

THE REFORMATION

14th-16th CENTURY


What It Meant THEN
What It Means NOW





BR 305 .J67 1913
Jones, Alonzo Tr evier, 1850
-1923.
The Reformation, 14th-16th
century





True
Houze Jones

MAY 27 1914

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE
REFORMATION

14th—16th Century

What It Meant Then
What It Means Now

ALONZO TRÉVIER JONES

1913



COPYRIGHT, 1913
BY
ALONZO T. JONES



P R E F A C E

This book is not a history of The Reformation.

It is a study of The Reformation: of —

Why it came,

How it came,

What it was when it came.

Was it and is it a proper thing that The Reformation should be in the world? or did Rome do right in refusing it? and should it now be repudiated by the people of the United States?

That there may be no room for question as to what The Reformation was when it came, each principle of it is clearly and fully stated in the very words of the men by whom it came.

Then, in order that the real character of it may be certainly known, each principle is tested by the Scriptures.

One special wish throughout has been to make everything plain even to the commonest understanding.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I.

The Reformation Renounced.

“A Solid Front”—Luther’s Disintegrating Doctrine—Not Against Rome—The Great Councils—Parallel with Rome—“State Aid”—Faithlessness. 1-10

CHAPTER II.

What Is “Protestant?”

The Edict of Worms—The Secular Arm—Luther’s Answer—Luther to the Emperor—Diet of Nuremberg—The Pope’s Confession—Germany’s Grievances—The Pope Threatens Frederick—Second Diet of Nuremberg—“The New Mohammed”—Confederations—“Save the Church”—The Word of God—Diet of Spires—Church Holidays Evil—The Deadlock—“Save the Empire”—Religious Liberty—Papal Peace—Second Diet of Spires—Imperial Revolution—The Diet Stands Firm—Proposal of Compromise—The Crisis—“A Settled Affair”—The Protest—What Is Meant by True and Holy Church—The Protestants—What It Means. 11-44

CHAPTER III.

What “Protestant” Means in America.

The Falling Away Begins—False Protestant—State Churches—Crime and Folly—Protest in Virginia—Virginia Freed—Madison Leads for Religious Liberty—Religious Freedom in Virginia—Natural Right—National Religious Freedom—Constitutional Guaranties—American Principles—Reformation Principles—Character of Legal Religion—Fruits of Established Religion—Gospel Liberty—Washington for Religious Liberty—Individuality—Separation of Christianity and the State—The Christian Principle—A Hundred Preachers Deny It—The Glory of America—Changed the Face of the World—Rome’s Designs on America. 45-70

CHAPTER IV.

What Caused The Reformation?

Submission or Expulsion—The Church Militant—Ecclesiastical Monopoly—All for Money—Pardon of Sin for Money—The Papal Tax List—Quarrels Cultivated—The Inquisition—Compelling to Sinfulness—Dissolution of Marriages—“A Wide-Spread Contagion”—The Church Responsible—The Papal Pinnacle—Two Popes at Once—Papal Anarchy—Three Popes at Once—The Council of Constance—Pope John Deposed—“The Church” Saved by “The World”—Worse than the World—“The Tempest of Abomination”—“Ministers of The Beast”—The Pope is Told the Truth—“More

Like a Step-Mother''—''The Ruin of the World''—''Religion a Mine of Gold''—Papal Supremacy Complete—God Sent The Reformation..... 71-104

CHAPTER V.

The Reformation: and the Roman Church.

The Key of All—''Isn't That The Church?''—''Stand by the Old Ship''—The Rise of the Reformation—Is That The Church?—Militz and Matthias—The Reformation is Regeneration—Oxford and Prague—God Defends The Reformation—Ziska: the Blind General—Miraculous Panics—''Negotiations''—The Reformation Given Away—The Faithful Ones—The Promises of Coming Day—Huss's Dream—The Elector Frederick's Dream—''Thou Art Come, O Desired One!''—Duke George Arraigns The Church—The Reformation or Rome—Rome or The Reformation.....105-132

CHAPTER VI.

The Reformation Church.

What Is The Church?—The True Church—The Divine Definition—The Church Is Infinite—The Fulness of God—The Divine Concept—The Mystery of God—The Family of God—The Household of God—The Church in Heaven and Earth—The Pre-eminence—The Church of the Universe—The Associations of The Church—The Antagonist of The Church—The Mystery of God Finished—The Rejoicing Universe.....133-152

CHAPTER VII.

The Reformation Head of The Church.

Christ the Visible Head—The Visible Becomes Invisible—Christ with Us—The Invisible Becomes Visible—''The World'' Cannot See—''Ye See Me''—The ''Visible Church''—A Visible Fraud—The True and the False Invisible.....153-166

CHAPTER VIII.

The Reformation Building of The Church.

The Foundation Stone—Receive Him—''Added to the Lord''—The Marriage Ceremony—''Added to The Church''—The Lord Does Not Cast Out—''The Church is thy House''—''The Churches of God''—The Single Assembly—God's Building—The Crown of Creation....167-180

CHAPTER IX.

The Reformation Guidance of The Church.

The Spirit to Every One—The Head of Each One—Head Over All to The Church—The Gifts of the Spirit

—Be No More Children—The Greco-Roman Obtrusion—
The Colossal Presumption—Subject to Christ.....181-192

CHAPTER X.

The Reformation Christian Unity.

The Roman "Mark of Unity"—The Christian Unity
—The Christian Fellowship—All One in Christ Jesus—
That the World May Know—The False Unity.....193-204

CHAPTER XI.

The Reformation and the Bible.

The Roman Church and the Bible—The Scripture
the Faith of The Church—Understanding The Scriptures
—All Rules Are One—Freedom of Christians—The En-
thralled Conscience—The Evil of Human Ordinances—
Human Superstitions—Fundamental Principles—Noth-
ing but the Word of God—All Duty is Commanded—
Sanctification Through the Word.....205-220

CHAPTER XII.

The Reformation and The Gospel.

Righteousness by Faith—Christ Is All—"The Just
Shall Live by Faith"—The Ten Commandments—The
Purpose of The Law—Righteousness Without the Law—
The Purpose of The Gospel—The Faith of Jesus—Into
the Holiest—Unlawful Use of The Law.....221-234

CHAPTER XIII.

The Reformation Christian Brotherliness.

The Universal Priesthood—The Primitive Dignity
—Christian Liberty—The Highest Service—Authority to
Preach—The Real Excommunication—The Divine Call
—"Orders, Sects, and Parties, Fall"—Price of Loyalty
to God—Simple Christianity—Princes of the Gentiles—
The Church Not to Rule—"The Form of a Servant"—
Christian Government—The Christian Ministry—Chris-
tian Dignity—All Are Ministers—"A Mischievous In-
sect"—The Nicolaitanes—Anti-pa-pas—"Which Thing
I Hate"—The Greatest of All.....235-260

CHAPTER XIV.

The Reformation Religious Liberty.

The Holy Empire Church—Spiritual Emperor: Secu-
lar Pope—The Sole Point of Issue—The Word Above The
Church—The Church Off The Throne—"Unconditional
Submission"—Submission Only to the Word—Apostolic
Religious Liberty—"Lord, Thou Art God"—"God
Rather than Men"—Christian Religious Liberty—Bands
and Fetters—Religious Liberty Itself.....261-278

CHAPTER XV.

The Reformation and the Papacy.

Wicklif on Antichrist—"The Chief Antichrist"—Militz on Antichrist—Militz Preaches in St. Peter's—Matthias on Antichrist—The Cunning of Antichrist—False Miracles and Wonders—The Person of Antichrist—Huss on Antichrist—Luther on Antichrist—Truth That Must be Told—The Bible on Antichrist—Against the Most High—Papacy Confirms the Prophecy—Rome Fastens It upon Herself—Divine Description of Rome—Jesus on the Prophecy—Paul on the Prophecy—Daniel and Paul—The Heavenly Things—The Sanctuary of Christianity—In Heaven Itself—The Daily Ministry of Christ—Taken Away and Cast Down—The Daily Ministry of Rome—In Place of The True—Can Never Take Away Sin—Desolation and Abomination—The Secret of Rome's Power—The Place of Satan's Seat—The Throne of Satan—The Beast—The Ultimate Antichrist.....279-320

CHAPTER XVI.

The Reformation and Federation.

The Splendid List—The Masterpiece of Christian Truth—Men Instead of Word and Spirit—The New England Theocracy—Extension of The Reformation—John Wesley on The Church—Wesley on the Papacy—The Reign of Satan—Wesley on the False Christian—Purpose of The Reformation—The Advent Movement—Culmination of The Reformation—Wm. Miller on The Church—The Name of "Adventists"—"Sectarianism"—Christianity is Individual—Denominationalism—The Baptists and Federation—Object of the Federal Council—The Ecclesiastical Power—"Say Ye Not 'A Confederacy'"—Individuality and Salvation.....321-356

CHAPTER XVII.

The Federal Council and The Reformation.

"Power Over Men"—The State Supplanted—The New Inquisition—Religious Legislation—The "Christian" Religion by Force—The Fourth Commandment—What The Issue Is—Enforced Sabbath Observance—The Lord's Day—Two Separate Things—A Sacerdotal State—Sunday Laws Religious Only—Union of Church and State—Both Days Observed—The Council of Friuli—Sunday First Called Sabbath—The Council of Trent—The Change Accomplished—The Rise of the Puritans—The Puritans' Perplexity—The Puritan "Sabbath"—Queen Elizabeth—The Book of Sports—Charles I—The Sunday

Law of Charies II—The “Model” Sunday Law—Genealogy of Sunday Laws—The Federal Council Follows—History Repeating—The Reformation Principle—The Will and Worship of Rome—The Sign of Rome—All the World Worships—All Denominations—Both Days “Free From All Work”—Rome’s Reign Enforced.....357-404

CHAPTER XVIII.

The Reformation and The Sabbath.

The Reformation Demands It—The Doctrine of Sunday—What Is The Sabbath—It Was Made for Adam—Christ the Only “Adam”—The Divine Sign—Knowledge of God—God as Revealed in The Sabbath—God as Revealed in Christ—The Sabbath Blessing—The Divine Parallel—The Bread of The Presence—The Sabbath “Remaineth”—Christ Is The Way—“As God Did”—What Sabbath Keeping Is—In the Lives of Christians—To the End of the Bible—After the Bible Closed—To the Eleventh Century—To the End—The Sign of Loyalty to God—Forevermore405-434

CHAPTER XIX.

That Woman Jezebel.

Jezebel’s Reign—Jezebel Restored—The Crowning Evil—False Worship Enforced—The Mystery of Iniquity Finished—The Reformation Finished—The True Ones Delivered435-444

CHAPTER XX.

The Two Women of Revelation.

No Daughter: Many Daughters—The Children of Babylon—The Children of Zion.....445-450

CHAPTER XXI.

The Christian and Reformation Religious Liberty of The Fourteenth Amendment.

Citizenship National—Its Intent—Protects Inborn Rights—A New Charter of Liberty—Privileges and Immunities—It Means Religious Liberty—It Includes Sunday Laws—Washington Against Sunday Laws—Washington’s Letter—Every Sunday Law Void—The Constitution Disregarded—The Right of The People—The Twin Despotisms—Upon Principle Alone—Lincoln’s Work and Ours—Emancipation Proclamation—The Gospel Principle—The Two American Principles—Columbia Queen of the Nations—This All Means You—Conclusion—The Crowning Contest.....451-481

THE REFORMATION

CHAPTER I.

THE REFORMATION RENOUNCED.

In the City of Chicago, Ill., Dec. 5, 1912, an assembly of three hundred and nineteen clerical delegates from thirty-one professedly Protestant denominations intentionally and expressly repudiated the word "Protestant."

That is an occurrence that can never mean less than *much every way*. It will be found to mean much more, and in more ways, than was thought of by the three hundred and nineteen who did it. And to the people of the United States it means the most of all.

The assembly by which this meaningful thing was done, was the "Second Quadrennial Meeting of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America." It was held in the Hotel La Salle, Chicago, Ill., Dec. 4-9, 1912, and was composed of three hundred and nineteen actually present and participating delegates.

This "Federal Council" was then composed of thirty-one denominations, including *all* of the most prominent ones, having a total membership of "more than seventeen millions." It was origi-

nally organized by five hundred delegates from twenty denominations, who met for the purpose in Carnegie Hall, New York City, Nov. 15-21, 1905.

In its original organization the "Federal Council of Churches" was expressly and distinctly Protestant. In the call under which the convention met in New York City, the object of the proposed meeting was distinctly stated to be "to secure an effective organization of the various Protestant communions of this country;" and "to form a bond of union that will enable Protestantism to present a solid front," etc.

And then, in only the second meeting of the Council as such, and without any issue or crisis to demand it, spontaneously and voluntarily this professedly Protestant organization repudiated the word "Protestant" that gave them an existence as a Federal Council, that gave them an existence as denominations, and that gave them existence even as Christians! And this was done in the very first business session of the Council, and in dealing with the very first "Report" that was made to the Council: that is, at the first possible opportunity.

The occasion for it was this: The "Executive Committee" presented its report. In that report the committee expressed the "earnest hope that the Second Federal Council will make yet more clear certain fundamental facts as to the churches

of the country, through their federation." And the first of these was —

“The fact of the substantial unity of the Christian and Protestant Churches of the nation.”

No sooner was opened the discussion of the report than that word “Protestant” was challenged as if it were a mortal enemy that had invaded the Council.

“Why emphasize a word that is not a *uniting* but a *dividing* word? a word that recalls a most unhappy and trying experience,” said one.

“By using this word, you make it more difficult for many of your Christian brethren to work with you,” said another.

Discussion was soon cut off by a motion to resubmit the report for revision, eliminating the word “Protestant.” And this was done thus: —

“To express the fellowship and catholic unity of the Christian Church.”

Then the report was promptly adopted, and with applause.

All the circumstances of this action of the Council plainly show that there was a full and waiting readiness to do it. Indeed, preceding facts prove that all that was really new or sudden about it was the actual doing of it at the first possible opportunity.

1. In a “Moral and Religious Conference” held

at Colorado Springs in May, 1908, in the opening address, there was spoken the following words:—

“Once the church embraced all human activity. It was a great social structure. Then Luther proclaimed his doctrine of individual responsibility, and the social structure disintegrated. Individualism in the church produced individualism in economic relations and in the State.

“But there is coming rapidly a change. The Christian Church must recognize this movement and be the leader in it.”

That was not officially a conference of the Church Federation; but prominent men were of it who in 1905 had aided in the formation of the Federal Council. And that it is strictly indicative of the spirit of the Council itself, is confirmed in the next item.

2. In December, 1908, at Philadelphia, Pa., in the first meeting of the Federal Council as such, the “right of private judgment” that was “emphasized,” and the “individuality” that was “developed in a notable manner,” by “the Protestant Reformation,” was specifically abandoned as that which should “no longer blind the minds of believers to the need of combination and of mutuality in service.”

The right of private judgment in religion, and the principle of individual responsibility to God, are two essentials of the Protestant Reformation. Without these there never would — there never

could — have been any Reformation. But these are not only essentials of the Protestant Reformation. They are essentials of Christianity itself.

And yet in the keynote speech of the first meeting of the Federal Council that was ever held, the declaration was made and published as the standing word of the Council that these essentials of the reformation and of Christianity should “*no longer* blind the minds of believers.”

When the first meeting of the Council could publish such a statement as that, it is perfectly logical that the second meeting should eliminate altogether the word “Protestant” as in any way properly attaching to that organization.

3. In the public announcement of the date and place of holding that meeting in Chicago, it was plainly stated that this “United Protestantism is not to be construed as a demonstration against the Roman Catholic Church.”

When anything bearing the name “Protestant” is not even to be *construed* as a demonstration against the Roman Catholic Church, then that thing is not Protestant at all; and of course in honesty should no longer bear the title.

Accordingly when that open statement had been most widely made in behalf of the Council, again it was perfectly logical as well as only consistent that the Council should formally renounce the title of “Protestant.”

4. The Roman Church as represented or manifested in her Councils, especially in the Council of Nice, was openly the aspiration of this Council.

In his speech at the opening of the Council, the outgoing president said that by this assembly he was caused to —

“think of the Council of Nice — the first General Council of the Christian Church. This Council has almost the exact number that composed the Council of Nice. The history of the Church is largely told in her great Councils.”

And when the number of the delegates who actually were present and officially acting in the Council was made up and announced as “three hundred and nineteen,” the statement was accompanied with the remark, “Just one more than the Council of Nice.”

Yes, the history of the Roman Church *is* largely told in her great Councils. And beyond all question her conspicuously great Councils were those of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon, Second of Nice, Trent, and the Vatican.

In brief the story of these “great Councils” is this:

The net result of the first four was to put the dead formulas of human creed in the place of the living Word of God; a woman in the place of Christ; and a man in the place of God.

The Second Council of Nice, three hundred and fifty bishops, “unanimously pronounced that the worship of images is agreeable to Scripture and reason, to the Fathers and Councils of the Church.”

The Council of Trent put church-tradition above the Bible as “more sure and safe.”

The Vatican Council established the infallibility of the Pope.

And when the Federal Council in Chicago could count worthy of her aspiration such a record as that, then it certainly was about time that she were renouncing the name and title of *Protestant*.

All of this is fully confirmed by another act of this Council itself, at Chicago. The Council unanimously adopted a report in which it is declared that —

“The business of the State is to bring about such economic conditions and environment that the idealism of the Gospel may have as clear and fair a field as possible. It is this that justifies the Church . . . in turning to the State for a co-operation which will enable her to do her sacred task.”

And that is in exact parallel with the instruction given by Pope Leo XIII in his encyclical of Jan. 6, 1895, to the hierarchy in America, saying that in this “American nation” the Catholic church —

“would bring forth more abundant fruits, if, in addition to liberty, she enjoyed the favor of the laws and the patronage of the public authority.”

The Protestant Reformation neither had nor sought either the favor of the laws or the patronage of public authority.

The Protestant Reformation neither sought nor expected any State to bring about for her such economic conditions and environment as should give to the idealism of her Gospel any clear or fair field at all.

The Protestant Reformation never sought for any State, and there was none if she had, to which she could turn for a co-operation that would enable her to do her sacred task.

So also was it with Christianity at the first.

Yet not only without any, but actually against all, of these, both the Protestant Reformation and Christianity in the beginning, did each her sacred task triumphantly and gloriously.

And as in the beginning, so also in the latter: when Christians lost their first love in the loss of the fulness of the Holy Spirit and His power, they were ready to dally with the world, to seek the co-operation of worldly power, and to tickle their fancy with “economic conditions” and “civic environments” as “aids” in the sacred task of preaching the Gospel of the blessed God!

But all of this was, and ever is, only to aban-

don the Reformation and Christianity. It is to cease to be Protestant and Christian, and to become papal only.

“The Reformation was accomplished in the name of a spiritual principle. It had proclaimed for its teacher the Word of God; for salvation, faith; for King, Jesus Christ; for arms, the Holy Ghost; and had by these very means rejected all worldly elements.

“Rome had been established by ‘the law of a carnal commandment:’ the Reformation, by ‘the power of an endless life.’

“The Gospel of the Reformers had nothing to do with the world and with politics. While the Roman hierarchy had become a matter of diplomacy and a court intrigue, the Reformation was destined to exercise no other influence over princes and people than that which proceeds from the Gospel of peace.

“If the Reformation, having attained a certain point, became untrue to its nature, began to parley and temporize with the world, and ceased thus to follow up the spiritual principle that it had so loudly proclaimed, it was faithless to God and to itself. Henceforward its decline was at hand.

“It is impossible for a society to prosper if it be unfaithful to the principles it lays down. Having abandoned what constituted its life, it can find naught but death.”—*D’Aubigne*.

There has been an apostasy from the Reformation, as truly as there was from Christianity at the first. This has been manifest in each form of Protestantism that has arisen. And now this apostasy has reached the point of open repudiation of the very title of Protestant, by the federation of thirty-one of them together.

The apostasy from Christianity at the first meant much to the world, for it developed the papacy in all that it has ever been. This apostasy from *Christianity revived* in the Protestant Reformation can scarcely mean any less.

CHAPTER II.

WHAT IS "PROTESTANT?"

What is the meaning of the word "Protestant?" How came it into the world?

The word "Protestant," as expressing a religious distinction; the word "Protestant" with a capital P; the word "Protestant," as dealt with by the Chicago Council of the Federated Churches; came into the world with the word "Protest" that was used in the Protest that was made at the Diet of Spires in Germany, April 19, 1529.

That Protest was made against the arbitrary, unjust, and persecuting, procedure of the papacy in that Diet.

This procedure in the Diet of Spires of 1529 swept away the religious liberty that had been agreed upon and regularly established in the Diet of Spires of 1526.

The religious liberty established by the Diet of Spires of 1526 was the result of a deadlock in the proceedings of that Diet over the enforcement, by all the power of the then papacy, of the Edict of Worms that had been issued in 1521 commanding the destruction of Martin Luther, his adherents, his writings, and all who printed or circulated his writings, or who on their own part should print or circulate the like.

Thus the Protest in which originated the word "Protestant" was against the effort of the papacy to destroy the Reformation, and was in behalf of the Reformation and its principles.

And now for anybody to renounce, repudiate, or disown, the word or title "Protestant," is to repudiate the Protest.

To repudiate the Protest, is to repudiate as unworthy the cause and the principles in behalf of which the Protest was made.

And that cause was the Reformation. Those principles were the principles of the Reformation.

Therefore, to renounce, repudiate, or disown, the word and title "Protestant" is nothing less and nothing else than to repudiate the Reformation.

And the Federal Council of Churches, thirty-one denominations, having "a membership of more than seventeen millions," at Chicago, Ill., Dec. 5, 1912, did unanimously renounce, repudiate, and disown, the word and title "Protestant."

And that this may be made so plain that all may see for themselves that just such is unquestionably the meaning of that action taken, let us now consider directly the facts, documents, and dates, in which rests the indisputable truth of the case.

In 1521 the Diet of Worms condemned Luther

and the Reformation. There immediately followed the "Edict of Worms" that is the key to the proceedings that called forth the Protest in which originated the word "Protestant."

The Edict of Worms was issued by the Emperor Charles V, "the ablest and most powerful monarch of the sixteenth century." After denouncing Luther personally in sweeping terms, the imperial edict thus commands:—

"We have therefore sent this Luther from before our face, that all pious and sensible men may regard him as a fool, or a man possessed of the devil; and we expect that after the expiry of his safe-conduct, effectual means will be taken to arrest his furious rage.

"Wherefore, under pain of incurring the punishment due to the crime of treason, we forbid you to lodge the said Luther as soon as the fatal term shall be expired, to conceal him, give him meat or drink, and lend him, by word or deed, publicly or secretly, any kind of assistance. We enjoin you, moreover, to seize him, or cause him to be seized, wherever you find him, and bring him to us without any delay, or to keep him in all safety until you hear from us how you are to act with regard to him, and till you receive the recompense due to your exertions in so holy a work.

"As to his adherents, you will seize them, suppress them, and confiscate their goods.

"As to his writings, if the best food becomes the terror of all mankind as soon as a drop of poison is

* The sources of the quotations, facts, and dates, in this chapter are, D'Aubigne's "History of the Reformation," Book VII, chap. viii; Book X, chap. iii, v, xii; Book XIII, chap. i, v, vi.

Ranke's "History of the Popes," Book I, chap. iii.

Wylie's "History of Protestantism," Book VI, chap. vi; Book IX, chap. iii, iv, vi, ix—xi, xv.

mixed with it, how much more ought these books, which contain a deadly poison to the soul, to be not only rejected, but also annihilated! You will therefore burn them, or in some other way destroy them entirely.

“As to authors, poets, printers, painters, sellers or buyers of placards, writings or paintings, against the Pope or the church, you will lay hold of their persons and their goods, and treat them according to your good pleasure.

“And if anyone, whatever be his dignity, shall dare to act in contradiction to the decree of our imperial majesty, we ordain that he shall be placed under the ban of the empire.

“Let everyone conform hereto.”

And that the emperor meant every word of that edict, and that it should be enforced in full of all that it said, is made plain in the following sentences which he wrote with his own hand:—

“Sprung from the Christian emperors of Germany, from the Catholic kings of Spain, the archduke of Austria, and the dukes of Burgundy, who are all illustrious as defenders of the Roman faith, it is my firm purpose to follow the example of my ancestors. A single monk, led astray by his own folly, sets himself up in opposition to the faith of Christendom! I will sacrifice my dominions, my power, my friends, my treasure, my blood, my mind, and my life, to stay this impiety.”

Before the Diet had assembled, the Pope had included Luther in the list of heretics denounced in the annual proclamation of the “Greater Excommunication.” The Edict of Worms was the movement of the “secular arm” that should give effect to that excommunication.

In the Diet, April 18, 1522, to the Emperor, to the papacy, to the Diet itself, to all Germany, to Europe, and to the world, Luther had given his "answer." That answer, as summed up by Luther himself, after having spoken two hours, stands as follows:—

"Since your most serene majesty, and your high mightinesses, call upon me for a simple, clear, and definite answer, I will give it. And it is this:

"I cannot subject my faith either to the Pope or to Councils; because it is clear as day, that they have often fallen into error, and even into great self-contradiction.

"If, then, I am not disproved by passages of Scripture, or by clear arguments, — if I am not convinced by the very passages which I have quoted, and so bound in conscience to submit to the Word of God, **I neither can nor will retract anything.** For it is not safe for a Christian to speak against his conscience.

"Here I stand. I cannot do otherwise. God help me. Amen."*

The personal presence of the Emperor and of the Pope's nuncio in their known antagonism to it all, could not wholly restrain applause in response to that quietly brave and noble answer in the very moment of its giving. And that applause, with the noble "answer" itself, presently resounded through the whole of Germany, inspiring multitudes to speak out the faith and truth of the Gospel.

In the Diet the papacy had been arraigned by

* "Hier stehe ich. Ich kann nicht anders. Gott helfe mir. Amen."

loyal Roman Catholic princes no less vigorously than by Luther. As a result, a formulated list of one hundred and one grievances had been lodged with the Diet for redress.

This had given great force in the minds of all to the merit of Luther's attacks, and above all to his plea for something better than a system that could produce only such grievous fruits. And his free answer to the Emperor and the Diet; and his plain refusal, alone, in the face of all the power of the empire and the papacy, to recede an inch or to retract anything, was the trumpet-sound of freedom that all were glad to hear.

April 26 Luther left Worms to return to his home at Wittenberg. April 28, at one of the stations on the way, he wrote to the Emperor a personal letter in which he said:—

“God who is the searcher of hearts is my witness that I am ready with all diligence to obey your majesty, whether in honor or disgrace, whether by life or by death, and with absolutely no exception **but the Word of God**, from which man derives life.

“In all the affairs of the present life, my fidelity will be immutable; for, as to these, loss or gain cannot at all affect salvation. But in regard to **eternal blessings**, it is not the will of God that **man** should submit to **man**. Subjection in the spiritual world constitutes worship, and should be paid only to the Creator.”

While he was on his homeward journey, May 4, 1521, Luther was “captured” by friendly hands and was carried to the Wartburg, where he re-

mained out of the knowledge of the world till March 3, 1522. But in all this time the Reformation went triumphantly onward throughout Germany, and even to Denmark and other neighboring countries.

In spite of the Edict of Worms and all the power behind it, in the very year of its proclamation there issued from the press at Wittenberg more than two hundred evangelical publications that were scattered and read everywhere. They were even translated into French, Spanish, English, and Italian.

The progress of the Turkish armies in 1522 so occupied the attention of the empire that there was no room for any general enforcement of the Edict of Worms. Yet the Emperor was determined that the Reformation should not be lost sight of. October 31 he wrote to the Pope:—

“It is necessary to arrest the Turks, and punish the partisans of the poisonous doctrines of Luther with the sword.”

In December, 1522, the imperial Diet assembled at Nuremberg, with its chief purpose, under instructions from the Emperor and the Pope, to deal with the Reformation.

The first thing that was put before the Diet was the demand from the Pope by his legate that Luther should be destroyed. With the papal brief in his hand. the legate declared:—

“It is necessary to amputate this gangrened limb from the body. The omnipotent God has caused the earth to open and swallow up alive the two schismatics, Dathan and Abiram. Peter, the prince of the apostles, struck Ananias and Sapphira with sudden death for lying against God. Your own ancestors at Constance put to death John Huss and Jerome of Prague, who now seem risen from the dead in Martin Luther. Follow the glorious example of your ancestors; and, with the assistance of God and St. Peter, carry off a magnificent victory over the infernal dragon.”

Yet the Pope thought to make sure of the favor of the Diet by confessing the corruptions of the papacy, and actually declaring the universal desire for the reformation of the papacy “both in the head and the members.” He said:—

“We know well that for a considerable time many abominable things have found a place near the holy chair: abuses in spiritual things, exorbitant straining of prerogatives—everything turned to evil. The disease has spread from the head to the limbs—from the Pope to the prelates. We are all gone astray; there is none that has done rightly, no, not one. We desire the reformation of this Roman court, whence proceed so many evils. The whole world desires it. And it was with a view to its accomplishment that we were resigned to mount the pontifical throne.”

It is true that this so much “desired reformation” was not to be wrought “too precipitately;” no one must be “too extreme;” it must “proceed gently and by degrees, step by step.” But for the Pope to pronounce such a thing at all, as he did, and in writing, officially to the whole imperial

Diet, and under precisely that sort of attack! The papal party in the Diet could scarcely believe their ears. The evangelicals rejoiced.

Instead of this stroke's winning the Diet to the papal side, it put a decided check upon the Edict of Worms, fully justified Luther and the Reformation, and encouraged the Diet to bolder measures.

The Diet therefore "resolved to collect into one body all the grievances which Germany complained of against Rome, and despatch them to the Pope." To this even the ecclesiastics in the Diet offered no opposition.

When those grievances were formally listed, there were found to be eighty-four of them: a "terrible catalogue of the exactions, frauds, oppressions, and wrongs, that Germany had endured at the hands of the Popes." And the presentation concluded with the significant sentence —

"If these grievances are not redressed within a limited time, we will consider other means of escaping from this oppression and suffering."

As to Luther the Diet informed the Pope that to enforce the Edict of Worms against him and put him to death for saying the very things that the Pope himself had just now said, would be both so unjust and so dangerous that it would be but madness. If theologically Luther were wrong, the proper thing to do was for the church to refute

from the Scriptures his errors; and they knew of but one way effectually to do that, which was by a General Council. And they demanded that such a Council should be called to meet within a year in some free city of Germany; and decreed that "in the meantime the pure Gospel shall be freely preached piously and soberly, according to the exposition of Scripture received and approved by the Church."

By this unexpected turn of affairs the legate was so displeased that he utterly abandoned the Diet, and left Nuremberg. And when the official account of the proceedings reached Rome, the Pope was filled with wrath; and gave vent to it in a scathing letter to the Elector Frederick, Luther's sovereign, in which he blamed Frederick for all the wars, calamities, and evils, that afflicted the empire, because he had not destroyed Luther. He threatened the Elector with the vengeance of God here and hereafter, and of the "two swords of the empire and the popedom," if in this thing he were not "speedily converted."

This cry of the Pope awakened the enforcement of the Edict of Worms in the Catholic States of Germany. Duke George took the lead in this. He too wrote to Frederick, who was his own brother, urging him to enforce the Edict of Worms. The noble Elector replied —

"Whosoever shall do a criminal act within

my States shall not escape condign punishment. But matters of conscience must be left to God.”

In 1524 the Imperial Diet met again in Nuremberg. The imperial commissioner came with the word of the Emperor, complaining that the Edict of Worms was not observed, and demanding that it be put into execution. The Pope’s legate, in his opening address, cited the Edict of Worms, called for its enforcement, and demanded that “the Reformation should be suppressed by force.”

Members of the Diet immediately inquired, “What has become of the grievances presented to the Pope by the Germanic nation?”

The legate answered that although three copies of the resolutions had reached Rome, —

“the Pope and college of cardinals could not believe that they had been framed by the princes! They thought that some private persons had published them in hatred to the court of Rome! Therefore I have no instructions as to that!”

That the solemn representations of the Diet should be ignored, and a slur cast upon the Diet itself, through such a subterfuge as that, caused a wave of just indignation to sweep the whole assembly. When their turn should come, they would know how to answer. And presently it came.

Both the legate and the imperial commissioner, each for his master, insisted on the full enforcement of the Edict of Worms. The Diet had no

power to repeal it. They would not enforce it. Nor would they allow themselves to be put in the attitude of rebellion, by a flat refusal. Therefore they framed and adopted a decree that —

“It is necessary to conform to the Edict of Worms and vigorously to enforce it *as far as possible.*”

And all knew, indeed a majority of the States had already declared, that it was not possible at all. But both Emperor and Pope had to be content with the “decree.”

Again the Diet demanded a General Council to be held on German soil. They also agreed that a Diet should assemble at Spires in November of that same year, 1524. These acts offended both the Emperor and the Pope, each that *he* was not first consulted and deferred to. The Pope wrote to the Emperor: —

“If I am the first to face the storm, it is not because I am the first to be threatened by it; but because I sit at the helm. The rights of the empire are attacked even more than the dignity of the court of Rome.”

The Emperor issued an edict declaring:—

“It belongs to the Pope alone to assemble a Council, — to the Emperor alone to ask it. The meeting fixed to take place at Spires can not, and will not, be tolerated. It is strange in the German nation to undertake a work which all the other nations of the world, even with the Pope, would not be entitled to do. The proper course is to hasten the execution of the decree of Worms against the new Mohammed.”

Following the adjournment of the second Diet of Nuremberg, the Pope's legate, in a conference at Ratisbon, formed a league, composed of the archduke of Austria, the dukes of Bavaria, the archbishop of Salzburg, and nine bishops, against the Reformation. This league engaged —

1. To execute the Edicts of Worms and Nuremberg.

2. To allow no change in public worship.

3. To give no toleration within their States to any married ecclesiastic.

4. To recall all the students belonging in their States who might be at Wittemberg.

5. To employ all the means in their power for the extirpation of heresy.

6. To enjoin upon all preachers that, in expounding difficult passages of the Scripture, they confine themselves to the interpretation given by the Latin Fathers Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and Gregory the Great.

The League also offered as a reform that priests should be forbidden —

1. To engage in trade.

2. To haunt taverns.

3. To frequent dances.

4. To engage over the bottle in discussing articles of faith.

May 5, 1525, died the Elector Frederick. Immediately Duke George set about to form in north

Germany a league similar to that of Ratisbon in the south, against the Reformation. In July this was consummated at Dessau. It was composed of the Electors of Mentz and Brandenburg, two dukes of Brunswick, and Duke George.

Just at this time there arrived in Germany from Spain, a decree of the Emperor appointing that a Diet be held at Augsburg in November of that year, to take measures —

“to defend the Christian religion, and the holy rites and customs received from their ancestors; and to prohibit all pernicious doctrines and innovations.”

Under this appointment the attendance at Augsburg was so small that the Diet adjourned to meet at Spires in midsummer of 1526.

In this intervening time a church convention at Mentz sent a deputation to the Emperor and one also to the Pope, asking them to “save the Church.”

About the same time Duke George and two other members of his league conferred together and decided to send one of their number personally to the Emperor to beg his assistance, because “the detestable doctrine of Luther makes rapid progress.”

The Emperor gave to their deputy a special commission to assure them that —

“with deep grief he had learned of the continual progress of Luther’s heresy; and that, neg-

lecting every other affair, he was going to quit Spain and repair to Rome to make arrangements with the Pope, and then return to Germany to combat the detestable pest of Wittemberg.”

The Leagues of Ratisbon and Dessau, with the reawakening of the Emperor and the Pope, all unitedly to enforce the Edict of Worms everywhere, amounted to a general alliance against the Reformation.

This of necessity caused that the Princes who had received the Gospel, and such others as would not afflict their own people nor war upon their own States, should stand in mutual sympathy and support against that thing being forced upon their States or their people.

The Princes who had decidedly accepted the Gospel, made public their agreement in a signed document running as follows:—

“God Almighty having, in His ineffable mercy, caused His holy and eternal Word, the food of our souls and our greatest treasure here below, to appear again amongst men: and powerful manoeuvres having been employed on the part of the clergy and their adherents to annihilate and extirpate it; we being firmly assured that He who has sent it to glorify His name upon the earth is able to maintain it, engage to preserve this holy Word to our people: and for this end to employ our goods, our lives, our States, our subjects, all that we possess — confiding not in our armies, but solely in the omnipotence of the Lord, whose instruments we desire to be.”

The Elector of Saxony and ten other powerful Princes signed this document. Upon their banners and escutcheons, and upon the liveries of their retainers and servants, they emblazoned and embroidered the full five initials "V. D. M. I. Æ." of their motto — "*Verbum Domini Manet in Æternum*" — The Word of the Lord abideth eternally.

This Christian courage of the evangelical Princes, and the expressive inaction of those Princes who were willing to be neutral, put a check upon the papal leagues and general alliance; and still suspended the force of the Edict of Worms. Thus matters stood at the time of the assembling of the Diet of Spires, June 25, 1526.

On arrival at Spires the evangelical Princes immediately asked the Bishop of Spires for the use of a church in which to worship and to listen to the preaching of the Gospel. The bishop, resenting such temerity, indignantly refused: "What would be thought of me at Rome?"!

The Princes complained of the injustice, for the churches belonged as much to them as to the bishops and were properly for the religious benefit of all the people.

Not being allowed any church, the evangelical Princes had the Gospel preached daily in the halls of their palaces. Immense crowds, of people from both city and country, attended the preaching of

the Gospel, while the mass was said in empty churches. Evangelical writings were abundantly distributed, and eagerly read by both princes and people. The whole city and region round was moved more by the Reformation than by the Diet.

An immediate effect of all this was that the Princes who had been only neutral as to the enforcement of the Edict of Worms, now in the Diet stood decidedly against any enforcement of it. The Diet did not say that the Edict of Worms should be enforced "as far as possible." It said plainly, not only that the enforcement of the Edict was impossible, but *also* that if the Emperor were present he himself would be of the same mind.

Next, against the opposition of the ecclesiastical section of the Diet, a resolution was adopted that the Diet should consider the church-abuses. The deputy from the City of Frankfort said:

"The clergy make a jest of the public good, and look after their own interests only."

The deputy from Duke George the rabid enemy of Luther, said:

"The laymen have the salvation of Christendom much more at heart than the clergy."

"Never had the towns spoken out more freely; never had the Princes pressed more urgently for a removal of their burthens." — *Ranke*.

Several cities, by their representatives, presented to the Diet a paper containing a list of

abuses from which they asked relief. They asked that the law of forbidden meats should be abolished: that as to ceremonies all men should be left at liberty, till a General Council should meet: that till then also there should be the free preaching of the Gospel.

They complained of the church holidays, which, of course, were all compulsory. They said —

“The severe penalties which forbid useful labor on these days, do not shut out temptations to vice and crime; and these periods of compulsory idleness are as unfavorable to the practice of virtue, as to the habit of industry.”

These complaints too were entertained, and “the Diet was divided into committees for the abolition of abuses.” August 1 a general committee reported “the necessity of a reform of abuses.” Finally “the proposal was made that the books containing the new statutes should be forthwith burned without reserve, and that the holy Scriptures should be taken as the sole rule of faith. Although some opposition arose, yet never was a resolution adopted with more firmness.” — *Ranke*.

The tide was flowing strongly in the unexpected direction. The Diet that was confidently convoked to speak the last word to the heretics, and if not heard was to deal the finishing blow to the Reformation, was speaking weighty words and dealing body blows to the papacy.

The situation was desperate. Something telling must be done. "Fanatical priests, monks, ecclesiastical princes, all gathered round Ferdinand. Cunning, bribery, nothing was spared."

The reason that Ferdinand was the centre of effort was this: Ferdinand was the Emperor's brother. He was the voice of the Emperor in the Diet. He had in his possession a document of "instructions" from the Emperor to the Diet, dated March 23, 1526, four months before the Diet had assembled. In this document the Emperor —

"willed and commanded that they should decree nothing contrary to the ancient customs, canons, and ceremonies, of the Church; and that all things should be ordered within his dominions according to the form and tenor of the Edict of Worms."

The papal party in the Diet knew that Ferdinand had this document. The evangelical Princes and the deputies from the cities did not know that he had it. In the hope that the course of things in the Diet should be such that he might not have to use it, Ferdinand had not given it to the Diet at the beginning; and now that the Diet had gone so far in the opposite direction, he hesitated to publish it, knowing that in the present circumstances it amounted almost to a declaration of war.

Those who surrounded Ferdinand urged that he now bring forth the Emperor's "instructions." "To refuse their publication was to effect the ruin of the Church and the Empire! Let the voice of Charles oppose its powerful veto to the dizziness that is hurrying Germany along, and the Empire will be saved!"

Ferdinand yielded, and August 3 put the document before the Diet. The immediate effect of its promulgation was just what Ferdinand had feared. But presently the date of the document was asked for. When it was given, "March 23," all breathed freely again; for the whole effect of it was gone.

The Diet calmly replied that since that time the Emperor and the Pope had fallen out and were now at war, and this fact itself vitiated the force of the instructions; for they were founded on concert with the Pope. Indeed the document itself said that the Emperor was "about to proceed to Rome to be crowned," and that he would then "consult with the Pope touching the calling of a General Council." And since these parts of the document were now inoperative, so were all.

Further investigation developed the even more decisive fact that the Emperor had actually written to Ferdinand lately, saying in so many words,

"Let us suspend the Edict of Worms. Let us bring back Luther's partisans by mildness, and by a good council cause the triumph of evangelical truth."

This proposal was only a political turn taken by the Emperor to play against the Pope. But it perfectly fitted the necessity of the Diet; for it both suspended the Edict of Worms, and sanctioned all that the Diet had done to “cause the triumph of evangelical truth.”

The result was a deadlock in the proceedings in the Diet. Yet the way out was another advance of the Reformation, and further “triumph of evangelical truth.” That way was the way of religious liberty and the supremacy of the Word of God. There was unanimous agreement to —

“Let every man do as he thinks fit: until a council shall re-establish the desired unity by the Word of God.”

This conclusion was framed into a formal decree of the Diet. This decree was called “the Recess of the Diet of Spires.” It was dated Aug. 17, 1526, and was officially signed by Ferdinand on the part of the Emperor. It provided that —

1. A universal, or at least a national free, Council should be convoked within a year.

2. The Emperor should be invited to return speedily to Germany.

3. “As to religion and the Edict of Worms, in the meanwhile till a General or National Council can be had, all shall so behave themselves in their several provinces as that they may be able

to render an account of their doings both to God and the Emperor."

The expected Council was not called within the year suggested, nor at all. This allowed the religious liberty established by the Diet to continue, with no check nor limitation: except in the rigidly Romish States.

The Emperor's war with the Pope occupied all the attention of both. After that war had brought upon the City of Rome such a sacking by the imperial troops as it had never known since that by the Goths and the Vandals, if even then, the Emperor and the Pope concluded a "peace," June 29, 1528.

Of course this "peace" meant only destruction to the Christians of the Reformation. An article of the treaty stipulated that the Emperor should re-establish the authority of the Pope in Germany. The Emperor promised that "with all his might" he would put down the heretics.

However, this should be done by means of the action of a Diet and the power of the States, if possible. But if that should fail, then it must be done by the power of the imperial armies. Accordingly, Aug. 1, 1528, the imperial letters were sent out appointing the meeting of the Diet Feb. 21, 1529, at Spires.

To attack the Reformation through the action of a Diet was now more difficult than ever, because

the present order of religious liberty was of the direct and unanimous action of the Diet signed with the names and sealed with the oaths of all. By every formal and constitutional sanction that act was the law of the empire. Yet in the "peace" between the Emperor and the Pope, these considerations should count for nothing. All must be swept away, to give place to the Edict of Worms. The Reformation must be put down.

When the time came for the assembling of the Diet, everything was made to bear the impress of the purpose of the new compact. The papal party attended in greater numbers than ever before, and distinctly manifested a superior and confident air. The evangelical Princes were now forbidden to have the preaching of the Gospel even in their own halls. However, they did not respect this command. The Elector of Saxony wrote that about eight thousand people attended morning and evening worship in his chapel on Palm-Sunday.

Upon the formal opening of the Diet, the imperial commissioners conveyed the information that —

"It is the Emperor's will and command that the Diet repeal the Edict of Spires."

The papal party of course insisted that this should be done immediately, because, as they said, that Edict of religious liberty —

1. Protected all kinds of abominable opinions.
2. Fostered the growth of heretical and disloyal communities. (Meaning evangelical congregations.)

3. It was the will of the Emperor.

4. Whoever opposed the repeal was not the friend of the Emperor.

The evangelical Princes maintained that —

1. The Edict of religious liberty had been unanimously adopted, signed and sworn to, by the members of the Diet, and by Ferdinand on behalf of the Emperor.

2. It was thus a part of the constitution of the empire.

3. For only a majority now to presume to repeal it, would be an open breach of national and constitutional faith.

4. If such procedure were to be adopted, there could never be any security in anything.

5. Also a centralized authority would thus be established that would sweep away the local.

6. The independence of the individual States would be destroyed.

7. Yet after all, there would yet remain the right of each State to resist such an order of things in its own territory.

8. Therefore the demand of the Emperor meant nothing less than revolution and war.

These arguments were so forceful, and the dan-

gerous consequences of repeal were so manifestly logical, that even Catholic princes were won. The Emperor's proposal did not carry. The Diet refused to repeal the Recess of Spires.

Then the papal party played a bold stroke. The imperial commissioners announced that —

“By virtue of his supreme power, the Emperor **has annulled the Edict of Spires.**”

This was worse yet. The Emperor's action in this was wholly unconstitutional and arbitrary. For a majority of the Diet to do such a thing would be arbitrary and revolutionary. But for the Emperor alone to do it of his own arbitrary will and power, was more so. The Diet — not the evangelical Princes only, but the main body of the Diet — met this new assertion with calmness and courage. They refused to recognize it.

But this being a part of the settled program, the papal party proceeded as if the Emperor's arbitrary act were fully and formally legal. And with the Edict of Spires presumed thus to be out of the way, they demanded that the Diet now order the full enforcement of the Edict of Worms.

The Diet would not itself repeal the Recess, nor would it recognize the Emperor's annulment of it. With it standing, the Edict of Worms could not be revived. Then the papal party took a course seemingly to propose the continuance of the Edict of Spires and the avoidance of the Edict

of Worms; but really to undermine the Edict of Spires, and to *smother* the Reformation, instead of to *crush* it.

April 7 they secured a majority vote in the Diet in favor of a resolution that —

1. In all places where the Edict of Worms had been enforced, every religious innovation should continue to be interdicted.

2. In all places where the Edict of Worms had not been, or could not be, enforced, there should be no new reform.

3. The reformers should not touch any controverted point.

4. They should not oppose any celebration of the mass.

5. They should not permit any Catholic to embrace the doctrines of Luther.

6. They *should acknowledge* the episcopal jurisdiction of the Catholic Church.

7. They should not tolerate any Anabaptists nor any Sacramentarians.

This on its face was a proposal for the positive smothering of the Reformation; for it stopped every activity of the reformers, and gave full scope to every activity of the Catholics.

Against the new proposal the evangelical Princes contended that —

“This Diet is incompetent to do more than to preserve the religious liberty established by the

former Diet, until the Council shall meet according to the original agreement embodied in the provision of the Recess. Therefore we reject this decree. We reject it also because, in matters of faith the majority have no power.”

The passage of the new proposal, April 7th, was but the first step: others had to follow before it could be a law. But bearing down all pleas or considerations of right or justice, it was jammed through the remaining stages; for “Ferdinand and the priests were determined on vanquishing what they called a ‘daring obstinacy.’”

“They commenced with the weaker States. They began to frighten and divide the cities, which had hitherto pursued a common course. On the 12th April they were summoned before the Diet. In vain did they allege the absence of some of their number, and ask for delay. It was refused, and the call was hurried on. Twenty-one free cities accepted the proposition of the Diet, and fourteen rejected it.

“On the 18th April it was decreed that the evangelical States should not be heard again; and Ferdinand prepared to inflict the decisive blow, on the morrow.

“When the day came, the king appeared in the Diet surrounded by the other commissaries of the empire and several bishops. He thanked the Roman Catholics for their fidelity, and declared

that the resolution, having been definitely agreed to, was about to be drawn up in the form of an imperial decree.

“He then announced to the Elector and his friends, that their only remaining course was to submit to the majority. The evangelical Princes, who had not expected so positive a declaration, were excited at this summons; and passed, according to custom, into an adjoining chamber to deliberate.

“But Ferdinand was not in a humour to wait for their answer. He rose and the imperial commissioners with him. Vain were all endeavors to stop him. ‘I have received an order from his imperial majesty,’ replied he; ‘I have executed it. All is over.’” — *D’ Aubigne*.

