take proper care of our own life and health." It includes wilful murder, fighting, anger, hatred and bad example. And yet in standard Roman Catholic authorities, we are told that there is no harm to kill heretics. Liguori, in his "Moral Theology," says: "To strike a clergyman (ecclesiastic) is sacrilege; but it is lawful for a person to sell poison to one whom he believes will use it for bad purposes, providing the seller cannot refrain from selling without losing his customer." Again: "If a calumniator will not cease to publish calumnies against you, you may fitly kill him, not publicly, but privately, to avoid scandal. It is lawful to kill an accuser, whose testimony may jeopardize your life and honor." And, as Mr. Van Dyke says: "To make this code of infamous morals as vile as possible, it is further affirmed in all the above cases that, if a man has a right to kill any person, another may do it for him, if affection move the murderer;" so that on certain conditions, papal morality allows us to break the command, "Thou shalt not kill." "Tell it not in Gath!" Whisper it not to the rising generation; they will learn it soon enough if they study for orders, and decide to become the servants of the papal power!

The command, "Thou shalt not steal," is beautifully explained. "It means," we are told, "that we are to give to all men what belongs to them, and respect their property; it forbids all unjust taking or keeping what belongs to another; we are bound to restore ill-gotten goods, or the value of them, as far as we are able to;" all of which is good, and we would not part with a clause of it.

But some books of Catholic theology set aside this commandment, or so modify it as to make it sinless, under some circumstances, to break it. Even Cardinal Manning has recently said that every man has a right to a living; and, if he cannot get it in any other way, he has a right to steal it.

In a Catechism approved by French bishops is this question and answer: "Is one always guilty of robbery, when he takes the property of another?" "No, it might happen that he whose goods he takes has no right to object. For instance, when he takes in secret of his neighbor by way of compensation."

"Servants," we are told, "may steal from their masters as much

as they judge their labor is worth more than the wages they receive." "If a son has robbed his father, as a compensation, the confessor need not enforce restitution, if he has taken no more than the just recompense of his labor." "A woman may take the property of her husband, to apply to her spiritual wants, and to act as other women act;" so that the pressure of need, or sense of injustice, or even a desire to live as other people live, according to this theology, will excuse a man for stealing.

The Eighth Commandment, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor," is just as beautifully expounded. "We should speak the truth in all things, and be careful of the honor or reputation of every one. It forbids all rash judgments, slanders and lies." And yet we are plainly taught, by the moral code of Roman Catholic theology, that "no faith is to be kept with heretics;" and the weight of infallibility itself is given to this position. As many as four Popes have put themselves on record to that effect. Martin V. said: "Be assured thou sinnest mortally, if thou keep faith with heretics." Not only is it right to break faith with heretics, but a sin not to do it!

Gregory VII., in one of the solemn councils at Rome, said: "We, following the statutes of our predecessors, do, by our apostolic authority, absolve all those from their oath of fidelity who are bound to excommunicated persons, either by duty or oath, and do loose them from every tie of obedience."

Gregory IX. is just as emphatic: "Be it known to all who are under the domination of heretics, that they are set free from every tie of fealty and duty to them, all oath and solemn agreement to the contrary notwithstanding."

Pope Innocent VIII., in his bull of excommunication against the Waldenses, echoes the same sentiment, when he gives his Nuncio authority, "to absolve all who are bound by contract to assign and pay anything to them."

The Council of Constance, though under solemn pledge to protect John Huss, condemned him as a heretic, and burnt him at the stake. The Emperor tried to interpose, pleading his plighted word of honor; but it was solemnly decreed, "the person who has given the safe conduct thither, shall not in this case be pledged to keep his promise."

But, enough of the bad, which so fearfully counteracts the good.

Now, as to the question, how can we get at the good in Roman Catholicism, and escape the bad? We answer in one sentence.

TURN FROM TRADITIONS AND TEACHINGS OF COUNCILS TO THE
BIBLE.

Whatever in Romanism that is good, you can find in the Bible. The bad was borrowed from the paganism that surrounded her. She took from pagan Rome her Pontifex Maximus, her Vestal Virgins, her patron saints, her canonization of heroes, her processions and candles, and Latin language, and her Purgatory. So, the best way to get rid of all the bad is to go to the fountain-head of the good. Study the best translations of the Scriptures you can find. The Douay version, recommended by the Roman Catholic Church, is better than none. Read that, without the fetters of priestly admonition and anathema. Determine that you will know what God has said in this Book of Life. The Douay Bible contains the Apocrypha, which, beyond doubt, is not trustworthy. In selecting other books you wish the best on the subject. Let your ambition be for the best in Bible translation. The Canterbury version was made by the best scholars in the world; the manuscripts from which it was translated are the most authentic. Get that, and study it prayerfully, asking God to guide you into all its truth.

While Mr. Davies was preaching once in the presence of George III., the king and his courtiers were disorderly. Mr. Davies paused, looked toward the royal pew, and said: "I am speaking the word of God. When the lion roars, the beasts of the earth tremble; and when God speaks, let the kings of the earth keep silence." And George honored him for his faithfulness.

God speaks through this inspired Book. Listen to his word, whatever others may say against it! Take the position that, while God is speaking, all councils and traditions must keep silence.

Are you under the burden of life's cares? Go to this Book for the promises that cheer, and sustain, and comfort.

Are you in perplexity as to duty? Turn to the Book that lays down principles of truth upon which you may act!

Do you want to help others in their struggles? Open the Bible, and gather from it the treasures with which you can enrich the poor, strength for the weak, joy for the sorrowful, life for the morally dead!

Are you afflicted in body or harassed in mind? Come to this stream for healing; come to this harbor for quiet!

Have you battles to fight within and without? Come into this armory, and take the sword, and the breast-plate, and the helmet, and the shield, and the girdle of righteousness, and the shoes of the preparation of the gospel of peace. Going forth in God's strength, you will conquer with these his weapons!

Have you come to death? Are the sands of time crumbling beneath your feet? Does heart and flesh fail? Put this book under your dying head, and your mind can rest upon its truth! Lay it upon your throbbing heart, and its words will quiet its beating! Look through it, and there will come light gleaming from the beyond, that shines through the valley and the shadow! It brings you into personal relation with the Saviour and Mediator, into association with guardian angels, into reconciliation with God, into perfect freedom from the guilt and penalty of every sin!

You are absent from home, a pilgrim and a stranger. Your time is but a span; and, if the breath is leaving your body, this Book tells you that you are going home, and not through the sulphurous flames of Purgatory to reach the Golden Gates, but straight up the highway of glory, unto the crown and the throne! And, as you read it, you will grow home-sick to depart, rather than shrink in terror from the portals of death. Turn from everything that is human to the Divine Word, with its Divine Saviour, its Divine Father, its Divine Spirit, its everlasting home!

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries



1 1012 01245 3496