When the Princes returned from their deliberation and found Ferdinand and his party gone, they sent to him a deputation entreating him to return. He replied only, “It is a settled affair. Submission is all that remains.”

Then the evangelical Princes, seeing that the whole matter had been decided against them, and the meeting adjourned to prevent their answering, and all this *in their absence*, decided “to appeal from the report of the Diet to the Word of God, and from the Emperor Charles to Jesus Christ the King of kings and Lord of lords.”

Accordingly the next day, April 19, 1529,

the evangelical Princes appeared before the Diet, and, for himself, for the princes, and for the whole evangelical body, the Elector John of Saxony read the declaration of *Protest* that put the word "Protestant" in the world, and gave to the Reformation the name and title of *Protestant*.

That noble, just, and Christian Declaration runs as follows:—

"Dear Lords, Cousins, Uncles, and Friends! —

"Having repaired to this Diet at the summons of his majesty, and for the common good of Christendom, we have heard and learnt that the decisions of the last Diet concerning our holy Christian faith are to be repealed, and that it is proposed to substitute for them certain restrictive and onerous resolutions.

"King Ferdinand and the other imperial commissioners, by affixing their seals to the last Recess of Spires, had promised, however, in the name of the emperor, to carry out sincerely and inviolably all that it contained, and to permit nothing that was contrary to it. In like manner, also, you and we, electors, princes prelates, lords, and deputies of the empire, bound ourselves to maintain always and with our whole might every article of that decree.

"We cannot, therefore, consent to its repeal: —

"Firstly, because we believe that his imperial majesty (as well as you and we) is called to maintain firmly what has been unanimously and solemnly resolved.

"Secondly, because it concerns the glory of God and the salvation of our souls, and that in such matters we ought to have regard, above all, to the commandment of God, who is King of kings and Lord of lords; each of us rendering Him account for himself, without caring the least in the world about majority or minority.

“We form no judgment on that which concerns you, most dear Lords; and we are content to pray God daily that He will bring us all to unity of faith, in truth, charity, and holiness, through Jesus Christ, our throne of grace, and our only Mediator.

“But in what concerns ourselves, adhesion to your resolution (and let every honest man be judge) would be acting against our conscience, condemning a doctrine that we maintain to be Christian, and pronouncing that it ought to be abolished in our States, if we could do so without trouble.

“This would be to deny our Lord Jesus Christ, to reject His holy Word, and thus give Him good reason to deny us in turn before His Father, as He has threatened.

“What! we ratify this edict! We assert that when Almighty God calls a man to His knowledge, this man cannot, however, receive the knowledge of God! Oh! of what deadly backslidings should we not thus become the accomplices, not only among our own subjects, but also among yours!

“For this reason we reject the yoke that is imposed on us. And although it is universally known that in our States the holy sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord is becomingly administered, we cannot adhere to what the edict proposes against the Sacramentarians, seeing that the imperial edict did not speak of them, that they have not been heard, and that we cannot resolve upon such important points before the next Council.

“Moreover, the new edict declaring the ministers shall preach the Gospel, explaining it according to the writings accepted by the holy Christian Church, we think that, for this regulation to have any value, we should first agree on what is meant by the true and holy Church. Now, seeing that there is great diversity of opinion in this respect; that there is no sure doctrine but such as is conformable to the Word of God; that the Lord forbids the teaching of any other doctrine; that each text of the Holy Scriptures

ought to be explained by other and clearer texts; that this holy book is in all things necessary for the Christian, easy of understanding, and calculated to scatter the darkness, we are resolved, with the Grace of God, to maintain the pure and exclusive preaching of His holy Word, such as is contained in the biblical books of the Old and New Testament, without adding anything thereto that may be contrary to it. This Word is the only truth; it is the sure rule of all doctrine, and of all life, and can never fail or deceive us. He who builds on this foundation, shall stand against all the powers of hell: whilst all the human vanities that are set up against it, shall fall before the face of God.

“For these reasons, most dear lords, uncles, cousins, and friends, we earnestly entreat you to weigh carefully our grievances and our motives. If you do not yield to our request, we **Protest** by these presents, before God, our only Creator, Preserver, Redeemer, and Saviour, and who will one day be our Judge, as well as before all men and all creatures, that we, for us and for our people, neither consent nor adhere in any manner whatsoever, to the proposed decree, in anything that is contrary to God, to His Holy Word, to our right conscience, to the salvation of our souls, and to the last decree of Spires.

“At the same time we are in expectation that his imperial majesty will behave towards us like a Christian prince who loves God above all things; and we declare ourselves ready to pay unto him, as well as unto you, gracious lords, all the affection and obedience that are our just and legitimate duty.”

“Thus, in the presence of the Diet, spoke out those courageous men whom Christendom will henceforward denominate The Protestants.”

And that is the origin of the word “Protestant.” That is the true story of the word “Protestant” as dealt with and repudiated by the

Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, thirty-one denominations with "a membership of more than seventeen millions."

And now, having looked the story through, —

What is there in it anywhere from beginning to end, that should cause anybody but a papist to want to repudiate the *word* "Protestant," or the *principle*, or the *idea*, of it?

What is there anywhere in the story that "serves to recall" such a "most unhappy and trying experience" that anybody but a papist should now want to repudiate the word "Protestant?"

What is there anywhere in the story that can be so compromising or discreditable to anybody but a papist, that he must needs repudiate it in order that his "Christian brethren may work with him?"

Please look that story over again, yes even over and over and again and again; analyze it: examine each particular phase of it: distinguish each particular principle in it. Then upon the straight and simple story ask yourself, —

In fact and in truth, what does the word "Protestant" indicate? What does it tell? What does it mean?

And by the open evidence of the plain, straight, and simple, story, the answer comes.

It means protest against the burning or other-

wise destroying of either the men or the writings of the men who are found to disagree in religion or faith with other men either in a church or a State.

It means protest against arbitrary and unjust procedure of ecclesiastical combines.

It means protest against any denunciation or condemnation of men in their absence, or without their being heard.

It means protest against any alliance or connection whatever between the ecclesiastical and the civil power.

It means protest against any assertion or claim of any power or right of any majority in matters of religion or faith.

It means protest against any intrusion whatever of the civil power, under whatever plea, in any matter that in any way partakes of religion or faith.

It means protest against all arbitrary authority of the church under whatever form, name or claim.

In this it means protest against any exercise of ecclesiastical authority or power in any other wise than only by the ministry of the word of God.

It means protest against any restriction whatever, of any kind, on the full preaching of the word of God, even on "controverted points," to every creature everywhere and always.

It means protest against any restriction whatever, of any kind, on the full and free exercise and

enjoyment of the right of any individual at any time to embrace any doctrine that he may choose to believe.

It proclaims and defends the full and complete liberty of every individual, himself alone.

In this it proclaims and defends the perfect individuality of every soul.

And in this it proclaims and defends the sole and complete responsibility of the individual soul to God only, in all things pertaining to religion or faith.

It rests in and proclaims the word of God alone, as in the Bible of the Old and New Testaments, as all-sufficient in all things pertaining to religion and faith.

That, all of that, and nothing less than that, in truth and in fact, is what the word "Protestant" means. That is what it means to be a Protestant. And that is what was repudiated by the Federal Council of Churches, when it unanimously repudiated the word "Protestant."

Are you a Protestant?

CHAPTER III.

WHAT "PROTESTANT" MEANS IN AMERICA.

The development of the splendid word "Protestant" was not for that day only. The principle of it was then, and always has been, a very practical thing.

"It was this noble resolution that gained for modern times liberty of thought and independence of faith." — *D'Aubigne*.

And in and for all modern times the liberty of thought and independence of faith — the Religious Liberty — established as a natural and unalienable right of mankind by the Constitution of the United States, is the truest expression of the principle of the Protest that there is in any organic connection in the world.

Yet it was at a great price, and only through a long and strenuous contest that in this New Nation there was gained at last for mankind this freedom.

It was not many years after the Protest was presented at Spire, before, in principle, it had to be repeated and maintained even against those who professed to be Protestants. For when the original and true Protestants had passed away, many ceased to be Protestants and became only Lutherans, Zwinglians, etc. They ceased to think

only on the truth of God, and cared only for the truth of Luther or some other.

The Reformation and the Protest appealed only to the plain Word of God as it stands in the Scriptures. This Word was steadily and faithfully preached; and each one was free to believe and to preach the Word as he found it.

But ere long it came to be required that all must believe and preach the word as *some one else* had found it: and that none should preach except he preach this.

This renewal by professed Protestants of the same old attitude, inevitably brought renewal of the Protest by every one who would be a true Protestant.

The continuance of the Protest, against the continuance of the papacy among professed Protestants, brought again intolerance, excommunication, and persecution even by means of the civil power, on the part of those who would not advance with the ever advancing truth of God.

*"The principles which had led the Protestants to sever themselves from the Roman Church, should have taught them to bear with the opinions

* The sources of the quotations, facts, and dates, in this chapter are, Bancroft's "History of the United States," Vol. V, epoch iv, chap. ix, xvii, xxi; Vol. VI, Book II, chap. v; Book IV, chap. iii; Book V, chap. i.

Baird's "History of Religion in America," Book III, chap. iii.

Bryce's "Holy Roman Empire," chap. xix.

of others and warned them from the attempt to connect agreement in doctrine or manner of worship with the indispensable forms of secular government. Still less ought they to have enforced that agreement by civil penalties; for faith, upon their own showing, had no value save as it was freely given.

“A church which does not claim to be infallible, is bound to allow that some part of the truth may possibly be with its adversaries. A church which permits or encourages human reason to apply itself to revelation, has no right first to argue with people and then to punish them if they are not convinced.

“But whether it was that men only half saw what they had done, or that finding it hard enough to unrivet priestly fetters, they welcomed all the aid a temporal prince could give; the actual consequence was that religion, or rather theological creeds, began to be involved with politics more closely than had ever been the case before. . . .

“In almost every country the form of doctrine which triumphed associated itself with the State, and maintained the despotic system of the Middle Ages while it forsook the grounds on which that system had been based.

“It was thus that there arose National Churches, which were to be to the several Protestant countries of Europe that which the Church

Catholic had been to the world at large; churches, that is to say, each of which was to be co-extensive with its respective State, was to enjoy landed wealth and exclusive political privilege, and was to be armed with coercive powers against recusants.

“It was not altogether easy to find a set of theoretical principles on which such churches might be made to rest. For they could not, like the old church, point to the historical transmission of their doctrines; they could not claim to have in any one man or body of men an infallible organ of divine truth; they could not even fall back upon general councils, or the argument, whatever it may be worth, *‘Securus indicat orbis terrarum.’*”

“But in practice these difficulties were soon got over. For the dominant party in each State, if it did not claim to be infallible, was at any rate quite sure that it was right; and could attribute the resistance of other sects to nothing but moral obliquity. The will of the sovereign, as in England; or the will of the majority, as in Holland, the Scandinavian countries, and Scotland; imposed upon each country a peculiar form of worship, and kept up the practices of mediæval intolerance without their justification.

“Persecution, which might be at least palliated in an infallible Catholic and Apostolic Church, was peculiarly odious when practiced by those who

were not Catholic, who were no more apostolic than their neighbors, and who had just revolted from the most ancient and venerable authority in the name of rights which they now denied to others.

“If union with the visible church by participation in a material sacrament be necessary to eternal life, persecution may be held a duty, a kindness to perishing souls. But if the kingdom of heaven be in every sense a kingdom of the spirit; if saving faith be possible out of one visible body and under a diversity of external forms; if the sense of the written revelation of God be ascertainable by the exercise of human reason guided by the Divine breath which bloweth where it listeth; persecution becomes at once a crime and a folly.” — *Bryce*.

Yet, against all the principles of the Protest, in spite of consistency and justice, and in defiance of plain Christianity and common sense, that execrable crime and egregious folly persisted among professed Protestants in all their States and countries except in the one little blessed spot of Rhode Island, until the rise of the New Nation in 1776.

When, July 4, 1776, the notable Declaration proclaimed that “these colonies are and of right ought to be free and independent States,” every one of these new-born States, except Rhode Island only, had an establishment of religion. In New

England it was Congregationalism. In others it was the Church of England. In yet others it was "the Christian religion"—a sort of "general Christianity" that any religious fanatic or heathen magistrate might enforce by "the Common Law."

In Virginia was begun the Protest and the contest for Religious Liberty in this land. There the Church of England was the form of the religious establishment. All the people were taxed to support the preachers and to build the meeting-houses of that denomination. The will of that church was a part of the law of the State, to which all must conform or pay harassing and heavy fines.

No sooner had the Declaration of Independence been made than the Baptists, the Quakers, and the Presbyterians of the Presbytery of Hanover, in Virginia, presented to the General Assembly a Memorial pleading for Religious Liberty. They said in substance: We have declared ourselves free and independent of the *government* of England. Now let us also be free and independent of the *church* of England.

Their plea was heard. And after two months of what Jefferson said was the severest contest in which he was ever engaged, the cause of freedom prevailed. Dec. 6, 1776, by a legislature "of which the majority were Protestant Episcopali-

ans," a law was enacted repealing all the laws and penalties prejudicial to dissenters, releasing them from any further compulsory contributions to the Episcopal Church, and discontinuing all State support to the clergy after Jan. 1, 1777.

The church was disestablished. Virginia was free. Yet the contest for Religious Liberty was not ended. Immediately there was a combine of all the denominations in Virginia, except the Presbyterians, the Baptists, and the Quakers, to secure the establishment of "the Christian religion" by law.

In the very Assembly that had disestablished the Episcopal Church, there was made a motion to levy a general tax for the support of "teachers of the Christian religion." The matter was postponed to the consideration of "a future Assembly." To the next Assembly petitions were sent by the Episcopalians and the Methodists, pleading for a law levying a general tax for the support of "teachers of the Christian religion."

These petitions and associated efforts were vigorously opposed by the Presbyterians in their original memorial renewed with additions; by "the strenuous efforts of the Baptists;" and by the loyal strength of the Quakers. In 1779 the bill for the general assessment for the support of teachers of "the Christian religion" was defeated, though it had been carried to the third reading.

Then Jefferson prepared with his own hand a document entitled "An Act for Establishing Religious Freedom," and proposed that it be adopted by the General Assembly "as a part of the Revised Code" of Virginia. This proposed law was submitted to "the whole people of Virginia" for their "deliberate reflection," before the vote should be taken upon it in the Assembly.

This was in 1779; and the war for independence had now become so all-absorbing that the movement for the establishment of "the Christian Religion" had to be suspended. And Jefferson's bill for "Establishing Religious Freedom" was before the whole people for such consideration as the times might allow.

However, no sooner had peace come to the land than under the lead of "The Protestant Episcopal Church" the demand for established religion was again forced to the front. Petitions were presented to the General Assembly and a bill was framed, proposing a legal "provision for teachers of the Christian Religion." Patrick Henry was its patron; and "many others of the foremost men" supported it.

Personally Jefferson was out of the country as minister to France. But his place on the ground, in the General Assembly and everywhere, was most worthily filled by Madison as the leader in the cause of Religious Liberty.

Madison declared: "The assessment bill exceeds the functions of civil authority. The question has been stated as if it were, Is religion necessary? The true question is, Are establishments necessary to religion? And the answer is, They corrupt religion."

In spite of all opposition the bill was successfully carried to the third reading. It was certain to pass if it should come to the vote. Therefore the opposition fought for time.

Using as a base the fact that the bill "Establishing Religious Freedom" had been submitted to "the whole people," and was at that moment still before them, Madison and his associates moved that the bill "Establishing a Provision for Teachers of the Christian Religion" be likewise submitted to the whole people for their deliberate reflection.

This motion was so evidently just that it gained the majority and was carried. "Thus the people of Virginia had before them for their choice the bill of the revised code for 'Establishing Religious Freedom,' and the plan of desponding churchmen for supporting religion by a general assessment."

"All the State, from the sea to the mountains and beyond them, was alive with the discussion. Madison, in a Remonstrance addressed to the Legislature, embodied all that could be said against

the compulsory maintenance of Christianity, and in behalf of religious freedom as a natural right, the glory of Christianity itself, the surest method of supporting religion, and the only way to produce harmony among its several sects."

Washington cast his mighty influence in behalf of Religious Liberty. The outcome of the contest was that "when the Legislature of Virginia assembled, no person was willing to bring forward the Assessment Bill; and *it was never heard of more*. Out of a hundred and seventeen articles of the revised code which were then reported, Madison selected *for immediate action* the one which related to Religious Freedom.

"The People of Virginia had held it under deliberation for six years. In December, 1785, it passed the House by a vote of nearly four to one. Attempts in the Senate for amendment produced only insignificant changes in the preamble, and on the 16th of January, 1786, Virginia placed among its statutes the very words of the original draft by Jefferson, with the hope that they would endure forever:—

" "No man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; but all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinion in matters of religion, and the

same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities. . . . The rights hereby asserted are of the natural rights of mankind, and if any act shall be hereafter passed to repeal the present or narrow its operation, such act will be an infringement of natural right'."

Of this blessed result of that splendid campaign in Virginia, Madison happily exclaimed, as he had well earned the right to exclaim, "Thus in Virginia was extinguished forever the ambitious hope of making laws for the human mind."

Yet this grand result in Virginia did not end either the story or the campaign of Religious Liberty in this land. Before the campaign in Virginia had closed in that triumph of Religious Liberty, the first steps had been taken for the calling of a convention to consider the forming of a national government by and for the people of all the States. And out of that campaign of Religious Liberty which they had made triumphant in Virginia, Madison and Washington went directly into the campaign for the forming of a national government. And into the new campaign they carried with them and finally fixed in the National Constitution the very principles of Religious Liberty which they had carried to such a triumphant issue in Virginia.

All that was said on this subject in the Constitution as originally framed was the closing clause of Article VI:—

“No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office of public trust under the United States.”

The National Government being one only of delegated powers, if nothing had been said on the subject, this itself would have excluded the government from any and all connection with or cognizance of religion. But then such power might have been usurped on the plea that the subject was forgotten. The insertion of that clause proved both that the subject had been considered and that it had been decided: and that it had been decided in the way of excluding religion entirely.

Yet this did not satisfy the people. The discussion of the subject in Virginia had spread through all the other States, and had awakened there an interest that now found expression. When the Constitution was submitted to the people for ratification, objection was made everywhere that it did not fully secure Religious Liberty. Only negative expression was not enough. What was intended should be positively asserted.

Accordingly the ratification of the Constitution was with the distinct understanding that there should immediately be appended articles of the nature of a Bill of Rights. By the first Congress that ever met under the Constitution, this was done in the form of the first ten Amendments. And the very first clause of all is the one that posi-

tively assures the complete Religious Liberty that had all the time been intended:—

“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.”

Yet even that did not quite finish the story. In 1797 there was made and signed by President Washington regularly “by and with the advice and consent of the Senate” according to the Constitution, a treaty in which it was declared—

“The government of the United States is not in any sense founded upon the Christian religion.”

And by the Fourteenth Amendment, this Religious Liberty is extended and guaranteed to all the people in all the States: for—

“No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States.”

Such is the straight and plain story of The Fact of the establishment of full and complete Religious Liberty as a natural and constitutional right in this New Nation of the United States.

It is now necessary to cite from the same sources The Principles upon which all of that was done. And herein lies the great importance to all the people of the United States and of the world, of that action of the Federal Council of Churches in repudiation of the word “Protestant:” when in the Protest there was wrapped up the Reforma-

tion. For, people who are capable of repudiating the Protest are already qualified to abandon the results of it.

The men who erected this noble temple of Religious Liberty, first made clear what they meant, and what is to be understood, by the word "Religion." They said: —

"Religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence, and is nowhere cognizable but at the tribunal of the universal Judge."

Then they distinguished and declared the Principles upon which they claimed for themselves and advocated for all, perfect Religious Liberty. They said: —

"To judge for ourselves, and to engage in the exercise of religion agreeably to the dictates of our own consciences, is an unalienable right, which, upon **The Principles** on which **The Gospel** was first propagated and **The Reformation from Popery** carried on, can never be transferred to another."

Further they said: "In the event of a statute for the support of the Christian religion, are the courts of law to decide what is Christianity? and as a consequence to decide what is orthodoxy and what is heresy?"

"Who does not see that the same authority which can establish Christianity, in exclusion of all other religions, may establish, with the same

ease any particular sect of Christians, in exclusion of all other sects?"

"It is impossible for the magistrate to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects that profess the Christian faith, without erecting a *claim to infallibility which would lead us back to the Church of Rome.*"

Upon the principles on which the Gospel was first propagated and the Reformation carried on, they declared against any governmental recognition of any religion. And they declared specifically against any governmental recognition of "the Christian religion," expressly in order that this Nation and people should *forever be kept from being led back to the Church of Rome.*

Other splendid sentences from the documents of that campaign, equally show that the men who wrought for Religious Liberty had ever in mind the distinction between the principles of the papacy and those of the Reformation.

Of that "Bill Establishing a Provision for Teachers of the Christian Religion," they said:

"What a melancholy mark is this bill, of sudden degeneracy! Instead of holding forth an asylum to the persecuted, it is itself a signal of persecution. . . . Distant as it may be in its present form from the Inquisition, it differs from it only in degree. The one is the first step, the other is the last in the career of intolerance."

“During almost fifteen centuries has the legal establishment of Christianity been on trial. What have been its fruits? More or less, in all places, pride and indolence in the clergy; ignorance and servility in the laity; in both, superstition, bigotry, and persecution. . . .

“What influence, in fact, have ecclesiastical establishments had on civil society! In some instances they have been seen to erect a spiritual tyranny on the ruins of civil authority. In many instances they have been seen upholding the thrones of political tyranny. *In no instance* have they been seen the guardians of the liberties of the people.”

“Torrents of blood have been spilt in the Old World in consequence of vain attempts of the secular arm to extinguish religious discord by proscribing all differences in religious opinion. Time has at length revealed the true remedy. Every relaxation of narrow and rigorous policy . . . has been found to assuage the disease.

“The American theatre has exhibited proofs that equal and complete liberty, if it does not wholly eradicate it, sufficiently destroys its malignant influence on the health and prosperity of the State. If, with the salutary effects of this system under our own eyes, we begin to contract the bounds of religious freedom, we know no name which will too severely reproach our folly.”

These quotations are sufficient to show that in their contention for Religious Liberty, those noble men held steadily before them the principles of the Protest and the Reformation; and that they held consistently to those principles.

And they blended in one with these, "the principles on which the Gospel was first propagated." In this too they held consistently, and were eminently correct and true to the truth.

The Lord Jesus, the Author of the Gospel as it was first propagated, proclaimed from God this perfect Religious Liberty, in the sweeping words, "If any man hear my words and believe not, I judge him not." John 12:47.

When the Creator and Lord of all declares every man's freedom not to believe even *His* words, then that utterly excludes all other persons, potentates, and powers, from ever judging or condemning anybody for any dissent or variance in any matter of religion or faith.

And that is the American and Constitutional principle, from the Christian and Reformation principle.

And so says the Scripture again: "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own Master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up; for God is able to make him stand.

"So then every one of us shall give account of himself *to God.*" Rom. 14: 4, 12.

And from the Christian and Reformation principle that is the American and Constitutional principle; for Washington said: "Every man who conducts himself as a good citizen is accountable *alone to God* for his *religious faith*; and should be protected in worshipping God according to the dictates of his conscience."

Again Jesus said: "Render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's." Matt. 22: 21.

When that word was spoken, in all the "civilized" world Cæsar and God, religion and the State, were held to be one and inseparable. But by that word Jesus split in two that heathen and Satanic thing, and set them as far apart as are the world and Christ, and Satan and God.

And from the Christian and Reformation principle, that is the American and Constitutional principle.

In the sense of "revolt" being "to turn away in horror or disgust, to be repelled or shocked," the Reformation was a *revolt* from the papacy. And it was much more than that. It was a revival of original Christianity. And *in that* it was the revival of the divine principle of Individuality.

In this respect also the American and Constitutional principle of Liberty is the truest expression that there is in any organic connection in all the world, of "the principles upon which the Gos-

pel was first propagated and the Reformation from popery carried on.”

“No one thought of vindicating religion for the conscience of the individual, till a voice in Judea, breaking day for the greatest epoch in the life of humanity by establishing a pure, spiritual, and universal, religion for all mankind, enjoined to render to Cæsar only that which is Cæsar’s. The rule was upheld during the infancy of the Gospel for all men.

“No sooner was this religion adopted by the chief of the Roman Empire than it was shorn of its character of universality and enthralled by an unholy connection with the unholy State. And so it continued, till the New Nation — the least defiled with the barren scoffings of the eighteenth century, the *most general believer in Christianity* of any people of that age, *the chief heir of the Reformation in its purest form* — when it came to establish a government for the United States, refused to treat faith as a matter to be regulated by a corporate body, or having a headship in a monarch or a State.”

“The Constitution establishes nothing that interferes with equality and individuality. It knows nothing of differences by descent, or opinions, or favored classes, or legalized *religion*, or the political power of property. It leaves the *individual* alongside of *the individual*.

“No nationality of character could take form, except on *the principle of individuality*: so that the mind might be free, and every faculty have the unlimited opportunity for its development and culture. . . . The *rule of individuality* was extended as never before. . . . *Religion* was become avowedly the attribute of *man*, and *not* of a *corporation*.

“Vindicating the *right of individuality* even in religion, and in religion above all, the New Nation dared to set the example of accepting in its relations to God the principle first divinely ordained in Judea.”

It is important especially to emphasize the fact and the truth that the American and Constitutional principle of Religious Liberty is the separation of *the Christian* religion and the State, the separation of *Christianity* and the State, and *not* merely the separation of *Church* and State.

The separation of *Church* and State was a question already settled, and was in the past, before there was even begun the contest that ended only in the establishment of the Religious Liberty of the Constitution.

And when that contest was begun it was not over any revival of the union of *Church* and State; but distinctly over an attempt to form a *union of "Christianity"* and the State, in the proposal to

establish the legal recognition and support of “the Christian religion.”

The sole question from beginning to end of the whole campaign, was as to whether “the *Christian religion*” should have governmental recognition and support, or whether it should be excluded from all governmental support, connection, or recognition.

In all the documents that are the essential features of the issue, there is not once found the phrase “Church and State” nor any phrase of kindred import.

Throughout, the phrases are “religion” — in the abstract, “the Christian religion,” “Christianity,” “the legal establishment of Christianity.” *This* is what was opposed, in the interests of Religious Liberty.

They said that the proposal for the legal recognition and support of “the Christian religion” was “entirely subversive of Religious Liberty.”

They said that it was “a contradiction to the Christian religion.”

They said that it was “a departure from the plan of the Holy Author of our religion;” because “Almighty God hath created the mind free,” and He “being Lord both of body and mind yet chose not to propagate His religion by coercions on either, as was in His Almighty power to do.”

And the campaign ended with the whole ques-

tion summed up in the plain word of Washington in the supreme law of the Nation, —

“The government of the United States is not in any sense founded on *the Christian* religion.”

That and that alone is the American and Constitutional principle of Religious Liberty. And it is the Protestant and Christian principle.

That is, the Christian principle absolutely excludes *Christianity* from all governmental support, connection, or recognition.

Thus by the facts and essential documents of the whole record, nothing can be plainer than that the American Constitutional principle of Religious Liberty is *not* merely the separation of *Church* and State, but *it is* specifically the separation of *Christianity* and the State.

Yet plain as that is in the essential history of the Nation and the Constitution, plain as it is by Protestant and Christian principle, it is safe to say that hardly one in a thousand of the professed Protestant preachers in the United States recognizes it or will allow it.

For illustration, in the month of March, 1912, more than a hundred professed Protestant preachers of Washington City met together to adopt a resolution to be presented to President Taft against the wearing of the garb of the Roman Church by teachers in government schools. Yet in that meeting, for that purpose, and *on that*

question, it was distinctly declared, and endorsed by the whole body with applause, that —

“We mean the separation of **Church** and State: **not** the separation of **Christianity** and the State.”

Benjamin Franklin said that “he who shall introduce into public affairs the principles of primitive Christianity, will change the face of the world.”

Jefferson, Madison, Washington, and the people of the United States did introduce into public affairs in this Nation the principles of primitive Christianity that are specially for the guidance of States and nations as such — the principle of the exclusive jurisdiction of God alone in all affairs of religion, the principle of the exclusion of the government from all things pertaining to religion, the principle of freedom of conscience, the principle of Individuality, the principle of perfect Religious Liberty.

And this *has changed the face of the world.*

Not till the planting of this newest nation did these principles ever find any place of recognition in government — except always upon the little theatre of Rhode Island. The principles had always been in the Bible for recognition by every government. The principles were ordained of God for the recognition of governments and of men everywhere. But to this New Nation

alone of all the world befell the splendid distinction of taking the divinely ordained way of genuine Religious Liberty as a fundamental governmental principle.

When this great thing had been done by this New Nation, there was not another nation in the world that would consent that it was in any wise a sound or safe thing to do. But *now* every nation in the world has accepted and officially proclaimed Religious Liberty as a governmental principle. It is not in all of them practically applied in its true measure; but it has in all of them been adopted and proclaimed as a governmental principle.

And thus by making these principles of primitive Christianity, and of primitive Christianity *revived in the Reformation*, a fundamental fixture in public affairs — by this one thing alone this New Nation has wrought a revolution of this whole world. She has changed the face of the world.

But Rome never wanted the face of the world thus to be changed. It meant to her, weakening of influence and loss of power. It was all done in spite of her, and against all her principles and interest. And now that it has been done, she is determined to reverse it. And since by the New Nation it was done, upon this Nation Rome centres all her energies for the reversal of it.

Accordingly, as far back as 1892, in a letter direct from the Vatican, there was published in

the United States the will and hope of the papacy concerning this Nation. The following are some of the expressive sentences of that letter:

“What the church has done in the past for others, she will do for the United States.”

“That is the reason the Holy See encourages the American clergy to guard jealously the solidarity, and to labor for the fusion, of all the foreign and heterogeneous elements into one vast national family.”

“Like all intuitive souls, he [Leo XIII] hails in the united American States and in their young and flourishing church the source of **new life for Europeans.**”

“He wants America to be powerful, in order that **Europe may regain strength** from borrowing a rejuvenated type.”

“What can we borrow, what ought we to borrow, from the United States for our social, political, and **ecclesiastical, reorganization?**”

“If the United States succeed in solving the many problems that puzzle us, **Europe will follow her example**, and this outpouring of light will **mark a date** in the history not only of the United States, but of **all humanity.**”

In 1893, by his “apostolic delegate” in this country the same pope sent to the Catholics of America the special message and command —

“Bring your fellow-countrymen, **bring your country** into immediate contact with that great secret of blessedness — Christ and his Church.”

“For **here in America do we have**, more than elsewhere, **the key to the future.**”

To that ambitious and pernicious end, all since has been and ever is most diligently worked. The

chief stroke so far was the appointing in 1912 of three American cardinals all at once. And if the sinking of the *Titanic* had not put the etiquette of the thing at the bottom of the sea, the American cardinals would even now be parading their papal pomp as "princes of the blood" in precedence of every official, native or foreign, in this land.

And to all that papal program for marring the now fair face of the world, the Federal Council of Churches *in America* — in America, think of it! — swings her influence, by that public repudiation of the word and idea of "Protestant."

For to Rome herself in her wicked encroachments what greater encouragement could be given; and on principle what greater favor could be shown to the papacy in every way; than in the fact that there are thirty-one denominations——"more than seventeen millions" of people — who are thus distinctly pledged to silence, whatever Rome may do?!

No worse betrayal of a nation and people was ever played in the world than in that blind and thoughtless action of the Federal Council of the Churches *in America*, in repudiating that splendid word "Protestant."

Are *you* a Protestant?

CHAPTER IV.

WHAT CAUSED THE REFORMATION?

The Roman Church filled Europe. The Papacy ruled all.

The Roman Church was an ecclesiastical structure that embraced all the people of Europe: claiming dominion over every activity of human life — mental, moral, and spiritual; over every interest of mankind — temporal and eternal; and over all regions — heaven, earth, and hell.

The Papacy was the Roman Church permeating and possessing all the power of State and Empire: bending all to her own use; and controlling all in her own interests; to the making of her claimed dominion over mankind and the world absolutely effective, and effectively absolute.

“The whole fabric of medieval Christianity rested upon the idea of the Visible Church;” and “The Holy Empire is but another name for the Visible Church.” “Thus the Holy Roman Church and the Holy Roman Empire are one and the same thing, seen from different sides.” — *Bryce*.

The ecclesiastical structure consisted of —

1. The gradation of priests, bishops, archbishops, cardinals, and the Pope.

2. The monks of every order, subject only to their respective superiors and to the Pope.

By ages of possession this church had succeeded in filling all the people with the superstition that the church had full control of eternal Salvation: that this Salvation rested peculiarly in the "sacraments," and that of her own will the church could bestow or withhold the "sacraments."

Whether, therefore, any person could be partaker of Salvation depended upon his attitude and degree of submission to the church. This submission was held under threat not only of the loss of eternal Salvation, but also the incurring of Perdition hereafter, and this accompanied by as large a measure as possible of perdition *present*, in unescapable and unappeasable persecution.

*"Step by step the supremacy of the Roman see had been asserted and enforced, until it enjoyed the universal jurisdiction which enabled it to bend to its wishes every prelate, under the naked alternative of submission or expulsion. The Papal mandate, just or unjust, reasonable or unreasonable, was to be received and implicitly obeyed; for there was no appeal from the representative of St. Peter.

"In a narrower sphere, and subject to the

* The sources of the quotations, facts, and dates, in this chapter are, Lea's "History of the Inquisition," Vol. I, chap. i; De Cormenin's "History of the Popes;" Bower's "History of the Popes;" Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," Book XIII.

Pope, the bishop held an authority which, at least in theory, was equally absolute; while the humbler minister of the altar was the instrument by which the decrees of Pope and bishop were enforced among the people: for the destiny of all men lay in the hands which could administer or withhold the sacraments essential to salvation.

“It would be difficult to set bounds to the intrusion upon the concerns of every man, which was thus rendered possible, or to the influence thence derivable. Not only did the humblest priest wield a supernatural power which marked him as one elevated above the common level of humanity, but his person and possessions were alike inviolable. No matter what crimes he might commit, secular justice could not take cognizance of them and secular officials could not arrest him.”

“Holy orders were become a full protection for all enormities.” — *Hume*.

“The church militant was thus an army encamped on the soil of Christendom, with its outposts everywhere, subject to the most efficient discipline, animated with a common purpose, every soldier panoplied with inviolability and armed with the tremendous weapons which slew the soul. There was little that could not be dared or done by the commander of such a force, whose orders were listened to as oracles of God from Portugal to Palestine and from Sicily to Iceland.” — *Lea*.

The church held in full possession an absolute monopoly. And as with every other monopoly, this one was held primarily and principally for power and profit.

As to Profit.

Carrying such dignities and such immunities — such powers — all ecclesiastical offices were the objects of wholly selfish ambition: of every cardinal to be Pope, of every archbishop to be cardinal, of every bishop to be an archbishop, of every priest or monk to be a bishop.

And to attain the object of ambition each one was ready to employ the means most likely to win. And this was *money*. “Under these circumstances simony, with all its attendant evils, was almost universal.” For not only were the principal dignities thus obtained, but likewise all the minor offices or positions of trust within the jurisdiction of these.

Naturally the thing was worked from both sides: by the one who would obtain the office, and by the one who had the office to bestow. The one who would get the office, must pay high for it. But if what this one would pay seemed, to the one who had the office to bestow, not to promise enough, then the office was given to the one who would most largely share with the superior the plunder of the office — often even to boys of four-

teen, ten, or even seven years, and to the most worthless characters.

Of course, at the final turn all of this money must come from the people. Thus money, money, money, money, was the one chief subject of thought and of administration.

Money and how to get it, was the one chief activity of the clergy from highest to lowest. Money was the one chief thing kept before the people and ever pressed upon them. Whoever could invent some new form of exaction, some new trick to turn money, some new device to wring out yet more money, was immediately distinguished.

To the local priest and his assistants fell the regular and perpetual presentation of the demand for money. Whenever the bishop made his visitation, it was a new occasion for money. When the archbishop made a progress, it meant more money. When a cardinal came, it meant still more money. When the Pope's nuncio came, it meant yet more money. And when the Pope himself came, it meant most money of all.

In addition to all these, there were many agents traversing the countries bearing papal letters "empowering them to exercise judicial functions and enforce them with the last dread sentence of excommunication. Europe was thus traversed by multitudes of men armed with these weapons, which they used without remorse for extortion

and oppression. These letters thus afforded a *carte blanche* through which injustice could be perpetrated and malignity gratified to the fullest extent.

“An additional complication which not unnaturally followed was the fabrication and falsification of these letters. It was not easy to refer to distant Rome to ascertain the genuineness of a papal brief confidently produced by its bearer; and the impunity with which powers so tremendous could be assumed, was irresistibly attractive. . . . To the people, however, it mattered little whether they were genuine or fictitious: the suffering was the same whether the papal chancery had received its fee or not.”

Another addition was in the crowds of monks, “bearded and tonsured, and wearing the religious habit, who traversed every corner of Christendom, living by begging and imposture, peddling false relics and false miracles.”

Yet another was an equally widely distributed and industrious horde of *pardoners*, bearing “papal or episcopal letters by which they were authorized to issue pardons for sins in return *for contributions*. Though these letters were cautiously framed, yet they were ambiguous enough to enable the pardoners to promise, not only the salvation of the living, but the liberation of the damned from hell — for a few small coins.

“Needy bishops and popes were constantly issuing such letters; and the business of the pardoner became a regular profession, in which the most impudent and shameless were the most successful.” This invention and enlistment of traveling pardoners to carry to the most remote and the poorest, indulgences for cash, was for the purpose of getting the money of those who could not make the pilgrimages nor attend the jubilees that had been invented for the same purpose.

Births were taxed, marriages were taxed, deaths were taxed, burials were taxed, purgatory was taxed, and hell was taxed.

By a trick even excommunication was made a source of revenue. For if a demand or a command, however unjust, were resisted, excommunication was inflicted. Then to obtain “reconciliation” with “the church” the victim must render the original demand, and pay an additional levy besides.

From this it is easy to see how readily every failing as well as every offense of every person was made a means of revenue. Pope John XXII actually reduced to specific formulæ the rates to be levied on the sins of all. The list is sufficient to cover almost every sin that mankind might commit. Yet all these are levied upon at set rates of so many “livres,” “francs,” and “sous.” Thus it is literally and undeniably true that no small

portion of the vast revenues of the papacy was derived from a direct and specific tax upon sinning.

Nor was it a tax for prohibition, or to induce cessation, of the sinning. It was expressly for "absolution," "free dispensation," "assurance against all pursuit," "guaranteed from all pursuit and all infamy." Such are the words that are used throughout: with no word or implication of prohibition or cessation.

The condition of society revealed in this awful list, is fearful in its blackness. But when it is seen that the whole purpose of the scheme was to secure revenue, and this for "absolution," "free dispensation," "assurance," and "guarantee" of immunity from all pursuit or penalty, the evil was palliated and encouraged rather than checked or forbidden, and the blackness is intensified rather than relieved, by any agency or ministration of Pope or church.

In strict consonance is the fact that litigation of differences and quarrels of the people was cultivated: this also for the revenue that it would bring through the church-courts by the costs of the case, and the fines exacted. "When a priest was inducted into a benefice, it was customary to exact of him an oath that he would not overlook any offenses committed by his parishioners, but would report them to the Ordinary, that the of-

fenders might be prosecuted and fined; and that he would not allow any quarrels to be settled amicably.”

Of course it was necessary for the church to have *something* with which to satisfy impertinent inquiry from the victims, as to what caused the need of all this money, and what was done with it.

One of the principal things so employed, was the building of grand cathedrals and great churches and abbeys that were kept always under construction — any one of them continuing *unfinished* from a hundred to five hundred years. It is well known that “the building of St. Peter’s” was the ostensible basis of the indulgence market that aroused Luther.

Peter Cantor affirms that these magnificent structures with their wonderful works of art in stained glass, paintings, and sculpture, “were built out of exactions on the poor, out of the unhallowed gains of usury, and out of the lies and deceits of the pardoners.”

Another successful blind was the crusades for the confirmation of “the faith” against the invasions of “the devil” by means of heresy. Then a source of immense revenue was found in the confiscation of all the possessions of heretics.

The inquisitors were gliding everywhere. The universal oppressions and exactions of the church caused universal discontent among the people.

There were many genuine heretics. The teachings of these with the widespread discontent excited double diligence and activity to detect and prosecute heretics.

Then appeared another unquestionable proof of the church's essential hatred of righteousness and love of iniquity. The genuine heretics preached and practiced the righteousness of the faith of Jesus and the keeping of the commandments of God: producing a truly pure and correct manner of life. These were bitterly and uncompromisingly persecuted. Any one therefore who held really a correct life was subject to suspicion of heresy, and was in danger of prosecution by the inquisition.

For instance: A certain Catholic cleric of Spire by his sincere preaching "led certain women to lay aside their vanities of apparel, and behave with humility." He escaped being burnt as a heretic only by the special intercession of a churchman who could be trusted.

A genuine Catholic was by mistake brought before the tribunal of the Inquisition. The proof, in his own words, that effectually purged him of even suspicion of heresy, was, "I eat flesh, and lie, and swear, and am a faithful Christian."

Another fruitful source of revenue was *divorce*. For kings, princes, and nobles, who could pay enormous sums and swing political influence,

the divorce market was always open. And through god-fathers, god-mothers, etc., the degrees of "spiritual relationship" were almost boundlessly extended; and all these degrees were of equal force with those of the flesh and blood.

For a sufficient price, therefore, it was easy to find that a marriage was within the forbidden degrees of relationship; and, therefore, void. Peter Cantor was a Catholic churchman of such standing as to have influence even with Innocent III. And he asserts that "the most holy sacrament of matrimony, owing to the remote consanguinity coming within the prohibited degrees, was made a subject of derision to the laity by the venality with which marriages were made and unmade to fill the pouches of the episcopal officials."

Of course all this was held not to be *divorce*; but only the *finding of the fact* that the marriage was within the forbidden degrees: and, so, that it never was a valid marriage. And if never a marriage, then the severance of it *couldn't* be divorce!

But this was only another phase of the infinite casuistry by which any truth or principle of righteousness could be avoided. For the forbidden degree was never discovered till after the marriage: and the marriage according to all the many rules, formulæ, and forms, of the church. And even then it was never discovered *except for a price*.

The church rigidly forbade marriage of the

clergy, and forbade divorce to all who were married. Under these prohibitions, those who were married could do everything but be divorced — except for a sufficient price; and the clergy could do everything but be married.

To the clergy marriage was the one unpardonable offense. For this there was no “absolution,” nor “free dispensation,” nor “assurance against pursuit,” nor “guarantee from all pursuit and from all infamy.”

“The records of the Middle Ages are accordingly full of the evidences that indiscriminate license of the worst kind prevailed throughout every rank of the hierarchy.” No small portion of the tax-list of John XXII was devoted to the many phases of activity in this field of iniquity. “The personal evil wrought by a dissolute priesthood was a wide-spreading contagion.”

“The abuse of the lawful authority given by the altar and the confessional was a subject of sorrowful and indignant denunciation in too many synods for a reasonable doubt to be entertained of its frequency, or of the corruption which it spread through innumerable parishes and nunneries.

“The almost entire practical immunity with which these and similar scandals were perpetrated, led to an undisguised and cynical profligacy; which the severer churchmen acknowledged to ex-

ercise a most deleterious influence on the morals of the laity, who thus saw the exemplars of evil in those who should have been their patterns of virtue.”

“There is no injustice in holding the church responsible for the lax morality of the laity. It had assumed the right to regulate the consciences of men, and to make them account for every action and even for every thought.

“When it promptly caused the burning of those who ventured on any dissidence in doctrinal opinion or in matters of pure speculation, it could not plead lack of authority to control them in practical virtue. Its machinery was all-pervading, and its power was autocratic.

“It had taught that the priest was to be venerated as the representative of God, and that his commands were to be implicitly obeyed. It had armed him with the fearful weapon of the confessional; and by authorizing him to grant absolution and to pronounce excommunication, it had delegated to him the keys of heaven and hell. By removing him from the jurisdiction of the secular courts, it had proclaimed him as superior to all temporal authority.

“Through ages of faith the populations had humbly received these teachings, and bowed to these assumptions, until they entered into the texture of the daily life of every man.

“While thus grasping supremacy, and using it to the utmost possibility of worldly advantage, the church could not absolve itself from the responsibilities inseparably connected with power. And chief among these responsibilities is to be numbered the moral training of the nations thus subjected to its will.”

As to Power.

The office, the dignity, the authority, and the wealth, of the Pope, had been raised higher than all else in the world. This pinnacle of papal absolutism was attained in Pope Boniface VIII, and was proclaimed by him in the two notable sentences: —

1. “There is no other Caesar, nor king, nor emperor, than I, the sovereign pontiff and successor of the apostles.”

2. “We assert, define, and pronounce, that it is necessary to salvation to believe that every human being is subject to the pontiff of Rome.”

The Pope asserted *claim* to equality with God. He exercised *powers* far beyond God. To be Pope, then, became the supreme object of iniquitous ambition.

This development had been greatly aided by the almost constant wars between the popes and the emperors. The emperor, the more to further his cause against the Pope, would resort to the expedient of bringing about the election of a rival

Pope: and sometimes the rival Pope became fully the Pope.

Many times had this occurred. But when a plurality of Popes became a fixture for fifty years, no emperor nor king had any part in it. It was wholly of the church, and was strictly ecclesiastical procedure.

April 8, 1378, the cardinals elected Pope Urban VI. Becoming displeased with him, September 20 the same year the same cardinals elected Pope Clement VII.

This threw all Europe into confusion that not only continued but increased for fifty years. Not only were the nations divided, but "even private families: some adhering to one of the competitors, and some to the other.

Urban was received as lawful Pope in Italy and almost all over Germany, in England, Portugal, Hungary, Poland, Denmark, Sweden, Prussia, Norway, Bohemia, Tuscany, Lombardy, and the duchy of Milan.

Clement was acknowledged in France, Spain, Lorraine, Savoy, Scotland, Sicily, and in the islands of Rhodes and Cyprus.

"As nothing could be certainly determined in favor of either of the pretenders, some sided at one time with one, and at another time with another: as their interests directed them. Indeed both had amongst their partisans some of the most eminent

men of the age for their integrity as well as their knowledge in the civil and canon law; and by those of one party, new pieces were daily published, and answered by those of the other." — *Bower*.

The division and confusion was not confined to the field of opinion and literary discussion. "Anathemas, interdicts, depositions, and maledictions, were the prelude to the bloody strife which was soon to overwhelm the Western nations.

"Urban launched a bull against his competitor, and cited him to appear before the court of Rome to be judged and condemned as antipope.

"Clement, on his side, fulminated a terrible decree against his enemy, and cited him to appear before the consistory of Avignon to be judged for the usurpation of the apostolic chair.

"Finally, both having refused to appear, they anathematized each other by the ringing of bells and the light of torches, declaring each other apostates, schismatics, and heretics.

"They preached crusades against each other, and called to their aid all the banditti and malefactors of Italy and France; and let them loose like wild beasts on the unfortunate inhabitants who recognized Clement or preferred Urban.

"In the States of the church the Clementists made horrible havoc: ruined castles, burned villages, and even several cities. They penetrated as far as Rome, under the lead of Budes, a Breton

captain, seized on the fortress of St. Angelo and committed atrocities in all parts of the city.

“In Naples and Romagna the Urbanists, commanded by an Englishman named Hawkwood, took their revenge and committed reprisal.

“Everywhere pillage, rape, incendiarism, and murder, were committed in the name of Clement, or in the honor of Urban. The unhappy cultivators fled with their wives and children, to escape the satellites of the Roman pontiff, and were massacred by the soldiery of the Pope of Avignon.”—*De Cormenin*.

“Everywhere might be found divisions, spoliations, even bloodshed; ejected and usurping clergy, dispossessed and intrusive abbots and bishops; feuds, battles for churches and monasteries.

“Among all other causes of discord, arose this the most discordant: to the demoralizing and unchristianizing tendencies of the times was added a question on which the best might differ, which to the bad would be an excuse for every act of violence, fraud, or rapacity.”—*Milman*.

The anarchy continued under the successors of the original two Popes. In 1398 the king of France took the lead and was joined by the kings of Hungary, Bohemia, England, Aragon, Castile, Navarre, and some of Germany, in an effort to relieve their dominions of the anarchy. They demanded that both Popes resign.

The Pope in Rome replied:—

“Pope I am, and Pope will I remain: despite all entreaty of the kings of France and Germany.”

The Pope in Avignon made answer:—

“I have been invested by God in the papacy. I will not renounce it for count, nor duke, nor king. Let the king of France issue what ordinances he will, I will hold my office and popedom till I die.”

Next, both colleges of cardinals united against both Popes. This, with the influence of the kings, secured the assembling of a General Council at Pisa in 1409. This Council declared both Popes deposed, all their acts null and void, and the cardinals at full liberty to proceed to an entirely new election. The cardinals elected Pope Alexander V, June 26, 1409.

All this procedure of Council and cardinals was intended to restore the papacy to only one Pope. But it did not work that way. Instead of the afflicted world having now only one Pope, the discovery was soon made that it had *three*. And Europe, instead of being divided between only two Popes, was divided among the *same two* and *another one*.

The triple-headed monstrosity of the papacy now stood:

Pope Gregory XII in Gaeta: acknowledged by the king of Sicily, the Emperor Rupert, and some of the cities of Italy.

Pope Benedict XIII in Avignon: acknowledged by the kings of Aragon, Castile, and Scotland, and the earl of Armagnac.

Pope Alexander V first at Pisa and then at Bologna: acknowledged by the remaining kings and princes of Europe.

Alexander V died in less than eleven months after his election. He was succeeded by John XXIII—the last and worst of the Johns, and one of the worst even of the Popes.

In former times this John, as Balthasar Cossa, had been a pirate on the Mediterranean Sea. Now he was chief pirate of the Papal See, and of the deepened sea of papal anarchy that flooded Europe.

Pope John and the king of Sicily were at deadly enmity, and their warring desolated vast regions of Italy. To strengthen himself against the king of Sicily, John sought an alliance with the Emperor Sigismund. To secure this he had to agree to the assembling of a General Council, and this in the imperial city of Constance: to quench the schisms of the Popes and heal the miseries of Christendom.

Accordingly, an imperial letter and a papal bull were sent throughout Christendom summoning “the General Council of Christendom to meet at Constance” Nov. 1, 1414. The Council met on that date, and continued till April 22, 1418.

At the opening of the Council, John XXIII was present in person, and presided. Both the other Popes sent deputies: not to be of the Council, nor to recognize the Council; but to be watchful of the interests of those Popes respectively. Pope Gregory's deputies lodged with the emperor a petition that John should not be permitted to preside in the Council.

Gregory's deputies announced to the Council on his behalf, that he was ready to resign the popedom *provided* both the other Popes would resign at the same time.

To consider this subject, there was appointed, apart from the Council as such, an assembly of the heads of the nations who were present. This assembly unanimously agreed and recommended that all three of the Popes resign.

John made a show of accepting the recommendation. He himself wrote a form of his own, *promising* to resign, *provided* the other two would resign at the same time.

This was not satisfactory to the assembly, and they wrote one for him to accept. Yet this was so written that it was not of itself actually a resignation; and John made a most impressive show of accepting it. In the presence of the whole Council, on his knees at the "altar" with his hand on his breast, he declared, vowed, promised, and swore to God that he would accept it.

All this he did with such an air of sincerity, that the emperor was so carried away with it as to take off his imperial crown, prostrate himself before John, kiss his feet, and in the name of the whole Council thank him for his "good resolution."

But lo! as soon as John saw that the Council was really going to put the recommendation into immediate effect, he with his cardinals ran away in the night.

This he did for the purpose of breaking up the Council. For the Popes held, and he supposed that the Council would consent, that without the Pope the Council would be powerless and would of necessity dissolve.

But his calculation missed entirely. The Emperor Sigismund, attended by the marshal of the empire, and with trumpets sounding before him, personally rode through the city proclaiming that the Council was not dissolved by the flight of the Pope; and that he would defend the Council with the last drop of his blood.

Before the emperor and the assembly of the heads of the nations, the chancellor of the University of Paris presented an argument proving to their satisfaction that a General Council is superior to the Pope; and that its deliverances hold good, with or without the Pope or his approval. Accordingly the Council met in regular session and adopted these articles:—

“I. That the Council had been lawfully assembled in the city of Constance.

“II. That it was not dissolved by the withdrawal of the Pope and the cardinals.

“III. That it should not be dissolved till the schism was removed and the church **reformed in its head and members.**

“IV. That the bishops should not depart, without a just cause **approved by the deputies of the nations,** till the Council was ended; and if they obtained leave of the Council to depart, they should appoint others to vote for them as their deputies or proxies.”

From his retreat, John sent to the Council a notification that his pledges, oaths, and agreements, in the presence of the Council, had been made under duress and because of fear; therefore he was not obliged to be bound by them.

Then the Council in regular session made the following declaration:—

“The present Council, lawfully assembled in the city of Constance, and representing the whole church militant, holds its power immediately of Jesus Christ, and all persons of whatever state or dignity (the papal not excepted) are bound to obey it in what concerns the faith, the extirpation of the schism, and **the reformation of the church in its head and members.**”

Then the Council unanimously deposed John XXIII because of his “scandalous conduct,” his “highest degree of maladministration in both temporals and spirituals,” his “detestable behavior,” his having “shown himself incorrigible,” and “other crimes.”

Gregory XII did really resign: but only by

being allowed to convene the Council anew, as a Council of his jurisdiction.

Benedict XIII was deposed: but he persisted till his last breath — about seven years — that he was the only true and lawful Pope, and that “the only holy catholic and apostolic church was to be found at Peniscola” where he was. Dying, he charged his cardinals to elect another Pope to succeed him. This they did; but he immediately abdicated in favor of the Pope, Martin V, who had been elected by the Council of Constance, Nov. 8, 1417.

Thus by the efforts, the authority, and the power, of the emperor and the heads of the nations, the open anarchy of the Roman Church was ended and she was saved from herself.

It is particularly to be remarked and remembered that it was *not* by the papacy, nor by the church as such, that this was accomplished.

From beginning to end the initiative was in *the heads of the nations*.

It was the emperor, through Pope John’s necessity, who secured the calling of the Council of Constance.

It was the emperor’s determination and public proclamation, that held the Council together after the flight of the Pope with the direct purpose of dissolving it.

It was the “assembly of the heads of the na-

tions," apart from the Council as such, that took the initiative and held the helm throughout the term of what was the Council of Constance in fact.

Thus it was by the heads of the nations — the "secular estate" — and by these alone, that the Council of Constance was made a *fact*, when by all that was the church — the "spiritual estate" — it would have been made only a *fizzle*.

And under the determination and guidance of these the Council was made a fact *without the presence* of any Pope, or Pope's legate, or Pope's representative in any way whatever.

And under the determination and guidance of the emperor and the heads of the nations — "the secular estate" — the Council was made a fact *expressly* for the one chief purpose of "*the reformation of the church in its head and members.*"

Now all those who did this were only of the "laity." In the theory and practice of the Roman Church, these were the worldly or "secular estate," while the "clergy" and the monastic orders were the church proper or "spiritual estate."

The sum of the situation, therefore, is that *the laity* must reform the clergy: the *secular* must *save the spiritual* — the *world* must *save the church!*

But The Church is in the world to save the world.

The Roman Church professed that she was in

the world to save the world, and that Salvation was only of *her*. But lo! this church had sunk herself so low, and was so certainly dragging the world with her to perdition, that by an effort of very desperation the *world* must first save *itself* from the church, and then save the church from herself.

The Church of right being in the world to save the world; the Roman Church professing to be the only and true Church and the only way of Salvation for the world; and that church so reversing the order that she herself must be saved *by the world* and *from herself* — in this she demonstrated in perfection that she is not in any sense the true Church, *and* that she is not only the worst thing *in* the world but that she is worse than the very world itself.

This is evident from the plain facts. And it is abundantly confirmed by unquestionable authority.

Cardinal Baronius is the standard annalist of the Roman Church. He lived 1538-1607. Of the papacy in the ninth century, he says: —

“Never had divisions, civil wars, the persecutions of pagans, heretics and schismatics caused it to suffer so much as the monsters who installed themselves on the throne of Christ by simony and murders. The Roman Church was transformed into a shameless courtesan, covered with silks and precious stones, which publicly prostituted itself for gold.

“The palace of the Lateran was become a disgraceful tavern, in which ecclesiastics of all nations disputed with harlots the price of infamy. Never did priests, and especially Popes, commit so many adulteries, rapes, incests, robberies, and murders; and never was the ignorance of the clergy so great, as during this deplorable period. . . .

“Thus the tempest of abomination fastened itself on the church, and offered to the inspection of men the most horrid spectacle. The canons of councils, the creed of the apostles, the faith of Nice, the old traditions, the sacred rites, were buried in the abyss of oblivion; and the most unbridled dissoluteness, ferocious despotism, and insatiable ambition, usurped their place.

“Who could call legitimate pontiffs the intruders who seated themselves on the chair of the apostles? and what must have been the cardinals selected by such monsters?”

Of the papacy in the tenth century the same writer says:—

“In this century the abomination of desolation was seen in the temple of the Lord; and in the See of St. Peter, revered by angels, were placed the most wicked of men: not pontiffs, but monsters.

“And how hideous was the face of the Roman church, when filthy harlots governed all at Rome, changed Sees at their pleasure, disposed of bishoprics, and intruded their gallants and their bullies into the See of St. Peter!”

Of the twelfth century Baronius avows that “it appeared as if Antichrist then governed Christendom.” He wrote as a historian; but Bernard, of Morlaix, a monk of Cluny, lived at the time, and he wrote of it thus:—

“The golden ages are past. Pure souls exist no longer. We live in the last times. Fraud, impurity, rapine, schisms, quarrels, wars, treasons, incests, and murders, desolate the church. Rome is the impure city of the hunter Nimrod. Piety and religion have deserted its walls. Alas! the pontiff, or rather king, of this odious Babylon, tramples under foot the Gospels and Christ, and causes himself to be adored as a god.”

Honorius of Antron, a priest, also lived at the time; and he declared:—

“Behold these bishops and cardinals of Rome! These worthy ministers who surround the throne of the Beast! They are constantly occupied with new iniquities, and never cease committing crimes. . . .

“Thus, in all the churches, the priests neglect divine service; soil the priesthood by their impurities; deceive the people by their hypocrisy; deny God by their works; render themselves the scandal of nations; and forge a chain of iniquities to bind men. . . .

“The reign of God has finished, and that of Antichrist has commenced. A new law has displaced the old. Scholastic theology has sallied from the depths of hell to strangle religion. Finally there are no longer morality, tenets, nor worships—and lo! the last times announced in the Apocalypse have come.”

Hadrian IV was Pope from Dec. 4, 1154, till Sept. 1, 1159. He was an Englishman. His countryman John of Salisbury visited him, and was received on terms of intimacy. One day, in an exchange of confidences, the Pope asked John to tell him freely and honestly what opinion the world entertained of him and the Roman church.

John did so: telling him with all the freedom of a friend what he had heard expressed in the

countries through which he had travelled. And this is what he said:—

“They say, holy father, that the Roman church, the mother of all churches, behaves toward other churches more like a step-mother than a true mother:

“that scribes and Pharisees sit in her, laying heavy weights upon men’s shoulders, which they themselves touch not with a finger:

“that they domineer over the clergy, but are not an example to the flock nor do they lead the right way to life:

“that they covet rich furniture, load their tables with silver and gold, and yet, out of avarice, live sparingly:

“that they seldom admit or relieve the poor, and when they relieve them it is only out of vanity that they do it:

“that they plunder the churches, sow dissensions, set the clergy and people at variance, are not affected with the miseries and sufferings of the afflicted, and look upon gain as godliness and piety:

“that they do justice, not for justice’ sake, but for lucre:

“that all things are venal — that for money you may obtain today what you please, but the next day you will get nothing without it.

“I have heard them compared to the devil, who is thought to do good — when he ceases from doing mischief:

“I except some few, who answer the name of pastors and fulfill the duty.

“The Roman pontiff himself is, say they, a burden to all almost insupportable.

“All complain that, while the churches that the piety of our ancestors crected are ready to fall, or already lie in ruins while the altars are neglected, he builds palaces and appears gorgeously attired in purple and gold.

“The palaces of the priests are kept clean, but the Church of Christ is covered with filth.

“They plunder whole provinces, as if they aimed at nothing less than the wealth of Croesus.

“But the Almighty treats them according to their deserts, often leaving them a prey to the very refuse of mankind; and while they thus wander out of the way, the punishment they deserve must and will overtake them; the Lord saying, ‘With what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged,’ and ‘With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.’

“This, holy father, is what people say: since you want to know it.”

When honest John had finished, the Pope asked him to give his own opinion. John did, thus —

“We must obey your commands, but must not imitate you in all your actions.

“Why do you inquire into the lives of others, and not into your own?

“All applaud and flatter you, all call you lord and father: if father, why do you expect presents from your children?

“If lord, why not keep your Romans in awe and subjection?

“You are not a father in the right way.

“Give freely what you have received freely.

“If you oppose others, you will be more grievously opposed yourself.”

In the thirteenth century Robert Greathead, bishop of Lincoln in England made earnest Christian effort to reform the clergy of his diocese. He found himself baffled at every turn by appeals to

Rome. Robert himself went to Rome to make a personal appeal to Pope Innocent IV for a check on this practice. But he found every attempt utterly to fail, because every channel was blocked before him with bribes. And in the very presence of Pope Innocent, Robert indignantly exclaimed,—

“Oh, money, money, how much thou canst effect! especially in the court of Rome.”

In an address before Pope Innocent and his cardinals Robert told them plainly that —

“The clergy were a source of pollution to the whole earth: they were antichrists and devils masquerading as angels of light, who made the house of prayer a den of robbers: and the Roman curia was the source of all the vileness which rendered the priesthood a hissing and a reproach to Christianity.”

Gregory X was Pope 1268-1276. In his speech of dismissal of the Council of Lyons in 1274, he told the assembled clergy that they were “the ruin of the world.”

In the fourteenth century we come to the times of John XXII with his systematic tax on sins, for “absolution,” “free dispensation,” “assurance,” and “guarantee against all pursuit and all infamy;” and the times of the double- and triple-headed papacy.

Of that John’s scheme of making capital of sinning, the abbot of Usperg exclaimed:—

“Rejoice now, O Vatican! all treasures are open to thee. Thou canst draw in with full hands. Rejoice in the crimes of the children of men, since thy wealth depends on their abandonment and iniquity! . . . **Now** the human race are subject to thy laws! **Now** thou reignest — through depravity of morals and the inundation of ignoble thoughts. The children of men can now commit with impunity every crime, since they know that thou wilt absolve them for a little gold. Provided he brings thee gold, let him be soiled with blood and lust. Thou wilt open the kingdom of heaven to debauchees, Sodomites, assassins, parricides — what do I say? Thou wilt sell God himself for gold!”

In the time of the double popedom of Boniface IX and Clement VII the doctors of the University of Paris addressed a letter to the king of France, in which they said: —

“Two Popes elevate to prelacies only unworthy and corrupt ministers, who have no sentiments of equity or shame, and who think only of satiating their passions.

“They rob the property of the widow and the orphan, at the same time that they are despoiling churches and monasteries.

“Sacred or profane, nothing comes amiss to them, provided they can extract money from it.

“Religion is for them a mine of gold, which they work to the last vein.

“They sell everything from baptism to burial.

“They traffic in pyxes, crosses, chalices, sacred vases, and the shrines of saints.

“One can obtain no grace, no favor, without paying for it.

“It is not the worthiest, but the richest, who obtain ecclesiastical dignities.

“He who gives money to the Pope can sleep in

safety though he may have murdered his own father; for he is assured of the protection of the church.

“Simony is publicly exercised, and they sell with effrontery to the highest and last bidder, dioceses, prebends, or benefices.

“Thus do the princes of the church. What shall we say of the lower clergy, who no longer administer the sacraments but for gold?

“What shall we say of the monks, whose morals are more corrupt than those of the inhabitants of ancient Sodom?

“It is time, illustrious prince, that you should put an end to this deplorable schism, proclaim the freedom of the Gallican church, and limit the power of the pontiffs.”

And when the popedom became triple-headed, all forms and phases of the incubus were proportionately intensified. Then came the Council of Constance, with the effort of the heads of the nations for deliverance.

In complete and horrible measure it had been demonstrated to all the world that the essence of the papacy and the ultimate of the power and rule of the Roman church is only anarchy — the complete undoing of men and nations.

At the height of her power the Roman church had everything her own way. All the nations were absolutely subject to her will. Nobles, princes, kings, and emperor, all moved at her bidding. Her dominion over mankind was complete and absolute. The power and legitimacy of her empire there was none to dispute.

In that position of absolute supremacy, with simply nothing to restrain her from doing exactly as she pleased and what she would, *then* whatsoever she did, *that* is *only* what *was* in her to do.

And what did she do? — There is the record: the blackest in all the history of the world. She compelled mankind to sin; she filled her world to the sinking point with iniquity and woe; she so afflicted the nations with her anarchy that they must rise up against her to save themselves from her, and to save her from herself.

And the climax of all that is of her, *of herself*, is that when all had been subdued unto her *then* she could only tear her own vitals by first a double and then a triple rending of herself.

She must rule all the world, only to prove that she could not rule herself. And when there remained nothing but to rule herself, she could only destroy herself.

And *than that* there could be no more certain evidence that the power and rule of the Roman church is essentially anarchistic — the very mystery of iniquity.

And that — that church itself, what that church showed itself essentially to be, *that* is what caused The Reformation.

All the world was calling for a reformation, and God sent The Reformation.

When the Council of Constance declared the

necessity of a “reformation of the church in its head and members,” The Reformation had already begun.

Indeed that Council itself met The Reformation — and unmercifully, that is papistically, *condemned it*.

The Council of Constance burnt at the stake both John Huss and Jerome of Prague — the then two chief sounding voices of The Reformation.

And the absolute necessity that a complete revolution should be wrought in the *minds* of men, no less than in their manners, is sufficiently indicated in the awful fact that the same Council — the same identical men — that in order to accomplish “a reformation,” deposed the three Popes because of palpable, notorious, and specified, enormities, *consumed out of the world* the two saints of God whom He sent to it with His message of The Reformation which essentially consists only in *Regeneration*.

CHAPTER V.

THE REFORMATION : AND THE ROMAN CHURCH.

How came The Reformation?

The Reformation did not and does not consist in exposure and denunciation of the iniquities of the Roman church.

That is included in The Reformation, as an incident; because it is of the essence of Christianity to hate iniquity, as it is to love righteousness.

It was the iniquities, enormities, and desolations, wrought by the Roman church, that caused the universal desire and the pressing demand that there should be a reformation. Yet The Reformation was not wrought by magnifying or dwelling upon those things.

The Reformation springs from another principle, lives in another atmosphere, and works in another field, than that.

If exposure and denunciation of the iniquities of that church could have wrought reformation, then The Reformation would have been in the world more than five hundred years before it was.

The quotations in the preceding chapter of the many scathing words of denunciation and exposure of the Roman church on her own part, and of the papacy as a whole, and all by men of standing in that church itself, are sufficient to show that if

that could work reformation there was enough of it to have accomplished the most complete and perfect reformation.

Yet all that is only a little of what could just as easily be quoted. And all of it said by men who lived all their days and died in full and honored membership in that church: some of them now saints of that church.

The men whose preaching made The Reformation could have said all that they ever said, and more, in denunciation of the iniquity in the church, and the enormities of the Popes; and yet could have remained in good standing in that church, all their days: *if* they had still held that church to be the only and true church, and have held themselves in conformity with her accordingly.

All men saw the iniquities practiced. They actually *felt* them on every side. Nobles, kings, emperors, priests, bishops, cardinals, and councils, called for reformation. Even Popes confessed the sore need of it.

Princes and peoples wanted it for relief. The more observant of the clergy wanted it because of the fear that without it there would be such an universal uprising of the people in wrathful retaliation as would literally wipe out the whole order of the clergy.

But from whatever cause a reformation was desired, it was always attempted without right-

eousness. It was from men only, and not from God. And it was in this way from the very men who were essentially the cause of the demand for reform, and were essentially of the thing that must be reformed: that is, the church.

Inevitably all such attempts must be flat failures. How dismal was the effort — the failure — of the Council of Constance at reformation, when what was considered the best that it could do to save the church, — the burning of Huss and Jerome — was the worst thing that it could possibly do, for any cause or for any reason!

The explanation of this blank incongruity, and the key of the whole vicious circle of self-involved contradictions, is in the fact that all those men who denounced the Popes and their evil practices, and the extortions and oppressions of the clergy, held that the church of which all these evils were but the expression, was the true and only church!

Even when they were compelled to admit that the church was inextricably involved in it all, and when they were thus required to reflect even upon the church, this was always done with the reservation and apology that in spite of all this she was the true and only church.

They denounced the *men* and the activities of the *men*, even of the Popes and the papal court, but still apologized and pleaded for *the machine*.

They condemned the evil *practices*, but justi-

fied *the system* by which alone it was possible that those practices could not only be perpetuated, but could even exist.

The *times* were evil, but “the church,” which made the times what they were, was “righteous!”

Church-men were bad; but “the church,” whose members and the expression of whose life those church-men essentially were, was “good!”

Customs were pernicious; but “the church,” whose the customs essentially were, was “the abode of sanctity!”

Practices were abominable; but “the church,” which invented *many* and profited by *all* of these practices, was “holy!”

Popes were demoniac; but “the church,” of which the Popes were “the head” — the acting will, the guiding mind — was “divine!”

See the grand churches and magnificent cathedrals! Hear the “heavenly” music of the “divine” chants! Catch the impressive odor of the “holy” incense! Feel the awe of the “solemn” services, as the richly-robed ecclesiastics minister at the “altar,” kneel before the “host,” and move in “holy” procession! Think of the wide extent of her “missions!” Behold her “perfect organization,” by which she executes as by one man the wonders of her will, holds empires in awe, and rules the world! Isn’t *that* the true and only holy church?

The church was “the ark of God,” the “ship of Salvation.” The pilot, the captain, and the crew, might all be pirates, and use every motion of the ship only for piratical purposes, and load her to the sinking point with piratical plunder, and keep her ever headed straight toward perdition, yet “the grand old ship” herself was all right and would come safely to the heavenly port. Therefore, “cling to the ark,” “stand by the old ship,” and *you* will be safe and will land at last on the heavenly shore.

Such in essence is the conception held, and that for ages had been inculcated. For instance, in the very passage quoted on page 96 from Cardinal Baronius, in which he describes the fearful conditions of that church in the ninth century, there stand the cardinal’s words as follows: —

“Christ was then assuredly sleeping a profound sleep in the bottom of His vessel whilst the winds buffeted it on all sides, and covered it with the waves of the sea. And what was more unfortunate still, the disciples of the Lord slept more profoundly than He, and could not awaken Him either by their cries or clamors.”

And in the General Council of Basle, 1432, the Pope’s legate exhorted the Bohemians that —

“In the time of Noah’s flood, as many as were without the ark perished.”

So long as this delusion was systematically inculcated, blindly received, and fondly hugged, of course reformation was impossible.

But as soon as there arose men with the courage of conviction and the confidence of truth, and spoke out plainly and flatly that the Roman system is *not* The Church at all in any feature or in any sense, *then* The Reformation had begun.

That is how The Reformation came. And without that The Reformation never could have come.

The Reformation as in the sixteenth century — the times of Luther — is not in fact the beginning of The Reformation. That was more the revival of it than the beginning.

The Reformation in truth began near the middle of the fourteenth century. And it takes that of both the fourteenth and the sixteenth centuries to make The Reformation indeed.

The Reformation arose practically at the same time in England and in Bohemia: in England by Wicklif, 1360-1384; in Austria and Bohemia by Conrad of Waldhausen, 1350-1369; in Bohemia by Militz, 1360-1374; by Matthias of Janow, 1370-1394; and all of these were summed up in John Huss in Bohemia, 1398-July 6, 1415, and Jerome of Prague through the greater part of Europe, 1374-May 30, 1416.

These men saw the Roman church as it is. They were compelled to contemplate the deplorable scene of exactions, oppressions, and devastations, wrought by the church, and the anarchy of the popedom. It was ever before their eyes.

They considered this universal and deepening sea of iniquity, of all of which the Roman church more than anything else was the chief cause. They considered that church herself, in what she claimed to be, and in what she had proved herself to be. And upon thoughtful consideration, and in sober view, of it all, they were compelled to ask —

Is that, can that be, the true Church?

Is that the Church that Jesus sent into the world, to bless and save the world?

Is it the best that Christ the Lord could do to save the world, to put in the world a system and a power that proved itself only an unmitigated and deepening curse to the world?

Then they studied anew the Scriptures to know what is The Church according to the word, the thought, and the purpose, of God.

They asked of the living personal Christ that He make plain to them His own truth as to just what is His Church.

They asked that the Holy Spirit of promise should guide them into *this truth*: that *in this*, He should take the things of Christ and of God and show unto them.

Here is a prayer of Miltz, that is good for every person in the world for all time: “I prayed often that Almighty God would give me the Holy Spirit, and anoint me with His unction, that I might not fall into any error, and might

enjoy the taste and perfume of true wisdom, so that I might deceive none and be deceived by none, and wish no longer to know anything but what is necessary for me and the Holy Church.”

And here is a touch of the experience of Matthias which is met with an answering glow in the heart of every Christian: “Once my mind was encompassed with a thick wall. I thought of nothing but what delighted the eye and the ear, till it pleased the Lord Jesus to draw me as a brand from the burning. And while I, worst slave of my passions, was resisting him in every way, he delivered me from the flames of Sodom, and brought me into the place of sorrow, of great adversities, and of much contempt.

“Then first I became poor and contrite; and searched with trembling the Word of God. I began to admire the truth in the holy Scriptures, to see how, in all things, it must be fulfilled. Then first I began to wonder at the deep wiles of Satan: to see how he darkened the minds of all, even those who seemed to think themselves wisest.

“And there entered into me, that is into my heart, a certain unusual, new, and powerful fire; but a very blessed fire, and which still continues to burn within me and is kindled the more in proportion as I lift up my soul in prayer to God and to our Lord Jesus the crucified. And it never abates or leaves me: except when I forget the Lord

Jesus Christ, and fail to observe the right discipline in eating and drinking! *then* I am enveloped in clouds, and unfitted for all good works, till, with my whole heart and with deep sorrow I return to Christ, the true physician, the severe judge, He who punishes all sin, even to idle words and foolish thoughts.”

Those earnest Christian words fairly indicate the Spirit and source of The Reformation. It is only from the Spirit and Word of God, manifested in the regeneration of *men*: *not* in any revamping of a *system*, nor even in a renovation of manners.

Wicklif taught in the University of Oxford. The king of England married Anne, a sister of the king of Bohemia. Queen Anne received the Gospel. She read the Wicklif Bible, and recommended it to the high ones of the kingdom about her.

The University of Oxford, the University of Paris, and the University of Prague, were at that time the three great universities of Europe. Anne of Bohemia being England's queen formed a connecting link between Prague and Oxford.

Bohemian youth went to Oxford to study “and were there seized with enthusiasm for the doctrines of Wicklif;” and young English theologians went from Oxford to Prague where they spread the truths which they had learned from Wicklif. The writings of Wicklif were owned

and studied by professors of the University of Prague.

Also the English students who went to Prague, met there the preaching and writings of the Bohemian Reformers; and the students who went to Oxford from Bohemia carried there these writings and teachings. Thus The Reformation in England and Bohemia became one. Jerome studied in Oxford. Huss studied the writings of Wicklif in the University of Prague.

Wicklif's teachings centred in the keeping of the Commandments of God and the Faith of Jesus. The teaching of the Bohemian Reformers included that, but centred more in the prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation, Matthew 24, and 2 Thess. 2, and other scriptures concerning the second coming of the Lord, and The Church: the Church, true and false.

By the work of Militz, Conrad, Matthias, and their disciples, evangelical truth was spread throughout Bohemia; and the field was thus prepared for the writings of Wicklif.

The mingling of the students of the two countries was the means of the blending of the great features of the respective teachings: each becoming the complement of the other.

Thus the teachings in the two countries of England and Bohemia became a symmetrical whole in the evangelical message that sounded

throughout Europe, that was the rise of The Reformation.

Then the papacy arose in her wrath to put it down.

The burning of Huss and Jerome kindled a flame that speedily spread over all Bohemia. "Within four years from the death of Huss, the bulk of the nation had embraced the faith for which he died." The papacy attempted by the force of mighty imperial armies to quench it; but at every turn she was miraculously defeated.

"Miraculous" is the word to use. No other would tell the whole truth.

*Crusade after crusade was pushed upon devoted Bohemia. The armies of 70,000; 80,000; 100,000; 130,000; 180,000; were of the veterans of Europe. They were led by the emperor and the Pope's legate-a-latere. They were officered by electors, dukes, landgraves, and princes. They were directed by the best and most practiced generals that Europe knew.

The Bohemians were mostly innocent peasants armed with flails and such other implements as they might gather — till they were supplied with arms from the defeated crusaders. Their general was a man totally blind — John Ziska. And yet,

* The sources of the quotations, facts, and dates, in this chapter are, Wylie's "History of Protestantism," Book III, chap. xiii — xix; D'Aubigne's "History of the Reformation," Book III, chap. iv; Book VII, chap. iv, viii.

besides many skirmishes and sieges, in sixteen pitched battles that blind man and his peasants defeated the imperial armies. They never lost a single battle, siege, or skirmish.

Ziska died of the plague in 1424. He had named Procopius as his successor. The victories continued: and, in some sense, in even a more miraculous way.

In 1427 the crusading army of 180,000 was at the river that flows by Meiss prepared to attack the town. The Hussites marched up to the river on the opposite bank, and stood still. "It was only for a moment that the invaders contemplated the Hussite ranks. A sudden panic fell upon them. They turned and fled in the utmost confusion."

In 1431 the crusading army of 130,000, marching from Nuremberg, invaded Bohemia. They were encamped at a point near Reisenberg. The Hussites were not yet in sight; but the sound of their wagons and the chanting of their host were heard. The Pope's legate stood on an eminence to see the great battle that was impending. But instead of his expected battle he saw a stampede of his whole army.

He was "startled by a strange and sudden movement in the host. As if smitten by some invisible power, it appeared all at once to break up and scatter. The soldiers threw away their armor and fled, one this way, another that; and the

wagoners, emptying their vehicles of their load, set off across the plain at full gallop.

“The panic extended to the officers equally with the soldiers. The Duke of Bavaria was one of the first to flee. He left behind him his carriage: in the hope that its spoil might tempt the enemy to delay their pursuit. Behind him, also in inglorious flight, came the Elector of Brandenburg; and following close on the elector were others of less note, chased from the field by this unseen terror.

“The army followed: if that could be styled an army which had so lately been a marshalled and bannered host; but was now only a rabble rout, fleeing when no man pursued.”

The cardinal legate tried to stem the tide. He threw himself in the path of flight, exhorting that they stand and fight “for Christ and the salvation of souls,” and urging that they had “a better chance of saving their lives” by fighting than by flying.

He succeeded in rallying a few. “But it was only for a few minutes. They stood their ground only till the Bohemians were within a short distance of them. Then that strange terror again fell upon them, and the stampede became so perfectly uncontrollable that the legate himself was borne away in the current of bewildered and hurrying men. . . .

“He left behind him his hat, his cross, his bell,

and the Pope's bull proclaiming the crusade — that same crusade that had come to so ridiculous a termination.

“This is now the second time the strange phenomenon of panic had been repeated in the Hussite wars. . . . There is here the touch of a Divine finger — the infusion of a preternatural terror.

“So great was the stupefaction with which the crusaders were smitten that many of them, instead of continuing their flight into their own country, wandered back into Bohemia. While others of them, who reached their homes in Nuremberg, did not know their native city when they entered it; and began to beg for lodgings as if they were among strangers.”

Then the papacy turned to new tactics. She proposed negotiations. And the Bohemians allowed themselves to be lured with her wiles and to be taken in her net!

The council of Basle was in session, 1432. The Bohemians were invited to come to the Council for a conference. Three hundred of them went; and in a discussion continued through three months, held their ground. Then they went home.

Next the Council sent “a proposal to renew at Prague the negotiations that had been broken off at Basle.” “The Bohemian chiefs returned answer to the Council, bidding them to send forward their delegates to Prague.”

The Diet of Bohemia was convoked, in 1434, with special reference to this matter. The outcome of the meeting was that the Bohemians agreed to a compromise. And of all things, a compromise of such character as revealed that they had already forgotten The Reformation; and that they now cared far more for peace with Rome than they cared for divine truth and the peace of God for which the Bohemian Reformers had so nobly contended, and for which Huss and Jerome had gone to death at the stake.

The compromise was that the four articles on which the Bohemians insisted, were accepted by the Council: the *right of explaining the articles*, to belong to *the Council!**

This was only to give everything away to Rome. Rome knew this, and so intended it. The secretary of the Council, who himself drafted the document, said of it:—

“This formula of the Council is short, but there is more in its **meaning** than in its **words**. It banishes all such opinions and ceremonies as are alien to the faith, and it takes the Bohemians bound to believe and to

* The four articles were—

“I. The free preaching of the Word.

“II. The right of the laity to the Cup, and the use of the vernacular tongue in all parts of Divine worship.

“III. The ineligibility of the clergy to secular office and rule.

“IV. The execution of the laws in the case of all crimes, without respect of persons.”

maintain all that the Church Catholic believes and maintains.”

And when this same man became Pope — Pius II — he “repudiated his own handiwork, and launched excommunication against Podiebrad [king of Bohemia] for attempting to govern on its principles.”

Why could not the Bohemians see that this compromise was nothing but a complete surrender to Rome? — They had turned from the light to the darkness, from God to Rome.

God could fight for them and wondrously deliver them from all the power and expectation of Rome. He had abundantly shown to all the world that He would do this — while they stood with Him against Rome.

But when they allowed themselves to be lured from Him by the wiles of Rome and drawn into negotiations for “peace” with Rome, He could not fight for them in that. He could only let them have their own chosen way — and *that* the way of Rome!

The Reformation which had been so nobly begun and so wondrously maintained in Bohemia, was given away. It was not sold for a price. It was not even bartered, for a consideration. It was thoughtlessly given away.

This surrender was made by
those who professed to be of The Reformation,

but did not know The Reformation in spirit and in truth:

those who had espoused "the cause" of The Reformation, but not The Reformation itself:

those who had never received the divine principle and truth of The Church of the living God, but in whose minds and hearts there still lurked the superstitious fallacy that the Roman church is the true and only church:

those who were glad to be freed from the exactions and oppressions of Rome, but cared not *most of all* to be freed from Rome herself.

When *these* met what seemed to them to promise the privilege of enjoying the benefits brought by The Reformation, and *also* the fellowship of Rome, of course they accepted it; for *that* is just what they had always wanted.

Yet there were those who were faithful. These utterly rejected the compact in which all was surrendered to Rome. Of those who accepted that compact, these said — "In this manner they receded from the footsteps of Huss, and returned to the camp of Antichrist."

These who were true to The Reformation became the object of bitter attack from all parties, and of persecution from all sides. Those who had professed to be of them, but had given themselves away to Rome, were the first to make war upon them.

By the cruel persecutions poured upon them, “they were dispersed in the woods and mountains. They inhabited dens and caves. And in these abodes they were ever careful to prepare their meals by night, lest the ascending smoke should betray their lurking places.

“Gathering round the fires which they kindled in these subterranean retreats in the cold of winter, they read the Word of God, and united in social worship.” As they read and worshipped, and year after year went by; their numbers few, and the persecution ever persistent; and the reign of Rome universal; they were led to wonder how fared it with Christians elsewhere, or whether there were any others.

“Were they alone all the witnesses of truth left on the earth? or were there others: companions with them in the faith and patience of the kingdom of Jesus Christ? They sent messengers into the various countries of Christendom, to inquire secretly and bring them word again.

“These messengers returned to say that everywhere darkness covered the face of the earth; but that nevertheless, here and there, they had found isolated confessors of the truth — a few in this city and a few in that — the object like themselves of persecution.”

Yet they remembered the words of promise of coming day, that had been left them.

Wickliff had written that from amongst the monks “some brothers whom God may vouchsafe to teach, will be devoutly converted to the primitive religion of Christ, and, abandoning their false interpretations of genuine Christianity, after having demanded, or acquired of themselves, permission from Antichrist, will freely return to the original religion of Christ; and they will build up the Church like Paul.”

Matthias of Janow, as he was dying, said to his sorrowing friends: “The rage of the enemies of the truth now prevails against us; but it will not be forever. There shall arise one from among the common people, without sword or authority, and against him they shall not be able to prevail.”

Huss, in the dungeon in chains, just before his death, dreamed that certain persons had resolved to destroy in the night all the pictures of Christ that were on the walls of Bethlehem chapel in Prague where he used to preach: and that, indeed, they did destroy them.

But the next day many painters were engaged in drawing more pictures, and more beautiful ones, than were there before: upon which Huss gazed in rapture. When the painters had finished, they turned to the company of people who were looking on, and said: “Now let the bishops and priests come and destroy *these* pictures.”

And a great multitude of people joyed over it;

and Huss rejoiced with them. And in the midst of the laughter and rejoicing, he awoke.

There were no real pictures of Christ on the walls of Bethlehem chapel. There were inscribed only the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and single verses of precious Scripture.

Of the dream, Huss said: "I hope that the life of Christ which, by my preaching in Bethlehem, has been transcribed upon the hearts of men, and which they meant to destroy there, — first by forbidding preaching in the chapels and in Bethlehem, next by tearing down Bethlehem itself — that this life of Christ shall be better transcribed by a greater number of better preachers than I am: to the joy of the people who love the life of Christ. Over which I shall rejoice when I awake: that is, rise from the dead."

And as he stood at the stake, made fast to it by a chain, he said: "It is thus that you silence the goose; but a hundred years hence there will arise a swan whose singing you shall not be able to silence."*

The hundred years passed. And then came from among the monks the "brother" of Wicklif, the one from "the common people" of Matthias, and the "swan" of Huss — Martin Luther.

On the morning of Oct. 31, 1517, the Elector

* The word "Huss" in the Bohemian language is equivalent to goose.

Frederick of Saxony, in his castle of Schweinitz, about eighteen miles from Wittemberg, related to his brother, Duke John, and his chancellor, the following experience:—

The Elector. — “Brother, I must tell you a dream which I had last night: the meaning of which I should like much to know. It is so deeply impressed on my mind, that I will never forget it were I to live a thousand years. For I dreamed it thrice, and each time with new circumstances.

Duke John. — “Is it a good or a bad dream?”

The Elector. — “I know not: God knows.”

Duke John. — “Don't be uneasy at it; but be so good as to tell it to me.”

The Elector. — “Having gone to bed last night, fatigued and out of spirits, I fell asleep shortly after my prayer, and slept quietly for about two hours and a half. I then awoke, and continued awake till midnight — all sorts of thoughts passing through my mind. Among other things, I thought how I was to observe the feast of All Saints. I prayed for the poor souls in purgatory; and supplicated God to guide me, my counsels, and my people, according to truth.

“I again fell asleep, and then dreamed that Almighty God sent me a monk, who was a true son of the Apostle Paul. All the saints accompanied him by order of God, in order to bear testimony before me and to declare that he did not come to contrive any plot; but that all that he did was according to the will of God. They asked me to have the goodness graciously to permit him to write something on the door of the church of the castle of Wittemberg. This I granted, through my chancellor.

“Thereupon the monk went to the church, and began to write in such large characters that I could read the writing at Schweinitz. The pen which he used was so large that its end reached as far as Rome, where

it pierced the ears of a lion* that was couching there; and caused the triple crown upon the head of the Pope to shake. All the cardinals and princes, running hastily up, tried to prevent it from falling. You and I, brother, wished also to assist; and I stretched out my arm — but at this moment I awoke, **with my arm in the air**, quite amazed, and very much enraged at the monk for not managing his pen better. I recollected myself a little; it was only a dream.

“I was still half asleep, and once more closed my eyes. The dream returned. The lion, still annoyed by the pen, began to roar with all his might so much so that the whole city of Rome and all the States of the holy empire ran to see what the matter was. The Pope requested them to oppose the monk, and applied particularly to me on account of his being in my country. I again awoke, repeated the Lord’s Prayer, entreated God to preserve his holiness, and once more fell asleep.

“Then I dreamed that all the princes of the empire, and we among them, hastened to Rome, and strove, one after another, to break the pen. But the more we tried, the stiffer it became — sounding as if it had been made of iron. We at length desisted. I then asked the monk (for I was sometimes at Rome, and sometimes at Wittemberg) where he got his pen, and why it was so strong. ‘The pen,’ replied he, ‘belonged to an old goose of Bohemia — a hundred years old. I got it from one of my old schoolmasters. As to its strength, it is owing to the impossibility of depriving it of its pith or marrow; and I am quite astonished at it myself.’

“Suddenly I heard a loud noise — a large number of other pens had sprung out of the long pen of the monk. I awoke a third time: it was daylight.”

Duke John. — “Chancellor, what is your opinion? Would we had a Joseph or a Daniel enlightened by God.”

* *Leo X* was then Pope.

The Chancellor. — “Your highnesses know the common proverb, that the dreams of young girls, learned men, and great lords, have usually some hidden meaning. The meaning of this dream, however, we will not be able to know for some time, — not till the things to which it relates have taken place. Wherefore, leave the accomplishment to God, and place it wholly in His hand.”

Duke John. — “I am of your opinion, Chancellor: ’tis not fit for us to annoy ourselves in attempting to discover the meaning. The God will overrule all for His glory.”

The Elector. — “May our faithful God do so. Yet I will never forget this dream. I have indeed thought of an interpretation; but I keep it to myself. Time, perhaps, will show if I have been a good diviner.”

At noon of that very day the interpretation of the dream began, and the meaning to be made plain. For at that hour, without having made known to anybody his intentions, the monk, Martin Luther, nailed to the door of Wittemberg church his ninety-five theses against Rome.

The Reformation had arisen again.

And it had risen, nevermore to be put down. Luther in Germany, Zwingle in Switzerland, and soon others with these and everywhere, to the joy of a great multitude were engaged in restoring the image of Christ in the lives of men.

And among the laughing and rejoicing peoples there were *two hundred congregations of Reformation Christians in Bohemia*, who were descended through the long night and had watched eagerly for the promised day.

What it meant to all, was summed up in the words and sounded forth in the voice of one in curious garb, holding aloft a large cross, and chanting in a tone that seemed fitted to cause the dead to hear, as Luther entered the City of Worms —

*“Thou art come, O desired one! — thou for whom we have longed and waited in the darkness!”**

Through a hundred years the Roman church had demonstrated that for The Reformation, for The Church and the Christianity which The Reformation revealed, she holds only perpetual enmity. In this additional field — the field of the strictly spiritual — the Roman church had further proved to all the world the truth that the Reformers preached, that she is not the true church in any feature nor in any sense.

The conditions in Europe were now barely less deplorable than when The Reformation first arose. The hundred years between, had been but a hundred years *more* of all that the Roman church could show herself to be.

The promise and effort of the Council of Constance to “reform the church in its head and members,” had amounted to nothing more than the ending of the open anarchy of the church, and the bringing back of the popedom to only one Pope

* “Advenisti, O desideribilis!
Quem expectabamus in tenebris!”

at a time. All of the other evils of the church held steadily onward.

The speech that was made by Duke George in the Diet of Worms, and that was put in writing for the action of the Diet, will be sufficient evidence here that the church was still the same — simply incorrigible: and this simply because that church being “infallible” is “irreformable of itself.” Duke George said: —

“The Diet must not forget the grievances of which it complains against the court of Rome.

“What abuses have crept into our States!

“The annats which the emperor granted freely for the good of Christendom, now demanded as a debt;

“the Roman courtiers every day inventing new ordinances in order to absorb, sell, and farm out, ecclesiastical benefices;

“a multitude of transgressions winked at;

“rich offenders unworthily tolerated, while those who have no means of ransom are punished without pity;

“the Popes incessantly bestowing expectancies and reversions on the inmates of their palace, to the detriment of those to whom the benefices belong;

“the **commendams** of abbeys and convents of Rome conferred on cardinals, bishops, and prelates, who appropriate their revenues, so that there is not one monk in convents which ought to have twenty or thirty;

“stations multiplied without end, and indulgence shops established in all the streets and squares of our cities — shops of St. Anthony, shops of the Holy Spirit, of St. Hubert, of St. Cornelius, of St. Vincent, and many others besides;

“societies purchasing from Rome the right of holding such markets, then purchasing from their bishop

the right of exhibiting their wares, and, in order to procure all this money, draining and emptying the pockets of the poor;

“the indulgence, which ought to be granted solely for the salvation of souls, and which ought to be merited only by prayers and fastings, sold at a regular price;

“the officials of the bishops oppressing those in humble life with penances for blasphemy, adultery, debauchery, the violation of this or that feast-day, while, at the same time, not even censuring ecclesiastics who are guilty of the same crimes;

“penances imposed on the penitent, and artfully arranged so that he soon falls anew into the same fault, and pays so much the more money.

“Such are some of the crying abuses of Rome.

“All sense of shame has been cast off, and one thing only is pursued — money! money!

“Hence, preachers who ought to teach the truth, now do nothing more than retail lies — lies, which are not only tolerated, but recompensed, because the more they lie, the more they gain.

“From this polluted well comes forth all this polluted water.

“Debauchery goes hand in hand with avarice.

“The officials cause women to come to their houses under divers pretexts, and strive to seduce them, sometimes by menaces, sometimes by presents, or, if they do not succeed, injure them in their reputation.

“Ah! the scandals caused by the clergy precipitate multitudes of poor souls into eternal condemnation!

“There must be a universal reform, and this reform must be accomplished by summoning a General Council.

“Wherefore, most excellent princes and lords, with submission I implore you to lose no time in the consideration of this matter.”

That he should retract what he had written in

denunciation of the Roman church in all these things, was part of the demand that was made upon Luther at the Diet of Worms.

He replied: "I have composed books against the papacy — books in which I have attacked those who, by their false doctrine, their bad life, and scandalous example, desolate the Christian world, and destroy both body and soul. Is not the fact proved by the complaints of all who fear God? Is it not evident that the human laws and doctrines of the Popes entangle, torture, martyr, the conscience of the faithful; while the clamant and never-ending extortions of Rome engulf the wealth and riches of Christendom, and particularly of this illustrious kingdom?"

"Were I to retract what I have written on this subject, what should I do? — What but fortify that tyranny, and open a still wider door for these many and great iniquities? Then, breaking forth with more fury than ever, these arrogant men would be seen increasing, usurping, raging, more and more.

"And the yoke which weighs upon the Christian people would, by my retractation, not only be rendered more severe, but would become, so to speak, more legitimate; for by this very retractation, it would have received the confirmation of your most serene majesty, and of all the States of the holy empire.

“Good God! I should thus be, as it were, an infamous cloak, destined to hide and cover all sorts of malice and tyranny.”

And because he would not retract, and so confirm the papacy in all that she is, there was published against him the Edict of Worms, which brought, in opposition to it, the Protest that put into the world the word *Protestant* which the Federal Council of Churches *did retract*.

And the retraction of the word *Protestant*, by the Federal Council of Churches, carries *in it*, the sanction of all that the retraction by Luther that day would have sanctioned. This means the same as that would have meant.

It means the making choice of Rome, not merely *instead of*, but *against*, The Reformation.

And this creates the situation in which every person in America must now make his choice of—

THE REFORMATION OR ROME.

And the impetus given to the Romeward trend, and the encouragement given to Rome herself, in this Nation, by that retraction of *Protestant* — that choice of Rome against The Reformation — by the Federal Council, will soon develop the situation in which every person will be compelled to make his choice of —

ROME OR THE REFORMATION.

CHAPTER VI.

THE REFORMATION CHURCH.

The men who made The Reformation were not men who started out with an ambition to be Reformers, nor even heretics.

Their sole ambition and one supreme aim was simply to be Christians: Christians according to the truth of God as in His Word and Spirit.

This became the life of each one of them. And this made them to be both heretics and Reformers: *heretics* first of all, and throughout all their days and afterward, in that age; but later and now *Reformers*.

The Roman church claims that “the church” is rightly defined to be:—

“The society of the validly baptized faithful united together in one body by the profession of the same faith, by the participation of the same sacraments, and by obedience to the same authority, Christ, its invisible head in heaven, and the Roman Pontiff, the successor of St. Peter, Christ’s visible representative and vicegerent upon earth.” — “Christian Apologetics,” Section 300.

The condition of tyranny and misery that had been forced upon the world by the Roman church, of which these men were members, caused these men who, above all things else, would be Christians according to the Word and Spirit of God, to inquire of God in His Word and by His Spirit—

What, in God's truth, is God's Church?

And in God's Word, and by His Spirit, they found the answer.

They found this answer so full and complete, and of such transcendent glory, that it carried them with calm and confident rejoicing through all the cruelty of persecution and flame that Rome and her spirit could kindle.

And what is this answer? What did they find The Church of God's truth to be?

Wicklif said*: "Holy Church is the congregation of just men for whom Christ shed His blood."

"All who shall be saved in the bliss of heaven are members of Holy Church, *and no more.*"

"There is one only universal Church: consisting of the whole body of the predestinate."

Matthias of Janow said: "All Christians who possess the Spirit of Jesus the Crucified, and who are impelled by the same Spirit, and who alone have not departed from their God, *are the one Church* of Christ: His beautiful bride, His body."

"The Church is the body of Christ, the community of the elect."

"All who have been sanctified, have been sanctified by the anointing grace and sprinkling of

* From here to the end of the book, all the quotations of the words of Wicklif and of the Bohemian Reformers are from Neander's "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. V; and of Luther and Zwingli, from D'Aubigne's "History of the Reformation."

the blood of Jesus. Hence it follows that every Christian is a saint, and every saint a Christian. So one cannot be a Christian and at the same time not a saint.”

“Do not object to me the bad Christians, who have lost the first grace by reason of their misuse of it; for these are not Christians.”

Huss said: “The Church is the community of the elect. ‘Where two or three are gathered together in My name, I am in the midst of them.’ *There*, then, would be a *true particular* church: and, accordingly, where three or four are assembled, and up to the whole number of the elect. In this sense, the term ‘Church’ is often used in the New Testament.

“And thus all the righteous who now, in the archbishopric of Prague, live under the reign of Christ, are the true Church of Prague. But *the Catholic Church* is the predestinate of *all times*.”

“The true Church lies in nothing else than the totality of the elect.”

Luther did not begin with this truth. But the fundamental truth of Justification by Faith only — the Righteousness of God which is by Faith — with which he did begin, inevitably led him presently to this. And in his discussion with Eck, before he had been excommunicated by Rome, Luther said:

“Certain of the tenets of John Huss and the

Bohemians are perfectly orthodox. This much is certain. For instance, ‘that there is only one universal Church;’ and again, ‘that it is not necessary to salvation to believe the Roman church superior to all others.’ Whether Wicklif or Huss has said so, I care not. *It is the truth.*”

Later he said:

“The Pope, the bishops, the monks, and the priests need not make a noise. *We are the Church. There is no other Church than the assembly of those who have the Word of God and are purified by it.*”

And Zwingle said: “The Church universal is diffused over the whole world, wherever there is faith in Jesus Christ — in the Indies as well as in Zurich.

“And as to *particular* churches, we have them — at Berne, at Schaffhausen, here also.

“But the Popes, their cardinals, and their councils *are neither the Church universal, nor the church particular.*”

“In every nation whosoever believeth with the heart in the Lord Jesus Christ, is saved. *This is The Church out of which no man can be saved.*”

Those men made not these statements in collusion. The last two of them were hundreds of miles apart, and had no communication with each other; and were both more than a hundred years after the first three.

Of the first three, while Matthias and Wicklif lived at the same time, they were apart the wide distance between Oxford and Prague, and they worked entirely independently. Huss was a student during the latter years of the life of Matthias, and arrived at the same truth by his own personal study.

Yet all of these found in the Bible the same identical view of the truth of The Church. That itself is strong evidence that such is the Scripture view of The Church.

But we have the Scriptures, and can test this for ourselves. Is that, then, the truth of the Word of God as to The Church? Let us see.

The plain statement of Inspiration as to what The Church is, is this: "The Church which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." Eph. 1: 22, 23.

That is the Lord's own definition of His own expression "The Church." It is a double definition.

First, it defines The Church to be "His body."

Secondly, it defines the expression "His body," to be "the fulness of Him that filleth all in all."

Who is He who filleth all in all? — Plainly, God.

What, then, is the extent of "the fulness of Him?" — Plainly, nothing less than infinity.

And The Church is *that* — "the fulness of

Him who filleth all in all.” Plainly then, The Church is nothing less than an infinite thing.

Accordingly, anything ever in the world that claims to be The Church, but is anything less than infinite, is a fraud and an imposture. It is a fraud in the claim, and an imposture upon those who accept the claim.

Of this “fulness of Him,” it is written: “Do not I fill heaven and earth, saith the Lord?” Jer. 23: 24.

He fills heaven and earth. The Church is “the fulness of Him.” Plainly then The Church fills heaven and earth.

Anything then claiming to be The Church that comes in any wise short of filling heaven and earth, comes just so far short of being The Church in truth.

Now the Roman church never filled even the earth, much less heaven and earth. When The Reformation arose, that church did fill Europe. But Europe is a very small part of the earth.

And when that church was the fulness of even Europe, it was such fulness only in overtopping wickedness. But the fulness which The Church is, is a fulness in *righteousness*, not in *wickedness*. It is the fulness of *God*, not of *the Devil*.

But there are others in the world claiming to be The Church. Is there any one of *these* that is the fulness of heaven and earth? It is the same

again: none of them fills even the earth, much less heaven and earth. Not all of them together fill even the earth.

Therefore, not one of them is The Church. Not all of them together compose The Church. And each of them alone, and all of them together as one, comes as far short of being The Church as each and all come short of filling heaven and earth: that is infinitely far.

Even though all the denominations in the world were completely one, and that one completely Christian, yet even this would come far short of filling the earth, and infinitely far short of filling heaven and earth. And it would all come just that far short of being The Church, which is "the fulness of Him who filleth all in all."

That would be *of* The Church; but it would not *be* The Church. The Church is a larger thing than that would be.

Yet more: Even though all the people in the world were such Christians as John and Paul, and were all united in truest fellowship, *that* would not fill the earth: and still less would it fill heaven and earth. Thus even *that* would not be The Church.

It would be *of* The Church; but it would not *be* The Church. The Church is infinitely a larger and grander thing than even *that* would be.

The Church is the fulness of God. He fills

heaven and earth. What is *this* fulness of Him? Read it: "Behold, the nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance. . . . All nations before Him are as nothing; and they are counted to Him less than nothing, and vanity."

"Before Him" — as *to* Him, as to the fulness of Him — all the nations are as a drop of a bucket. Think of the largest bucket. Let it be filled to overflowing. Then take from it a drop. What proportion will be that drop to the fulness of the bucket?

Yet *that* illustrates what are all the nations in proportion to "the fulness of Him that filleth all in all."

Therefore, if all of all the nations were as perfectly Christian as John and Paul, and not a soul in the world otherwise, yet all of that would be as far short of being The Church, as a drop of a bucket is short of being the fulness of the bucket; or as the "small dust of the balance" is short of being the fulness of the dust of the earth.

The Word says that "*to* Him," not *by* Him, all the nations are counted as nothing, and even "less than nothing." As counted *by* Him, a man is more precious than gold and is more than a world. But as "counted *to* Him," in proportion to the fulness of Him, all the nations are "less than nothing."

And The Church is "the fulness of Him."

Only *that* is The Church. Anything that is less than that cannot possibly be The Church.

What an infinite deception, then, is that with which Rome has filled the professed Christian world — that a little 7 x 9, or 2 x 4, *structure*, or a thing of the *conception of the pinhead capacity*, of finite-minded, sinful man, could be The Church of the infinite God!

No, no. The Church is the glorious conception of the infinite, the living God.

Its structure is the expression of “the eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord.”

It is perceived only by means of “the Spirit of wisdom and *revelation in the knowledge of Him.*”

No eye ever saw, no ear ever heard, it never entered into the heart of man to conceive, what The Church is, nor what *in The Church* God hath prepared for them that love Him. 1 Cor. 2: 9-12.

“But God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit.” Knowledge of The Church itself, knowledge of the structure of The Church, and knowledge of the things of The Church, is found only by finding the thought of God in His Word. And *this* is found only through the Spirit of revelation in the knowledge of Him. Eph. 1: 16-23.

To receive this Spirit, to be taught by this Spirit, to be led by this Spirit, was the prayer that led to The Reformation, and that led *in* The Refor-

mation. And that is the prayer that must lead *now* in this time when there is forced upon all the people the choice of The Reformation or Rome.

In this prayer let us proceed in the study of the Word, to know in Spirit and in Truth what is The Church.

The first Scripture that occurs is the beginning of a prayer. And the prayer is in view of this very feature, this transcendent feature, of the Mystery of God. The prayer begins with the words, "And for this cause."

And the "cause" of the prayer is this: "Unto me who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given that I might preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ, and make all see what is the fellowship of the Mystery which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God who created all things by Jesus Christ."

And *this* preaching is "to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known *by The Church*" — that is, *by means* of The Church, *through* The Church, unto these might be known — "the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord."

"And for *this cause* I bow my knees unto the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named," Eph. 3: 8-11, 14.

Note that it is not the *families* in heaven and earth, as if there were two or more. It is specifically singular — “*the whole family*” — as of *one* in heaven and earth. That is, all the children of God, all creatures who are His, in heaven and earth, compose just one family — God’s family. And that *family* is The Church — God’s Church.

An earthly family might be not all at home, at the birth-place — one there, another in Ohio, another in California, another in Florida. Yet they would be the one family of the father, and of the birth-place. And the father could speak truly of them as his whole family, at home, in Ohio, California, and Florida.

So the children of our heavenly Father are all the one family. Some of us are not at home: we are in a foreign land, amongst strangers, and even enemies. But bless the Lord, we are all members of the *one family* of the heavenly Father.

And, oh! joy, we are all going home one of these days. There is going to be a grand home-coming, an eternal reunion, when He comes to receive to Himself His own. And when He thus comes to take His children all home, it is then that He presents to Himself the “glorious *Church*, . . . holy and without blemish.” Eph. 5: 27.

Again, it is written: “Ye are no more strangers and foreigners; but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God.” Eph. 2: 19.

A household is an organized family, those who are at home in the same house. And though some of God's children are in a foreign country, and strangers *here*, we are not foreigners to the country of *promise*, we are not aliens from the commonwealth of the Princes of God, we are not strangers in "the house of God which is The Church of the living God." And they that be planted in the house of the Lord, shall flourish in the courts of our God." Ps. 92: 13.

The arms of the cross of Jesus the Crucified embrace heaven and earth. "For it pleased the Father that in Him should all fulness dwell. And having made peace through the blood of His cross, by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself. By Him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven." Col. 1: 19, 20.

All in earth who are reconciled to God by the blood of the Cross, are of The Church. And all in heaven who are reconciled to God by the blood of the same Cross, are equally and as truly of *the same Church*. And all these in both heaven and earth compose The Church: one, only, true, and ever the same Church, "growing unto an holy temple in the Lord, for an *habitation of God* through the Spirit. Eph. 2: 22.

Not only does The Church itself as a whole embrace heaven and earth. The Church, even only as it relates to the earth, is found only in heaven

and earth. For there are some who used to be of The Church as in the earth, who are now alive on the other side and are of The Church as in heaven.

Some of these, as Enoch and Elijah, went alive from here to there without any touch of death at all. Moses, the four and twenty elders, and the multitude of those who came out of the graves after Christ's resurrection, and formed the train in His triumphal ascension, went to the other side through a resurrection from the dead. Jude 9; Rev. 5: 9; Matt. 27; 52, 53; Eph. 4: 8 with margin; Col. 2: 15.

All of these were members of The Church when they were on this side. And when they went through to the other side, it was not necessary in any sense for any one of them to change his church-membership, nor in any way to change his relation to The Church.

Each one of all that glorified number was just as much a member of The Church while he was here as he has been since he went over there. Elijah was a member of The Church while he was on this side, he was a member of The Church in the moment of his translation, he has been a member of The Church every moment since, and will be the same forevermore: and always the same member of the same Church. And so with all the others of that glorified company: for The Church is one and the same everywhere in the universe.

And now suppose that Elijah were to return to this side to live through the last days with those who shall be translated as was he from the wrath of "that woman Jezebel." Rev. 2: 21. What "church" would he need to "join," of what denomination must he be a member, in order to be a member of the "true church?"

Plainly, just none of them at all: and for the simple and sufficient reason that he is already and forever a member of The One True and Only Church. Wherever he may go in the wide universe, he is still and ever a member of that One Church. And yet *that* is but The Church of which he was a member when he was here.

Thus by every evidence and every consideration of *Scripture*, it is certain that The Church is a higher, nobler, grander, thing — indeed that it is by far *another* thing — than is anything that has ever been thought of as The Church by churchmen of all this world.

And so it is written that Christ is "the Head of The Church, *that*" — so that, in order that — "in all things He might have the pre-eminence." Col. 1: 18. That is to say that if Christ were Head of everything in the universe *except* The Church, He would not in all things have the pre-eminence. But just by the *one thing* of being the Head of The Church, this one thing alone gives Him "in *all things* the pre-eminence."

That one single expression of the Scripture reveals the truth that The Church is the biggest thing in the universe. It is the universe of *intelligences*, who live with God and in God.

That one thought alone reveals The Church as the fulness of the universe — “the fulness of Him who filleth all in all.” Indeed, the very next word of the Scripture stands thus: “that in all things He might have the pre-eminence. *For* it pleased the Father that in Him should *all fulness* dwell.”

Also, in another place, it is written that God has “made known unto us the mystery of His will, according to His good pleasure, which He hath purposed in Himself.” And this purpose is, “That in the dispensation of the fulness of times He might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, even in Him.” Eph. 1: 9, 10.

That is to say: In and through Christ by the Holy Spirit God is unifying the universe.

And that unified universe is “The Church,” “the Household,” “the whole family” of the living God.

And that is the accomplishing of the eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord before there was ever a creature or any creation.

And when this unification of the universe shall have been accomplished in Christ, “*then* shall the

Son also Himself be subject unto Him that put all things under Him.” And all this is in order “that *God may be all in all.*” 1 Cor. 15: 28.

And this is The Church into which — to the fellowship and infinite and eternal benefits of which — all people are kindly called and graciously invited in tenderest tones of the compassionate pleadings of divine love.

And see the wonderful associations and Associates that are found in this Church by all who come.

“Ye are come — unto

“Mount Zion; and unto

“the City of the living God, the Heavenly Jerusalem; and to

“an innumerable company of angels; to

“the general assembly and *Church of the First-born which are written in heaven*; and to

“God the Judge of all; and to

“the spirits of just men made perfect; and to

“Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant; and to

“the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better things than that of Abel.” Heb. 12: 22, 23.

All these associations and Associates are heavenly, and nothing but heavenly. Whosoever is of *The Church of the Bible* is of this heavenly company; and all these heavenly associations are his, to help and cheer him on the way, and for him to enjoy as he goes.

“And the Spirit and the Bride say, Come. And let him that is athirst, come. And let him that heareth, say Come. And whosoever will, let him” come.

This is The Church which Christ loved, and for which He gave Himself, “that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the Word, that He might present it to Himself a glorious Church.” Eph. 5: 25-27.

This is The Church of which Christ speaks to God, when He says to Him, “In the midst of The Church will I sing praise unto thee.” Heb. 2: 12.

The Lord Jesus, the Son of God, the Head of The Church, has never yet had a chance to be in the midst of The Church.

In The Church as it was in heaven, the pride and self-exaltation of Lucifer wrought division and confusion.

As soon as He had started The Church in the earth, the same proud and self-exalted one insinuated the same confusion here.

In The Church as carried over the Flood, the mischievous one wrought to confusion again.

In “The Church in the wilderness” and in the land of Canaan, the same one still wrought division and confusion.

In The Church as brought back from Babylon, the same vicious schemer and ever antagonist of The Church wrought to the same end (Zech. 3),

and so continued that when the Lord Jesus “came unto His own” He was rejected by His own *professed* Church, and was crucified out of the world.

In The Church as Christ renewed it in the earth, the same arch-enemy of The Church wrought more insidiously than ever: *this time* unto the great “falling away” and the revelation of “that man of Sin, the son of Perdition,” “the mystery of Iniquity,” opposing and exalting himself above all that is called God or that is worshipped, even sitting in the temple of God and passing off himself for God. Gal. 2:12, 13; Acts 21: 18-24; Acts 20: 17, 29, 30; Rev. 2: 1, 4, 5; 3 John 9, 10; 2 Thess. 2: 3, 4.

And in The Church as renewed in The Reformation, the same original antagonist of The Church again so wrought that he at last persuaded even those who professed the name and principles of *Protestant* to renounce that very word: and this in order that they might not even seem to antagonize the Roman church — that most inveterate antagonist of The Protestant Reformation!

But thank the Lord, He again renews His Church in the earth: and *this time*, against all the wiles and all the power of the Devil, to stand true and pure unto the end. For it stands written: “In the days of the voice of the Seventh Angel when he is about to sound, The Mystery of God shall be finished.” Rev. 10: 7.

And now in this final effort of the arch-enemy against The Church, in this time of the finishing of the Mystery of God, she is to arise and shine with the glory of the Lord risen upon her unto the finishing of the Mystery in the blending of her glory with that of the King of glory at His glorious appearing in the glory of His father and His own glory and that of all the angels and glorified ones with Him. Isa. 59: 19; 2 Thess. 2: 9, 10; Isa. 60; 1, 2; Matt. 16: 27.

For then it is that He presents to Himself His glorious Church.

And *then*, with all the heavenly ones *with Him*, with all of His that are in their graves hearing His voice and coming forth, and all of His who are alive “caught up *together with them* to meet Him” — *then it is* that He is “in the midst of The Church.” 1 Thess. 4: 16, 17.

And *then* in the infinite joy of “the travail of His soul” satisfied in God’s eternal purpose in Him actually accomplished, His divine soul bursts forth in that long-awaited song of praise to God.

None but He can sing that song, and so the words of it are nowhere given. None but He has the experience; none but He knows the awful cost; and none but He can know the joy. Heb. 12: 2.

None but He can sing the song; but all the others can respond.

And *then* there peals forth the voice of the “great multitude of all them that fear Him, both small and great, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings,”

“Loud as from numbers without number,
Sweet as from blest voices utt’ring joy,
The heavens of heavens ring with jubilee,
And loud Hosannas fill th’ eternal regions.”

“Alleluiah. Salvation, and glory, and honor, and power, unto the Lord our God.

“Alleluia. Alleluia. Alleluia.

“For the Lord God omnipotent reigneth.

“Let us be glad and rejoice and give honor to him; for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and His wife hath made herself ready.” Rev. 19: 1-7.

And over all and to all, the eternal God responds — with joy and singing. For He says:

“The Lord thy God . . . will rejoice over thee with joy;

“He will rest in His love;

“He will joy over thee with singing.”

“The Household of God” is all assembled. “The whole Family in heaven and earth” is all at home. The Church is herself. The universe is singing.

“Christ is all and *in* all,”

and

“God is *all* in all.”

CHAPTER VII.

THE REFORMATION HEAD OF THE CHURCH.

When the Reformers once saw The Church, it was easy for them to see The Head of The Church.

When Wicklif, Militz, Matthias, Huss, and Jerome, saw The Church of the Scriptures, it was not difficult for them to see that the Roman church is the infinite imposture that she is.

Then also it was just as little difficult for them to see how infinitely impossible it is for anybody but the Divine Christ Himself in Person to be The Head of The Church. Therefore,

Wicklif said: "The Church stands in no need of a visible head."

"So long as Christ is in heaven, The Church hath in Him the best pope. And that *distance hindereth Him not* in doing His deeds: as He promiseth that He is with *His* always to the end of the world."

"We dare not put two heads, lest The Church be monstrous. Therefore the Head above is alone worthy of confidence."

Huss said: "Christ is the all-sufficient Head of The Church: as He proved during three hundred years of the existence of The Church, and still longer, in which time The Church was most prosperous and happy."

“Why should not Christ be *more* present to The Church, than the Pope, who, living at a distance of more than eight hundred miles from Bohemia, could not himself act directly on the feelings and movements of the faithful in Bohemia, as it is incumbent on The Head to do?”

“Christ, who is seated at the right hand of the Father, must necessarily govern the militant Church as its Head. Christ can better govern His Church . . . without such monsters of supreme heads.”

“He alone is the secure, unfailing, and all-sufficient refuge for His Church, to guide and enlighten it.”

“It injures not The Church, but benefits it, that Christ is no longer present to it after a visible manner: since He Himself says to His disciples, and therefore to all their successors (John 16: 7), ‘It is good for you that I go away; for if I went not away the Comforter would not come to you; but if I go I will send Him unto you.’

“It is evident from this, as the truth itself testifies, that it was a salutary thing for the Church militant that Christ should ascend from it to heaven: that so His longer protracted bodily and visible presence on earth might not be prejudicial to her.

In the Leipsic disputation occurred the following:—

Dr. Eck. — “The Church **militant** is an image of The Church **triumphant**. But the latter is a monarchical hierarchy rising step by step up to the sole Head who is God.

“Accordingly Christ has established the same gradation on earth.

“What kind of a monster would The Church be if she were without a head?”

Luther. — “The doctor is correct in saying that the universal Church must have a Head. If there is any one here who maintains the contrary, let him stand up! The remark does not at all apply to me.”

Dr. Eck. — “If the church militant has never been without a monarch, I should like to know who that monarch is if he is not the pontiff of Rome?”

Luther. — “The Head of The Church militant is not a man, but Jesus Christ Himself. This I believe on the testimony of God. Christ must reign till He has put all enemies under His feet.

“We cannot, therefore, listen to those who would confine Christ to The Church triumphant in heaven. His reign is a reign of faith. We cannot see our Head, and yet we have Him.”

After His rising from the dead, the Lord Jesus was here on the earth forty days personally and bodily with His disciples, “seen of them.”

In these forty days He walked with His disciples, He ate with them, He talked with them. He talked with them “of the things concerning the kingdom of God:” that is the things concerning The Church.

Beyond all question then, during that period of forty days The Church as on earth had a “visible Head.” And that visible Head was her own,

true, only, Head: visibly with her and in her, teaching and counselling.

Why did He not stay thus with His Church until now? Why did He not continue always as the visible Head of The Church?

If in any degree or under whatever plea a visible head could ever by any possibility be needed, then He should have continued as that visible Head while He *was* so: and not to do so would plainly be to deprive The Church of that which she needed.

As visible Head, could not *He* have guided The Church as in the world, in all her affairs? Could not *He* have done this from Jerusalem while Jerusalem was the religious centre of the world, and then from Rome when Rome became the religious centre?

And could not *He* have done this infinitely better than ever could any pope or king or president or committee or board that ever sat in Jerusalem, or Rome, or London, or Washington, or Salt Lake City, or Chicago?

Yet He did not stay in the world as visible Head of The Church here.

But did He leave, did He cease to be visible Head of The Church here, *in order* to give that place and opportunity to *men*, as popes or kings or presidents or superintendents or committees or boards, to do their worldly, political, fantastic, fiddling, sinful tricks?

Did He care so little as *that* for The Church which He had loved to the point of giving Himself for it?

Did He care so little as that for any solitary individual of The Church, when each of these individuals He had loved to the point of giving Himself for Him in the agonies of the Cross?

No, no, no. "Having loved His own, He loved them to the end." "I have loved thee with an everlasting love," "the same yesterday, today, and forever."

In this love He had left heaven and all its glory and joy, to be with men on the earth because they needed Him.

In this love He had stayed with men on the earth, as long as they would allow Him to stay.

And when men would not let Him stay any longer, but crucified Him out of the world — after all that, in only three days He came back again: back to His own because they needed Him.

And He stayed there with them *forty days*, when any minute He might have gone straight to heaven and stayed there in all its beauty and glory and joy.

All this proves over and over that of His own free choice the Lord Jesus would rather be on earth with needy men than to be in heaven with the perfect God.

Yet against all this He went away from being

visible Head of His Church here. And this proves beyond all possibility of question that however great may be the need of men — even His own men in His own Church — there never can be any need of Him as visible Head of His Church here.

And when there can be no need of *Him* as visible Head, then beyond all conception there can never be any need of any other.

And He did not go away *to be away*: for He said, “I will not leave you comfortless. *I will come to you.*” John 14: 18.

Therefore His going away from being visible Head of His Church here, was just *because of the need of His people* and Church here. This again certifies that instead of His people and Church ever needing Him to be visible Head, their *constant need* is precisely that He shall *not be that*.

And this need of The Church that He should *not be* visible Head was so great that it could overcome all His overwhelmingly demonstrated desire to be here with His people and Church.

He did not say, It is expedient *for Me* that I go away.

He did not say, It is *expedient* that I go away.

But He did say, “It is expedient *for you* that I go away.”

Therefore, His going away from being visible Head of His Church, or of any individual, was altogether on our behalf.

And so He said: "It is expedient for you that I go away. For if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you. But if I depart, I will send Him unto you." John 16: 7.

And here is why that is: "I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you forever.

"Even the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him.

"But ye know Him; for He dwelleth with you and shall be in you.

"I will not leave you comfortless, *I will come to you.*"

That is to say: When the Comforter, the Spirit of Truth, comes to you, *by Him I myself* will come to you.

The Holy Spirit does not come, to be here apart from Christ; but *to bring to us* the personal presence of the living Christ Himself. As it is written —

"Strengthened with might *by His Spirit* in the *inner man.*"

And *this* is in order "*that Christ* may dwell in your hearts by faith."

And *this* is in order "*that ye* might be filled with all the fulness *of God.*"

Thus the Holy Spirit comes, He is sent, *not* that He may be here of Himself; but that *by Him*

both the Father and the Son may be with each believer and with The Church.

So completely is this so that the Spirit never speaks as *of Himself*, or *from Himself*, but only what He hears through Christ from God. As it is written: "He shall not speak of Himself; but what He shall hear, that shall He speak."

"He shall glorify Me; for He shall receive of mine and shall show it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine. Therefore said I that He shall take of Mine and shall show it unto you." John 16:13-15.

When Jesus was in the world, He was not here to be in the place of God; but that God might be here Himself, in His own place.

Jesus emptied Himself, that God might appear to men. And so "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself." Phil. 2:5-7; 2 Cor. 5:19.

Jesus emptied Himself and became in all things one of us, so that God with Him should be "God with us." Heb. 2:11, 14, 17; Matt. 1:23.

Accordingly, He said, "I came not to do mine own will; but the will of Him that sent me." "The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself."

"The Father which sent me, He gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. Whatsoever I speak, therefore,

even as the Father said unto me so I speak.”
John 6: 38; 14: 10; 12: 49, 50.

Just so it is with the Spirit of Truth now. He is here not to do His own will; but the will of Him who sent Him. The words that He speaks are not His; but the words of Him who sent Him. In His teaching us all things, He does it only by bringing to our remembrance all things that Christ *has said* unto us. John 14: 26.

As God was in Christ in the world, so Christ is in the Spirit in the world. As Christ came to us so that God with Him might be God with us, so the Spirit comes to us and is in us, in order that Christ may come to us and be in us, and in The Church.

And when, on Pentecost, Christ thus came to His disciples, and took up His abode with them, and in The Church, He was then the Head of The Church *no less* and no less *personally* than He was in the forty days when He was visibly with them. Yea, not merely *no less*, but *much more*.

And He was just *so much* the more the *visible* Head now than He was in those forty days.

It is only the fallacy of men spiritually blind to argue *since Pentecost* about the “visible” and the “invisible” Head of The Church, or about the “visible” and the “invisible” Church.

In that period of forty days He was visible Head of The Church, in the sense of His being

visible to their natural eyes and discernible with their natural sensibilities.

And He was *that* only because that *as yet* they were unable to see with spiritual eyes and discern with the spiritual sensibilities.

But the Pentecostal baptism translated them out of the natural into the spiritual. And what *before* was *invisible* was *now visible*. *Now* they could *see* the *invisible*.

Thus to them Christ was now *more visible*, and more *truly visible*, than ever He was before. And *they* never talked about any “invisible” Head of The Church, nor any “invisible” Church. There was no such thing, *to them*. And *now* to those who know that baptism, and so know The Church, there *is* no such thing.

Jesus said that “the world cannot receive” the Spirit of Truth “because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him.” And the world *knows* Him not, because it *sees* Him not. “The world” must *see* — must *see* with the *world’s eyes*, and in the world’s way — or else it will not know.

And worldly men and the worldly church — the church of “the world” — must *see* something: must see a “visible church,” and a “visible head of a visible church:” or else they never can know anything of the church. And so they never *do* either *see* or *know* anything of The Church.

But thank the Lord, to all who are His, the

Lord Jesus says, “But *ye* know Him; for He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.”

And by receiving Him, by His dwelling with us, and being in us, *we see*.

Therefore, to all people the gracious word is spoken, “Receive ye the Holy Ghost.” “Except a man be born again he *cannot see* the kingdom of God.”

But whosoever receives the Holy Spirit in the heavenly baptism in the power that brings forth a new creature — he knows and *sees*.

He can see spiritual things. He can see The Church. He can see the Head of The Church. For the Head of The Church says plainly: “Yet a little while and *the world* seeth Me no more. But *ye see Me*.” John 14:19.

To the Christian — the spiritual man — there is neither invisible Church, nor invisible Head of The Church: for he can see the invisible. To him the invisible is visible.

But to the natural man, to the man of “the world,” everything that is real and abiding is invisible, because he cannot see. To all these there must be a “visible church” and then a “visible head” of the “visible church,” and then a “visible” representative of the “visible” head of that “visible” church. And in the dizzying whirl of this fallacious thing the church, the head, and all becomes invisible and he never sees anything.

For of all the dull tricks of the "sleight of men" in their "cunning craftiness," this of a "visible" church is the dullest and the dumbest.

Nobody ever saw a "visible church." Nobody ever saw the Roman church; nobody ever saw the Episcopal church; nobody ever saw the Methodist church; nor any other such thing that is called a church.

When brought down from etherealism to plain fact of sober inquiry and sound sense, the elusive thing is always invisible.

Any person can test this for himself any minute. There is not such a dearth of them that for that reason it should be difficult to see one. There are thirty-one of them in the Federal Council alone.

Let any person look for only one of these — largest or smallest. Let him ask the aid of some one who is of one of these "visible churches:" Please sir, I wish to see the "visible church." Can you show it to me? or direct me to where I can see it?

He would not know what either to say or do.

Possibly he might tell you to wait till the meeting of the General Council or the General Synod, or the General Assembly, or the General Conference, or the General Convention. "Then the representatives of the church from all parts of the world will be assembled," and you can see it.

You go to one of these assemblies of the “visible” church. You look it over. You ask:—

“Is this the —— church?”

“Oh! no. This is not the church itself; this is a very small part of the church. But this represents the church.

“I do not want to see a representative nor a representation of the church. I have seen that many times. What I want now is to see the —— church itself.

“But, brother, you cannot do that. In **that sense** the church cannot be seen. It is all over the world.

“Is your church a visible church?”

“W-e-l-l, why of course every denomination and ‘organized church’ is a visible church.

“But just now you told me that what is really your church cannot be seen. Is it visible, then? Is that visible that you confess cannot be seen?”

“But the official, organized, representative, body — **that** can be seen.

“But is that the real church? Is **that** the visible church?”

“N—n—o—o— it is not really **that**.”

“Then your church is not a visible church, is it?”

“Well, it does seem so.”

And that is the truth of everything ever in the world that has been held or claimed to be a “visible church.”

There is no such thing. It is a sheer delusion.

But under cover of that deluding sleight of cunningly crafty ecclesiastics, the Roman church has rung in on men and the world that visible head that is the papacy in all that it ever was.

And under cover of that same sleight continued from the same source, every other denomination

has been able to ring in on men in one *form* or another, the same thing *in principle*, of a visible head as nearly like the Romish original as it can be carried without general revolt.

There is no such thing as the “visible church.” *Everything* claiming to be the church, is invisible.

The Church in truth, is truly and properly invisible because it is wholly spiritual. It is Christ’s body, and His body is invisible.

But this truly and rightly invisible Church is invisible *only to those who are not spiritual*, those who cannot see the invisible.

Yet the true and only possible Head of this truly and rightly invisible Church has freely poured out upon all flesh His Holy Spirit, and is ever graciously inviting all people to receive this Divine Spirit that they may know the things of the Spirit, the things of God.

Thus every soul in the world is shut up to the one single alternative of —

The invisible church that is a delusion and an imposture, or

The truly and rightly invisible Church that is an eternal excellency, and whose glorious Head is He whose goings forth have been from the days of eternity and who bestows the inestimable gift of eternal life, and rewards with eternal glory the acceptance of the gift.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE REFORMATION BUILDING OF THE CHURCH.

The Reformers knew The Church.

They knew The Head of The Church.

They knew also The Foundation of The Church.

Matthias said of Christ, "Other Foundation can no man lay than that is laid."

Huss said: "I place myself on the immovable Foundation, the Chief Corner-Stone, which is the Truth, the Way, and the Life, — our Lord Jesus Christ."

"Christ Himself is the Rock which Peter professed, and on which Christ founded The Church, who will therefore come forth triumphant out of all her conflicts."

Luther said: "It is undeniable that St. Augustine has, again and again, said that the rock is Christ: and he may, perhaps, have once said that it was Peter himself.

"But even should St. Augustine and all the fathers say that the apostle is the rock of which Christ speaks, I would combat their view on the authority of an apostle—in other words, Divine authority; for it is written: No other foundation can any man lay than that is laid, namely, Jesus Christ.

"Peter himself calls Christ the chief and cor-

ner-stone, on which we are built up a spiritual house.”

Zwingle said: “The Foundation of The Church is that Rock, that Christ who gave Peter his name because he confessed Him faithfully.”

Long before either Paul or Peter wrote, the great evangelical prophet had written: “Thus saith the Lord God, Behold I lay in Zion *for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious cornerstone, a sure foundation*: he that believeth shall not make haste.” Isa. 28: 16.

Peter himself cites this prophecy as referring to Christ and not in any sense to Peter himself. He says: “Wherefore also it is contained in the Scripture, Behold, I lay in Sion a chief cornerstone, elect, precious: and he that believeth *on Him* shall not be confounded.” 1 Peter 2: 6.

There is The Foundation of The Church. And every member of The Church is built on that Foundation. For so says the Word of God by Peter: “To Whom coming as unto a Living Stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God, and precious, ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house.”

Whoever disallows Christ as The Foundation is of those “who stumble at the Word, being disobedient.” But those who *believe* the Word, *these* believe *on Him* as The Foundation whom God has chosen and laid “for a foundation.”

These coming to Him the Living Stone, and living from Him, and living *by* Him, and living *in* Him, are built up a spiritual house which is "The Church of the Living God." 1 Tim. 3: 15.

And all these, built upon Christ who is The Foundation of apostles, prophets and all, grow unto an holy temple in the Lord, *in whom* all are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit. Eph. 2: 20-22.

And other foundation can no man lay. Whoever thinks of any other foundation, or accepts of any other foundation, is only of the blind stumblers at the Word being disobedient. 1 Peter 2: 8.

The whole building of The Church is from Christ only. "*I will build My Church.*" Each stone in the building is one who *first* has *come to Him* the Living Stone, and *from Him* and by Him has become a living stone.

The same thought is expressed in connection with Him as The Head: "From Whom the whole Body fitly joined together, by joints and bands having nourishment ministered and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God."

And the consequence of having any other foundation or any other head, is only "voluntary humility," "worshipping of angels," "will-worship," "ordinances, commandments, and doctrines, *of men*" "and neglecting or punishing of the body." Col. 2: 20-23.

The Lord Jesus “came to His own, and His own received Him not. But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God: even to them that believe in His name. Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, but of God.” John 1:11-13.

Note that it is those who receive *Him* — not those who receive creeds and doctrines of men *about* Him — to whom He gives the power to become the sons of God.

It is not even those who receive *the Scriptures* that tell *about* Him, but those who receive *Him* — the Personal Christ.

Those to whom He came had the Scriptures that tell *about* Him. They greatly prided themselves on being the possessors of the Scriptures, and being “the people of the Book.” But they rejected and crucified *Him*.

He said to them, “Ye search the Scriptures; for *in them* ye think ye have eternal life. And ye will *not come to Me* that ye might have life.”

“Ye search the Scriptures, and they are that testify of Me; and ye *will not come to me.*” John 5:39, 40.

They received the Scriptures, instead of *by the Scriptures* receiving *Him*. They put the Scriptures in the place of Him, and then against the Scriptures rejected Him.

There is no sonship of God, there is no Christi-

anity, in any such way as that even with the Scriptures. How much less with the ordinances, doctrines, and commandments of men!

No. It is those who receive *Him*, the Personal Living Christ: it is those who receive Him in His own Personal presence by the Holy Spirit: it is only *these* to whom He gives power, it is only *these* to whom He can give power, right, and privilege, to become the sons of God. And to these He does give that power. “Receive ye the Holy Ghost.”

He, as The Foundation and The Head, coming to us; the believer coming to Him; and thus each coming to the other in the fulness of the Spirit, *the union is accomplished* in which alone is the building of The Church.

And so it is written that in the preaching and ministry of the Gospel by the apostles “believers were added to the Lord.” Acts 5: 14.

Note that they were added to *the Lord*: not to The Church. Not by any man, not by any ministry of men, is anybody ever added to The Church.

By the preaching of the Word men are brought to believe on Christ, and to receive Him. Then by baptism in water the believer is joined to Christ in the spiritual union symbolized in the thought of marriage.

“Ye are become dead to the Law by the body of Christ, that ye should be married to another: even to Him that is raised from the dead.” Rom. 7: 4.

Baptism is the marriage ceremony by which the believer and Christ are united, that they may live together and bring forth fruit unto God. "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Gal. 3: 27; Rom. 6: 4, 5, 8.

The believer being thus "added to the Lord," then "*the Lord* added to *The Church* daily such as should be saved" — "such as were being saved." For "*God* hath set the members *every one of them* in the Body" — The Church — "as it hath pleased Him." Acts 2: 47; 1 Cor. 12: 18.

And as by faith in Christ and baptism in water, believers are "added to the Lord," so by faith in Christ and baptism of *the Holy Ghost*, *the Lord* adds them to The Church.

"For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one Body" — The Church. And "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of *water* and of *the Spirit*, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." 1 Cor. 12: 13; John 3: 5.

No man nor any combination or association of men can ever by any possibility add anybody to The Church which is Christ's Body the fulness of Him who filleth all in all. *That is accomplished* only by the baptism of the Holy Spirit; and none but *the Lord* can baptize with the Holy Spirit.

No man can add anybody to The Church, and thank the Lord no man nor any combination or

association of men can ever cut off, “excommunicate,” or cast out, anybody from The Church.

It is The Church of God, it is The Body of Christ, it is the home of the Holy Spirit; and only God, and Christ, and the Spirit rule there. And these rule only in righteousness and holiness and in the tenderness of infinite love and compassion.

Men do add people to what *they* call “the church,” as pleases them. And men do cast out of such “churches” those who do not please them. And so such *things* are only *men’s* “churches,” and it is far better to be out of all such things than in them.

Not so in The Church of the living God. For He himself says, “He that cometh to Me I will in *no wise* cast out.” And of *His* Body “the Head cannot say to the feet” nor to any other member, “I have no need of you.” John 6: 37; 1 Cor. 12: 21.

He has so much need of every soul that He gave *Himself* on the Cross for each one. And He never *can* say to anyone, “I have no need of you.”

But men — cruel, hard-hearted, church-officials — can say it glibly and readily. *These* never died for anybody: and they never will. These feed themselves, but feed not the flocks.

These eat the fat and clothe themselves with the wool, and kill them that are fed: but *they* feed not the flock.

These strengthen not the diseased, nor heal that which is sick, neither bind up the broken, nor bring again that which is driven away, nor seek that which is lost; but with force and cruelty do they rule them.

These thrust with the side and with shoulder, and push all the diseased with their horns, till they have scattered them abroad. Eze. 34.

But with the gracious Lord it is not so. When one is thus cast off and driven out by *men*, *He* immediately goes seeking for him. And when He has found him, He reveals Himself to him, and teaches him how to believe on Him and how to worship Him *as never before*. John 9: 34-38.

And to such His gracious message is, "Hear the word of the Lord, ye that tremble at His word: Your brethren that hated you, that *cast you out* for My name's sake, said, Let the Lord be glorified; but He shall appear to your joy and *they* shall be ashamed." Isa. 66: 5.

"Blessed are ye, when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake.

"Rejoice ye in that day, and leap for joy; for, behold your reward is great in heaven: for in like manner did their fathers unto the prophets." Luke 6: 22, 23.

In the Lord's Church, it is only after every-

thing possible has been done *to keep him in The Church*, and when against all this *he will go* — it is only *then* that the fixed separation which he himself has thus made is sorrowfully recognized by the congregation and in The Church. Matt. 18: 10-20; Gal. 6: 1; Titus 3: 10, 11; 2 Cor. 13: 1.

Here, then, is the *individual believer*: by the ministry of the Gospel “added to the Lord” and by “the Lord added to The Church.” Wherever any such individual may be, he is a member of The Church.

Wherever two or three *of these* may be together, *He*, their Head, is in the midst of them; and *there is a church*, and there is *the church in that place*.

Four times in the New Testament these are spoken of as “the church that is in their house,” “the church which is in his house,” “the church in thy house.” Rom. 16: 3, 5; 1 Cor. 16: 19; Col. 4: 15; Philemon 2.

Not the church which *meets* in their house, his house, or thy house — not once. Every time it is “the church that *is* in their house,” his house, thy house.

That is, Christians dwelling together in a house compose a *church in that house*.

This is seen certainly to be the truth by the facts connected with the several statements.

1. The first letter to the Corinthians was

written from Ephesus. Chap. 16: 8, 9. There was a church in Ephesus. Aquila and Priscilla were in Ephesus, and were members of that church. Yet in addition to this there was a church "in their house" in Ephesus.

2. When the letter to the Romans was written, Aquila and Priscilla were in Rome. There was a church in Rome. Aquila and Priscilla were members of the church in Rome. Yet in addition to this there was a church "in their house" in Rome.

3. At Laodicea there was the church of the Laodiceans. In Laodicea Nymphas was a member of that church. Yet in addition to this there was a church "in his house."

These facts put beyond all question *the truth* that *by the Scriptures* Christians dwelling together in the same house compose a church, and are the church, *in that* house.

Next is the larger assembly of Christians in a place: instead of two or three, there may be two or three dozen, or two or three score. These compose the church in that place: as "the church of God which is at Corinth," "the church of the Thessalonians," "the church that was at Antioch."

And now comes a remarkable fact. And though it stands all through the New Testament without a single exception, it is hardly recognized at all among Christians and denominations.

This is *the fact* that in the New Testament, Christians in private houses, and congregations or assemblies in cities or other places, are *never* spoken of *collectively* as *the church*: but *always* as “the churches.” There is not one exception.

“Then had the churches rest.” Acts 9:31.

“So ordain I in all churches.” 1 Cor. 7:17.

“We have no such custom, neither the churches of God.” 1 Cor. 11:16.

“God is not the author of confusion; but of peace, as in all churches of the saints.” 1 Cor. 14:33.

“The care of all the churches.” 2 Cor. 11:28.

“He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches:” said the Lord Jesus *seven times* in the second and third chapters of Revelation.

It is not accident, it is not inadvertence, it is of design, and the design of Inspiration, that all the congregations or assemblies of Christians in the world are invariably spoken of collectively as “the churches.”

And it being the invariable use, even in places where, if there were any such thing, it would be fitting to use the expression “the church,” this proves beyond all valid question that *in truth* there is no such thing as all Christians and congregations in the world forming The Church. The Church goes far beyond all that.

Therefore, in the truth of the Bible all Christians and all assemblies and congregations of Christians in the world do not compose The Church of the Scriptures, and cannot be correctly spoken of as The Church; but only as “the churches.”

This establishes the integrity and individuality of the *single assembly*, whether of “two or three” or more, as being of the divine order. And this single assembly, the local congregation, in the divine order *has no earthly ecclesiastical organization above it.*

And any person or any thing that ever in any way or under any plea or pretext comes in between “the churches” and “*The Church* which is His Body the fulness of Him” and is passed off as “the church” or the “administration” or “organization” is an iniquitous interloper, a fraud and an imposture.

It breaks up the divine order. It severs “the churches” and Christians from their Head and from The Church. It puts *man* between Christ and His churches, and between Him and His own members. It puts *man* in the place of Christ and of God. It is of Satan, *not of Christ* whom *God gave* to be The Head *over all things to* The Church.

In the divine order, the next step beyond the single assemblies which are the churches is —

“The Church which is His Body.

“The Church of the Firstborn which are written in heaven.”

“The Church of the Living God.”

The Church of which Christ is The Head, The Foundation, the all in all, of which each individual is a member — being set in the Body by the Lord Himself as it hath pleased Him.

And just as the single assemblies of Christians are invariably spoken of by the Spirit of Inspiration as “the churches,” so the expression “the church” as relating to The Church in general, is invariably used with sole reference to “The Church which is His Body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.”

Accordingly the divine order of God’s building of The Church is this:

1. The Foundation-Stone — Christ.
2. Individual believers who come to that Foundation and “as lively stones” are built upon *Him*.
3. The church in a private house.
4. The church in a city or other place.
5. The churches of God.
6. The Church which is His Body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.
7. The Head-Stone — Christ.

Christ is the Foundation; Christ is the Head; the whole Building is built upon Him and in Him;

and so “groweth unto an holy Temple in the Lord.”

The natural body of man is the divinely chosen illustration of the structure of the spiritual Body of Christ, which is The Church.

The natural body of man is “fearfully and wonderfully made.” It is a mystery of God. Ps. 139:13-16.

The spiritual Body of Christ is more fearfully and wonderfully made. It is “*the* Mystery of God.”

Only God through Christ by the Holy Spirit built the natural body of man. Only He could possibly do it. Gen. 1:26; Job 33:4.

Only God through Christ by the Holy Spirit builds the spiritual Body of Christ, which is The Church. Only He could possibly do it. Eph. 4:12-16.

Not all the ecclesiasticism of bishops, presidents, Popes, boards, committees, Councils, in all the ages could ever have taken the first true thought toward building the natural body of man.

Infinitely less could they ever have taken the first true thought toward building the spiritual Body of Christ, which is The Church. Isa. 55:8, 9.

The natural body of man is the crown of God’s natural creation.

The spiritual Body of Christ, which is The Church, is the crown of God’s spiritual creation.

CHAPTER IX.

THE REFORMATION GUIDANCE OF THE CHURCH.

The Reformers knew Christ's *Guidance* of The Church as truly as they knew His Headship of The Church.

They knew that by the Holy Spirit the Lord Jesus personally guides The Church and personally guides each individual person who is of The Church.

In this they knew that the Holy Spirit is given to each individual Christian, and that by the Spirit the Lord Jesus gives Himself personally to each individual Christian.

The Roman doctrine is that the Holy Spirit is given to "the church" and that "the church" bestows the Spirit on the individual in the ceremony of "confirmation."

By the light and power of God's truth, the Reformers were made free from that Romish superstition and monopoly.

Wicklif said: "Christ ever lives near the Father and is the most ready to intercede for us, *imparting Himself* to the soul of *every wayfaring pilgrim* who loves Him."

Matthias said: "It is Jesus Christ Himself, who, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, ever dwells in His Church, *and in each*, even *most insig-*

nificant portion of it, holding together, sustaining and vitalizing the whole *and all the parts, directly and from within*, giving growth outwardly to the whole *and to each*, even the *most insignificant part*.

“He is, therefore, Himself the spirit and life of His Church, His mystical body.”

Huss said: “Christ alone, on whom the heavenly dove descended as a symbol of the Holy Spirit, can bestow the baptism of the Spirit.”

“The Holy Spirit, in the absence of a visible Pope, inspired prophets to predict the future bridegroom of The Church, strengthened the apostles to spread the Gospel of Christ through all the world, led idolaters to the worship of the one only God, and *ceases not, even until now*, to instruct the Bride *and all her sons*, to make them *certain of all things* and guide them in all things that are necessary for salvation.

“The Church has all that it needs, in the guidance of the Holy Spirit; and *ought to require nothing else. Nothing else can be a substitute for that*.

“Accordingly, The Church is sufficiently provided for in the invisible guidance, and should need no visible one by which she might be made dependent.”

Let us see in the Scriptures how truly and how fully in this they had the truth of God.

At Pentecost, in the presence of that great

outpouring of the Spirit, Peter said to the multitude: "The promise is to you and to your children, and to *all them that are afar off*: even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Acts 2: 38, 39.

And further it is written: "The manifestation of the Spirit is *given to every man* to profit withal . . . dividing to *every man, severally*, as *He* will.

"We have been *all* made to drink into one Spirit." 1 Cor. 12: 7, 11, 13.

"If ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, *how much more* shall your heavenly Father *give the Holy Spirit* to them that ask Him!" Luke 11: 13.

All that Christ is to The Church He is to each individual who is of The Church.

He is the Head of The Church. He is likewise the Head of each individual in The Church? "I would have you know that the Head of *every man* is Christ." 1 Cor. 11: 3.

"He is the Head of The Body." And in the very nature of things, *in that* He is Head of each particular member of The Body.

"Now ye are The Body of Christ, and members in particular." "For we are members of His Body, of His flesh and of His bones." 1 Cor. 12: 27; Eph. 5: 30.

When Christ shed forth the Spirit at Pentecost, He gave Him to all—to each individual personally, as well as to The Church as a whole.

When He by the Spirit came to The Church here, He came to each individual as truly as He came to The Church, and became the Head of each individual as truly as He is Head of The Church.

Indeed He is Head of The Church by being Head of each individual who is of The Church. First, Head of the individual; then Head of the *assembly* of these, of whom He is already the Head individually.

“The Head of every man is Christ.” “Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them.” “Ye are *buildded together* for an habitation of God through the Spirit.” And He is the Head of The Body — The Church which is the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. Matt. 18: 20; Eph. 2: 22; 1: 22, 23.

Thus Christ is not Head of The Church in only a general sense, but in the *most particular sense*.

He is not Head by occupying the *chief position* and having charge of “the large affairs” of The Church, with the “details” left to others.

He is Head of The Church in the widest and most intricate sense; for God “gave Him to be Head over *all things* to The Church.” Eph. 1: 22. He is the Head of everything that can ever pertain “*to*” The Church.

Anything of which He is not the Head *in the direct and full sense* in which He is Head of The Church — *that* thing does not reach The Church.

Even though it be done in the name of the church, and as if in behalf of the church, if *He* is not the Head of it, it pertains to something else, it springs from *somebody else*, and comes just so far short of being *of* The Church or of pertaining “*to*” The Church.

And this is eternally right. In the eternal purpose, The Church is to be the expression of the fulness of all the perfections of God. To The Church this is expressed, and can be expressed, *only from Christ* in whom all fulness dwells.

For *anything* of which He is not the Head and spring to reach The Church, or to be of The Church, would be only to mar or stain the divine perfection of The Church. And Christ is now engaged in sanctifying and cleansing The Church from all these things “with the washing of water *by the Word*, that He may present it to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot nor wrinkle *nor any such thing*, but holy and without blemish.”

The blessed work of preparing The Church for this glorious presentation, the Lord Jesus *began* with the beginning of The Reformation, and He will now *finish* it. For we are *now* in the time of the finishing of the Mystery of God. He began it according to the original standard in His Word, and He will so finish it.

And by that Word the whole operation in, the whole administration of, the affairs and interests

that pertain to The Church — of “all things to The Church”—is Christ’s from God through the Spirit. As it is written —

“There are diversities of gifts, but the same *Spirit*.

“There are differences of administrations, but the same *Lord*.

“There are diversities of operations, but it is the same *God* which worketh all in all.”

By gracious gifts from God through the Spirit, Christ Himself, Personally and directly, keeps His own divine mind and hand “over *all things to The Church*.”

Therefore, in The Church of the Scriptures every responsibility is the gift of Christ direct by the Spirit; and is thus set in The Church by God Himself Personally.

“Wherefore when He ascended up on high, He gave gifts unto men. And He gave some —

“apostles; and some,

“prophets; and some,

“evangelists; and some,

“pastors and

“teachers.” Eph. 4: 8, 11.

And so “God hath set some in The Church.

First —

“apostles, secondarily

“prophets, thirdly

“teachers, after that

“miracles, then
“gifts of healings,
“helps,
“governments,
“diversities of tongues.” 1 Cor. 12: 28.
“For to one is given by the Spirit the word of
“wisdom; to another the word of
“knowledge, by the same Spirit; to another
“faith by the same Spirit; to another the work-
ing of
“miracles; to another
“prophecy; to another
“discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds
of
“tongues; to another the
“interpretation of tongues.

“But *all these* worketh that one and the self-
same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as
He will.” 1 Cor. 12: 8-11.

The responsibility of “elders” or “bishops”
is included in the gift of “governments;” for the
word denotes a helmsman or pilot, who guides a
ship. Yet in addition to this we are told plainly
that *this* responsibility, as the others, is *the gift
of the Spirit*. Paul, talking to elders only, said to
them: “Take heed, therefore, to yourselves, and
to all the flock, over the which *the Holy Ghost hath
made you overseers.*” Acts 20: 17, 28.

The responsibility of “deacon” is included in

the gift of “helps;” for the word “deacon” signifies “a servant.” Rom. 16: 1.

And all of this care of Christ in these gracious gifts, is for a double purpose. *First* —

“for the perfecting of the saints,

“for the work of the ministry,

“for the edifying of The Body of Christ.”

And *this*, “Till we all come, in the unity of the faith, and the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.”

And the *second* purpose, the consequence of the first, is “*That ye be no more children*, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive.” Eph. 4: 12-14.

Thus Christ supplies all that is needed to bring The Church to perfection, and so protect her from all the powers of deception, and thus prepare her for the glorious Presentation.

It should be repeated, that it may not be forgotten, that every responsibility in The Church is the direct gift of God by Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit.

And the membership of The Church, by the Spirit are to be able to recognize the gift upon the individual and accordingly to recognize that individual in the place and work in The Church

for which the gift has prepared him. Acts 13: 2-4; 6: 3-5.

For The Church is The Body of Christ. And the will of the Head can be truly manifested *as that will is in Him*, only by the response, *in spirit* and in *the Spirit*, of the members of The Body. Matt. 6: 10; Ps. 103: 20; Eze. 1: 20.

The failure of James and the church in Jerusalem to recognize Christ's gift *of* Paul and *in* Paul to The Church, put Paul in Roman prisons to the day of his death (except a very short interval near the end), robbed the churches of Christ's wonderful revelations in the Mystery of God, and hastened the rise of the mystery of iniquity. Gal. 2: 12; Acts 21: 18 — ; 2 Tim. 1: 15; 4: 16; Gal. 1: 15, 16; Eph. 3: 2-5; Col. 1: 26-29; 2 Thess. 2: 3-10.

And the failure of professed Christians to recognize Christ's spiritual gifts, is always of the mystery of iniquity. For it is but the manifestation of the natural against the spiritual, of the will of man against the will of Christ, and of *man* instead of *Christ* — of man in the place of God — *in The Church*.

Therefore, again let it be said: In the Scriptures and according to the order of God every responsibility in The Church is the direct gift of God by Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit.

In the Scriptures there is no such thing as appointment or election *by men* in The Church,

nor in the churches. There is *ordination*, but not election.

And the ordination is the *act of response* of the members of The Body to the will of their Head: *not* the endorsement nor the legalizing of it.

Elections came in from Greece, by those Greeks who, in the "falling away," had not the Spirit, and so had lost their Head.

Appointments came in from Rome, when the Greek political system in church affairs was imperialized and the bishop of Rome became the head.

The Reformation threw off the Greco-Roman heathen political *naturalism*, and restored the *spiritual principle* of the divine order.

But there has been another falling away. Again the spiritual principle has been lost. In every denomination of professed Protestants the Greco-Roman naturalistic principle of human election and appointment prevails.

Yet they are not consistent even in this inconsistency. Only *some* of the responsibilities that rightly pertain to The Church are allowed to be subject to election or appointment: as deacons, elders, and others of "helps" or "governments."

Evangelists, pastors, and teachers, stand in a sort of "twilight zone" — of the gift of God in a sense, but of no standing till "authorized" by appointment or vote of *men*.

Apostles, prophets, miracles, tongues, and all the rest are left wholly to God as *His* gifts: or even *denied to Him*, and *left out altogether*, as belonging only to primitive Christian times.

But when *men* can elect or appoint *some* of God's gifts, why not all? If men have any authority at all, upon any ground or under any plea, to elect or appoint *any* of these, they have equal authority to elect or appoint all.

When every responsibility known to the Scriptures, that pertains to The Church, is the direct gift of God by the Spirit Himself in His own divine administration and Kingdom, then what superior right or wisdom can *men* have *above God* to discriminate among them?

But deeper than that, what right can *men* have under any possible plea to assume any authority or control in the matter? It is all of the realm of God. All here relates exclusively to the kingdom of God. In all these things Christ is conducting the affairs of His own House.

What colossal presumption it is, then, for finite, fleeting *men* to assume to exercise dominion and authority *there!*

While Jesus was with His Church here those forty days after His resurrection, "speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God," what an arrogantly disrespectful and presumptuous thing it would have been for the disciples,

with *Him present*, to take upon themselves the conducting of the affairs of His kingdom — and of course according to their thinking concerning the kingdom!

And how *much more* would it have been arrogantly disrespectful and presumptuous in them to do such thing *after Pentecost* when He was *more present* than He was in those forty days! !

And such only is it ever for anybody. Has not God sufficiently characterized that thing at its first appearance in the world — in the awful branding that He gave it as “the mystery of iniquity,” “the man of sin,” “the son of perdition,” “that Wicked,” “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?*”

No, no, no. “The Church is *subject* unto Christ in *every thing* :” not His *superior*, nor even His *equal*, in any thing. Eph. 5: 24.

God will yet have *in this world* that Church that will be “subject unto Christ in *every thing* .”

Out of all the Babylonish confusion of the two great fallings away *combined*, Christ calls all of His own *unto Himself*, in *His own Church* which He is *now* sanctifying and cleansing with the washing of water *by the Word*, preparatory to her Glorious Presentation. Rev. 17: 5; 18: 4.

CHAPTER X.

THE REFORMATION CHRISTIAN UNITY.

In the Scriptures the Reformers found the divine principle and Christian truth of Christian unity.

Matthias said: "The Body of the omnipotent and altogether indivisible Jesus Christ, the community of saints, is not divided, neither indeed can be divided.

"That Church, by virtue of its eternal and immutable unity, depends *wholly on the unity of God, and of the Lord Jesus Christ, and of His Spirit.*"

"It is *Jesus Christ Himself, who, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, ever dwells in His Church and in each most insignificant portion of it, holding together, vitalizing, sustaining, the whole and all its parts.*

"Bound with each other *in the unity of the life of Jesus, many shall come together and be held in union by the cords of a glowing love.*"

Huss said: "Christ alone is the all-sufficient Head of The Church. The Church needs no other. And *therein* consists its *unity.*"

"All true unity must have its foundation in Christ."

When this fundamental Christian truth was

announced, to the churchmen it was all new and strange and hateful. And when it was proclaimed abroad to all the people *in their own tongue*, it was all the more so.

How utterly foreign it was to all the realm of their horizon may be seen in some measure in the following standard definition of the "Mark of Unity" of the Roman church:—

"This unity is two-fold; it comprises:

"1. Unity of **doctrine** and faith, which consists in the common accord of all the Faithful in admitting and believing all that the teaching Church proposes to them as revealed or confirmed by Jesus Christ.

"2. Unity of **government**, which produces unity of **communion**, and which consists in the submission of all the faithful to their respective bishops and in particular to the Roman Pontiff, supreme Head of the Church.

"To break the unity of faith, by rejecting even only one point of doctrine, constitutes heresy; to break the unity of government, by rejecting the authority of the legitimate heads, produces schism."—"Christian Apologetics," Section 313.

Christian unity, the only true unity that can ever be, is *toto caelo* different from that. It is as far higher than that as heaven is higher than the earth. And it is as far truer than that as the precision of the Spirit of Truth is beyond the wanderings of the carnal mind.

Christian unity is far more than is any unity *upon doctrine*, among Christians; and is far above that.

Christian unity is far more than is any unity *of belief, of Christians*; and is far above that.

Christian unity is far more than is any unity of Christians *upon a platform* of belief, of doctrine, or of principles; and is far above that.

Christian unity is far more than is any unity of *submission* to church government; and is far above that.

Christian unity is far more than is any *union of Christians, or among Christians*; and is far higher than that.

Christian unity is far more than is any unity *of purpose*, of Christians; and is far higher than that.

Christian unity is far more than is any unity *of effort of Christians* in promoting a cause; and is far higher than that.

Christian unity is far more than is any unity of *association* of Christians; and is far higher than that.

Christian unity is far more than is any unity even of *brotherhood*, among Christians; and is far higher than that.

Christian unity is far more than is *any* unity or *all* unity of association, or of brotherhood, or of denomination, or of federation, even of *all the Christians that are in the world*, for any purpose, or upon any platform, or in any cause, or in submission to any church government.

Christian unity is nothing less, and is nothing else, than *the divine unity itself*: “the unity of the Spirit.”

Note that it is *not* unity from the Spirit. That is, it is *not* a unity of people, derived from the Spirit.

Nor yet is it, *primarily*, a unity that is caused among people by their possessing the Spirit.

It is “the unity OF the Spirit” Himself.

Christian unity, then, is only *the divine unity*, as that unity is *in* the Divinity, and *of* the Divinity Himself.

See this in the Scriptures of Truth, where the Reformers found it; for *there* it is plainly and repeatedly stated.

First, in the Saviour’s promise of the Comforter: “I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you forever. . . .

“I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you. . . .

“At that day ye shall know that *I am in My Father, and ye in Me, and I in you.*” John 14: 16, 18, 20.

There is Christian unity. *There* is “the unity of the Spirit.” It is the unity of the *individual Christian with, and in, the Father and the Son*: this unity accomplished by the mighty grace of “the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost.”

And just to accomplish this divine unity is the primary purpose and the grand object in the gift of the Holy Spirit.

This is plain in the Scripture just quoted; but see it again as shown in the prayer in Eph. 3: 14-19: "That He would grant you . . . to be strengthened with might *by His Spirit* in the inner man; *that*" — so that, in order that — "*Christ may dwell in your hearts* by faith; . . . *that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God.*"

Next, read the Saviour's prayer for Christian unity: and see there the same thought *three times expressed*:

"Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also who shall believe on Me through their word: *that they all may be one.*"

That is the prayer. How is that prayer to be fulfilled? How is that unity to be accomplished? What is the real key of it? Here it is:

"That they all may be one:

(1) "As Thou, Father, *art in Me, and I in Thee, THAT*" — so that, in order that — "they may be *one* IN US."

(2) "And the glory which *Thou gavest Me, I have given them, THAT*" — so that, in order that — "*they may be one, EVEN AS We are One.*"

(3) "*I in them, and Thou in Me, THAT*" — so that, in order that — "*they may be made perfect in One.*" John 17: 21-23.

Thus, three times in direct connection, there stands expressed by the Lord Jesus His own thought of Christian unity.

Three times He tells how it is to be found; and *every time*, without a scintilla of variation, this Christian unity which He defined and for which He prayed for us, finds its key, its spring, its *idea*, *only in unity with the Father and with the Son, in the very unity of the Father and the Son.*

That, and that alone, is Christian unity.

Christian unity then is nothing less and nothing else than the divine unity itself, *as that unity is in the very Godhead.*

The unity of the Godhead is the unity of Spirit, *in the Spirit; for the Godhead is only Spirit.*

And all who “have been made to drink into this one Spirit,” of the “one Lord,” through the “one faith” of the one Christ, and of the “one God and Father of all;” and who are possessed of this “one Spirit;” and “live” and “walk” “in the Spirit;” — all these are one in Him and with Him in the very “unity of the Spirit,” which is the divine unity itself.

Next, see this thought in the words of the Scripture defining Christian Fellowship.

“That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye may have fellowship with us: and truly *our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ.* . . .

“This then is the message which we have heard of Him and declare unto you, that God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all.

“If we say we have fellowship *with Him* and walk in darkness we lie and do not the truth: but if we walk in the Light *as He* is in the light we *have fellowship one with another.*” 1 John 1: 3-7.

By this Scripture it is plain that Christian fellowship is not *primarily* fellowship with *one another*; but *first* fellowship *with the Father* and *with the Son*: and *then* fellowship with *one another* as *the consequence* of this fellowship with the Father and the Son.

It is only when Christians “walk in the light *as He is in the light;*” it is only when we have “fellowship *with Him;*” that “we have fellowship *one with another.*”

That light is God. Walking in the Light is walking in God. Thus, we have fellowship *with Him*: and having fellowship *with Him* we *have* it with *one another*.

And this Life and Light is “declared” in order that, having the Life, and walking in the Light, we may have fellowship *with Him*: and *this in order that* we may have fellowship *with those* whose “fellowship is,” truly and primarily, “with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ.”

Next we see the thought of the Spirit on this as expressed through Paul, in Eph. 2: 11-18.

When God would put an end to the enmities, and spites, and separations, between Circumcision and Uncircumcision, and would “make both *one*,” He did it by “reconciling *both unto God in one body by the Cross;*” so that, “*through Christ, we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father.*”

Thus again is Christian unity portrayed; and again it is only unity *with* the Father, *through* the Son, *by* the Spirit, *in* the very unity of the Godhead.

That and that alone is Christian unity. And all so-called unity of “church-governments” of organization, association, federation, confederation, accomplished even by Christians, is of only human contrivance, is only a hollow sham, is a sheer counterfeit, and never Christian unity at all.

All who are of this true unity *are* one. They are one already by the very virtue of the divine unity itself; and they need no “church-governments,” federations, confederations, organizations nor associations to cause them to *be* one.

They are all one already; and all such contrivances as these are only the open confession that they have not the real unity *of* the Spirit and *in* the Spirit — the divine unity; and they must go about to supply the lack by constructing a mere human, political and worldly “unity.”

All who are of this true, this divine, unity *are* one. The prayer of Jesus is fulfilled in all such. They do not have to feel around to see whether it is so.

It *is* so already, and they know it; they know it by the Spirit of Him in Whom alone the unity is found.

They are one, *from* God and *in* God. And their unity being in God and coming from God, nothing that can ever come from man can ever affect it in the least.

It being of heaven and from heaven, nothing from earth can ever spoil it. In heavenly love it abides, even upon earth.

And among all these, “there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female.” “There is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free.”

As applied to modern conditions, there is neither Gentile nor Jew, Circumcision nor Uncircumcision, there is neither white nor black, red nor yellow, American, European, Asiatic, nor African: “for ye are *all one* in Christ Jesus.”

“Christ *is* all, and *in* all.” “The one God and Father of all is above all and through all and in you all;” with “the Son also himself subject” unto the Father, “that *God* may be *all in all.*” 1 Cor. 15: 28.

That is Christian unity; and nothing else is.

And *this* is only the revelation of “the mystery of His will, according to His good pleasure which He hath purposed in Himself: that in the dispensation of the fulness of times He might gather together in *ONE* all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are in earth; even *in Him*.” Eph. 1: 9, 10.

Jesus prayed for this divine unity of believers, in order that another great and glorious thing might follow: that is, —

“That *the world* may know that *Thou hast sent Me*.”

And when this the true Christian unity is found and manifested, that grand and glorious thing does follow, and will ever follow.

And has not the fallacious unity of church-governments, denominations, creeds, and federations been sufficiently manifested in the world to demonstrate to the world its utter vanity? and of all things, for any such result as the convincing of the world that God sent Jesus Christ!

There are now more of these “church-governments,” denominations, creeds, and federations than there are days in the year. And is all of this convincing the world that God sent Jesus? — Instead of that, the direct and well-known effect of it all is the rather to cause the world to doubt whether God or anybody else ever sent Him.

And now national, international, and world, Federation "unity" will no more convince the world of that great and glorious thing than has denominational or credal "unity" convinced it.

Nothing but Christian unity can ever accomplish it; and Federation "unity" is not Christian unity.

No, no, no. Let all the fallacious and false notions of "unity" of church-governments, denominations, creeds, and federations be forever abandoned. Let only the true Christian unity be sought and courted by each *individual soul* who names the name of Christ and of God — the unity of the believer *with the Father* and *with the Son*, in the very unity of the Father and the Son.

Then will the prayer of Jesus be fulfilled. They will all be one as the Father is in Jesus and Jesus in Him; and the world will know that God sent Jesus, and that He loves us as He loves Him.

The time has come when Christian unity as it is in truth — "the unity of the Spirit" — will be known and manifested. For now is the time when "the mystery of God should be finished." Rev. 10: 7.

This mystery is "*God manifest*" in the flesh, "*Christ in you the hope of glory*," through the divine Spirit. And thus is the divine Spirit making manifest the *divine unity in Christians*, and *thus true Christian unity*.

And the culmination of this true Christian unity is that “glorious Church” which the divine Lord “will present to Himself” without “spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but holy and without blemish” at his “glorious appearing,” in the soon-coming day of the glorious Presentation.

CHAPTER XI.

THE REFORMATION AND THE BIBLE.

It was the Word of God as in the Bible that made The Reformation.

It was in the Bible only that the men who made The Reformation found the things which they taught; and in these things their appeal was solely to the Bible.

The Reformation turns altogether on what is the place of the Bible: and whether a person is of The Reformation or not, depends on what is the place of the Bible *to him*.

Is the Bible above “the church?” or is “the church” above the Bible?

Is the Bible the supreme standard in the things of religion and faith? or is that standard the Bible *and something else?*

Is the Bible the standard, in what the Word *itself says?* or is it the standard through what *somebody else says*, or through what *somebody says that the Bible says* or means?

Is it the Bible only? or is it the Bible *and tradition?*

Through all these tests did the men have to go who made The Reformation.

And it was only by their going *through* every test, and holding that Word to be itself the *Word*

of God above and independent of all the things of men and "the church," that 'The Reformation was made. The Roman church holds:—

"The letter of the written Word is dead without the spirit of interpretation, which alone unfolds its hidden meaning. Now this spirit is not granted to every Christian, but to the church.

"Scripture ought, therefore, to be understood in the sense determined by the church, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

"Whoever rests not in the doctrine of the Roman church, and the Roman pontiff, as the infallible rule of faith, from which the Holy Scripture itself derives its force and authority, is a heretic."

Wicklif "made the sacred Scriptures the ultimate standard of all law; and declared it to be 'the great problem of Church evolution, to reform everything according to the principles therein contained'."

Accordingly, he said: "The Sacred Scriptures are the highest and the only source of knowledge with regard to the truths of faith. It is necessary to examine all doctrines and determinations by this standard; and we are justified in attacking every doctrine that cannot be derived therefrom."

"They are blasphemers of God, who confidently advise things of a doubtful character: things which are, in the Holy Scriptures, neither expressly commanded nor forbidden."

Because of this high regard for the Scriptures, and knowing their great value to the individual,

Wicklif translated the Bible into the English of the common people. This brought upon him the wrath of the churchmen. Henry Knighton wrote:

“Master John Wicklif has translated out of Latin into English, the gospel which Christ delivered to the clergy and doctors of the church that they might administer to the laity and to weaker persons, according to the state of the times and the wants of men, in proportion to the hunger of their souls and in the way which would be most attractive to them.

“Thus was the gospel by him laid more open to the laity, and to women who could read, than it had formerly been to the most learned of the clergy. And in this way the gospel pearl is cast abroad, and trodden under foot of swine.”

In this, Knighton expressed “the prevailing view” of even “the better class of the clergy, who ever regarded themselves as tutors over the religious consciousness of the laity, and assumed it as certain that laymen must always be dependent for their religious education on the priests.”

The priests were to impart to the laity “just so much of the Bible as seemed to *them* proper and befitting.” To the priests “it was an abuse of the Bible to bestow it all at once upon laymen, who were incapable of understanding it, and hence could only be led by it into error.”

Wicklif replied: “They would condemn the Holy Ghost, who taught the apostles to speak in divers tongues. They are heretics who affirm that

people of the world, and lords, have no need of knowing the law of Christ, but that it is sufficient for them to know only what the priests impart to them orally.

“For the Holy Scriptures are the faith of The Church, and the more familiar the people become with them, in a right believing sense, the better. All believers must stand before the judgment seat of Christ to give an account of the talents committed to them. Therefore all should rightly know these talents and their use, in order that they may know how to render an account of them. For *then* no answer which must be given through a prelate or a steward, can be of any avail; but each must answer in his own person.”

The Roman clergy contended that to understand the Scriptures required “a peculiar sort of preparation which was possible only to the order of priests.” Indeed in the University of Oxford it had actually been ordered that even “priests and parsons should not read the Holy Scriptures until they had spent there *nine or ten years.*”

One of the Franciscan Order wrote: —

“The prelates should not tolerate it, that every man according to his inclination should be allowed to read the Bible translated into English; for this has often proved an occasion of falling into heresies. It is not politic that every man should, whenever and wherever he pleases, devote himself to the earnest study of the Bible.”

Wicklif replied: "The New Testament is intelligible to all laymen who only do what in them lies to attain to the understanding of it. Whoever observes gentleness and love, he possesses the true understanding of the Holy Scriptures."

To Wicklif all of this meant that the Scriptures *alone* are all-sufficient. He declared: "It is a heresy to affirm that the Gospel, with its truth and freedom, does not suffice for the salvation of a Christian, *without* the ordinances and ceremonies of sinful and ignorant men."

This meant too that the Scriptures are supreme in all the field of the *intellectual* as well as in that of the *spiritual*. For he wrote: "There is no subtlety in grammar, neither in logic, nor in any other science, but that it is found in a more excellent degree in the Scriptures."

Matthias wrote: "The Holy Spirit and the Word are the only true rule for all that relates to man."

"The highest rule, by which every thing is to be tried, is Christ: that single rule which is alone necessary and alone sufficient for all apostles and every man that cometh into the world, in all matters, in every place, and at all times: not only for men, but also for angels, because He is Himself that truth and wisdom that works from one end of being to the other."

"God alone is the infallible and self-sufficient

Being, needing no rules from without to govern His conduct.

“His own *will* is His rule, and His *wisdom* is the immutable rule for that.

“Therefore, the Father is the shaping principle from which all things proceed; the Son the shaping principle towards which all things aim; the Holy Ghost the principle in which all things repose. And yet there are not three rules or forms, but *one*.

“All rules are *one*. They proceed from *one* principle and aim at *one* end. They do not obtain their authority from themselves, nor are they observed in the Church of God on their own account; but they are inseparably included in *the same* holy law of Christ, which is inscribed by the Holy Spirit on the hearts of believers, which binds many widely separated nations in union with one another, and makes all dwell with *one* set of manners in the House of Jesus the Crucified.”

“In illustration: The Ten Commandments are plain to every one, even to the dullest of understanding, so that no man can pretend that he is embarrassed by them. And Jesus the Crucified, who is the power of God and the wisdom of God, has in a certain manner briefly summed them up in a single precept, requiring love to God and our neighbor. For *love* is the fulfillment of the law, and love is the perfect law of liberty.

“Jesus, who simplifies everything, has abolished the multitude of sacrifices and ceremonies, and substituted in their place the *one* heavenly Sacrifice. This was so ordered for the purpose of preserving *unity* in The Church.”

Having all the precepts of the Scriptures summed up in the one New Commandment of the love of Christ; having all the ceremonies of the Scriptures summed up in the one Sacrifice of Christ; and having thus all the *thought* of the Scriptures met in Christ the sum of all the will and wisdom of God; — *upon this*, Matthias proclaims the emancipation of the Christian from all precepts, from all prohibitions, and from all traditions, *of men in The Church*.

“While the one commandment of Christ, and His one sacrifice, preserved in The Church greatly promote unity; so on the other hand, the multitudinous prescriptions of men *burden and disturb* the collective body of The Church of Christ.

“The righteous, they who are actuated by the Spirit of Jesus the Crucified, stand in no need of multiplied human commands and prohibitions; because the Spirit of God guides and teaches them. and because they practice the virtues and obey the truths of God spontaneously and cheerfully like a good tree which brings forth good fruit of itself, God ever supplying the power from above.

“Such, made free by the indwelling Spirit of

Christ, generally feel themselves cramped and confined by the multitude of ordinances, even in the performance of virtuous works.

“No man can possibly invent laws suited to every contingency and relation. The Spirit of God alone can do this, who knows all things and holds them together. And inasmuch as this Spirit is present everywhere and to all men, the spirit of man also which is in himself, which with the Spirit of Christ alone knows what is in man, *this alone* can give to each man befitting laws and establish them.

“Let not precepts and prohibitions, then, be multiplied in The Church; for by means of them the devil has acquired a great power of involving the people in greater guilt: partly because he takes occasion from these ordinances to tempt them, and partly because these ordinances *ensnare men’s consciences* and make the sins of the unrighteous still heavier.

“And if one should act differently from what these ordinances require, he knows that he must incur the anger of God and His saints or the anathema. They have enthralled the conscience of the people, declaring the transgression of *their rules* to be a mortal sin.

“For in these days they lay more stress on a failure to observe minutely the order of the liturgy, than on sins of lying, of a sleepy indolence,

or covetousness, or anything of a like nature. So that men nowadays are more afraid to transgress one of these human ordinances, than the commandments of God Himself.

“The more ordinances there are the more frequent are transgressions, and the stronger the temptation to transgress.

“Neither do they consider how these multifarious ordinances force the multitude to despise them *and the commandments of the Lord* at the same time.

“This arises from the fact that he whose mind is turned on *many things*, is so much the less fitted for *single* duties; and from the fact that such ordinances, since they relate to sensible and outward things, appear to the communities in a peculiarly clear light, and inspire in them reverence, while the commandments of God are spiritual, and God who ordains them is a Being whom they cannot see.

“Such ordinances, therefore, owing to the constant presence of the lawgiver, make a greater impression on the multitude than the commandments of the invisible God.

“Then again the commandments of God appear to carnal men as every-day matters; while those human ordinances, being something new, make a stronger impression on the minds of the people.

“Again, men are fond of seeking their salvation in such sensible and corporeal things which lie near their capacities; and lose sight of the Crucified, who alone is the salvation of souls. And they settle it fast in their consciences that they can be *justified* by such *visible things*, though the spiritual love of Christ may be absent from their hearts.

“I wish that things might be so ordered that no other fear or punishment should ever be held up before subjects than in reference to the words of Jesus Christ and His commands.

“All other — the multiplied laws of men are superfluous and inadequate. They ought not to be called traditions, but *superstitions*.

“It would be a salutary thing, and calculated to restore peace and union to Christendom, to root up that whole plantation, and once more sum up the whole in that one single precept: to bring back the Christian Church to those sound and simple beginnings, where it would be needful to retain but a few, and these *only* the apostolic laws.

“All other — the inventions of men should be regarded simply as counsels. Thus *human laws* are to be recognized *only as such*; and the *commandments of God* to remain in their dignity, and *as such* to be revered and obeyed.

“I speak to all. Let him who is capable of receiving it, receive it: So have I gathered from the

Holy Scriptures, and I believe, that *all the above-named works of men, ordinances and ceremonies, will be utterly extirpated, cut up by the roots and cease. And God alone will be exalted, and His word will abide forever.*

“*And the time is close at hand when these ordinances shall be abolished.*”

Huss set it as a maxim, that, “The precepts of Scripture, conveyed through the understanding, are to rule the conscience: in other words, God speaking in the Bible, and *not the church speaking through the priesthood*, is the one infallible Guide of men.”

“The glory of Christ, and of His bride, The Church, consists particularly in the practical imitation of the life of Christ in this: that a man put away all inordinate affections, and all *human ordinances* that would obstruct him in the pursuit of his object.

The theological faculty of the University of Prague declared: —

“To say that the ordinances of the holy fathers, and the praiseworthy customs in the church, are not to be observed because they are not contained in Holy Scripture, is an error.”

Along with that they designated many other *such* “errors,” and then declared that all these “errors” were from “the one cause” that the party of Huss —

“admitted no other authority than the sacred Scriptures, explained in their own sense and in contrariety with the doctrine of the church and of entire Christendom.”

Luther said:

“It is the most impudent of all things to affirm in The Church, and among Christians anything that Jesus has not taught.

“The Christian believer has no other authority than the Holy Scriptures — they alone constitute *Divine law.*”

And in replying to a papal attack, Luther laid down the fundamental principles of The Reformation, thus:

“The Word of God, the whole Word of God, and nothing but the Word of God.”

How true to the Scriptures is all this, will easily be seen from only a few references.

First, the Scriptures as the Word of God: “When ye received the Word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it *not* as the *word of men*; but as *it is in truth, The Word of God*: which effectually worketh also in you that believe.” 1 Thess. 2: 13; Acts 7: 1-4.

“Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.” 2 Peter 1: 21.

“The Spirit of God spake by me.” 2 Sam. 23: 2; Acts 28: 25; Heb. 3: 7.

Next, the all-sufficiency of that Word: “All

Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for —

“doctrine, for

“reproof, for

“correction, for

“instruction in righteousness:

“that the man of God may be perfect,

“thoroughly furnished unto all good works.”

—2 Tim. 3: 16-17.

“His divine power hath given unto us *all things* that pertain unto *life* and *godliness*, through the knowledge of Him that hath called us to glory and virtue.

“Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises, that *by these* ye might be *partakers of the divine nature*: having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust.” 2 Peter 1: 3, 4.

“For the Word of God is living and powerful, . . . and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.” Heb. 4: 13.

Next, to the *exclusion of every thing else*. In the presence of that Word, the wicked is to forsake his *way*, and the unrighteous man his *thoughts*;

“For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.” Isa. 55: 7, 9.

And Jesus said: “When ye shall have done

all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do." Luke 17: 10.

All that is duty is *commanded*.

For anyone to do as duty what is not commanded of God, is to undertake to do *more* than his duty.

But God is the *Author of duty*; and by Him *all that is duty is commanded*. Then for any one to think of doing *more than duty*, is at once to put himself beyond God and above God.

Therefore, for any one to do *as duty*, as of *obligation*, anything that is *not commanded* by God, is to go beyond God and is to put *himself* or *the source of the obligation*—is to put *man*—*above God*.

And *that* is precisely the story of the Roman church: "the church" has "authority to command men:" "the church" has "authority" to "oblige men under sin!" And by doing things *commanded by the church*, but that are *not commanded by God*, men can make up for their failures to do what *is commanded by God*!

In all that, there can be made "a *show* of wisdom in will-worship," and a show of *worship* in a voluntary and ostentatious "humility;" but in it all there is no help for man against the indulgence of his earthly nature.

It is all only the provision of Error, that fos-

ters the passions instead of sanctifies the soul.

Error only fosters the passions. *Truth* only sanctifies the soul.

God would have His sanctifying truth, *as that truth is* in spirit and in truth, to reach the heart and life of man.

To this end He has given His word covering in completest detail "the whole duty of man" — "all things that pertain to life and godliness;" and has carefully excluded every thing that is not commanded in that word. Rev. 22: 18, 19.

Thus He would *shut out from man*, all human, hindering, burdensome, mischievous, things; and would *shut in man with Himself*, in His holy audience-chamber alone, that man may hear His word as that Word is.

And *there*, with His *Word of Truth* alone, and with the *Spirit of Truth* alone to take that Word and make it plain to the mind and seal it upon the heart, God would sanctify unto Himself the soul of man according to the gracious destiny that He fixed for him before the world was.

By this sanctifying Word of divine Truth, in The Reformation, Christ is cleansing The Church from everything that is *not of Him*, preparatory to her soon-coming glorious Presentation.

This is what *meant* The Reformation, in the minds of the men of God who began it.

This is what *means* The Reformation *now* in

the time of its finishing in the finishing of the Mystery of God.

And *that* is why that in its *beginning*, in its *revival*, *now*, and *unto its finishing* in the glorious Presentation of The Church, the fundamental principles of The Reformation are just these three:

1. The Word of God.
2. The *whole* Word of God.
3. *Nothing but* the Word of God.

CHAPTER XII.

THE REFORMATION AND THE GOSPEL.

The Reformation was not in any sense a creedal, nor a doctrinal, nor a theological, discussion or controversy.

It was the direct and devout study and preaching of the Gospel, in a spiritual, practical, experience, that converts the soul, regenerates the man, and transforms the life.

In this, Wicklif found The Ten Commandments to be the Law of God, and as such the foundation of "the whole body of Christian morality."

One of the very first publications of Wicklif in The Reformation was "a detailed exposition of the Ten Commandments: in which he contrasted the immoral life prevalent among all ranks in his time, with what these Commandments require."

Thus he brought to the minds of men the knowledge of sin and its consequences, awakened the conscience, and aroused the desire for a righteousness that should reign against all the power of sin and sinfulness.

That was his primary and direct purpose. Secondary to this, was the purpose to have the people become acquainted with God; and so to counteract the workings of the church-system that

inculcated “greater concern for the opinions of men than for the Law of God.”

From the words of Matthias in the preceding chapter of this book, it is abundantly evident that with him the Ten Commandments occupied the same place and were used for the same purpose precisely as in the work of Wicklif.

With Huss it was still the same. As stated on page 124 he had the Ten Commandments, with other Scriptures, painted on the walls of Bethlehem chapel, which was the place of his regular preaching — till it was destroyed by the Roman church.

“Huss was accustomed wherever he lodged to leave for his hosts on departing, a copy of the Ten Commandments: or even to write them in the meal, as he had written them on the walls of Bethlehem chapel.”

And among the last things that he did in the awful prison at Constance awaiting the stake, was to write “short tracts on the Ten Commandments and the Lord’s Prayer.”

Among the first writings that Luther ever issued in print were “Discourses on the Ten Commandments,” and tracts “On The Lord’s Prayer.”

Yet not with any of these men was the Law of God the way of righteousness. It was used only to indicate, and to lead men *to, the Way* of Righteousness—Christ only.

Not in any of the teachings of the Reformers did righteousness *come by the Law*, nor was it *retained* by the Law. It *came and remained* only by the faith of Christ *without* the Law.

Yet when it did thus come and thus remain, it was *witnessed by the Law*, as the very righteousness which all the time the Law had *demande*d of every soul, — but which the Law could not supply — the righteousness *of God*.

Wicklif “ever presupposes the connection of all his teaching with trust on Christ as the only Saviour,” “deriving everything from the divine fellowship of life with Christ.” “Before all we are bound to follow Christ,” said he, and “All obedience should be paid solely to Christ.”

“He ascribes the whole work of salvation to Christ alone;” declaring that “When God rewards a good work, He crowns His own gift.”

The great Centre of all the preaching of Miltiz was the power of Christ to save men from sin and to keep them from sinning.

A section of the city of Prague so devoted to vice as to bear the name of “Little Venice,” was so transformed by the Gospel in the preaching of Miltiz that it acquired the name of “Little Jerusalem.”

So was it also with Conrad. The one transcendent note of all his preaching was “the transforming grace of Christ.” The leader of the wild-

est youth of Prague was converted and the whole course of his life so changed that he was notable for his devotion and his mildness of Christian grace.

As to Matthias, the quotations in the preceding chapter are sufficient to show how true it is that "he everywhere holds distinctly up to view the immediate reference of the religious consciousness to Christ." "Jesus the Crucified" is his favorite expression; and *He alone* must be all in all.

For example: "Jesus the Crucified is the Vine: and all the branches proceeding from Him and abiding in Him, have, and ought to have, respect to Him alone: and other foundation can no man lay."

"All holy Scripture, all Christian faith, proclaims, preaches, and confesses, that Jesus Christ the Crucified is the one Saviour, and the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth;

"that He alone is all power, all wisdom, for every Christian, He Himself the Alpha, the beginning and the end;

"and that every one who is longing and striving to be a just and virtuous man, must first of all and immediately put on Christ Himself and His Spirit; because He is Himself the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

"After Him alone, first of all and with the whole heart, we should seek, begin to glorify Him

and to carry Him in our souls, Who alone hath redeemed us at that great price — His precious blood.”

“Our Lord gives to Christians the beginning of a life of grace, as it is written, ‘The just shall live by faith.’”

With Huss also Christ was the great Centre of his faith and of his life. The final act of the Council of Constance in his condemnation was to put on his head a cap painted all over with pictures of devils, and to say —

“Now we give over thy soul to the devil.”

Huss, with his eyes raised toward heaven, calmly and joyfully said, “But *I* commend into *Thy* hands, *Jesus Christ*, my soul, *by Thee* redeemed.”

And at the stake, as the flames put out his life, the last words that came from his dying lips, were, “Jesus, Son of the living God, have mercy upon *me*.”

In a word, the whole faith and teaching of all these saints of God who made The Reformation is summarily expressed in that Scripture, “Here are they that keep the Commandments of God, and the Faith of Jesus.” Rev. 14: 12.

And *than that* nothing could be truer to the truth of the Bible. For, clearly and beyond all other words of Scripture, the Ten Commandments are the Law and Commandments *of God* alone.

With the coming of the Ten Commandments into the world, no human hand or mind had anything at all to do but merely to receive them and place them in the Ark of His Testament as directed by Him.

First, the Ten Commandments *only* were spoken from heaven with the voice of God that shook the earth. Ex. 20: 1 - 17; Deut. 5: 22; Heb. 12: 25, 26.

Then they were written "with the finger of God" on two tables of stone.

Then He said to Moses, "Come up to Me into the mount, and be there, and I will give thee tables of stone, and a Law, and Commandments, which *I have written.*" Ex. 24: 12.

Moses did so, and *there* "He gave unto Moses, when He had made an end of communing with him upon Mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God." "And the tables were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God, graven upon the tables." Ex. 31: 18; 32: 16.

When Moses came down from the mount with the two tables in his hands, because of the Egyptian idolatry of the people at the foot of the mount he cast down the tables and broke them.

Then the Lord said to Moses, "Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first: and I will write upon these tables the words that were in the

first tables which thou brakest.” Ex. 32:19; 33:1.

Moses did so, and went up again into the mount with the tables in his hand. And there *the second time* “He wrote on the tables, according to the first writing, the Ten Commandments.” Deut. 10:4.

Thus the Ten Commandments are the Law and Commandments of God *in a sense and in a way* that is distinct from and above every other word *even of God* that ever came into the world.

They originated in God, they were brought into the world *only* by the *Voice, the writing, and the hand*, of God Himself. They are not the law or the commandments of Moses, nor of the prophets, nor of Peter, nor of the apostles, nor of “the church.” They are distinctly and distinctively “the Commandments of God.”

Yet for all that, they were never put into the world, they never were intended, to be to men *the way to righteousness*. But, under the Holy Spirit, to give the knowledge of sin and awaken and point men *to Christ* who alone is the *Way to righteousness and the Way of righteousness*.

Accordingly it is written: “The Law entered that *the offense might abound*.” “that sin, by the Commandment, might become *exceeding sinful*.”

“But where sin abounded, *grace did much more abound*: that, as sin hath reigned unto death, *even so might grace reign, through righteousness, unto*

eternal life, *by Jesus Christ our Lord.*” Rom. 5: 20, 21; 7: 13.

Again: “Whatsoever things the law saith it saith to them who are under the law, *that every mouth should be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.*

“Therefore, *by the deeds of the Law shall no flesh be justified in His sight for by the Law is the knowledge of sin.*”

“But now the righteousness of God *without the Law* is manifested; . . . even the righteousness of God *which is by faith* of Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all them that *believe*: for there is no difference, for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God.” Rom. 3: 19-23.

Again: The prophet Zechariah saw a flying roll representing the curse of sin. Then the angel said to him, “This is the curse that goeth forth over the face of the whole earth.

“For every one that stealeth [the second table of the Law] shall be cut off on this side according to it; and every one that sweareth [the first table] shall be cut off as on that side according to it.

“I will bring it forth saith the Lord of hosts, and it shall enter into the house of the thief, and into the house of him that sweareth falsely by my name; and it shall remain in the midst of his house, and *shall consume it* with the timber thereof and the stones thereof.” Zech. 5: 1-4.

That is to say, That holy Law is in the "house" of every soul. There also is the heavenly recorder noting the transgressions of the Law, that cause the curse. And that curse, because of transgressions, *unless it shall be removed*, will remain in that house until it shall consume the house with the timber and the very stones of the house.

But, Oh! abounding grace. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us. For it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree."

And *this* is in order "that the blessing of Abraham," which is the righteousness of a God by faith, "might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ." And *this* is in order "that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith." Gal. 3: 13, 14.

Therefore, the Law is, and always was, the means "to bring us unto Christ that we might be justified by faith." Gal. 3: 24.

The sole purpose of the Gospel is to establish in every soul the righteousness of God: to fix there the character of God. Rom. 1: 16, 17.

To do this, it must first save men from sin. And to do this there must first be given to men the knowledge of what sin is.

"By the Law is the knowledge of sin;" for "Sin is the transgression of the Law." Therefore the Law was given to give to men the knowl-

edge of sin. And thus the sole object of the Law is the Gospel.

The sole object of the Gospel is to secure to men the righteousness of God. And so the sole object of the Law is the righteousness of God *through the Gospel*.

The Law comes short of its object, without the Gospel. The Gospel cannot work effectually without the Law.

The Commandments of God, that compose the Law of God that brings men to Christ that they may be justified by the faith of Christ, originated in God and came to the world by the voice and hand of God alone.

So "the Faith of Jesus" which is the object of that law, is that faith which originated in Jesus, which was brought to the world by Jesus, which was manifested in Jesus in the world, and which was exercised by Jesus Himself in His own Person.

It is not the faith of Peter, nor of Paul, nor of John, nor of the apostles, nor of "the church." It is distinctly and distinctively "the Faith of Jesus."

And note that it is "*the Faith of Jesus:*" *not our faith in Jesus*. Our faith *in* Jesus, is one phase of faith. *The Faith of Jesus*, is another and higher phase of the principle of faith.

Faith in every phase is the gift of God, with

Jesus “the Author and Finisher” of it in its workings. So *our* faith *in* Jesus is the gift of God: yet it is small, weak, wavering, and often failing.

But “*the Faith of Jesus*” is Faith perfected. It is Faith that *has fought* the battle of the world, the flesh, and the devil, and *has triumphed* at every point. Heb. 4 : 15. It is separate and distinct from and above all other faith ever known by man.

And this perfected Faith, this triumphant Faith *of* Jesus, is the free gift of God to every soul; and is imparted by the Holy Spirit to every believer in Jesus, by him to be *kept*. 1 Cor. 12: 9; Gal. 5: 22.

And to the believer *in* Jesus, this perfected Faith *of* Jesus makes fully sure in all its fulness and certainty all the things of God to us exactly according to the mind and will of God.

The Faith *of* Jesus makes every promise of God *ours* in fullest assurance. “For all the promises of God *in Him* are yea, and in Him, Amen, to the glory of God by us.” Gal. 3: 22; 1 Cor. 1: 20.

The Faith *of* Jesus overwhelmingly and eternally justifies the believer *in* Him. For “we have believed *in* Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the Faith *of* Christ.” Gal. 2: 16.

The Faith *of* Jesus makes to be ours in absolute certainty, the righteousness of God: “even the righteousness of God which is by Faith *of* Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all *that believe*.”

The Faith of Jesus makes certain to the believer *in* Jesus, the life of Jesus in the mortal, flesh. Gal. 2: 20; 2 Cor. 4: 10, 11.

The Faith of Jesus gives to the believer *in* Jesus "boldness and access *with confidence*" "into the holiest" — the holiest of all experiences, the holiest of all places, "the holiest of *all*." Eph. 3: 12; Heb. 10: 19, 20, 22.

The keeping of the Commandments of God is the gift of God; and it is *ministered* to the believer by the Lord Jesus, through the Holy Spirit. Gal. 2: 17; 5: 22, 23.

Thus the *keeping* of the Law of God does not come by that law, but only by the Faith of Christ through the Holy Spirit.

Neither the *becoming* a Christian, nor the *remaining* a Christian, is by the Law; but solely by the grace of God through the faith of Christ.

"The law was not made for a righteous man; but for the lawless and disobedient, . . . and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine." 1 Tim. 1: 9, 10.

The righteousness of the Law, the keeping of the Law, is wholly of grace through faith — the Faith of Jesus.

Therefore "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." Rom. 10: 4.

Yet in all this, respect is had to the Law. It is

the Law of God, spiritual, holy, just, and good. It is not set aside by faith, it is *satisfied*. It is not made void through faith, it is *established*. Rom. 3: 26, 31; 7: 12.

Eternally "the Law is good." Whether it shall be good for particular persons turns altogether on their using it lawfully. 1 Tim. 1: 8.

Many will have righteousness to be *by the Law*. That is an unlawful use of the law.

Many others will have righteousness to be by the Law *and "faith."* That is an unlawful use of *the Law* and an unfaithful use of *faith*.

Many others will have righteousness to be by faith *and the Law*. That is an unfaithful use of *faith* and an unlawful use of *the Law*.

To have the Law give the knowledge of sin, and make it appear so exceeding sinful that nothing but the sacrifice of Christ can ever satisfy, *that* is lawful use of the law.

Then to depend solely upon Christ *to satisfy* — to "make His soul an offering" and the only offering "for sin," *that* is lawful use of the Law.

To find righteousness without the law, without the deeds of the Law, without works, *that* is lawful use of the Law.

To find without the Law a righteousness that is of such quality that the Law will witness that it is righteousness indeed, *that* is lawful use of the Law.

To receive the righteousness of God as a free gift by the faith of Christ, *that* is lawful use of the Law; for to that the Law always freely and fully witnesses.

The Christian — the Reformation Christian — will have righteousness only *by faith*, without the Law, but “witnessed by the Law.”

He thus finds the very righteousness of God, and establishes the Law in the keeping of the Commandments of God and the Faith of Jesus.

With that The Reformation began, and only with that will The Reformation end. Rev. 12: 17; 14: 12-14.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE REFORMATION CHRISTIAN BROTHERLINESS.

Each one of the men by whom The Reformation came, had found, in a personal experience of the grace of God and the power of Christ, redemption from sin.

This redemption was upon the divine principle that "there is no difference." Thus each one of them knew by the heart's experience that "there is no respect of persons with God."

In this there consists essentially the equality of all believers. Thus the perfect equality of believers is essentially a principle of The Reformation.

Wicklif denounced the distinctions that were made among Christians, such as "spirituals and seculars," "secular and religious," and all "the manifold gradations of rank among the clergy," as "utterly foreign to Christianity."

He declared that it is all an invention of "the fiend" by which there has arisen "sectarian animosities and the spirit of domination."

"All of this came of men's forsaking the rule of the New Testament, according to which it were better that there should be but one order."

Matthias said: "To style Christians *the world* and *seculars*, is a calumnious misrepresentation;"

because by the New Testament "Every Christian is an anointed man and a priest.

"The hitherto separating wall between priests and laymen must be broken down.

"The distinction of an *inferior* and a *higher* position in Christian life must be done away with.

"The universal priesthood must be revived, and the priestly character restored to the entire Christian life.

"Christianity must be made to appear as a principle of purification from all that is of the world.

"The priest, singing, praying, and administering the sacraments, thereby serves our common Lord, Jesus Christ, and is therein useful to the church.

"So the peasant, in ploughing and pasturing his cattle, as long as he stands fast in the common love, serves the Lord Jesus Christ and is necessary and useful to his family or to the Holy Church.

"The same holds good of other laymen, such as tradesmen and artisans in civil society. As the manner of calling and the works of the priest are necessary, so too are the various callings and works of the peasant.

"As the calling of the priesthood and its exercise comes to them from Jesus Christ, so the various callings and employments of the peasantry have come from God and Christ.

“Indeed the calling of the peasant is more primitive and more indispensable than that of the priest, since the occupation and practice of husbandry and of the other trades existed earlier than that of the priest.

“Countrymen and soldiers do not exist for the sake of priests, but priests for the sake of the peasantry and the soldiers.”

At this the clergy cried out, “You put the laity on a level with the clergy. And in so doing you cause the dignity of the priesthood to suffer diminution.”

Matthias: “The man who speaks thus, plainly evinces that he is a man actuated by a zeal without knowledge. For he censures as an impropriety what he would certainly *wish to take place* if he were animated by the good Spirit of God.”

“They who begin with despising the common manners of their fellow-Christians, who begin with extolling in particular their own societies and brotherhoods as compared with others, mar by this course the unity of the Christian Church and disturb Christian peace.

“They begin by thinking highly of themselves, and would exalt themselves above the common mass of Christians, hold themselves to be the only spirituals and apostolicals, and call the great mass of other Christians ‘Babylon’ and ‘the world.’

“They pretend that they alone fulfill the counsels of Christ: that the people neither can attain nor ought to attain the same perfection.

“And when a Christian, whatever he may be, man or woman, virgin or widow, living in the Christian community, consecrates his life to Christ with a view to live more perfectly in the simplicity of the Spirit, and for suitable reasons does not enter one of these monastic orders, he must at once suffer persecution from them and from his associates.

“Such an one must be looked upon as a heretic, and be called by the vulgar a Beghard, a Beguine, a Turlepinus, or by some such reproachful epithet. He must be called up and put on trial to determine whether he is a heretic. Hence it comes about that among the common laity, no pious people are to be found.”

All Christians being equally the sons of God, each one according to his ability was free to make known whatever truth of God he knew. And those who were called of God wholly to the preaching of the Gospel, freely did so.

Wicklif had a school from which he sent forth everywhere through the land travelling preachers, because, as he said, “The gospel relates how Jesus went about in the places of the country, both great and small, as in cities and castles or small towns; and this to teach us to profit generally unto

men, and not forbear to teach to a people because they are few, and our name may not as a consequence be great.”

These travelling preachers called themselves “poor priests” — the word poor used not as boasting of poverty, but in the sense of “deficient in desirable or essential qualities.”

However they soon acquired from the people the name of “lollards,” because of their singing: from *lollen* or *lullen*, to sing with a low voice as in a lullaby lulling to sleep. They were also called “Bible men” because of their large use of the Bible.

As these went forth to preach, Wicklif said to them: “If begging friars stroll over the country preaching the legends of the saints and the History of the Trojan War, we must do for God’s glory what they do *to fill their wallets*: and form a vast itinerant evangelization *to convert souls to Jesus Christ*.*

“The highest service that men can arrive at on earth is to preach the Word of God.

“Go and preach: it is the sublimest work. But imitate not the priests whom we see, after the sermon sitting in the ale-house, or at the gaming-table, or wasting their time in hunting. After *your* sermon is ended, do you visit the sick, the

* D’Aubigne, Book XVII, chap. vii.

aged, the poor, the blind, the lame, and succor them according to your ability.”

In Prague, Miltz had the same kind of a school composed of from two hundred to three hundred young men. All of these “resided under the same roof with himself, were trained under his influence, and by his society.

“All here was to be free: to flow spontaneously from the one animating spirit by which all were governed. An *internal tie* was *all* that held them together: no outward discipline or rule, no vow, no uniformity of dress. They soon distinguished themselves by their serious, spiritual lives, and by their style of preaching.”

All of these preachers of the Gospel were discredited by the clergy as having “no right to preach,” because they were not “recognized” by “the church;” and as having “no authority to preach,” because they were not “authorized” by “the church.”

Even Wicklif, Miltz, Conrad, and Huss, were all held as having “no authority to preach” when “the church” had discountenanced or excommunicated them. The Pope in a bull spoke of Miltz as having, “in the spirit of temerity and self-confidence, taken upon himself the calling to preach, which does not belong to him.” The theological faculty of the University of Prague said that such preachers “ought to be silenced.”

But none of these people cared anything at all for any or all of that. They would not be silenced by anything but death. And even dead they still spoke, and will forever speak.

Wicklif said: "Those who forbear to preach the Word of God, to perform divine service or to assist at it, on account of *any excommunication or interdict*, incur thereby *excommunication.*"

That is to say, "Excommunication and interdict" by "the church" is nothing and effects nothing. But *he who yields to it* and is *ruled by it* so as to stop preaching the Word of God or performing divine service, thus *puts upon himself* an excommunication that *is something*.

Militz was not at all disturbed by the Pope's bull. He calmly said, "I trust in God and the power of the truth. These will triumph over every assault."

Conrad said: "The divine call moved me to preach in Prague. He who is afraid to speak the truth is not a true preacher sent of God. Unmoved, therefore, will I praise the Word, O Lord, in thee, and not be afraid. I long after the glory of our Saviour.

"While I am willing to answer them who say that Christ has not sent me, I am greatly at a loss when I ask what the proof is of *their own mission*. For if we look at the heart and the conduct as the proof of those who are sent of God, it will be evi-

dent that *by them* the rules of Christ are not at all obeyed.

“For Christ said to His preachers, when He sent them forth, Freely ye have received, freely give. But no sooner have *they* a congregation than they set up a *money-table* to make money out of their hearers.

“Simony is heresy. And there is still worse heresy than that of those who declare the Holy Ghost to be a mere creature: namely, when *by simony* the Holy Ghost is employed as a means of *getting money*.”*

Huss said: “He who lives conformably to the law of Christ, and, animated by a disposition of sincere love, has singly in view the glory of God, and his own and his neighbor’s salvation, and preaches *not lies*, not ribaldry, not fables, but the law of Christ . . . *such* a person *never* arrogates to himself the call to preach without authority. It is *not to be doubted* that the man in such case is *sent of God*.”

* The Reformation and Christian principle of the support of the exclusive preaching of the Gospel, as well as of all Christian giving, is voluntary and unsolicited giving.

Wicklif: “Thou shalt help according to thy power, that he may have a reasonable sustenance *when he doeth well his office*.”

Conrad insisted that “Christ never begged.”

Huss: “Whatever they obtain for their support, should be regarded simply as a gift of free love from the spontaneous affection of those for whose spiritual benefit they labor.”

Scripture: “As a matter of bounty and not as of covetousness. Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give: not grudgingly, or of necessity; for God loveth a cheerful giver.” 2 Cor: 9: 5-7.

“The internal divine call which springs from the work of the Holy Spirit on the soul, is of more authority than any outward call proceeding from men. And a person may be constrained by this internal call from God to stand forth *even in opposition to the ordinances of man*. Where the Spirit of God is, there is Liberty.

“It is evident that every priest or deacon who confesses the truth and practices righteousness, has a virtual testimony *in this very thing* that he is sent of God. And he needs not prove this divine mission by miracles, nor by an express passage of Holy Writ relating personally to himself, as one sent of God to preach the Gospel.

“It is a greater miracle to confess the truth and practice righteousness, than to perform marvellous works to the outward senses.

“The priest or deacon who loves his enemies, despises riches, esteems as nothing the glory of this world, avoids entangling himself in worldly business, and patiently endures terrible threatenings, even persecutions, for the Gospel’s sake — *such* a priest or deacon performs miracles, and has the witness in himself that he is a genuine disciple of Christ.

“A good death is better than a bad life. One ought never to sin through fear of death. He who fears death, loses the joy of living. He who speaks the truth breaks his own neck.

“Truth triumphs over all. *He* triumphs who dies for the truth; for no calamity can touch him, if no sin has dominion over him. Blessed are ye when men curse you, says the Truth.

“This is the foundation on which I build. This is the food for my spirit: recruiting it with fresh vigor to contend against all adversaries of the truth.”

Zwingle said: “All Christians are the brethren of Christ, and brethren of each other; and they have no fathers on the earth. Thus orders, sects, and parties fall.”

Luther said: “All Christians belong to the spiritual estate; and the only difference between them is in the functions which they fulfill. We have all but one baptism, but one faith: and these constitute the spiritual man.

“Hence it follows that laymen and priests, princes and bishops: or, as we have said, ecclesiastics and laics: have nothing to distinguish them but their functions. They have all the same condition; but they have not all the same work to perform.”

“They call upon me for moderation: and they themselves, in the judgment which they pass upon me, trample it under foot! Truth will no more gain by my moderation than it will lose by my presumption. I desire to know what errors have been found in my theses.

“Who knows not that a new idea is seldom advanced without an appearance of ‘arrogance,’ and an accusation of disputatiousness? Were Humility herself to undertake something new, those of an opposite opinion would charge her with pride.

“Why were Christ and all the martyrs put to death? — Because they were deemed proud despisers of the wisdom of the time; and advanced new truths *without previously taking counsel of the organs of ancient opinion.*

“Let not the wise of the present day, then, expect of me humility, or rather *hypocrisy*, enough to ask their opinion before publishing what duty calls me to say.

“What I do, will be done *not by the prudence of men*; but by the counsel of God. If the work is of God, who can arrest it? If it is not of God, who can advance it? Not my will, nor theirs, nor ours, but Thy will be done, O holy Father, who art in heaven.”

For that plain and simple loyalty to God and His word, and to God *in His Word*, each one of these men without exception was denounced and pursued by “the church” as —

“dangerous,”

“hostile to the church,”

“overthrowing all ecclesiastical order,”

“showing contempt of church jurisdiction,”

“subverting civil order,”

“inviting the people to rebellion against the church,”

“countenancing revolution,”

“in rebellion,”

“insurrectionist,”

“revolutionist,”

“destructionist.”

All of *that* came to such men as *those*, from *Popes!* from Popes in the time of the double and triple-headed papacy!! and from the Council of Constance!!!

Yet all that these men preached, all that they stood for, is but the simple Christianity of the plain word of Scripture: not alone of the New Testament, but of the whole Bible: in the original creation, no less than in the new creation which is *redemption*.

“Have we not all one Father? hath not one God created us?” “If I did despise the cause of my manservant or of my maidservant, when they contended with me, what then shall I do when God riseth up? and when *He* visiteth, what shall I answer Him? Did not He that made me make him? and did not one fashion us in the womb?” Mal. 2: 10; Job 31: 13-15.

“Now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the Law and the prophets: even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them

that believe, for *there is no difference.*” “For there is no respect of persons with God.” Rom. 2: 21, 22; 2: 11.

“He which sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are *all of one.* For which cause *He* is not ashamed to call them *brethren.*” Heb. 2: 11.

“Be not ye called Rabbi; for One is your Master, even Christ, and *all ye* are *brethren.*” “Neither be ye called masters; for one is your Master, even Christ.” Matt. 23: 8, 10.

Therefore, “My brethren, be not many masters, knowing that we shall receive the greater condemnation.” Jas. 3: 1. *Many* masters means *greater* condemnation. *Any* masters at all, means condemnation.

There is no exercise of authority, there is no place for domination, *among Christians*: neither by Christians upon other Christians, nor by Christians upon people *who are not Christians.*

For it is written: “The princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. *But it shall not be so among you.*” Matt. 20: 25.

Note that it is “the princes of the Gentiles” that exercise dominion and authority over people; and it is “them”—the Gentiles—over whom this dominion and authority are exercised.

And even though dominion and authority be exercised by *men* in “*the church,*” they are still

“princes of the Gentiles” who do it. *Christians* do not do it, for, “It shall not be so among you.”

And even though they be members of “the church,” over and upon whom this dominion and authority are exercised, and who allow it to be exercised over and upon “them,” they are Gentiles all the same. *Christians* do not allow it to be done: for, “It shall not be so among you.”

It is none but princes of the Gentiles who do it; it is none but Gentiles over and upon whom they do it; and it is none but Gentiles *who allow it* to be done over and upon them, in The Church.

It cannot be done over or upon *Christians*: they will not allow it: for these have the word of their “Leader and Commander,” “It shall not be so among you.”

No man can be loyal to Christ, nor true to His word, who allows any man *in “the church”* or in the field of religion and faith to exercise any dominion or authority over or upon him. For Christ has commanded, “It shall not be so among you.”

Whosoever among *Christians* exercises such dominion or authority puts himself in the place of Christ. And whosoever allows it to be done to him, allows *man* to be to him in the place of Christ.

“Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the servants of men.” 1 Cor. 7: 23.

Wherever such thing appears, he by whom it appears is a prince of the Gentiles; and a prince

of the Gentiles *in the place of Christ*. Whoever submits to it is a Gentile, and submits to a prince of the Gentiles in the place of Christ.

That is the whole story of the papacy. And whenever that thing is manifest in any church, it is just so much of the papacy there.

It is a fundamental principle of The Reformation that “the ecclesiastical power is exercised *only* by the *ministry of the Word*.”

Any ecclesiastical power ever, anywhere, that is exercised in any other wise than “only by the ministry of the Word” is not Christian, is not Reformation, but is papal.

Amongst Christians the only government in which *man* has any governing to do is *self-government*. Each one governs himself *only*, in the realm of his own spirit. And “He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty; and he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh a city.” Prov. 16:32.

Each one governing himself in God through Christ by the Holy Spirit according to the will of God, there is no room for any other government. Acts 24:25.

And for any who profess the name of Christian but are not Christians and so cannot govern themselves in righteousness, but must be governed from without, there is an established and divinely recognized “power” for the governing of all such—the “power” of “Caesar.”

And in the Scriptures there is nowhere recognized any *third* power beyond God and Cæsar, but that is neither God nor Cæsar, to come in and gather people together who cannot govern themselves and so must needs be “governed” by this interloper that is neither God nor Cæsar but tries to be both God and Cæsar and so can play the devil only.

All duty that is ever to be rendered by men pertains either to God or to Cæsar, and is to be rendered respectively to these accordingly: just *these two*. There is no other. Matt. 22:21.

Beyond this governing of himself by each individual, the *only activity* of Christians is in worshipping God and *serving God and men*.

Serving God is manifested in ministering to men that which we have received of God: first, His grace; and secondly, all His other gifts of every kind.

And this great office is to *all alike*. As it is written: “As *every man* hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God.” 1 Peter 4:10.

Every soul who has received, and knows in his own heart and life, reconciliation to God, *in that* has received the *ministry* of that reconciliation. To him, *for this ministry*, God has committed *the Word* of reconciliation. And he in this min-

istry is in Christ's stead in the world, praying men to be reconciled to God. Cor. 5:18-20.

Not every one is called to devote all his time and effort to this. But except in the devotion of all his time and effort to it, the one who is called is in nowise different from the Christian who is not so called.

The difference between them is *not* in a difference of *ministry*. It is only in the difference in the time and effort that can be *occupied* in the ministry, each in his place.

From the time when He was twelve years of age in the world, the Lord Jesus spent six times as long in the work of a carpenter as He spent in His preaching ministry.

And He was just as much the Saviour of the world when He was sawing boards and making benches as He was when He was preaching the Sermon on the Mount.

And forever there is just as much Christian dignity — true dignity — in the carpenter's shop or any other honest occupation as there is in the preacher's study or in the pulpit. Titus 3:14, margin.

For every soul, in every honest occupation, and from birth to death and onward to the right hand of the throne of Christ and of God, every step of the way *is consecrated* by the life of the blessed Christ in the flesh. "There is no differ-

ence,” and “There is no respect of persons with God.” Heb. 10:19, 20.

Among Christians *in truth* there simply cannot be any distinctions. There never can be any such thing as either ‘clergy’ or ‘laity:’ that is, neither aristocracy nor commonalty: but simply Christians — “a royal priesthood,” “kings and priests” *all*. 1 Peter 2:9; Rev. 1:6; 5:10.

Thus it was in the beginning. *All* were ministers of the Word of God’s grace in reconciliation to Him, and in service to men. For, from Jerusalem “they were *all* scattered abroad” except the apostles, and these *all* “went everywhere preaching the Word.” Acts 8:1, 4-8.

Here, then, were the whole body of believers, all brethren; all workers together with God; all fellow-workers in and unto the kingdom of the *one* God; all having but the *one* Lord and Master; all moved by the will of their *one* Head; all actuated and guided by the *one* Spirit; and all thus busy as bees, each and together, honoring God and blessing men.

But this was too much to be endured by Satan. It meant too much against his kingdom and dominion over men. He would move everything outside of heaven to throw into this heavenly family on earth the spirit of discord and confusion. The mystery of iniquity began to work.

Through the spirit of Pharisaism in those who

had not drunk deep into the Spirit of God as had those at the first, *traditionalism* and the *Mosaic order* were continued. This gave opportunity to make distinctions among *Christians*. Acts 11:2, 3; 15:1, 5; Gal. 2:11-13; Acts 21:20-25.

Among the elders, who were all equally *bishops*, one arrogated to *himself* the title of bishop. This made the three orders — bishops, presbyters or elders, and deacons: with the *bishop* corresponding to the *high-priest*, the *presbyters* corresponding to the *priests*, and the *deacons* corresponding to the *Levites*, of the Mosaic order.

Then these all were distinguished as “the clergy,” while *the people* in general, of the churches, were but “the laity.”

The word “clergy” comes from the word *kleros* in Greek. It signifies literally “a lot:” and so, of a *person*, an official chosen by lot. The word *kleros* also signifies “a mischievous insect in beehives” — *Clerus apiarius*.

The word “laity,” “laic,” “lay,” comes from *laikos* and this from *laos* in Greek. It signifies “the people at large:” not the people as composing a State or a political body, but merely as “a mass of men” — and *these* the “unlearned.”

With this aristocratic spirit of the distinction of “the clergy,” in the nature of the case there entered also the spirit of rivalry for the “dignity” and “offices” that pertained to “the clergy;” and

of self-exaltation, arbitrary “authority” and domination by the “higher clergy” over the “lesser,” and by *all* “the clergy” over the “laity.”

The actual working out of this spirit was first manifested in the church at Ephesus. To the elders of that church, in his last talk with them, Paul said, “Of your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them.” Acts 20:30.

About thirty years later it had developed to the point where Diotrephes would assume the place of Christ: by asserting “*the pre-eminence,*” by rejecting Christ’s apostle, by refusing Christ’s word by His apostle, and by “casting out of the church” all who would not yield to *his* dictation and domination. 3 John 9, 10.

Then about six years later than that, the Lord Jesus, in *His* closing words to *all*, exposed and denounced all this as the hateful thing that it is. In the first of His seven letters to “the churches” — the one to “the church of Ephesus” — He mentions this evil thing.

That church had “left her first love,” the “falling away” had begun; but this one thing she yet had for which He heartily commended her: “*This thou hast, that thou hatest the deeds of the Nicolaitanes, which I also hate.*” Rev. 2:6.

The word “Nicolaitanes” comes from the two words *nikao* and *laos*: *nikao* means “to conquer,”

to get "the *upper hand*," to have "the *ascendency*, in all relations;" and *laos* — "the people at large" as distinguished from "the clergy."

The word then signifies that conquering or conquest of "the people" of the churches by that mischievous insect of the *kleros* or "clergy" in the Christian bee-hive: that persistent spirit of the princedom of the Gentiles that must exercise among Christians dominion and authority.

In the Ephesus period of the churches where this thing was first manifested it was *hated*. But when we come only to the third period, that of Pergamos, it was actually *held*. "So hast thou also *them that hold* the doctrine of the Nicolaitanes, *which thing I hate*." Rev. 2:15.

The Pergamos period of the churches centred "where Satan's seat is," "where Satan dwelleth," and where "Antipas" was Christ's "faithful martyr." Rev. 2:13.

The word "Antipas," like the word "Nicolaitanes," is a symbolical word. It comes from the two words *anti* and *pas*: *anti* signifying "against" or "opposed to," and *pas* the plural of "pa," which is the abbreviation of pa-pa, from which come the words "pa-pa-cy" and "pope."

The Pergamos period of the churches, then, was the time of the rise and formation of the system of the pa-pa-cy. Those who opposed it are symbolized in the word "Antipas." And to op-

pose it meant martyrdom *then*, as it did also in The Reformation, and as it always does.

These two statements made by the Lord Jesus show the growth of the clerical spirit and power in its conquest of the people. In the first period, it was *hated* in the churches. But in only the third period that pernicious "doctrine" was *held*.

Yet in the first period, in the third period, and in all periods, the divine Christ sets forever His holy word, "*which thing I hate.*" And let all people forever say, Amen.

Serving God in ministering all His other gifts that we have received, in addition to and along with the ministry of the Word of reconciliation, makes the Christian the free and loving servant of all: as it is written, "Brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty as an occasion to the flesh, but by love *serve* one another." Gal. 5: 13.

Christian liberty is loving service. And loving service is Christian liberty.

Therefore, Jesus said: "Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister. And whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant" — "servant of all," "at everybody's call." Matt. 20: 26, 27; Mark 10: 43, 44.

He who can best serve the most people is the greatest. And in the nature of things, just by virtue of that grace, he *is chief*.

The reason that Jesus is the supremely greatest of all is that He was and ever is able to do *most for most people*. And whoever is nearest like Him, most nearly does most for most people.

The grace willingly to serve most people, the grace to be most cheerfully at everybody's call, is the badge of greatness, the certificate of chieftancy. And this is the primary and highest qualification for the "office" of elder or deacon.

An *official* "elder," one who had obtained the "dignity" by ecclesiastical politics, when brought into the presence of this truth of Christian service at everybody's call being the chief qualification for the responsibility of elder or deacon, exclaimed: "Why, if that were so, nobody would *ever* want the office!"

It is true. It is not a dignity to excite human ambition or political rivalry. It is not an office to be gained by political method.

It is the opportunity for greater service to more people; and is the result of the grace of God already upon the Christian, qualifying him for the place of larger opportunity for the enjoyment of the Christian liberty of loving service.

It is found only in the fellowship of Christ. For, when He had said, "Whosoever will be chief among you let him be servant of all," "at everybody's call," He continued: "*Even as* the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minis-

ter, and to give His life a ransom for many;" and "I am among you as he that serveth." Matt. 20:28; Luke 22:27.

The Church is not in the world to *reign*, but to be *subject*: not to reign over *anybody* in *anything*, but to be "*subject unto Christ in everything.*" Eph. 5:24.

The Church is not in the world to *rule*, but only to *minister*. The Church is not here to *command* anybody, but only to *obey her Lord* and to *serve everybody*.

And this Christian liberty of the ministry of salvation and of loving service *to men*, is The Reformation principle as to the place and work of The Church as in the world.

Wicklif "took special pains to get the hearts of Christians interested in works of charity, and to look after such as were neglected as to their spiritual wants and provide for the welfare of their souls."

He said: "Men who love not the souls, have little love for the bodies, of their neighbors. Hence the work of Christian instruction is the best service that man may do for his brother."

And with this ministry to the souls of men, Christians are told to "visit those who are sick, or who are in trouble, especially those whom God hath made needy by age or by other sickness, as the feeble, the blind, and the lame, who are in poverty.

These thou shalt relieve with thy goods, after thy power, and after their need; for thus biddeth the Gospel.”

The service of Militz to the poor and the afflicted, in their temporal needs as well as spiritual, was boundless.

Huss said: “In the last times The Church is to go about only in the form of a servant. She is to be tried by patience.

“The Church of Christ must appear in greater lowliness, and the righteous venerate her on account of the hope of heavenly good: not on account of visible signs.

“This servant-form of the true Church, in which the invisible godlike is all that attracts, as contrasted with the abundance of lying wonders in the worldly church of Antichrist, appearing in glory, serves as a means of separating the elect from the reprobate.”

Not in vain was Christianity in its heavenly integrity put into the world. Not in vain was it revived in The Reformation.

It was hidden by the first falling away in a false Catholicism. It has been hidden by the second falling away in a false Protestantism.

But the divine and heavenly life is in it, and again revived in its native integrity and rid forever of the mischievous insect of the spiritual *Clerus apiarius*, the original, revived, and ulti-

mate, Christianity will shine forth in her native glory and beauty, and will go on gloriously unto the perfect finishing of the Mystery of God in the day and *fact of the glorious Presentation*. Isa. 60: 1, 2; Rev. 18: 1.

All Christians again *one*; the whole Body of believers again all brethren; all working together with the *one* God; all fellow-workers in and unto the *one* kingdom of God; all having but the *one* Lord and Master; all moved by the will of their *one* Head; all receiving the word from the “*one* Shepherd;” all actuated and guided by the *one* Spirit; all again will be busy as bees, each and together honoring God and blessing men in the joyous fulfillment of the whole Law in the “*one* word;” and *God* “will *finish the work* and cut it short in righteousness, because *a short work* will the Lord make upon the earth.” Gal. 5: 13, 14; Rom. 9: 28.

Please read Judges 9: 7-20.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE REFORMATION RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

The Reformation proclaimed Religious Liberty.

The Reformers cared more for Religious Liberty than they cared for life. To them Religious Liberty was the only life.

All the Religious Liberty known today either by individuals, or by States, or yet by the churches, is due to The Reformation.

Yet the real *Reformation* Religious Liberty is little understood.

Most of the denominations think that Religious Liberty is freedom of *their* religion or faith from prohibition or interference *by the State*.

Some denominations extend the thought to the point of insisting that Religious Liberty is the freedom of every individual from any interference or notice in things religious by *the State*.

But not one of the denominations thinks, or will allow, that Religious Liberty is the perfect freedom of the individual believer from prohibition, or interference, or *jurisdiction*, in the matter of religion or faith, by *the church*.

And so the denominations all exercise *as churches* the very power and jurisdiction that they deny to the State.

They *deny* to the individual as a member of *the church* the very Religious Liberty which they *advocate* for him as a member of *the State*.

Thus they present the interesting situation that the Christian has more Religious Liberty as a member of *the State* than he can have as a member of *the church*.

For the individual as only a member of *the State* they demand as a *natural right*, a Religious Liberty that they will not allow to him as a member of *the church* under the grace of God!

And *in this*, by their own practice and even by their own arguments, the implication is that *the State* must be more Christian than should be *the church*!

That is, that the kingdoms of *this world* must be more liberal, must recognize a larger and truer freedom — *must be more Christian* — than the *kingdom of God*.

Does anybody but a confirmed denominationalist — a papist — need to be told that Reformation and Christian Religious Liberty is no such thing as *that?* that no Reformer was ever so blind and confused as that, in his thinking?

The Reformation had nothing to do with any such situation as now exists in the separation of Church and State, or of religion and the State. No such distinction was then existent even in idea. The Reformation had to create it.

When The Reformation was begun in the fourteenth century, and when it was revived in the sixteenth century, there was no such thing as the State proper, as now is so well understood by all.

Then all was the church only. Principalities, kingdoms, the empire, were *all* only the “secular arm” of the one all-pervading church.

Princes, kings, and the emperor, with all their power, were the secular or lay “estate,” while the clergy and monks were the spiritual or clerical “estate,” — the *two estates* of the *one* realm of the *one church*: just as today the “clergy” and the “laity” are the two estates of the one and same *denomination*.

Recall the words of Bryce: “The Holy Roman Church and the Holy Roman Empire are one and the same thing, seen from different sides;” and “The Holy Empire is but another name for the Visible Church.”

The relation of the soul and body of the one man, is the favorite illustration used by the papacy to convey her idea of the relation of the secular and spiritual estates of the one church.

“It is under the emblem of soul and body that the relation of the papal and imperial power is presented to us throughout the Middle Ages.

“The Pope as God’s vicar in matters spiritual, is to lead men to eternal life; the Emperor, as vicar in matters temporal, must so control them

in their dealings with one another that they may be able to pursue undisturbed the spiritual life, and thereby attain the supreme and common end of everlasting happiness.

“In the view of this object his chief duty is to maintain peace in the world, while towards the church his position is that of Advocate or Patron: a title borrowed from the practice adopted by churches and monasteries of choosing some powerful baron to protect their lands and lead their tenants to war.

“The functions of Advocacy are two-fold: at home to make the Christian people obedient to the priesthood, and to execute priestly decrees upon heretics and sinners; abroad to propagate the faith among the heathen, not sparing to use carnal weapons.

“Thus does the Emperor answer in every point to his antitype the Pope: his power being yet of a lower rank, created on the analogy of the papal as the papal had been modelled after the Elder Empire.

“The parallel holds good even in its details. For just as we have seen the churchman assuming the crown and robes of the secular prince, so now did he array the Emperor in his own ecclesiastical vestments, the stole and the dalmatic; gave him a clerical as well as a sacred character; removed his office from all narrowing associations of birth

or country; inaugurated him by rites every one of which was meant to symbolize and enjoin duties in their essence religious.

“Thus the Holy Roman Church and the Holy Roman Empire are one and the same thing, seen from different sides; and Catholicism, the principle of the universal Christian society, is also Romanism: that is, rests upon Rome as the origin and type of its universality; manifesting itself in a mystic dualism which corresponds to the two natures of its Founder.

“As divine and eternal, its head is the Pope, to whom souls have been entrusted; as human and temporal, the Emperor, commissioned to rule men’s bodies and acts.

“In nature and compass the government of these two potentates is the same, differing only in the sphere of its working. And it matters little whether we call the Pope a spiritual Emperor, or the Emperor a secular Pope.

“As God in the midst of the celestial hierarchy, rules blessed spirits in Paradise, so the Pope, His vicar, raised above priests, bishops, metropolitans, reigns over the souls of mortal men below.

“But as God is Lord of earth as well as of heaven, so must He be represented by a second earthly viceroy, the Emperor, whose authority shall be of and for this present life.

“Both alike claimed obedience on the ground that Truth is One, and that where there is One faith there must be One government.”

In the ceremony of the coronation of the Emperor in Rome, “the rites prescribed are rites of consecration to a religious office.

“The Emperor, besides the sword, globe, and sceptre of temporal power, receives a ring as the symbol of his faith, is ordained a sub-deacon, assists the Pope in celebrating mass, partakes as a clerical person of the communion in both kinds, is admitted a canon of St. Peter and St. John Lateran.

“The Emperor swears to cherish and defend the Holy Roman Church and her bishop.

“The Pope prays after the reading of the Gospel,

“ ‘Deus qui ad praedicandum aeterni regni evangelium Imperium Romanum praeparasti, praetendi famulo tuo Imperatori nostro arma coelestia’—God, who hast prepared the Roman Empire for the preaching of the gospel of the eternal kingdom, throw around thy servant, our Emperor, the armies of Heaven.”

When The Reformation began, that *practice* had been held before the eyes of all Europe for more than five hundred years; and that *theory* had been diligently inculcated upon the minds of all in Europe, generation after generation, for more than a thousand years.

When these facts are considered, some idea may be obtained as to how utterly foreign to the world in that age was any conception of the State as now known. It can be seen how completely *everything* was only the church.

And in it all stands the evidence complete that the contention of the Reformers was against the church only, and the prerogative, jurisdiction, power, authority, in matters of religion, faith, and conscience which they denied was *that of the church*.

This for the simple reason that as things then stood, *nothing but the church* was interfering with the rights of men in these things; and there was nothing there but *the church* to do it.

However, the Reformers clearly saw the distinction *and* the separation that should be made between the ecclesiastical and the civil power, and between religion and the State. They clearly made and proclaimed this distinction and separation, and steadily maintained it as one of the essential principles of The Reformation.

And this is how it is that "the people of the United States," making this the fundamental principle of their government, were truest of all people to The Reformation and to Christianity, *and so* "changed the face of the world."

But this blessed *result* of The Reformation never can be made the *ground* of The Reformation.

Ecclesiastics can not be allowed to shift *to the State* as the point of issue, the Reformers' denial of the exercise of authority in the things of religion, faith, and conscience, which pertained solely *to the church* because there was nothing else than the church involved in the issue.

And that which was the sole point of issue *then*, is the primary and only true point of issue *forever* in The Reformation.

That point of issue is that The Reformation principle, The Reformation itself, denies all exercise of authority by the church — any church — in the things of religion, faith, and conscience.

John Huss wrote a book on "The Church" embodying the splendid and Christian principles of the Bohemian Reformers as presented on pages 134-136 of this book. Yet it was charged that "he preached disrespect to the church and disregard to her power of punishing."

And in the Council of Constance, against that book on "The Church" it was charged that "through an endless multitude of arguments it attacked the papal *authority* and the plenitude of the papal *power*, as much as the Koran did the Catholic Faith."

What the Reformers did was to set the Word of God above the church, and require that *in everything* the church should be subject to that Word and follow it implicitly. Eph. 5: 24.

Then they maintained the right of the private judgment of each individual, in the reading and following of that Word under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

They therefore required that whenever and in all things whatsoever the church would correct them, she must do it by the plain Word of God and nothing else.

This at once stripped the church *as of herself* of all authority. It took her off the throne and set her in her native Christian place as subject to everybody's call in loving service and kindly helpfulness.

It was directly charged against Huss that he and his "party" "admitted no other authority than the sacred Scriptures, *explained in their own sense* and in contrariety with the doctrine of the church and of entire Christendom."

On the other hand it was held that those who stood for the church "were alone in possession of the truth, inasmuch as they agreed with the doctrine of the Roman church and of entire Christendom."

Therefore there was required of Huss "unconditional submission to the Roman Church."

This was carried to the point where, during the Council of Constance, it was actually said to Huss by a "doctor" of the Roman church: —

“If the Council declared that thou hadst but one eye, when thou hast two eyes, thou wouldst still be bound to submit to their decision.”

Oct. 31, 1517, Luther nailed up his theses. In August, 1518, the Pope commissioned his legate to examine into this affair in Germany. The legate called Luther to appear before him at Augsburg. October 7 Luther arrived there.

But the only terms offered or allowed were, “Submit unreservedly to the church,” “Retract.” The legate’s chief agent confidently assured Luther of the easy settlement of “the whole matter,” saying: —

“The whole matter may be summed up in six letters: **Re-vo-ca**” — Retract.

And when Luther stood before the legate himself the ultimatum laid down at the very first was the following: —

“**First**, You must **retract** your errors, propositions and discourses.

“**Secondly**, You must **promise** to abstain in future from circulating your opinions.

“**Thirdly**, You must **engage** to **avoid everything** that might grieve or **upset the church.**”

Luther replied: “I *protest* solemnly against the course which is sought to be given to this affair, and *against the strange pretension* of constraining me to retract *without having refuted me.*”

And in the Diet of Worms the word still was only, “Will you, or will you not, *retract?*”

Luther's Answer — The Reformation Answer — *was not* that he could not submit to the Emperor or the State because *the State* had no authority in religion; but that Answer then and forever *is* —

“I can not submit my faith either *to the Pope* or *to Councils*” — *the church*.

And “If I am not *disproved* by the *very passages* which I have quoted, and so bound in conscience to *submit to the Word of God*, I neither can nor will *retract anything*.”

That is The Reformation. That is The Reformation Religious Liberty. It is subjection, it is submission, to the authority of the Word of God only.

And this *without any* obtrusion, insinuation, administration, or dictation, of Pope or Councils: that is, of *the church — any church*.

Thus, for any one *now* to protest against *the State* having any jurisdiction in matters of religion and faith, while allowing and practicing the same thing in *the church*, is utterly wide of the mark and shows complete ignorance of what it is to be Protestant, and of what The Reformation ever meant.

And so says the Scripture in behalf of *The Church*, “*Not for that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy: for by faith ye stand.*” 2 Cor. 1:24.

Not only is this *stated* in the Scripture, but

in addition the full story of its actual working out is set down there for the instruction of all people forever.

The disciples and apostles in Jerusalem were all members of the church that had come down in direct descent from "the church in the wilderness." From the Lord they had learned truth which the officialdom of the church did not know.

Knowing this truth and the joy and power of it, these private members of the church spoke the truth which they knew.

Two of them were arrested by the church-officials, and they were brought before the church-council. There they were questioned "as to the power or authority by which men like them had done what they had."

Peter, "filled with the Holy Ghost," answered: "Leaders of the people and Councillors, . . . let me tell you all and all the people of Israel, that it is by the authority of Jesus Christ of Nazareth whom ye crucified and whom God raised from the dead."

The Council "commanded them not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus."

To this Peter, still filled with the Holy Ghost, replied: "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto *you* more than unto *God*, judge *ye*. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard."

The Council repeated the command with threats, and let them go. They went to the company of the rest of the disciples, and told all that the Council had said to them.

Not one of the whole company was willing for a moment to obey; nor to pause or parley as if there was a question involved. With them there was no *question* in the matter.

They simply all “with one accord” “lifted up their voice to God” and said, “*Lord, thou art God*” — this church-council is not God. “*Thou art God, which hast made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is.*”

“And now *Lord*, behold their threatenings; and grant unto thy servants that with all boldness they may speak thy Word.”

Lord, thou art God. This church-council is not God. And since they have put themselves in Thy place, we trust *Thee* to attend to *them* while *we* go straight on speaking Thy truth.

And the place where they were “was shaken,” and “they were all filled with the Holy Ghost and they spake the Word of God with boldness.”

Next, they were *all* arrested and were put in prison to be kept over night and to be brought next day again before the Council to answer for their disregard of the authority of the church.

But, behold, “The angel of the *Lord* came by night and opened the prison doors and brought

them forth and said: 'Go, stand and speak in the temple to the people all the words of this life.' And they entered into the temple early in the morning, and taught."

Yet they were again arrested and brought before the Council of "all the senate of the children of Israel." All the officialdom of the church was there.

The high priest demanded of them, "Did not we straitly command you that ye should not teach in this name? and behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine!"

The disciples calmly replied, "We ought to obey *God* rather than *men*."

The Council caused them to be beaten with the "forty stripes save one," commanded that they should not "speak in the name of Jesus," and let them go. "And in the temple and in every house they ceased not to teach and to preach Jesus Christ."

That story was written and set at the very threshold of the entrance of Christianity into the world, to teach to all churches and church-councils forever that no church has any right or authority to decide what any member of the church shall or shall not teach or preach.

And when any church or church-council even of "all the senate" of the church assumes any such authority, it usurps the prerogative of God

and puts itself in His place. And men, even churchmen, in the place of God never act like God.

The very existence of Christianity as a living religion in the world, turns upon the utter and careless disregard of the commands and "authority" of the official church-council of the day, by the original Christians: with God by miracles and angelic ministrations and gifts of the Holy Ghost endorsing and encouraging the "recusancy."

God had done the same thing in sustaining the three young men in their refusal to recognize any authority in religion, of the autocracy of King Nebuchadnezzar; and in sustaining Daniel in his refusal to recognize any authority in the realm of religion, of the government of the supremacy of *the law* of Medo-Persia.

And in this double lesson at the very beginning of Christianity there is made plain to all people forever that no command or prohibition of church or church-council touching religion or faith, is of any more weight or authority than the command of Nebuchadnezzar or the law of the Medes and Persians. God put them all on the same level, and set them all aside as the proud and empty and vain things which they all alike are.

Yet this essential truth of The Reformation and of Christianity, plain as it is from both, will be resented by the denominations today exactly as it was by the Jewish church at the beginning of

Christianity, and as it was by the Roman church at the time of The Reformation and as it is always.

These today will cry out as did Rome, "That would destroy all ecclesiastical order and organization!" and all the rest of the list on pages 245 and 246.

Thank the Lord it does destroy all of *that kind* of "ecclesiastical order and organization" — the human, the sinful, the papal, the antichristian. And it ought to be destroyed; for in truth it is nothing but *disorder* and *disorganization*, as to all that is the truly spiritual and divine.

That kind of "ecclesiastical order and organization" — only an outward, formal, and human, "unity" without the inward piety and purity of the divine life — is a curse to the world, and not a blessing. It has always proved itself so.

It is said that without that kind of "ecclesiastical order and organization," the churches, Christians, and even Christianity, itself, as to effectiveness in the world, would be only "a rope of sand."

The answer is that *without Christ* and the Holy Spirit dwelling supremely in the hearts of the church *members* and inhabiting the churches, they *ought to be* only a rope of sand.

God forbid that through denomination, federation, and confederation, they become a rope of Manila hemp or American steel, to bind and fetter liberty of thought and conscience after the same

old example of ecclesiastical "order and organization" from which The Reformation freed us.

But in The Reformation order — the Christian and divine order—wherein the Holy Spirit and the living Christ and the loving Father dwell in the heart and rule the life of each individual believer and inhabit the churches of *these individuals*, by the divine fervor the separate particles of clean and sparkling sand are molten into a sea of glass mingled with fire upon which stand the ransomed of the Lord having the harps of God, singing the song of eternal redemption.

Beyond all question this Religious Liberty that is freedom from the exercise of any authority by *the church* in religion or faith, is the Religious Liberty of The Reformation.

Equally beyond question, it is the Religious Liberty of original Christianity.

It is also beyond question that it is the Religious Liberty that is in the very two words that express it.

Religion is "the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it."

Liberty is "the state of being exempt from the domination of others, or from restricting circumstances: the power in any rational agent to make his choices and decide his conduct for himself, spontaneously and voluntarily, in accordance with reasons or motives."

Religious Liberty, therefore, is man's being exempt from the domination of others, and from restricting circumstances: man's freedom to make his choices and decide his conduct for himself, spontaneously and voluntarily, in accordance with reasons or motives: in the duty which he owes to the Creator, and in the manner of discharging that duty.

The Reformation and Christian principle of the total separation of religion and the State, established by "the people of the United States" as the fundamental principle of their supreme law. "changed the face of the world."

Let The Reformation and Christian principle of Religious Liberty be established by Christians as the fundamental principle of church order, and it will change the face of The Church as in the world.

And this, in turn, and from America will again and in infinitely grander measure *change the face of the world.*

CHAPTER XV.

THE REFORMATION AND THE PAPACY.

Every one of the men by whom The Reformation came, said that the papacy is Antichrist.

They said that the Pope is Antichrist, even the "chief Antichrist."

Yet he is not this only *as a man*, nor only as *a bishop*, nor even as *Pope of himself*; but because of his being the center and head of that body, that system — that hierarchical *thing* — that is composed of the many antichrists, which is *more* than the Pope, and by which even the Pope is more than only himself, and more than otherwise even *he* would be.

They said that there are many antichrists. Yet these are not allowed singly and of themselves to work their opposition to Christ. But under the moving of the great spirit of the original and ultimate Antichrist who is Satan, these many antichrists are manipulated, bound together, and centralized, so that the more readily they all can be swung by the one master-spirit against all that is of Christ.

And all of this in *the name of Christ!* all these passing as Christians! So that Antichrist is not composed of all the wicked *as such* — Pagans, Jews, Mohammedans — but is composed of all

possible of the wicked who, *without* change of heart, *without* the Spirit of Christ, can be brought under the *name* of Christian.

Therefore, this organized Antichrist is Satan's crowning work in the world against Christ.

This brief digest will enable the reader more readily to catch the thought of the words of the Reformers now to be given.

Wicklif said of the Pope: "He is ever taking money out of our land, and sends nothing back but God's curse for his simony, and some accursed clerk of Antichrist to rob the land still more for wrongful privileges."

Of the double-headed papacy, he said: "Trust we in the help of Christ on this point; for He hath begun already to help us graciously, in that He hath clove the head of Antichrist and made the two parts fight one against the other.

"Let the rival pontiffs continue to launch their anathemas against each other, or should one of them prevail, in either case a severe wound has been inflicted.

"And so God would no longer suffer the fiend to reign in only *one* such priest, but for the sin which they had done made division among *two*; so that men, in Christ's name, may the more easily overcome them both:

"The Pope is not on Christ's side, who put His soul for the sheep; but on the side of Antichrist,

who putteth many souls for his pride. This man feedeth not the sheep of Christ, as Christ thrice commanded Peter; but spoileth them and slayeth them and leadeth them many wrong ways.

“Why is not the proud priest in Rome willing to grant full pardon to all men when they live in peace, charity, and patience, as he grants it to all who will engage in the work of destroying Christians?”

The Pope cited him to Rome to answer the charge of heresy. He replied: “So far as it depends on myself, I am ready to go to Rome: but Christ has bid me do the contrary, and taught me to obey God rather than man. And I hope of our Pope, that he will be no Antichrist nor act in direct contradiction to the will of Christ; for if he cites me against reason, and this unreasonable citation is followed up, then he is an open Antichrist.

‘Therefore we pray God in behalf of our Pope Urban VI, that *His* holy purpose of old may not be hindered and frustrated by the fiend.’”

“The Pope is the chief Antichrist, for he himself pretends that he is the most immediate vicar of Christ and most resembling Him in life; and, consequently, the most humble pilgrim, the poorest man, and the farthest removed from worldly men and worldly things: when, however, the fact generally is that he stands first in the opposite sins.”

Militz surveyed the realm of the papacy, in

which "every description of vice and oppression" abounded. Then he said: "When I considered all this, I said to the Spirit, which spake within me, Who is Antichrist?"

"And he answered, There are many antichrists. He who denies Christ, and the authority of Christ, is an antichrist. And as many who say they know Him, deny Him by their works; while others deny Him by keeping still and not daring to confess Him and the truth of His cause before men; conclude from this who is Antichrist."

All of this was so plain to Miltiz, and the way of the truth of God that delivers from it all, was also so plain and so good, that he thought that the Roman church, and especially the Pope, would be glad to know it and to take the way of deliverance.

Therefore He went all the way from Prague to the City of Rome "to testify first of all in the ancient seat of the papacy and the chief city of Christendom concerning the revelation of Antichrist and the preparation for Christ's second coming."

When he had waited in Rome a month for the Pope to come from Avignon, and still he did not come, Miltiz "caused a notification to be posted up at the entrance of St. Peter's church, that on a certain day he would there make his public appearance and address the assembled multitude and announce the coming of Antichrist."

He was waylaid and captured by the Inquisition, and so was prevented from delivering his address at the time announced. Loaded with chains he was delivered to the Order of the Franciscans to be kept in close confinement.

His Christian demeanor in the prison so softened his keepers that after he had been there a long time he was asked what it was that he was going to speak that day in St. Peter's. He asked that paper, pen, and ink, be given him, and he would write it all out.

This was done, and his fetters were removed. Then he wrote down what he had intended to say. And strangest of all he was actually allowed to speak it all publicly in the great church of St. Peter's. There, "before a large assembly of prelates and learned men he delivered a discourse in Latin, which produced a great impression."

Then he was taken back to the prison. And there, in his own words, "a prisoner in chains, troubled in spirit, longing for the freedom of Christ's Church," he wrote a work "On the Antichrist."

By some miracle of God's care he was released from prison by the Inquisition! He returned safely to Prague. Several bulls were issued against him by the Pope from Avignon. In 1374 he went to Avignon, and died there while his case was pending.

Matthias wrote: "The Lord Jesus instructed me how to write all this which relates to the present condition of priests, that is, the carnal ones, and which throws light on the character of these times. But what the end is in which all this is to result, He only knows who set me to work.

"And He sent me: His Spirit, who shoots the fire into my bones and into my heart, leaving me no rest till I expose the son of iniquity and perdition, and lay bare the hidden shame of the mother of harlots." Jer. 20:9; 2 Thess. 2:3.

"It is one of the cunning tricks of the arch-enemy to persuade men that Antichrist is still to come: when, in truth, he is now present and so has been for a long time. But men are less on their guard against him, when they look for him as yet to come.

"Lest the abomination of desolation should be plainly manifest to men, he has invented the fiction of another abomination still to come: that the church, plunged still deeper in error, may pay homage to the fearful abomination which is present, while she pictures to herself another which is still in the future.

"It is a common, every-day fact, that antichrists go forth in endless numbers, and still they are looking forward for some other and future Antichrist.

"It is not to be imagined that Antichrist will

form a particular sect, or particular disciples and apostles. Nor will he come upon the church preaching his own name, in the open and obvious manner with which Mohammed spread abroad his doctrines. That would be a tyranny too strikingly apparent: not at all fitted to deceive mankind.

“Antichrist must be more cunning than all that. *His* organs must stand forth in the name of Christ, and profess to be His ministers. He is thus to deceive men under the mask of Christianity.

“The multitude of carnal men, led on by the most subtle artifices of wicked spirits, have been brought to think that, in following fables, they are pursuing the right way; to believe that in persecuting Christ’s believers, or Christ and His power, they are persecuting Antichrist and the false doctrines of his agents.

“Just as it happened with those Jews and Pagans who called Christ a deceiver, and put Him and His apostles to death, supposing that by so doing they did God service; thus too the actual Antichrists will dream of another Antichrist to come.

“An antichrist is every evil spirit, who in any way, directly or indirectly, opposes himself to the Christian faith, and Christian manners among Christians.

“Although Christ is eternal, and therefore all opposition to the divine being is in a certain sense opposition to Christ, still, in the proper sense, there was no Antichrist before the Incarnation.

“Hence the devil, although a liar and murderer from the beginning, first began to be Christ’s murderer and Antichrist at the beginning of the Christian Church. Yet then not everywhere, but only in The Church which is the Body and kingdom of Christ.

“Before the time of Christ’s appearance, Satan did not need many arts to maintain his dominion over men. For he had already brought mankind once under his yoke; and strongly armed, he kept watch over his palace; his goods were in peace, and he needed not give himself much trouble or use much deception. Luke 11:21.

“But when Christ appeared, and the Spirit was poured out in seven-fold gifts; when everything visible and invisible was made ministrant to their salvation; the case was altered. Luke 11:22.

“And as the evil spirit was now disarmed and laid bare by Christ, Satan must summon to his aid the collective host of most malignant spirits and employ their busy and cunning natures in the work of deceiving and warring against the saints of God. Rev. 12, 13.

“And so he has continued to do, down to the present day. Nothing is more imbecile than Satan when exposed to the light. He works through worthless monks, carnal priests, the wise of this world, great teachers; for these are his most efficient tools of mischief.

“In these times also, Antichrist deceives and draws men to himself by false miracles: wonders wrought by Satanic agency, thus turning the love of the miraculous to his own ends. But Satan and his instruments are allowed to perform miracles by demoniacal agencies, on account of them that perish because they would not receive the love of the truth. Rev. 16:14; 13:14; 2 Thess. 2:9, 10.

“They who are apostles and preachers of Antichrist, oppress the apostles, the wise men, and prophets of Christ: persecuting them in various ways, and boldly asserting that these ministers of Christ are heretics, hypocrites, and antichrists.

“And since many and mighty members of Antichrist go forth in a countless variety of ways, they persecute the members of Christ who are few and weak, compelling them to go from one city to another by driving them from the synagogues and excluding them from the fellowship of the church.

“As to the *person* of Antichrist, he will not be a Jew, nor a Pagan; neither a Saracen, nor a worldly tyrant persecuting Christendom. All

these have been already: hence they could not so easily deceive. Satan must invent some new method of attacking Christianity.

“*He is and will be* a man who opposes Christian truth and the Christian life in the way of deception.

“*He is and will be* the most wicked Christian: falsely styling himself by that name;

“assuming the highest station in the church, and possessing the highest consideration, arrogating dominion over all ecclesiastics and laymen;

“one who, by the working of Satan, knows how to make subservient to his own ends and to his own will the corporations of the rich and wise in the entire church;

“one who has the preponderance in honors and in riches, but who especially misappropriates the goods of Christ—the Holy Scriptures, the sacraments, and all that belongs to the hopes of religion, to his own aggrandizement and to the gratification of his own passions;

“deceitfully perverting spiritual things to carnal ends, and in a crafty and subtle manner employing what was designed for the salvation of a Christian people, as means to lead them astray from the truth and power of Christ.”

One of the charges that the Roman church brought against Huss was that he “styled Rome the seat of Antichrist.”

When Bethlehem Chapel was closed against his preaching, Huss said: "Nothing else can be at the bottom of this but the jealousy of Antichrist."

In a list of fifty-one articles drawn up against Wicklif and Huss — though Wicklif had been dead more than a quarter of a century — it was declared: —

"That in **these** days, to suppose that Great Antichrist is present and rules, who, according to the faith of the church, and according to Holy Scripture, and the holy teachers, shall appear at the end of the world, is shown by experience to be a manifest error."

Huss said: "The goose must flap her wings against the wings of behemoth, and against the tail which always conceals the abominations of Antichrist. The Lord will reduce the tail and his prophets to nothing: i. e. the Pope and his prophets, the masters, teachers, and jurists, who under the hypocritical name of holiness, conceal the abominations of the beast.

"The papacy is the abomination of self-deification in the holy place. Woe then is me, if I do not preach of that abomination, if I do not weep over it, write about it."

In the Council of Constance, composed as it was of the church and all the States of Europe, he saw before his own eyes "fulfillment of the

prophecy of Revelation, that the kings of the earth would commit fornication with the great whore of Babylon — the corrupt church. For they have fallen away from Christ's truth, and embraced the lies of Antichrist; yielding to seduction, or to fear, or induced by the hope of an alliance, and of obtaining the power of this world."

Luther said, "The time of silence is past: the time for speaking has arrived. The mysteries of Antichrist must at length be unveiled.

"The Pope should be ready to renounce the popedom, and all his wealth, and all his honors, if he could thereby save a single soul. But he would see the universe go to destruction sooner than to yield a hairbreadth of his usurped power.

"The church of Rome, formerly the first in holiness, has become a den of robbers, a place of prostitution, a kingdom of death and hell: so that Antichrist himself, were he to appear, would be unable to increase the amount of wickedness. All this is as clear as day.

"I know that the Pope is Antichrist, and that his see is that of Satan himself.

"Two years ago I attacked indulgences; but with so much fear and indecision that I am now ashamed of it. . . . I denied that the papacy was of God; but I granted that it had the authority of man. Now after reading all the subtleties by which these sparks prop up their idol, I know

that the papacy is only the kingdom of Babylon, and the tyranny of the great hunter Nimrod.

“I therefore beg all my friends, and all booksellers, to burn the books which I wrote on this subject, and to substitute for them the single proposition: *The papacy is a general chase, by command of the Roman pontiff, for the purpose of running down and destroying souls.*”

These statements of the Reformers, strong as they are, were not uttered as mere blatant epithets, nor in resentment to pile up reproach.

Both from the circumstances and the writings of *all*, it is perfectly plain that all of it was spoken and written, out of an overwhelming conviction of truth that *could not be kept back*.

Also it was all said and written in genuineness of Christian solicitude, and in a longing that individuals and the church should be delivered from an enormous evil.

Remember Wicklif, praying for the Pope whom he must denounce.

See Miltiz, making that long journey to Rome and patiently enduring unjust and cruel imprisonment only for the privilege to tell at the place where it was most needed what was in his heart.

See Huss, persecuted and pursued to his death at the stake yet weeping as he tells this truth, and under the “Woe is me” if he does not tell it.

Matthias’s every sentence witnesses of the deep

conviction that called it forth, and shows that it was but the setting forth of the truth of the Scriptures under the pressure of the Spirit of God.

Luther's sledge-hammer blows are but the result of his mighty assurance from the study of the Scriptures that "the reign of Antichrist predicted and described in the Bible is the papacy."

What particular Scriptures were these that so moved upon all alike? — They were the Scriptures in Daniel 7 and 8 touching the "little horn." 2 Thess. 2: 1-10; Rev. 13 and 17.

In Daniel 7 the prophet saw four great beasts in succession coming up out of the sea — a lion, with eagle's wings; a bear with three ribs in his mouth; a leopard with four wings; and the "fourth beast dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly, having great iron teeth and nails of brass, devouring and breaking in pieces and stamping the residue with his feet."

These symbolized in their succession, the world-empires of Babylon, Medo-Persia, Grecia, and Rome.

The fourth beast had ten horns. These represent the Ten Kingdoms into which the territory of Rome proper — Western Rome — was divided; and in which, except England, many of the laws and much of the spirit of Rome were continued.

While the prophet was considering these ten horns, he saw come up among them "another Lit-

tle Horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots: and behold! in this Horn were eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking very great things," and his "look was more stout than his fellows." Vs. 8, 19, 20.

This Horn continued through "a time and times and the dividing of time" — 1260 years — and even till the judgment was set and the books were opened and his dominion was taken away to consume and to destroy it even unto the end. Vs. 9, 10, 25, 26.

And all this time this Horn

"made war with the saints, and

"prevailed against them;

"*until* the Ancient of days came, and

"judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and

"the time came that the saints possessed the Kingdom." Vs. 21, 22.

He spoke "great words against the Most High," he

wore out the saints of the Most High, and

thought even "to change times and *the Law*" of the Most High. Vs. 25.

In view of only the preceding chapters of this book, can any one fail to see that the "Little Horn" symbolizes the papacy? Isn't that plain

enough? And the fuller the history should be written or read, the plainer this would be.

In the description of the closing of the career of the "Little Horn," there is a remarkable change of expression. The prophet says: "I beheld even till the beast was slain and his body destroyed and given to the burning flame." V. 11.

He was considering only the "Little Horn" and is telling only what the "Little Horn" did and of the destruction that finally came to the "Little Horn." Yet when the doom came, the word is *not* that the "Little Horn" was destroyed and given to the burning flame, *but* that "the *beast* was slain and *his* body destroyed and given to the burning flame."

This tells most forcibly that the "Little Horn" is only another phase of what is symbolized in the "great and terrible beast:" that the "Little Horn" is but a variant form of the manifestation of the beast: that the beast and the "Little Horn" are in essence one — so entirely one that the destruction of the "Little Horn" is the destruction of "the beast."

This is confirmed, and the application made unmistakable, by latter Rome, the papacy, herself.

Leo the Great was Pope A. D. 440—461: in the very time when former Rome was falling rapidly to ruin. And this Pope declared in a sermon, that —

The former Rome was but the promise of the latter Rome: that the glories of the former Rome were to be reproduced in the latter Rome; that Romulus and Remus were but the forerunners of Peter and Paul: that the successors of Romulus therefore were the precursors of the successors of Peter: and as the former Rome had ruled the world, so the latter Rome by the see of the holy blessed Peter must dominate the earth.

This conception of Leo's was never lost from the papacy. And when, only fifteen years afterward, Rome *as such* had perished, and only the papacy survived the ruin and firmly held place and power in Rome, this ambitious conception was only the more strongly, and with the more assurance, held and asserted.

That conception was also intentionally and systematically developed. The Scriptures were industriously studied and ingeniously perverted to sustain it.

By a perverse continuance of the Mosaic order, the authority and eternity of the Roman priesthood had already been established. And now by perverse deductions "from the New Testament, the authority and eternity of Rome herself was established."

Upon the ground that the papacy is the only true continuation of original Rome, she asserted that wherever in the New Testament the authority of original Rome is recognized or referred to, *the Papacy is now meant; because she is the true continuation of original Rome.*

Accordingly, where the New Testament enjoins submission to "the higher powers," "the powers that be," or obedience to "governors," it *now* means the papacy; because the only powers or governors that *then* were, were the Roman, and the papal power is the true continuation of *that* power to which all are by the Scriptures commanded to "be subject."

"Every passage was seized on where submission to the powers that be is enjoined; every instance cited where obedience had actually been rendered to the imperial officials: special emphasis being laid on the sanction which Christ Himself had given to the Roman dominion, by pacifying the world through Augustus, by being born at the time of the taxing, by paying tribute to Cæsar, by saying to Pilate, 'Thou couldst have no power at all against Me except it were given thee from above'." — *Bryce*.*

And since Christ the Lord had recognized, and submitted to, the power and authority of Rome,

* "Holy Roman Empire," chap. vii, par. 17.

as represented in Pilate the governor, then who could dare to deny the power, or disregard the authority, of the papacy which is the true continuance of that power and authority to which had submitted even the Lord from heaven!

It was only the logical extension of this argument to its culmination of assumption, when Pope Boniface VIII pronounced *ex cathedra*:—

“We therefore assert, define, and pronounce, that it is necessary to salvation to believe that every human being is subject to the Pontiff of Rome.”

By this industrious insistence that *she* is the continuance of original Rome, the papacy has fastened upon herself beyond all escaping, that in fulfillment *she* is the power that is symbolized in the “Little Horn” of the prophecy of Daniel.

And than this no further *proof* is needed. All that remains is to set down the specifications; for the application is unmistakably fixed by the Roman church herself.

In Daniel 8 the prophet saw a ram having two high horns: one of them higher than the other, and this one coming up last. This, the angel said plainly, means the kingdoms of Media and Persia.

Next he saw a he-goat coming from the west. He came so swiftly that “he touched not the ground.” He came to the ram, brake his two horns, cast him down to the ground, and stamped upon him. The goat had a notable horn between

his eyes. Presently this horn was broken, and in place of it came up "four notable ones toward the four winds of heaven."

Of this the angel said, "The rough goat is the king of Grecia; and the great horn between his eyes is the first king" — Alexander the Great. "Now that being broken, whereas four stood up for it, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation, but not in power." Vs. 5-8, 21, 22.

Next the prophet saw that out of one of these four, there "came forth a Little Horn, which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land." This "Little Horn" *too* continues till the end, and is "broken without hand." Vs. 9, 25.

These three chief symbols — the ram, the goat, and the "Little Horn," correspond to the last three of the four great beasts of chapter 7: Babylon having passed away when this vision was given.

The "Little Horn" in chapter 8 corresponds to the "Little Horn" and the beast of chapter 7. And *as* in chapter 7 the "Little Horn" and the beast are the manifestation of Rome in its ancient and modern phases, *so* in chapter 8 the "Little Horn" includes the manifestation of Rome in both these phases. For all that Rome was in the former phase, continues and is intensified in the latter phase.

And here is what Rome is always:—

- “A king of fierce countenance, and
“understanding dark sentences.
“His power mighty, but not by his own power.
“He shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper
and practice.
“He shall destroy the mighty and the holy people.
“Through his policy also,
“he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand.
“He shall magnify himself in his heart, and
“By peace shall destroy many.
“He magnified himself even to the Prince of the
host.
“By him the daily [of the Prince of the host] was
taken away, and
“the place of His sanctuary was cast down.
“An host was given him against the daily [of the
Prince of the host],
“by reason of transgression, and
“it cast down the truth to the ground, and
“it practiced and prospered.
“The transgression of desolation,
“to give both the sanctuary and the host to be
trodden under foot.”
“He shall also stand up against the Prince of
princes; but
“he shall be broken without hand.” Vs. 23-25,
11-13.

In further explanation the angel calls it “the abomination of desolation” and says that “The people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary” of Jerusalem; that the “overspreading of abominations” would be “even until the consummation;” and that then that which is determined shall be poured upon the desolator.” Dan. 9: 26, 27; 11: 31; 12: 11.

It is true that Josephus applies this prophecy to Antiochus Epiphanes who was king of Syria and subject to Rome, B. C. 175-164. It is true also that Josephus was a Jew. But it does not follow that he understood the Scriptures. There never was a people in the world, who had the Scriptures at all, who had less understanding of them than had the Jews.

Besides, we have the plain word of two Jews who *did* understand the Scriptures; and both of these show that it has no reference whatever to Antiochus Epiphanes.

The first of these is Jesus the Messiah. In His discourse on the then soon coming destruction of Jerusalem, and telling His disciples how to know when to escape, He said: "When ye shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains." Matt. 24: 15, 16.

And what the abomination of desolation was He makes plain by saying, "When ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. Then let them which are in Judea flee to the mountains." Luke 21: 20, 21.

The armies that compassed, destroyed, and desolated, Jerusalem were the armies of Rome. This therefore makes it certain that Rome was

then the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet. And *that* Rome being continued and intensified in the papacy, this makes it certain that in the papacy there is continued and intensified “the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet.”

The second of these Jews who certainly understood the Scriptures was Paul. At Thessalonica, in a synagogue of the Jews, “three Sabbath days” in succession Paul “reasoned with them out of the Scriptures, opening and alleging, that Jesus must needs have suffered and risen again from the dead; and that this Jesus whom I preach unto you is Christ.

“And some of them believed, and consorted with Paul and Silas; and of the devout Greeks a great multitude, and of the chief women not a few.” To these, Paul wrote the first letter to the Thessalonians.

In this letter he wrote so personally of the coming of the Lord — “*we which are alive and remain* unto the coming of the Lord,” “*we which are alive and remain*” — that, not well remembering what he had preached when present, they began to suppose that the coming of the Lord was to be expected in their very day while they were personally alive and remaining.

To correct this mistake, Paul wrote the second letter to the Thessalonians, saying, “Now we be-

seech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto Him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as the day of Christ is at hand.

“Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.

“Remember ye not that when I was yet with you I told you these things?” That is to say, that all of this Paul had preached to them while he was at Thessalonica those three Sabbath days. In that preaching he “reasoned with them out of the Scriptures.” The only Scriptures that were then written, were the Old Testament Scriptures.

In the Old Testament Scriptures, then, Paul found, and from those Scriptures he preached, that word concerning the falling away and the revealing of the man of sin, the son of perdition, and that manifestation of self-exaltation above all that is called God or that is worshipped, so that *a man* would pass himself off for *God!*

Where, then, in the Old Testament Scriptures did Paul find this? — Just where Jesus found it: that is, in the book of “Daniel the prophet.” Note

the parallels in Paul's words with those in the book of Daniel.

Daniel: "an host was given him by reason of *transgression*," "the *transgression* of desolation."

Paul: "that man of *sin*;" for *sin* is *transgression*. 1 John 3:4.

Daniel: "he shall think to *change the Law*" — of the Most High, thus putting himself above all law and making himself independent of God.

Paul: "*that Wicked*" — "*the Lawless one*."

Daniel: "he shall *destroy* wonderfully," "he shall *destroy*," "by *peace* shall *destroy*."

Paul: "the son of *perdition*" — because perdition is "utter destruction."

Daniel: "he *magnified* himself."

Paul: "*exalteth* himself."

Daniel: "magnified himself *even unto the Prince of the host*."

Paul: "exalteth himself *above all that is called God*."

Daniel: "he shall *stand up*" — reign — "against the Prince of princes."

Paul: "*opposeth* himself *above all that is called God*."

Daniel: "understanding *dark sentences*:" "through his *policy* he shall cause *craft* to prosper in his hand."

Paul: "the *mystery* of iniquity."

Daniel: "he shall be broken *without hand*,"
"given to the *burning flame*."

Paul: "whom *the Lord* shall *consume* with the Spirit of His mouth, and *destroy* with the *brightness of His coming*."

From this series of unquestionable parallels it is plain beyond all fair question that when Paul wrote 2 Thess. 2: 3-8, his mind was on the seventh and eighth chapters of "Daniel the prophet;" and that it was from these chapters that he "told these things" when he was at Thessalonica.

And from the specifications given, it is equally plain that the prophecy is fulfilled in Rome alone: and in Rome in its latter phase, *more* than in its former: that latter Rome only intensified all of the essential characteristics of the former.

This is seen yet more fully in others of the specifications: for Paul did not by any means exhaust the list.

Note in the list, the statement of the dealing of the Little Horn power with the sanctuary and ministry of the Prince of the host.

The "daily" of the Prince of the host" was taken away and the place of His sanctuary was cast down;" both "the sanctuary and the host" of the Prince of the host was by this power "trodden under foot;" and "it cast down the truth to the ground."

And these heavenly and divine things were all "taken away," "cast down," and "trodden under foot," by that horrible power, *in order* to "place the abomination that maketh desolate." Dan. 11:31.

What, then, is the meaning of all this? Here is the word in which it all centres: "*We have such an Highpriest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens, a minister of the sanctuary and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched and not man.*" Heb. 8:1, 2.

On earth there was a sanctuary which *man* made, and which *man* pitched. This sanctuary was made and pitched by men under the particular directions of the word of the Lord, and through wisdom specially bestowed for the purpose. Ex. 31:2-11.

Nevertheless, that sanctuary was far different from the sanctuary and true tabernacle "*not made with hands*" and "*which the Lord pitched, and not man*" — as far different as is the work of *man* from the work of *God*.

That "worldly sanctuary" was never anything but "a figure." And as only a figure, it was a figure only "for the time then present." In it priests and highpriests ministered and offered both gifts and sacrifices.

But all this priesthood, ministry, gift, and sac-

rifice, *equally with the sanctuary*, was only “a figure for the time then present” till “*Christ being come an Highpriest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood He entered in once into the holy place having obtained eternal redemption for us.*” Heb. 9: 9-12.

Thus Christ was the true substance and meaning of all the priesthood and service in the sanctuary on earth. Any part of it that ever passed without this as its meaning was simply meaningless.

And as certainly as Christ is the true High-priest of Christianity, of whom the Levitical high-priest was a figure; so certainly the sanctuary of which Christ is minister *is the sanctuary of Christianity*, of which the earthly sanctuary of the Mosaic order was a figure.

And so it is written: “*If He were on earth He should not be a priest, seeing, that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law: who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle; for see, said He, that thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the Mount.*” Heb. 8: 4, 5.

“It was therefore necessary that the patterns

of *things in the heavens* should be purified with these [animal sacrifices]; but the *heavenly things themselves* with *better sacrifices* than these" — even the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ.

"For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into *heaven itself*, now to appear in the presence of God for us. *Nor* yet that He should offer himself *often*, as the highpriest entereth into the holy place every year with the blood of others.

"For then he must 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. 9:23-26.

And in "heaven itself" in all Christian times there is seen the throne of God, and a golden altar, and an angel with a golden censer offering incense *with the prayers of all saints*. "And the smoke of the incense, which came *with the prayers of the saints* ascended up before God out of the angel's hand." Rev. 8:3, 4.

Also in all Christian times there is seen in "heaven itself" "the temple of God," and "in His temple the ark of His testament." Also there is seen there, "seven lamps of fire burning before the throne." There too is seen "one like unto the Son of man" clothed in the high-priestly garment. Rev. 11:19; 15:5-8; 4:5; 1:13.

Therefore, the earthly sanctuary was not a fig-

ure for the time then present, in the sense of a type of something to come that did not yet exist; but it was a figure for the time then present, in the sense of a *visible* representation of that which *then existed* but was *invisible*, to train them up in experience and faith to a true spirituality in which they could *see* the *invisible*.

By all this, God was revealing to men forever that it is by the spiritual Highpriesthood, ministry, and service, of Christ in the true sanctuary or temple *in heaven*, that God dwells with men.

He was revealing that in this faith of Jesus, forgiveness of sins and atonement is ministered to men: so that God dwells in them and walks in them, and thus they be separated from all the people that are on the face of the earth—separated unto God as His own true sons and daughters to be built up *unto perfection* in the knowledge and righteousness of God. Ex. 33:15, 16; 2 Cor. 6:16-18; 7:1.

This true Priesthood, ministry, and sanctuary, of *Christ in heaven* is too plain in the New Testament to be by any possibility denied. Yet it is a thing very little if at all thought of by professed Christians; and a thing almost unknown, and hardly believed, in the Christian world today.

Why is this? how came it about?—It is because that “the man of sin,” the “Little Horn” power “spoken of by Daniel the prophet,” *took*

away the daily ministrations of Christ the Prince of the host, cast it down, and gave both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot.

In Daniel 8:11-13; 11:31; and 12:11, it will be noticed that in both the King James and Revised versions there is a supplied word after the word "daily." In the King James the supplied word is "sacrifice," in the Revised it is "burnt-offering." And in either case, the word is wholly supplied; for in that place in the Hebrew there is no word at all.

In the Hebrew the only word that stands there is the word "*tamid*" that in the King James version is translated "daily," and in the Revised is translated "continual."

In these places the word "daily" or "continual" does not refer to the daily *sacrifice* or *burnt-offering* any more than it refers to any other part of the daily ministry or continual service of the sanctuary, of which the *sacrifice* or *burnt-offering* was only a part.

The word *tamid* in itself signifies "continuous or continual," "constant," "stable," "sure," "constantly," "evermore." Only such words as these express the thought of the Hebrew word that in these places in Daniel is translated "daily." In Numbers 28 and 29 alone, the word is used seventeen times in reference to the *continual service in the sanctuary*.

And it is this daily continual ministration of Christ the true High Priest “who continueth ever” and “who is consecrated forevermore” in “an unchangeable priesthood” — it is this continual ministry of Christ, that the “man of sin” — the “Little Horn” power — *has taken away* from men.

It is this sanctuary and true tabernacle in which Christ the only true High Priest exercises His *continual ministry*, that has been cast down by this “transgression of desolation.”

It is this ministry and this sanctuary of Christ that the “man of sin” has taken away from the knowledge of men and shut away from the world, and has cast down to the ground and stamped upon. And in place of it the mystery of iniquity has set up her own self and her own invention — “the abomination that maketh desolate.”

And thus, what the former Rome did physically to the visible or earthly sanctuary which was the “figure of the true” (Dan. 9:26, 27; Matt. 24:15), *that* the latter Rome has done spiritually to the invisible or heavenly sanctuary that is itself “the true.”

In preceding chapters there has been told how that the bishops, presbyters and deacons, of the order of “the clergy” were made to be the continuation of the highpriest, the priests, and the Levites, of the Mosaic order. In that same connection, and to fit that perverse invention, the Lord’s Supper

was made to be a "sacrifice" so that this new "priesthood" should "have somewhat also to offer." Heb. 8:3.

Now by every evidence of Scripture it is certain that *in the order of God* it is Christ and His ministry and sanctuary *in heaven*, and *this only*, that in truth was ever the object of the Mosaic order, and that is truly the Christian succession to that order.

Therefore when in and by the apostasy the system of bishops as highpriests, presbyters as priests, deacons as Levites, and the Supper as a sacrifice, was insinuated as the Christian succession to the Mosaic order, *this of itself* was nothing else than to put this false system of the apostasy in the place of the order of Christ and of God, was completely to shut out the true, and, finally, to cast it down to the ground and stamp upon it.

And this is how it is that this great Christian truth of the priesthood, ministry, and sanctuary, of Christ *in heaven* is not known to the professed Christian world today. The "Little Horn" power has taken it away, as Daniel foresaw.

The mystery of iniquity has hid this great truth from the churches and the world during all these ages in which the man of sin has held place in the world and passed itself off as God, and its iniquitous host as the church of God.

And yet even the man of sin, the mystery of iniquity, itself bears witness to the necessity of such a ministry in The Church in behalf of men. For though he has taken away from men the priesthood, ministry and sanctuary of Christ, and has hid these all from the eyes of the Christian world; yet he did not throw away *the idea*.

He threw away *the true*, and cast down *the true* to the ground. But, *retaining the idea*, in the place of the true he built up in his own realm an utterly false structure. He did not put away the true to exclude the idea; but only to put himself and his falsity in the place of the true.

In the place of the Priesthood of the true and divine High Priest of God's own appointment *in heaven*, he has substituted a human, sinful, and sinning, priesthood of his own *on earth*.

In the place of the *continual* heavenly ministry of Christ in His true Priesthood upon His true sacrifice, he has substituted only an interval ministry of a human, earthly, sinful, and sinning, priesthood, in the once-a-day "daily sacrifice of the mass."

In the place of "the sanctuary and the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man," he has substituted his own meeting places of wood and stone, to which he applies the term "sanctuary," with its "altar," and "sacrifice," and incense, and "priestly office."

Instead of the *one* continual High Priest, the *one* continual ministry, and the *one* continual sanctuary, of Him who "ever liveth to make intercession for us" in "an unchangeable Priesthood" of the "oath of God," and which is the only true, he has devised of his own heart and substituted for the only true, many "highpriests," many ministries, many sacrifices, and many "sanctuaries," *on earth*, and which in every possible relation are only human and utterly false.

And *it can never take away sin*. No earthly priesthood, no earthly sacrifice, no earthly ministry or service in any earthly sanctuary, can ever take away sin.

In the book of Hebrews it is repeatedly declared that even the priesthood, ministry, sacrifice, and service, in the sanctuary, which *the Lord Himself* ordained and established *on earth*, *never took away sin*. The word of Inspiration is that they never *did* take away sin, and that they never *could* take away sin. Heb. 9:9; 10:1-4, 11.

It is only the Priesthood and ministry of Christ in His own Person that can ever take away sin. And this is a priesthood and a ministry *in heaven*, and of a sanctuary that is *in heaven*. And it is written that even "if *He were on earth*, He should not be a priest."

Thus so certainly, by plain word and abundant illustration, God has demonstrated that no *earthly*

priesthood, sacrifice, or ministry, can ever take away sin.

Therefore by the plain word of the Lord it is certain that the priesthood, the ministry, the "sacrifice," and the "sanctuary," that the papacy has set up and operates on earth can never take away sin; but, instead, only perpetuates sin, is a fraud, an imposture, and the very "transgression and abomination of desolation" in the holy place.

By thinking to "change the Law" of the Most High, as far as in him lies the man of sin has taken away that Law from being the Law of God, and has made it his own law which is just no law at all. Thus as far as lies in him he has taken away *the Law*.

By taking away the sanctuary, the Priesthood, and the ministrations, of Christ, as far as in him lies he has taken away *the Gospel*.

By taking away *the Law*, he has taken from men the means of the knowledge of *sin*.

By taking away *the Gospel*, he has taken away from men the means of *salvation from sin*.

Taking away from men the means of both the *knowledge of sin* and of *salvation from sin*, this is *desolation*.

Putting in the place of the Law of God and the Gospel of Christ, only the vain and sinful invention of forms and ceremonies as the way of salvation, *this is abomination*. Isa. 1:13.

These two together plainly show the Roman system to be the fulness of "the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet."

There is one specification of the prophecy that remains to be more fully noticed. That is, "his power shall be mighty, but *not by his own power.*"

The power of the papacy is more than only human or the power of men. Yet it is not divine. It is the opposite of the divine; for he "*opposeth* all that is called God."

The source of this mysterious "power" is clearly given in Revelation. In the twelfth chapter there is described "a great red dragon" standing ready to devour Christ the "man-child" as soon as He was born.

And when that "child was caught up unto God and to His throne" the dragon persecuted His Church.

The actual governmental world-power that thus wrought against Christ at His birth and onward, was the Roman empire as represented first in Herod the king and Pilate the governor.

Herod's power was as truly the Roman as was that of Pilate. For, though Herod was an Indu-mean — a descendent of Esau — it was by a vote of the Roman senate, upon the special advocacy of Antony supported by Octavius, that he was made king: and this most unexpectedly to himself.

And even when thus made king *in Rome*, he

never could have been king *in Jerusalem* for an hour except by the power of Rome and the presence of her legions.

While Rome was the actual working governmental power in this opposition to God and to Christ, the *inspiration* of this power is declared to be "the great dragon, that old serpent which is called the devil and Satan." Rev. 12:9.

While the actual open working power of the "great red dragon" was Rome, the great dragon himself is "that old serpent called the devil and Satan."

Accordingly, at the centre of the Roman power was "Satan's seat" or throne and where he "dwelt." Rev. 2:13.

But Rome in that original phase passed away: the Roman empire was annihilated. When that occurred, there was no power in all that vast region that Satan could use in his enmity to Christ.

In this situation, Satan in his anxiety rose up from his "seat" and "*stood on the sand of the sea:*" "took his stand on the sea shore:" eagerly looking for the appearance of some worldly power that he might possess for his supreme purpose. Rev. 13: 1 Revised Version; Twentieth Century.

And lo! there rises up out of the sea, "a beast having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns. and upon his heads the name of blasphemy.

“And the beast was like a leopard, and his feet as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion.” Rev. 13:1, 2. This beast is exactly suited to Satan’s longing wish; for there are the very characteristics of the world-powers that he had once controlled. Dan. 7:4-6.

Joyously he welcomes the new-comer. He invites him into his own dwelling-place: into his very throne-room. He entertainingly presents his own throne, and deferentially indicates, Please be seated.

The new-comer is flattered by this so marked attention, and readily accepts the gift of “Satan’s seat” or throne, with Satan’s “power” and “authority” that ever attaches to the gift of that *see*. Luke 4:5-7.

And so it is written: “And the dragon [“that old serpent called the devil and Satan”] gave him *his* power, and *his* seat, and great authority.” Literally, *tan dunamin autou* — the *power of himself*, *kai ton thronon autou* — and the *throne of himself*.

There is the power and the secret of the power of the Little Horn whose “power is mighty, but not by his own power.” His power is more than only human. Yet it is not divine. It is Satanic.

“And all the world wondered after the beast.”

Literally, “followed the beast wondering:” as if hypnotized.

“And they worshipped the dragon which gave power unto the beast: and
“they worshipped the beast, saying,
“Who is like unto the beast?
“Who is able to make war with him? And there was given unto him a mouth
“speaking great things and blasphemies; and
“power was given unto him to continue forty and two months. And
“he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God,
“to blaspheme His name, and His tabernacle, and them which dwell in heaven” — “the sanctuary and the host” of Dan. 8: 11, 13.
And it was given unto him to
“make war with the saints, and to overcome them: and
“power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations. And
“all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him,
“whose names are *not* written in the Book of Life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.
“If any man have an ear, let him hear.” Rev. 13: 3-9.

And *there* is the Antichrist of The Reformation.

The manifestation of the whole Spirit and Truth of Christianity is this: "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus; who, being in the form of God thought it *not* robbery—thought it *not* a thing to be seized upon, to be violently striven for and eagerly retained; thought it *not* a usurpation to be meditated—to be equal with God; *but* emptied Himself and took upon Him the form of a servant." Phil. 2 : 5-7.

The manifestation of the whole spirit and falsity of the papacy is exactly the working of the mind which *has thought* it a thing to be seized upon, to be violently striven for and eagerly retained: which *has thought* it a usurpation to be meditated: which has magnified and exalted himself *to be equal with God*.

From the inception of the papacy in the days of the apostles unto the proclamation of the essential divinity of the papacy, in the dogma of the infallibility of the Pope in 1870, and the *ex cathedra* declaration of Leo XIII, June 21, 1894, "to the princes and peoples of the universe" that "It is We who hold the regency of God on earth," every step of the way has been but the manifestation of the mind that has thought only of seizing upon and eagerly retaining equality with God.

And that is nothing else than the manifestation of the spirit of the original and continuing Antichrist. Isa. 14 : 12-14.

In the Bible there are two mysteries — the Mystery of God, and the mystery of iniquity.

The Mystery of God, is “God manifest in the flesh,” “Christ in you the hope of glory. 1 Tim. 3:16; Col. 1:27.

The mystery of iniquity, is Satan manifest in the flesh “*as God*,” the papacy in men in *the place of Christ*.

The Mystery of God will be finished in the days of the voice of the seventh angel.

The mystery of iniquity will then also be finished.

When the Mystery of God shall be finished, God through Christ will see His own image perfectly reflected in all who are His.

When the mystery of iniquity shall be finished, *Satan* through the beast and his image will see *his own image* completely reflected in all who are *his*. Rev. 13:11-17; 2 Thess. 2:9; Rev. 16:14, 16.

The culmination of the Mystery of God will be in Christ’s personal appearing *in glory*.

The culmination of the mystery of iniquity will be in Satan’s personal appearing in glory *as Christ*.

And *this* is the *ultimate Antichrist*, of the Scriptures and of The Reformation.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE REFORMATION AND FEDERATION.

In the preceding chapters — VI - XV — are seen the principles of The Reformation.

It is impossible ever to be denied that these *are* the principles of The Reformation.

A man may dissent from any one of those principles, he may dissent from them all: he may hold that whole great movement to have been a mistake — even such a mistake as that it should “no longer blind the minds of believers:” yet no man *can dissent* from *the fact* that the preaching and holding fast those principles *made* The Reformation.

It is those principles, all and singular, *just those* — no more and no less — that made The Reformation. The Reformation *consisted* in those. If one of them had been lacking The Reformation would not have been what it was: that is to say, it would not have been at all.

Look again at the splendid list.

1. The Church “the fulness of Him who filleth all in all.”
2. The Head of The Church, “Head over *all things* to The Church.”

3. The building of The Church: Christ The Foundation and Christ The Head-Stone, and “all the building” built *in Him*.
4. The Guidance of The Church: “The Spirit of Truth guiding into all truth,” and “teaching *all things whatsoever He* has said.”
5. The Unity of The Church: unity with the Father and the Son, in the Spirit of the Father and the Son.
6. The Standard of Faith: “The word of God, the whole Word of God, and nothing but the Word of God.”
7. The Way of Salvation and Righteousness: “The Commandments of God and The Faith of Jesus:” the Law of God and the Gospel of Christ: the Government and Righteousness of God maintained by the Sacrifice and Ministry of Christ.
8. The Equality of Believers: all true worshippers, and all true servants of all in the liberty of Love and the love of Liberty.
9. Religious Liberty: each individual soul free *in God* by the Spirit of God, in the Liberty wherewith Christ and His truth hath made us free.
10. The Exposure of Antichrist.

Those principles are a complete round of Christian truth: in *principle* be it ever understood, *not in detail*.

Each one of them is all-comprehending. And all *together* are *The Masterpiece* of Christian truth since original Christian times.

And that masterpiece is not a creed, it is not a new form of "systematic theology" nor of "dogmatic theology" nor of "theology" at all: it is *The Reformation*.

Not one of the Reformers ever thought of "theology." All that they cared for was the truth of God as expressed in His Word and made plain by His Spirit. In The Reformation these principles were held and preached simply as the truths of Christianity.

It was the one single aim and the one longing hope of all the Reformers, each one in his time and place, to restore the apostolic pattern and renew all things according to that.

And it can not be denied that they succeeded in restoring the original Christian pattern. For as it can not be denied that these are the principles of The Reformation, *just so* it can not be denied that they are the principles of Christianity as in the Bible.

But to restore the apostolic pattern, to re-establish the original Christian principles, to renew the primitive order, is all that the Reformers them-

selves could actually do. They could not live long enough to insure the loyal perpetuation of it. *That* must remain for those who should come after.

And it must not be forgotten that Christianity *revived* in The Reformation was in the same world as had been Christianity at the first.

There were still here the same sort of natural-minded men who would pass off formalism and ceremonialism for Christianity, in the place of the spiritual power of an endless life.

Christianity *revived* had to run the same gauntlet of human selfishness and ambition, as had Christianity in its beginning in the world.

And through and above all the formalism, ceremonialism, selfishness, and ambition, of natural-minded men, there was still that same original spirit of Antichrist to manipulate, centralize, and swing, all against Christ; but still under the name of *Christian* and *Protestant*.

The result was the same as before. There came again "a falling away." Again there entered *human machinery* in the place of the *divine Spirit*, and the *rule of men* in the place of the rule of *Christ as Head of "His own house"* and *Father in His own "family."*

Also as before there continued the longing and struggle for the liberty that belongs to Christians and that inheres in the idea of *Protestant*. For everywhere *men* crowded themselves in among

Christians in the churches, and wherever possible seized control of the civil power, and Christian liberty could be had only at the expense of excommunication, persecution, and deprivation. Every one must "come under or get out."

This is illustrated by the course of the Independents or Congregationalists in the latter days of Cromwell. They presented a written formal petition to Cromwell "for liberty to hold a synod in order to prepare and publish to the world a uniform confession of their faith." And *this* — they actually wrote it — because the churches were "under *no other conduct than the Word and Spirit!*"

For churches to be under no other conduct than the Word and Spirit of God, was not enough. There must be a general "assembly," formal "association," of *men*. There must be "synod," "council," "delegation," official "election," and human domination.

For churches to be under no other conduct than the Word and Spirit of God, would never do; for then only Christ and God would have a chance to occupy their own place in and over the churches. Therefore the churches must be under the conduct of *men* in mere human "administration" and "organization."

Those in England were "urged" to this step by the Congregationalists in *New England*. These

had already taken that step, *and had followed it* to its straight conclusion in the banishment of Roger Williams, and the hanging of Quakers who would not be banished.

They followed it even to its logical culmination in the federation of the four colonies — Massachusetts, Plymouth, New Haven, and Connecticut — that fairly repeated the papacy itself in the theocracy of New England.

And after having banished Roger Williams out of their “jurisdiction,” they actually tried to compel him and the colony of Rhode Island to come under their jurisdiction in their confederated theocracy, so as to complete their endeavor to save New England from the Quakers.

In this strait, in behalf of Rhode Island Roger Williams appealed to Cromwell: pleading, “*Whatever fortune may befall, let us not be compelled to exercise any civil power over men’s consciences.*”

In all respects the Congregationalist theocracy of New England justified the indignant sentence of Bancroft the historian of the United States, that “The creation of a national and uncompromising church led the Congregationalists of Massachusetts to the indulgence of the passions which disgraced their English persecutors; and Laud was justified by the men whom he had wronged.”

And *all of that* rather than that the churches should be “under no other conduct than the Word

and Spirit” of God!! Could anything more plainly show that every such venture is of Satan, and is directly of his scheme to put himself always and everywhere in the place of Christ?

The most notable advance of The Reformation was in the Methodist movement, that was begun by Whitefield and the Wesleys.

This was not only an *advance*, it was actually an *extension*, of The Reformation. For it was by the Moravian remnant of the original Reformation in Bohemia that the Wesleys were led into the knowledge of the converting power and deep experience of the Holy Spirit.

The Christian missions and the “societies” of this remnant in London and other places were the greatest encouragement to Whitefield and the Wesleys at the beginning of their work.

Both of the Wesleys met Zinzendorf, and in only a little more than two months after his conversion John Wesley visited *Herrnhut*, the home of the Moravian Brotherhood, in Upper Lusatia close to the border of Bohemia, and stayed with them about a month.

In fundamental principles as well as in descent the movement called “Methodist” was an extension of The Reformation.

Of The Church Wesley said: “As ‘where two or three are met together in His name’ there is Christ; so (to speak with St. Cyprian), ‘where

two or three believers are met together, there is a church.' Thus it is that St. Paul, writing to Philemon, mentions 'the church which is in his house:' plainly signifying that even a Christian family may be termed a church.

"Several of those whom God hath *called out* (so the original word properly signifies), uniting together in one congregation, formed a larger church: as the church at Jerusalem. That is, all those in Jerusalem whom God had so called.

"He [Paul] frequently uses the word in the plural number. So, Gal. 1:2, Paul an apostle, . . . unto the churches of Galatia:" that is, the Christian congregations dispersed throughout that country.

"There is one God and Father of all 'that have the Spirit of adoption which crieth in their hearts, Abba Father,' which 'witnesseth' continually 'with their spirits' that they are the children of God 'who is above all' — the Most High, the Creator, the Sustainer, the Governor of the whole universe: 'and through all' — pervading all space, filling heaven and earth; 'and in you all' — in a peculiar manner living in you that are one body by one Spirit:

"Making your souls His loved abode
The temples of indwelling God."

"Here, then, is a clear unexceptionable answer to that question, *What is The Church?* — The

catholic or universal Church is all the persons in the universe whom God hath so called out of the world as to entitle them to the preceding character: as to be 'one body,' united by 'one Spirit,' having 'one faith, one hope, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in them all.'

“Certainly if these things are so, the church of Rome is not so much as a part of the catholic Church.” — *Sermon lxxix.*

Of the mystery of iniquity, he said: “Persecution never did and never could give any lasting wound to genuine Christianity. But the greatest it ever received, the grand blow that was struck at the very root of that humble, gentle, patient, love which is the fulfilling of the Christian law, the whole essence of true religion, was struck in the fourth century by Constantine the Great when he called himself a Christian and poured in a flood of riches, honors, and power, upon the Christians, especially the clergy.

“When the fear of persecution was removed, and wealth and honor attended the Christian profession, the Christians did not gradually sink, but rushed headlong, into all manner of vices.

“Then the ‘mystery of iniquity’ was no longer hid, but stalked abroad in the face of the sun.

“Then, not the golden, but the iron, age of the church commenced.

“Then one might truly say,

“At once in that unhappy age broke in
All wickedness, and every deadly sin;
Truth, modesty, and love, fled far away,
And force, and thirst for gold, claimed
universal sway.

“And this is the event which most Christian expositors mention with such triumph! Yea, which some of them supposed to be typified in the Revelation by ‘the New Jerusalem coming down from heaven!’

“Rather say, it was the coming of Satan and all his legions from the bottomless pit: seeing from that very time he hath set up his throne over the face of the whole earth, and reigned over the Christian as well as the pagan world with hardly any control.”

“Historians, indeed, tell us, very gravely, of nations, in every century, who were by such and such (*saints* no doubt!) converted to Christianity. But still these converts practiced all kinds of abominations exactly as they did before: no way differing either in their tempers or their lives, from the nations that were still called heathens.

“Such has been the deplorable state of the Christian church from the time of Constantine till The Reformation. A Christian nation, a Christian city (according to the Scriptural model), was nowhere to be seen. But every city and country, a

few individuals excepted, was plunged in all manner of wickedness.

“Has the case been altered since The Reformation? Does the ‘mystery of iniquity’ no longer work in the church? . . . Let any one survey the state of Christianity in the reformed parts of Switzerland; in Germany, or France; in Sweden, Denmark, Holland; in Great Britain and Ireland.

“How little are any of these reformed Christians better than heathen nations! Have they more (I will not say, communion with God, although there is no Christianity without it), but have they more justice, mercy, or truth, than the inhabitants of China or Indostan? Oh no! we must acknowledge with sorrow and shame, that we are far beneath them.

“From the preceding considerations we may learn the full answer to one of the grand objections of infidels against Christianity: namely, *The lives of Christians*.

“Of Christians, do you say? I doubt whether you ever knew a *Christian* in your life. When Tomo Chachi, the Indian chief, keenly replied to those who spoke to him of being a Christian, ‘Why there are Christians at Savannah! There are Christians at Frederica,’ the proper answer was, ‘No, they are not. They are no more Christians than you and Sinauky.’

“But are not these Christians in Canterbury, in London, in Westminster? No, no more than they are angels. None are Christians but they that have the mind which was in Christ, and walk as He walked.

“ ‘Why, if these only are Christians,’ said an eminent wit, ‘I never saw a Christian yet.’ I believe it: you never did; and, perhaps, you never will; for you will never find them in the grand or the gay world. The few Christians that are upon the earth, are only to be found where you never look for them.

“Never, therefore, urge this objection more. Never object to Christianity the lives or tempers of heathens. Though they are called Christians, the name does not imply the thing: they are as far from this as hell from heaven.”—*Id.*, *lxvi*.

Like all the other Reformers, Whitefield and the Wesleys never thought of forming any new sect or denomination; but only to preach the Gospel, to bring men to Christ to receive the Holy Spirit, and to live in righteousness unto holiness.

Wesley declared “the first principle of Methodism” to be “wholly and solely to preach the Gospel.” “Ye are a new phenomenon in the earth—a body of people who, being of no sect or party, are friends to all parties, and endeavor to forward all in heart-religion, in the knowledge and love of God and man.”—*Sermon cxxxix*.

In that marvellous awakening God in Christ by the Holy Spirit took again His own place in His own Church as in the world. The manifestations of the personal presence of God through the Spirit were constantly such as had never been surpassed since the times of the book of Acts.

The movement was utterly beyond men. It was beyond even the men by whom God most wonderfully wrought. All that they could do was to follow.

And sad to relate, even the Wesleys were most slow to follow. And deplorable to contemplate, they *did not* fully follow. With God working before their eyes and all around them in such a marvellous way as had never been transcended since the original Pentecostal days, even John Wesley called a meeting of preachers in London for *them* to give *him* "*their advice* respecting the *best method of carrying on the work of God!*"

And *that* was the beginning of, it opened the way for, that coming in and building up of human machinery and the rule of *men* that is so fully manifested in *that* "method of carrying on the work of God" by the Methodist denomination of today; and which, exactly in the measure of its growth, marks the loss of that power from on high which made and *was* the original movement called "Methodist."

There were ten persons, including himself, at

that meeting called by Wesley for that purpose. But there was no one to give the simple Christian "advice" that he be content to let *the Lord Himself* carry on His own work as already from the beginning He had been so grandly doing: that *he* and *they all* preach the Gospel, get souls acquainted with God and bound up with Christ in a bundle of the love of God, led and taught by the Holy Spirit *whose place it is* so to do. Isa. 48:17; John 6:45; 14:26; 1 John 2:27.

Oh! that it could have been so. Oh! that God could have been allowed fully His place in His own work which there He Himself had begun: that only God in Christ by the Holy Spirit should have been allowed to be seen! *Then* the movement called "Methodist" would have accomplished the wonderful purpose of God in making it so markedly the extension of The Reformation.

Then that movement so grandly begun *by God* would have been "carried on" *by Him*, and there would have been seen fulfilled that which, by the prophetic Spirit, was seen in The Reformation at its beginning by the meek and patient Miltitz, the devout Matthias, and the martyred Huss.

This is what those holy men saw as the meaning of The Reformation: "A renovation of The Church, by which it is to be prepared for the second advent of Christ; and for the divine judgment on the corrupt church."

For, they said, "All Holy Scripture predicts that before the end of the world The Church of Christ shall be reformed, renovated, and more widely extended: that she shall be restored to her pristine dignity; and that still, in her old age, her fruitfulness shall be increased.

"This new illumination of The Church is to prepare it for the last personal appearance of Christ."

That was God's purpose in beginning The Reformation.

That was His purpose in reviving The Reformation a hundred years later.

And that was His purpose in again reviving The Reformation two hundred years after that, in the time of Whitefield and the Wesleys.

This divine illumination and renovation of The Church is to fit her for her glorious Presentation in that day.

Through the Spirit and the Word He is to sanctify and cleanse The Church from every spot or wrinkle or any such thing, that she shall be holy and without blemish, reflecting *only* and *in perfection* the glorious image of her divine Lord.

Just as the finishing of the Mystery of God in *each individual* who will be of The Church in that great day, is the perfect and undimmed reflection of Christ Himself *only*, so also the finishing of the Mystery of God in *The Church* is the

perfect and undimmed reflection of Christ Himself *only*.

As in the individual there is to be no manifestation of the human self, but only the divine Christ—not *man, but God*; so in The Church which is composed only of *such individuals* there is to be no manifestation of the human self — not *man, but only God*.

There is to be no manifestation of either the machinery or the rule of men; but only the exclusive rule of God through the pure reign of the Holy Spirit. “Not by might nor by power, but by My Spirit saith the Lord of hosts.” Zech. 4:6; 1 Cor. 15:24.

Then in another hundred years God again made manifest His way: This time in the proclamation of the soon coming of the Lord in glory.

In this great movement His working was no less remarkable, and it was much more widely extended, than in the Methodist or any other of the former periods of The Reformation.

Within fifteen years the message of God was sounded literally throughout the whole world: “to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to Him; for the hour of His judgment is come.” Rev. 14:6, 7.

In *connection* with that movement there were mistakes made, as with every other; but *the move-*

ment itself was no mistake. It put into the world and before the minds of men, nevermore to be forgotten nor obscured, the divine truth of the Christian's "blessed hope" — "the glorious appearing of the Great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." Titus 2:13.

While William Miller was the leading preacher of this message in America, he was only one of five hundred who were doing the same thing in this land, and of fifteen hundred who were doing the same in all parts of the world.

Later, William Miller saw that the message of the soon coming of the Lord and the hour of God's judgment which he and the others had preached, was not the *final message*; but that there was to follow it, the proclamation of the message of "the third angel" of Revelation 14.

This message of "the third angel" is also to be proclaimed "with a loud voice" and just as widely as the first, saying, "If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of His indignation. . . . Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep The Commandments of God and The Faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:9-12.

These two loud-voiced messages *blend*. They proclaim the soon coming of the Lord in glory

and the hour of God's judgment. They warn all men against the crowning evil that sinks the world, and call all people to the "worship of Him who made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters," *in* the "keeping of The Commandments of God and The Faith of Jesus."

This is the culmination of The Reformation, as it is the culmination of the everlasting Gospel. For the next thing is the coming of the Lord on the "white cloud," with the "sharp sickle" in His hand to reap "the harvest of the earth" which is "the end of the world." Rev. 14:14-16; Matt. 13:39.

This is exactly what the first Reformers preached as the one great aim of The Reformation.

That was the one great thing in view when The Reformation began; and when in the progress of The Reformation that is reached, *with that* and *in that* The Reformation will be finished.

Thus the finishing of The Reformation is also the time of the finishing of the Mystery of God. For The Reformation was put into the world expressly to show the way of deliverance from the mystery of iniquity, and to prepare the way for the finishing of the Mystery of God.

But sadder yet to relate, and most deplorable of all to contemplate, those who were *called out* by the Lord through these glorious messages went

the way of all before. They refused to God the place that belongs to Him in His own "house," in His own "family," and in His own work; and, as all before, set themselves up in separate "bodies" and exclusive "denominations" under the machinery and rule of *men*.

And *this* as always before, in defiance of every principle and every manifestation of The Reformation and of Christianity at the first, and against the plain word of those who preached The Reformation and Christian truth to which they owe their very existence and distinction as "Adventists" — believers in the imminent *advent* of our glorious Lord!

One "body" of these stands as "the Advent Christian Church;" the other "body" as "the Seventh-Day Adventist Church." Both of these recognize and advertise William Miller and the great Advent movement as the beginning of their existence as Adventists.

And yet William Miller consistently held and plainly set down in writing the unquestionable Reformation and Christian principle and practice that repudiates denominationalism and the rule of *men* in The Church.

William Miller said: "I should oppose our being called, in an associated capacity, a church with *any name*.*"

* The italics are his own, throughout.

“To call any denomination *the* Advent Church, *the* Church of God, or any other name, I regard as contrary to the usage of the apostles.

“All true churches are ‘churches of God,’ 1 Thess. 2: 14; ‘churches of Christ,’ Rom. 16: 16; ‘churches of the saints,’ 1 Cor. 14: 33. They are thus called in the Scriptures; but they are not thus called as distinctive appellations; neither have we the right to choose either of those as a specific term.

“And if we wished to select either of those terms, by which to be designated, which should we select? The Winebrennarians of Pennsylvania call themselves ‘*The* Church of God,’ as a denominational term. If we were also to be known as such, we should be confounded with them.

“But we have no right to take a name that belongs generally to the whole family, and apply it exclusively to a branch of the family. If a branch of the family wish for a distinctive appellation, they must apply to themselves a term significant of what they are. But I contend that no name should be applied to the churches as such.

“*A* church, according to the Scriptures, is a religious assembly, selected and called out of the world, by the doctrine of the Gospel, to worship the true God according to His Word.

“*The* Church must include all the elect of God, of what nation soever, from the beginning to the

end of the world, who make but one body, whereof Jesus Christ is the Head. Col. 1:18.

“‘The church’ in any certain place must include all the faithful who are wont to assemble in such place for worship.

“We thus have in the Scriptures not only ‘churches of God,’ ‘churches of Christ,’ ‘churches of the saints;’ but we have ‘the church at Jerusalem,’ Acts 8:1; ‘the church which is in Nymphas’s house,’ Col. 4:15; ‘the church that is at Babylon,’ 1 Pet. 5:13; ‘the church in the wilderness,’ Acts 7:38; ‘the church at Antioch,’ Acts 13:1; ‘the church of Laodicea,’ Col. 4:16; ‘the church of Ephesus,’ Rev. 2:1; ‘the church that is in their house,’ ‘churches of Galatia,’ ‘of Asia,’ 1 Cor. 16:1, 19; ‘churches of Judea,’ Gal. 1:22; ‘churches of the Gentiles,’ Rom. 16:4; &c., &c.

“The above are sufficient, to my mind, to establish the position that a church should be simply called a ‘church,’ so described that its characteristics may be understood. You, therefore, in Boston, have considered yourselves as ‘the church at the Tabernacle.’

“Is it asked, Do you repudiate the name of ‘Adventists?’ In reply, I do, when it is applied to the church; but not when it is applied to those who compose the church.

“Words are the symbols of ideas. All bodies have their peculiarities and characteristics. It is,

therefore, necessary to distinguish them as such.

“Thus God has divided mankind into peoples, kindred, tribes, nations, and tongues. Those of the same peculiarities have an affinity for each other, and naturally associate together. All these branches of the race are known by their distinctive names, and all acknowledge the convenience of their being thus known. It enables us to designate those we wish by an intelligible term.

“Thus the Israelites of old were known as belonging to the tribes of Judah, of Joseph, of Dan, &c., as the case might be. To call men sons of Jacob was sufficient to show that they belonged to the nation; but even then it was found necessary to know their tribe, their family, and their household. And even the different members of the same household must have different names to distinguish one from the other.

“While all Christians in the days of the apostles were known as Christians, yet if they had had no other distinctive appellations there would have been as much confusion as there would be in a city, if all its inhabitants were known by the names of John and Mary or as there would be in a family, if there should be twelve children with no individual names,—call one and all would run; or as it is at the present time, none would regard the call. They would not know which was meant.

“Therefore, we find the apostles writing, now to the Hebrews, then to the Romans, and again to the Ephesians, and Galatians, &c., &c. If, therefore, it was right for Paul to speak of ‘the churches of the Gentiles,’ it may not be so very wrong for us to speak of the churches of the Adventists, or the churches of the Congregationalists, &c.; while at the same time, it would be unscriptural to call an association of churches *the* Advent church, *the* Methodist church, &c., &c.”—*Bliss’s “Memoirs of William Miller,” pp. 315-317.*

“Sectarianism is always produced by some private opinion of man, rather than by the plain declaration of God’s Word. For years after I began to proclaim this blessed truth of Christ at the door, I never, if possible, to avoid it, even alluded to sectarian principles. And the first objection my Baptist brethren brought against me was that I mixed with, and preached unto, all denominations; even to Unitarians, &c.

“But we have recently, my brethren, been guilty of raising up a sect of our own. The very things which our fathers did when they became sects, we have been doing. We have, like them, cried Babylon! Babylon! Babylon! against *all but Adventists.*”—*Pp. 282-3.*

“O, how much injury is done in church discipline! The hypocrite uses it as a tool to make others think he is very pious. The envious use

it as a weapon to bring down those they imagine are getting above them. The bigot uses it to bring others to his faith; and the sectarian to bring others to his creed, &c.”—*P.* 107.

“You must preach *Bible*. You must prove all things by *Bible*. You must talk *Bible*. You must exhort *Bible*. You must pray *Bible*, and love *Bible*; and do all in your power to make others love *Bible* too.”—*P.* 101.

Christianity is not national. It is not *denominational*. It is *universal*: as is its divine Author.

Christianity, sought to be made national, is robbed and spoiled of its native character.

Christianity, sought to be made *denominational*, is equally robbed and spoiled of its native character.

The Lord Jesus did not come to this world to establish denominations nor a denomination. He came to establish the divine life in individual believing souls: “to bring us to God” that *God* may be “manifest in the flesh” as in Him the divine example and Way.

Christianity kept forever *individual* is perfectly and permanently *universal*: as it was in its beginning in the world, as it was in its revival in The Reformation, as it has been in each step in the progress of The Reformation, and as *it will be* in its finishing in the world.

Denominationalism is not of Christ, nor is it

of The Reformation. It is essentially of that Nicolaitanism which the Lord Jesus hates.

It not only enables, but persuades, and even actually induces, people to take the Christian name and profess to be Christians, and to be deceived into thinking that they are Christians, when, as Wesley said, they are no more Christians than they are angels, and no nearer to real Christianity than hell is to heaven: and thus it promotes the kingdom of Antichrist more than the kingdom of Christ.

To sanction this confusion the Scripture is perverted. Then to escape the worse confusion the same Scripture is mangled. Against the plain word of Jesus who said, "The field is *the world*," the field is made to be "the church of Christ in the world." This of course sanctions that "the children of *the wicked one*" shall be *in the church!*

Then, instead of being consistent under their own perversion and letting "both grow together" in the church "until the harvest" as the Lord commands, the word of Christ is again defied and by the exercise of human "church-discipline" they go about to "root up the tares" and "cast them out of *the church*" which by their own perversion has been made "the field." Matt. 13: 28-30, 37-39.

The whole perverse tangle is only a continuation of the papal confusion, and it can not do

anything else than promote the kingdom of Anti-christ more than the kingdom of Christ.

Denominationalism has opposed every step of the advancing truth of God in the progress of The Reformation; and it will continue so to do unto the very hour of Christ's glorious appearing.

The full papacy is only the sum of denominationalism.

And whether standing as a single denomination, or as summed up in the federation of denominations in the Federal Council, or in the full papacy itself, the *thing* is ever the same as far as it goes.

In the form of the full papacy or of the Federal Council of denominations, the thing has more power and can do more; but to the extent of its power the single denomination is the same as is the sum of them.

The Federal Council as the federation of *denominations* that it is, is only the logical consequence of the federation of *congregations* in the respective denominations.

The "organized" denomination is as certainly a federation of *congregations*, as the Federal Council is a federation of *denominations*.

This truth has been so clearly worked out before the eyes of all in the story of the Baptist churches and the Federal Council, that this alone is sufficient to justify the writing of the geometri-

cal "Q. E. D." under the proposition just now under consideration.

It is well known that throughout their history, the church-order of the Baptists has been that of the New Testament churches. Each congregation stood alone under Christ, with no ecclesiastical organization between the congregation and Him.

When, in 1905, the conference was called to meet in New York City to consider the federation of the denominations, some of the Baptist churches sent representatives.

When there was read in that conference the list of denominations that were represented there, the Baptists were read in as "The Baptist Church of the United States." This *then* misnomer was immediately corrected from the floor, in the statement, "There is no such thing as 'the Baptist Church of the United States;' but only 'the Baptist churches of the United States'."

But by many influential members of the Baptist churches it was considered that only as the Baptist churches, their place in the Federation of denominations would be of uncertain value as compared with what it could be if they were themselves an effective denomination.

Therefore, in the Monday meeting of the Baptist ministers of Boston and vicinity, against all opposition of Christian and Baptist principles, there was adopted in April, 1907, the "Revised Re-

port of Committee of Five” recommending a “federation” and “strong confederation” of the Baptist churches, in order “to attain the highest denominational effectiveness.”

That same year, at the “anniversaries” of the Baptists held in Washington City in May there was adopted a provisional “organization” of the “Northern Baptist Convention,” which should be acted upon finally at the anniversaries to be held in May, 1908.

It will not be out of place to give a glimpse of the spirit that ruled in that meeting of the Baptists in Washington City, May, 1907, where that “strong confederation” of the Baptist churches established the “organized” Baptist denomination or *church*.

In a perfectly friendly and sympathetic report of the proceedings, published in “*The Watchman*, a Baptist journal” of Boston, Mass., May 23, 1907, it was said:—

“It was the stormiest, noisiest, and most disorderly meeting probably which the Baptists of the North ever held. But the denominational consciousness asserted itself in having its way. . . .

“Professor Shailer Matthews spoke on the functions of the new society. He said in substance: . . . The power of public opinion in the Baptist church is mighty, and woe to the man who opposes it. We don’t want a pope; we are all popes.”

And in an editorial *The Watchman* of the same date says:—

“The minds of the people were made up in advance. There was no discussion in a proper sense. As well try to stop a cyclone.

“At times the audience raged like a wild beast in a pen, with wild, inarticulate cries, when some obstacle arose which seemed to bar their way. For five or ten minutes they would be utterly beyond control.”

It should be remarked that where *all are popes* to begin with, it is only a question of time when there will certainly be a *pope of all*.

And in a strong pen or cage is the only fit place for a wild beast. And when he rages there it is infinitely better to let him exhaust his fury in impotent plunges against the strong bars of the cage than to relieve his rage by letting him loose among innocent and defenseless people.

In 1908 the Baptist “anniversaries” were held at Oklahoma City. That provisional “organization” was made permanent, with, then, Governor Hughes of New York as president.

Later, Prof. Shailer Matthews of Chicago University was president of it. And at the Chicago meeting of the national federation of denominations Dec. 4-9, 1912, Professor Matthews was elected president of the Federal Council of the denominations for the quadrennial term 1912-1916.

And interesting to relate, one of the very first things that the Federal Council did under the administration of President Matthews was that repudiation of the word “Protestant;” and Presi-

dent Matthews was in the chair when it was done.

This little piece of history certainly demonstrates that the federation of congregations in a denomination, is identical in character with the federation of denominations in the Federal Council, or in the full papacy.

And that the Federal Council is identical in character with the full papacy, is just as certain; and is as easily demonstrated.

When the Federal Council of Churches was formed at the conference in New York City, 1905, the necessity for a national federation and the purpose of it when secured, was indicated in the following forcible words of one of the principal speakers:—

“It is our province, in the name of our supreme King and seeking the good of mankind to ask rulers to respect the code of our kingdom. Rulers may ignore sects, but they will respect **the church**. This Federation will compel an audience, and it will speak with power, if it will put aside its differences and make its agreement its argument.”

How this respect of rulers for “the church” is to be compelled by the Federal Council is made plain in the plan and operation of its practical workings: *in*,

that *county* federation of local federations was found to be “*essential in order to bring pressure to bear upon the county officials for the suppression of the evils aimed at*” by the church:

that *State* federation was found to be essential in order "to bring to bear the pressure of the united influence of the churches of the State," upon *State officials*:

and *national* federation was now essential in order to bring to bear this pressure of the united influence of the churches of the nation, upon the *national officials*.

And it was declared by the whole conference in its "Plan of Federation" that these practical workings of the Federation are to be made applicable "in *every relation of life!*"

Plainly, therefore, the Federal Council of the churches was formed directly to the intent that *by it* the ecclesiastical will, through the "pressure" of "the combined influence" of the denominations, shall control *the civil power* "in every relation of life."

It was publicly declared that, on a number of public questions that are civil only, as well as on questions that are religious or ecclesiastical only, and on these different classes of questions indiscriminately mixed, "the voice of the churches should be heard," and that the "united and concerted action" of the church "is to lead effectively."

That is specifically one of the principal things that the Federal Council was created to do. But such declarations, such purpose, and such proce-

ture, are directly the opposite of original and fundamental Protestant and Reformation principle.

The next year after the *Protest*, there was assembled the Diet of Augsburg. The Emperor Charles V was present. He asked The Protestants to submit "a moderate and concise exposition" of what they must stand for, in order that if possible an accommodation might be arrived at."

In response, June 25, 1530, The Protestants presented by a public reading what has ever since stood as the Augsburg Confession. It is the complement of The Protest in the making of The Reformation.

Article XXVIII of that Confession says—

"The ecclesiastical power bestows things eternal, and is exercised *only* by *the ministry of the Word*.

"The civil administration is occupied about other things than is the Gospel.

"The ecclesiastical and civil power are *not to be confounded*.

"The ecclesiastical has its own command to preach the Gospel and to administer the sacraments.

"Let it not by force enter into the office of another.

"Let it not transfer worldly kingdoms.

"Let it not prescribe laws to the magistrate touching the form of the State.

“As Christ says, ‘My kingdom is not of this world.’ John 18:36. Again, ‘Who made Me a judge or a divider over you?’ Luke 12:14.”

When the professed Protestant churches have entered into city, county, State, and National federation in order effectually to bring “pressure to bear” upon public civil officials for the execution of the will of the combined church, this is nothing else than for the ecclesiastical power to “enter by force into the office of another.”

And that is not Protestant, but papal.

When the Federation, wielding the “combined influence” of the churches, or when any professed Protestant church, by *votes in an election* transfers the government — whether city, county, State or National — from one party to another, or from one person to another, it does in principle and in effect “transfer worldly kingdoms.”

And that is not Protestant, but papal.

When the Federation of churches frames bills, presents them to the legislative power, and swings the “combined influence” of the churches in lobbying and “pressure” to cause the will of the church to be enacted into law, it does in principle, in effect, and in fact, “prescribe laws to the magistrate.”

And that is not Protestant, but papal.

All these things the Federation has done, is doing, and was created to do. In all these things

the ecclesiastical and the civil powers are “confounded.”

And that is not Protestant, but papal.

In every professed Protestant denomination, ecclesiastical power is exercised otherwise than “*only* by the ministry of the Word.”

And that is not Protestant, but papal.

Thus all denomination and federation and confederation is all one, and is all equally anti-Protestant, anti-Reformation, and anti-Christian.

It is all of that spirit of combine and human contrivance that is so emphatically set at nought by the Word of God.

“*Associate yourselves, O ye people, and ye shall be broken in pieces.*

“Give ear, all ye of far countries :

“*Gird yourselves, and ye shall be broken in pieces.*

“*Gird yourselves, and ye shall be broken in pieces.*

“*Take counsel together, and it shall come to nought.*

“*Speak the word, and it shall not stand.*” Isa. 8:9, 10.

Accordingly William Miller said: “I believe that before Christ comes in his glory, all sectarian principles will be shaken and the votaries of the several sects scattered to the four winds; and that

none shall be able to stand but those who are built on the Word of God." Heb. 12: 26, 27.

Also the ringing words of the Protest: "This Word is the only truth; it is the sure rule of all doctrine, and of all life, and can never fail or deceive us. He who builds on this foundation shall stand against all the powers of hell, whilst *all the human vanities* that are set up against it *shall fall before the face of God.*

"The Lord spake thus to me with a strong hand"—He brought down his hand hard, for emphasis — "and instructed me, saying, —

"*Say ye not, A confederacy, to all them to whom this people shall say, "A confederacy;*

"Neither fear ye their fear, nor be afraid.

"Sanctify the Lord of hosts Himself.

"And let Him be your fear, and let Him be your dread.

"And He shall be for a sanctuary." Isa. 8: 11-13.

The only way in which I can sanctify the Lord of hosts *Himself*, is to sanctify Him *myself*.

And *this is Individuality.*

Individuality, always be it remembered: never individualism. For it is eternally an *ity*: never an ism.

Individuality is Christianity, and Christianity is Individuality.

This is The Reformation.

And The Reformation instead of the papacy, means Individuality and Salvation instead of the combine of denomination, federation, confederation, domination, and annihilation.

It was precisely through the combine of denomination, federation, and confederation, that in the fourth century was established the full-fledged papacy, which is never anything else than domination; and which, *with its new federation likeness*, ends only in annihilation. Rev. 17: 8, 11, 15, 16; 18: 21; 19: 20.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE FEDERAL COUNCIL AND THE REFORMATION.

At the time of the formation of the Federal Council of Churches the statement was made that its practical workings were to be made applicable "in every relation of human life."

At the Philadelphia meeting of the Council itself this was more fully stated thus:—

"The time has come when the churches may and must know every individual in the entire community as accurately as they now know their own membership.

"The churches have as great an opportunity as ever today, if they will combine to meet the real needs of each community, from building roads and organizing industry . . . to swinging the thought of a whole great metropolis to religious things by concerted evangelism . . . and make possible what we have never had before, a systematic campaign to Christianize every phase of the life of the entire commonwealth.

"It thus becomes possible, as in two States already, to announce the watchword: 'Some church responsible for each square mile.' Responsible, i. e., to know and seek in some way every individual therein.

"The Federation should emphasize the importance of the 'responsibility districts' which it establishes. When these cover the State, and the churches so appreciate their opportunity and responsibility that each church will know the position of every voter on moral issues and tirelessly work to place every one upon the right side, moral reforms will come swiftly and permanently.

"Knowledge of men alone gives power over men."

How now is this "power over men" to be used, that is obtained through such intimate knowledge of "every individual" and "every voter?"
Answer:—

"The enforcement and improvement of law often becomes the imperative duty of Local and State Federations."

"Civic action on the part of the churches, i.e., in law enforcement must proceed on lines of township."

"There has already been worked out a practical program of activities as definite and comprehensive as has ever been proposed for any religious or civic campaign."

"We have planned the work; let us work the plan."

Now note in that plan which is thus to be "worked," just what is embraced in the jurisdiction and included in the activities of this "combine" of the churches:

1. All of the territory: "each square mile," and in the discussion it was expressed as "each square foot."

2. All of the people: "every voter" and "every individual in the entire community."

3. All of these individuals and voters to be known "as accurately" as is the very church-membership itself; and every voter to be "tirelessly" worked for "the right side."

4. "All the moral issues of the community."

5. "All the real needs of each community, from building roads to evangelizing the metropolis."

6. "Every phase of the life of the entire community."

7. "Power over men." And this power exercised in

8. "Law-enactment," which is included in

9. "Law-improvement."

10. "Law-enforcement."

That most certainly is a very "definite and comprehensive" program.

And upon that the question arises, When that plan and program shall be actually in operation, and just so far as it shall be operated, where will be *the State*? Where indeed will be any room for the State?

Under that program as in their own very words where will there be any real difference between this order of things, and that against which The Reformation was raised up in Protest?

Under that program, the State as a body distinct from the church will be gone. As a distinct system and order of things in law and government the State will have been utterly supplanted by the church, and its machinery will exist only as the tool of the church to accomplish by force her arbitrary will and to make effective the ecclesiastical decrees.

In principle and in practice that will be only the order of things of "the Holy Roman Empire" over again.

When the whole “combine” of the Federal Council of the denominations in its exercise of “power over men” shall be actively engaged over every “square foot” of the territory of the United States, *inquiring* into “every relation of life” of “every individual” to know how he stands on “all moral issues;” to “know the position of every voter” and “tirelessly working to have every one to vote on ‘the right side’ on all questions” of this assumed ecclesiastical jurisdiction; to pry into and to dominate “every phase of the life of the entire commonwealth;” *what will that be* but simply a federated system of universal ecclesiastical meddling that will differ from the very Inquisition itself only in degree, and not at all in spirit nor in kind.

Then the central head of this Federation can say of this Nation as Pope Boniface VIII said of the King of France, “I know all the secrets of his kingdom.”

Note that the Federation’s purpose is to “know and seek *in some way* every individual.” In the winter of 1911-12 the Men and Religion Movement made plain one way in which this will be done: divide a designated territory into so many districts that every individual can be found and recorded within three hours on a certain Sunday afternoon by agents with such printed instructions as the following:—

“Do not miss a single house. If the people are absent call again.

“Remind them that every house in the community is being visited today.

“If they will not receive you take their name and number, and write across the card ‘Refused information.’

“Nevertheless **get all the information you can concerning them next door.**”

That is, people’s record as to religion will be taken, and that record will be used and those people counted, used, or dealt with, on information given by somebody else; and the persons themselves know nothing about it.

Did the Inquisition ever surpass that, except in using more forcible means to get the information? Yet even then all that the Inquisition did was to “know and seek *in some way* every individual” and the desired “information.”

All that the Inquisition ever was, was a lot of ecclesiastics circulating everywhere as agents of the church *asking questions* as to people’s attitude toward religion and the church; and making it uncomfortable for those who were not “on the right side.”

And the Federal Council of Churches co-operated with the Men and Religion Movement. And when that “Movement” went out of existence as a distinct body, all of its “information,” statistics, etc., was turned over to the Federal Council.

Of the Federation of churches in the fourth century, that developed the papacy in all that it ever was, it has been written:—

“As the acknowledged teachers and guardians of Christianity the clergy continued to draw within their sphere **every part of human life** in which man is actuated by moral or religious motives.

“The moral authority, therefore, of the religion, and consequently **of the clergy**, might appear legitimately to extend over **every transaction of life**: from **the legislation of the sovereign**, which ought, in a Christian king, to be guided by Christian motive, to the domestic duties of the peasant which ought to be fulfilled on the principle of Christian love.”

Those words were written by Dean Milman more than seventy years ago with sole reference to that church-combine and its clergy of the fourth century, in their assumption, encroachment, usurpation, and domination. Yet it is as closely descriptive of this present combine of the churches in the Federal Council as if it had been written only today and with sole reference to this.

Indeed there never was a closer resemblance to the papacy than is in every feature of this Federation of churches today. The “program” herewith given in their own words, and the “plan” that is to be so universally, so intricately, and so “tirelessly worked” is in its very details, as well as in its spirit and purpose, identical with that of the Federation of churches in the fourth century in the Roman empire.

And when this one of today in its beginnings is so altogether like that one, how can it be any less like the former one as it proceeds and grows?

With direct reference to such a combine, the Congress of the United States in 1829 and 1831 said: "Extensive religious combinations to effect a political purpose are always dangerous." That is the truth. And here is now the most extensive religious combination that could be in this Nation, *and for political purposes*. How much further will it have to go before the people of the United States will awake to the danger?

Already the Federal Council is following to the letter the former one in urging National legislation that is both religious and ecclesiastical, and nothing else.

Against the National Constitution, against vital American principle, against every Reformation principle, and against every Christian principle, the Federal Council urges upon Congress and everywhere in the United States legislation in recognition of "the Christian Sabbath" "the Lord's Day" as the Day of rest and worship, and enforcing upon all its observance as the Day of rest *for worship*.

Whatever is Christian is religious; for Christianity is nothing but a religion. Therefore legislation in behalf of "the Christian Sabbath" is nothing but religious legislation. And legislation

in recognition of "the Christian Sabbath" is nothing but recognition of the Christian religion. And that means the "Christian" religion *by force*; which is not Christian at all, nor is it of The Reformation at all, but is only papal.

Whatever pertains or belongs to the Lord is religious; for religion is "the duty which we owe to the Lord." Therefore legislation recognizing and establishing "the Lord's Day" is nothing but religious legislation; because it distinctly recognizes and establishes a religious institution.

And that means the "Christian" religion *by force*: which is not Christian nor The Reformation at all, but is only papal.

No person who is of the Federal Council can deny that the "Sabbath" legislation intended is religious; because—

By the terms "Christian Sabbath" and "Lord's Day" the Federal Council means Sunday.

The very first of all things named in the grand scheme of the Federal Council for "law-enactment," "law-improvement," and "law-enforcement," as "the imperative duty of Local or State Federations," is "especially in regard to Sunday-rest."

The Council urges the passage of the chief Sunday bill that for the past five years has been and is now before Congress.

That bill is openly based on "the Fourth Com-

mandment of an all-wise God;" and the Fourth Commandment is nothing but religious and wholly spiritual.

In the United States Senate, Senator Johnson of Alabama is the author and promoter of the bill. It is a "Bill for the Observance of Sunday in the District of Columbia." And in "Senate Report No. 33, Sixty-Second Congress, first session, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, Senator Johnson referred to this bill as—

"an attempt to enact into law the injunction of the Fourth Commandment of an all-wise God and Loving Father."

In his Haverford lectures on "The United States, a Christian nation," the late Justice Brewer, of the national Supreme Court, said that "through a large majority" of the court decisions on Sunday laws "there runs the thought of its being a religious day, consecrated by the commandment . . . 'The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.' "

Thus by Congress and courts Sunday legislation is positively based on the Fourth Commandment.

And thus by Congress and courts and the Federal Council of Churches there is definitely raised and openly forced upon the people of the United States the religious issue of the enforced observ-

ance of “the Fourth Commandment of an all-wise God and Loving Father.”

This being so, it is incumbent on every person who has any respect for “the Fourth Commandment” or for “an all-wise God and Loving Father, the author of the commandment,” just as openly and just as distinctly, to meet the issue thus raised and forced upon us.

First of all, let there be made perfectly clear and plain just what the issue is not and just what it is.

The issue is not whether or not God is “an all-wise God and Loving Father.” The issue is only whether God has committed to the Congress and the courts of the United States the work of making His wisdom and love effective upon all the people by governmental force.

The issue is not whether or not the “all-wise God and Loving Father” is “the author of the Fourth Commandment.” The issue is only whether He has commissioned the Congress and courts of the United States to be to the people of the United States the authoritative and infallible interpreters and expositors of His commandments.

The issue is not whether or not the people of the United States shall be religious. The issue is whether we shall be *compelled* to be religious, or, at least, to act as if we were.

The issue is not whether or not there shall be

religion. The issue is solely whether there shall be *enforced* religion.

The issue is not whether or not there shall be Sabbath observance. The issue is solely whether there shall be *enforced* Sabbath observance.

In meeting the issue thus forced upon us, of the *enforced observance* or recognition of "the Fourth Commandment" of "an all-wise God," the very first thing that arrests the attention is:

How is it that in enforcing "the Fourth Commandment" Congress and the courts and the Federal Council would enforce the observance of *Sunday* as the Sabbath of that commandment?

The Fourth Commandment, as the "all-wise God and Loving Father" spoke it and twice wrote it, says "the seventh day is the Sabbath." But Congress and the courts and the Federal Council propose to enforce that commandment by compelling the recognition of "the first day."

This very Sunday bill that is proposed by its author as the expression in law of "the Fourth Commandment," plainly designates "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday."

How is it, then, that Congress and the courts and the Federal Council will secure the observance or recognition of the commandment *of God* that requires rest on the seventh day of the week, by compelling the people to obey a law *of man* that requires rest on "the first day of the week?"

In short, how did Sunday, the first day of the week, become the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment, which is the seventh day of the week? This is the pivot of this whole issue.

It is the purpose here to answer that pivotal question so fully and so plainly that there shall be no room for any misunderstanding of the question or the issue, either by Congress or courts, or even by the plain citizen.

From the beginning to the end of the Bible, the first day of the week and the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment are as distinct as are any other two things anywhere.

On The Reformation principle of "nothing but the Word of God," there is no evidence at all that the Lord's Day is Sunday. The expression is used in the Bible just the one single time of Rev. 1:10.

Therefore unless the Bible in some other place tells what day is the Lord's, nobody ever can certainly know what day of the week it is.

But there is an obligation implied. The phrase is possessive—the Lord's Day. And Jesus has told us to "render to God the things which are God's."

The Word of God then must tell us what day is the Lord's Day, or else *in this* we never can render *to God* that which is His. *Then* the Bible would not be a complete guide. The guide would

have to be the Bible and something else. And *that* would be no guide at all; we should be all at sea, subject to every wind.

And the Bible does tell, in the word of God, what day is His, thus: "If thou turn away thy foot from *the Sabbath*, from doing thy pleasure on *My holy day*." Isa. 58: 13.

There is the day that is the Lord's. And it is the Sabbath: the seventh day of the Fourth Commandment.

And no man can find the Lord's Day to be anything else than the Sabbath of the Lord, the seventh day, without abandoning The Reformation and Christian ground of "nothing but the Word of God," and standing on the papal ground of the Bible and tradition.

As in the Bible the Sabbath and the first day of the week are two separate and distinct things, so it continued for nearly fifteen hundred years this side of the Bible time.

The first use of the term Lord's Day as applied to the first day of the week is by Ignatius, who lived not long after the death of John the apostle. And these are the words:—

"Let every one of you keep the Sabbath after a spiritual manner, rejoicing in meditation on the law, not in relaxation of the body, admiring the workmanship of God.

"And after the observance of the Sabbath, let every

friend of Christ keep the Lord's day as a festival, the resurrection day, the queen and chief of all the days."*

Thus when Sunday came in as the Lord's Day it was not with any suggestion of its being the Sabbath, nor even a sabbath; but only as "a festival" in addition to the Sabbath, and to be celebrated "after the observance of the Sabbath."

The period from the time of Ignatius to the fourth century is covered in what is called the "Apostolic Constitutions," which for the use of the clergy is a collection representing usages in the churches.

In these "Constitutions" throughout there is plain distinction made, both as to fact and to principle, between the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment and the first day of the week. Thus:

"Keep the Sabbath and the Lord's day festival, because the former is the memorial of creation and the latter of the resurrection."

There are not less than a dozen other statements on the same subject, all equally explicit, and all keeping up the same distinction.

* The authorities for the facts, dates, and quotations in this chapter are: the "Ante-Nicene Library;" the "Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers;" Neander's "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. II, sections 2, 3; a law book, the "Law of Sunday"—Appendix; Hallam's "Constitutional History of England," Chapter vii; Neal's "History of the Puritans;" Brooks's "History of Religious Liberty;" Moffatt's "Church in Scotland;" Eneye. Brit., Ninth Ed., under "Scotland," and "St. Margaret;" Holtzman's "Kanon und Tradition."

Thus the Sunday was set up along with the Sabbath without any Sabbatic character at all, but only as a day of festivity.

The first suggestion of the idea of any abstaining from work on Sunday was by the Bishop of Orleans, in A. D. 305, when, in a dissertation on the term, "Lord's day," applied to Sunday, he set forth that "Christians should abstain from work" on that day, since "the apostles wished this day to be no less honored than the Jewish Sabbath."

Such was the view and the practice in the church before there ever was any Sunday law. And all the records of that time demonstrate that the setting up of Sunday as a festival day was wholly of the church, and all the directions for the celebration of it were wholly from the same source. It was a church institution absolutely.

That period also marks the exaltation of the bishops into an episcopal dominating hierarchy, "only anxious," says Eusebius, "to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for themselves."

It is not necessary to inquire on this whether it was "the government" of the church or the government of the State that they were anxious to assert, for it was both.

For, says Neander, "There had, in fact, arisen in the church a false theocratical theory . . . which might easily result in the formation of a sacer-

dotal State, subordinating the secular to itself in a false and outward way.”

“This theocratical theory was already the prevailing one in the time of Constantine, and . . . the bishops voluntarily made themselves dependent on him by their disputes and by their determination to make use of the power of the State for the furtherance of their aims.”

And the Sunday laws were the means by which those bishops made effectual “their determination to make use of the power of the State” for the furtherance of their theocratical aims.

This can be verified by any one who will but trace the facts in Neander’s history of the time. He first tells of that “determination” of the falsely theocratical bishops, as above stated. Then he tells the story of the Sunday laws from the first one by Constantine in 314 down to the one by Theodosius the Younger in 425. And then, without a break, and with direct reference to these Sunday laws, he says: “In this way the church received help from the State for the furtherance of her ends.”

She started out with the “determination” to do it; she did it; and “in this way” she did it.

Just what that way was will now be traced. The first Sunday law in the world was in an edict of Constantine, about the year 314, which, according to Neander’s paraphrase, provided and or-

dered that on Friday and on Sunday “there should be a suspension of business at the courts and in other civil offices, so that the day might be devoted with less interruption to the purposes of devotion.”

And Sozomen says that Constantine—

“Comanded that no judicial or other business should be transacted on these days, but that God should be served with prayers and supplications.”

That puts it beyond all question that the express intent of the first legislation in behalf of Sunday as a day of cessation from common occupation was religious only. And the intent of the lawgiver being the law, that first Sunday law was religious only.

The second step in Sunday legislation was in the edict of Constantine, A. D. 321. The scope of the law was now extended to include not only the courts and other State offices, but also “the people residing in cities,” and “such as work at trades.”

And still the intent was unqualifiedly the same, for Eusebius, the historian of the time, and one of the bishops who had most to do with the legislation, says of it that Constantine—

“Comanded, too, that one day should be regarded as a special occasion for **religious worship.**”

In positive expression of the continued religious intent in the law, Constantine, as the inter-

preter of his own law, caused to be drawn up a prayer to be repeated in concert every Sunday by the imperial troops at a given signal, as they were paraded for the purpose.

It is, therefore, impossible fairly to deny or to ignore that this law was definitely religious. And in addition to this, there is the evidence that it was *exclusively* religious.

This evidence is again in the words of Bishop Eusebius, saying that Constantine—

“Comanded the nations inhabiting the continents and islands of this mighty globe to assemble weekly on the Lord’s day and to observe it as a festival, not indeed, for the pampering of the body, but for the comfort and invigoration of the soul by instruction in divine truth.”

That statement not only shows that Sunday law to be religious, but it shows that it was religious to the exclusion of every temporal, civil, or physical consideration.

In confirmation of all this, there is the further fact that it was by his office and authority as Pontifex Maximus—the head of religion, and not as Emperor—the head of the State, that Constantine issued his Sunday edicts.

For, says Duruy—

“In determining what days should be regarded as holy, and in the composition of a prayer for national use, Constantine exercised one of the rights belonging to him as Pontifex Maximus, and it caused no surprise that he should do this.”

Yet, beyond all this is the fact that it was the church federation of the time that was the secret spring, the inspiration and the initiative, by which it was all brought about. It was all only in the furtherance of the grand scheme of the bishops and their church-combine to establish the State as "the Kingdom of God."

And when they had accomplished their design, they proclaimed that "The kingdom of God had come," that "the saints of the Most High had taken the kingdom," and that the enforcement of these and kindred laws made the people "fit subjects of the kingdom."

That is the true story, as it is the only story, of the origin of Sunday legislation. That is the sole and exclusive character of Sunday legislation in its origin. That character is solely and exclusively religious. It has no hint nor savor of any other character than religious. And to the end of the world that character never can be separated from Sunday legislation.

The Sunday institution and all that was attached to it was wholly of the church. And when from the federated church the State accepted and embodied in the law this exclusively church institution, this, in the very fact of the doing of it, was the union of the church and the State.

Yet, though the Sunday was now embodied in the imperial law and enforced upon all the people,

it was neither held by the church nor adopted nor enforced by the State as the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment; but still only as another day of rest along with the Sabbath. And both days were still observed, and in most instances by the same persons, in that church-and-State system.

The status of both days as rest days at that time is indicated by Bishop Eusebius thus:—

“All things whatsoever it was duty to do on the Sabbath, these **we** have transferred to the Lord’s day.”
—Comment on Ps. 92.

The first definite step that was ever taken to establish Sunday observance to the *exclusion* of the Sabbath was by the Council of Laodicea, about A. D. 364. In canon 29 of that council Christians were forbidden to “be idle” and were commanded to “work on the Sabbath” and, “if possible, do no work” on the Sunday.

That council being not a general council, this canon was an index of what was wanted, more than an act of real force. This is shown by the fact that the council itself adopted three other canons recognizing the observance of the Sabbath.*

* “Canon 16. On Saturday, the Gospels and other portions of the Scripture shall be read aloud.

“Canon 49. During Lent the bread shall not be offered, except on Saturday and Sunday.

“Canon 51. During Lent no feasts of the martyrs shall be celebrated, but the holy martyrs shall be commemorated on the Saturdays and Sundays of Lent. Hefele’s “History of the Church Councils.” His translation of the canons gives “Saturday” every time, but the original is “Sabbath.”

In A. D. 416 Pope Innocent I recognized the fact of the Sabbath still being observed in the church equally with the Sunday. In a letter he commanded that "the Sabbath should be observed as a fast day," because "it shares the sadness and the joy of Sunday, and the apostles were in great affliction on that day;" and that Sunday ought to be observed as "a most festive day" on account of the joy that it brought to the disciples.

Socrates, whose ecclesiastical history reaches down to A. D. 439, says:—

"Almost all churches throughout the world celebrate the sacred mysteries on the Sabbath of every week, yet the Christians of Alexandria and at Rome have ceased to do this."

And he specifies what he calls "the festal days" of his time:—

"I mean Saturday and Lord's day in each week, on which assemblies are usually held in the churches."—Book V, chap. xxii; Book VI, chap. viii.

Sozomen, whose ecclesiastical history is carried down to A. D. 460, says:—

"The people of Constantinople and almost everywhere assemble together on the Sabbath, as well as on the first day of the week, which custom is never observed at Rome or at Alexandria."—Book VII, chap. xix.

In A. D. 538 a council at Orleans declared that what should be lawful or unlawful on Sunday was

a question “exclusively of ecclesiastical jurisdiction.”

In A. D. 585, in a council at Macon, in Gaul, another step was taken to make Sunday a Sabbath in the place of the Sabbath. This council declared that Sunday is “the day of perpetual rest” (referred to in Hebrews 4), of which “the seventh day in the law and the prophets is the type.” And any disregarding it would incur the cumulative penalty of, *first*, “the wrath of God;” and *secondly*, “the unappeasable anger of the clergy.”

In A. D. 596 Augustine wrote to Pope Gregory “the Great” from Britain that the Briton Christians were “given to Judaizing” and “were ignorant of the holy sacraments and festivals of the church.”

That is to say, they observed the Sabbath and were ignorant of Sunday observance.

In A. D. 602 Pope Gregory took another step toward making Sunday a Sabbath to the exclusion of the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment. In a letter he said:—

“It has come to my ears that certain men of perverse spirit have sown among you some things that are wrong and opposed to the holy faith, so as to forbid any work being done on the Sabbath day. What else can I call these but preachers of anti-Christ, who when he comes, will cause the Sabbath day as well as the Lord’s day to be kept free from all work.”

He said that such teaching "would Judaize the people;" that "Christ is our Sabbath," and that we ought to abstain from worldly labor and be diligent in prayer on Sunday, "that we may expiate the shortcomings of the other six days."

In A. D. 664 Oswald, King of Northumberland, ordered Sunday observance. And the Sabbath keepers, "rather than to submit to it," withdrew to the Isle of Iona and to Ireland.

In the time between A. D. 732 and 769 another step was taken in the making of Sunday a Sabbath to the exclusion of the Sabbath. The Archbishop of York made a compilation of "Selections from the Canons," in which it is taught that "the Sabbath was sanctified because of its reference to the suffering of Christ and His rest in the grave;" and that "we should keep a spiritual Sabbath on Sunday, which has been sanctified by His resurrection."

Still, however, the Sabbath was observed by some in the church. For in A. D. 791 the Council of Friuli, in Italy, spoke of "the Sabbath" as the day "observed by the Jews and our rustics." Not simply rustics, nor the rustics, but "*our* rustics:" which shows that the Sabbath was still observed even in the Roman church.

This same council took the widest stride yet made toward the exaltation of Sunday as the Sabbath. The council commanded that "the ob-

servance of Sunday should begin at the hour of the Sabbath evening office: not for the honor of the Sabbath, but for that of the Lord's day," and declared that Sunday is "the Sabbath of the Lord," to which reference is made in Exodus 35:2, in the words, "Whosoever doeth work therein shall be put to death."

That is the first place and time in all the history of the world where Sunday is called "the Sabbath of the Lord," or even "the Sabbath" at all.

And yet, even then Sunday was not held as the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment, but as "the Sabbath of the Lord," to the exclusion of the Sabbath of the Lord.

Twenty-two years afterward, however, nearer approach was made to having Sunday to be the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment; but not yet quite in positive assertion. In A. D. 813 the Council of Rheims decreed that, "according to the Lord's commandment," no one should "do any servile work" on Sunday.

In A. D. 829 the sixth Council of Paris set forth that "the pagans set apart certain days for the honor of their gods;" that "the Jews, whose manners were of a worldly sort, kept the Sabbath in a worldly fashion," and that—

"a custom had grown up among Christians, as a matter of religious observance, based upon an accredited apostolic tradition, and certainly on the authority

of the church, to honor Sunday: (1) in memory of the Lord's resurrection; (2) it was in that day that God gave light to the world; (3) the Holy Spirit descended upon the apostles; (4) 'as some doctors hold,' the manna fell from heaven;" that these and other things of similar character plainly show that "this day is more to be respected than others."

Pope Nicholas I, A. D. 858 to 867, declared that Sabbath rest "is the doctrine of anti-Christ;" but that Sunday rest "is obligatory."

In 1069 the Christians of Scotland were still keeping the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment "literally upon the seventh day of the week."

In that year Princess Margaret of England became the wife of the King of Scotland. "Her religion was of the newest Roman type." She wrought changes in the Church of Scotland from "the primitive type which down to her time it had exhibited."

And among these changes was "the abolition of the old practice of observing Saturday (Sabbath), not Sunday, as the day of rest from labor," and "the prohibition of labor on the Lord's day."

In the sixteenth century The Reformation prevailed so mightily that the General Council of Trent had to be called by the Church of Rome to consider her situation.

The strongest ground of the Protestants was their insistence that "the Bible, and the Bible alone, is the only true standard of faith and

morals," as against Rome's claim of "the Bible and tradition" as such standard.

When the council assembled it was found that in the council itself, as the Pope's legates wrote to him, there was "a strong tendency to set aside tradition altogether and to make Scripture the sole standard of appeal."

This was dangerous to Rome, for with her "tradition" means not merely antiquity, but "continuing inspiration," which is but another form of expressing "infallibility." Something must be done to save the day for Rome.

And this is what was done: At the opening of the last session, Jan. 18, 1562, "the Archbishop of Rheggio made a speech, in which he openly declared that tradition stood higher than the Bible."

And the proof of it is thus given by him:—

"This very authority of the church is most of all glorified by the Holy Scriptures. . . . By the same authority, the church, the legal precepts of the Lord contained in the Holy Scriptures have ceased. The Sabbath, the most glorious day in the law, has been merged in the Lord's day. . . . This day and similar institutions have not ceased in consequence of the preaching of Christ (for He says that He did not come to destroy the law, but to fulfill it), but yet **they have been changed**, and that solely by the **authority of the church.**"

There was no escape from this by the Protestants. For their own confession of faith—the

Augsburg Confession, 1530—had clearly admitted that “the observation of the Lord’s day” had been appointed by “the church” only. And in this the Protestants plainly held, not “the Bible, and the Bible alone,” but “the Bible and tradition,” with the tradition above the Bible. And this was but Rome’s own ground—and so Rome’s cause was saved.

Note that in the council the archbishop said: “The Sabbath . . . has been merged in the Lord’s day.”

Then the catechism of the Council of Trent, A. D. 1567, completes the story thus:—

“When the ceremonies of the law were removed, the Sabbath also, as a ceremonial, was removed. The sanctification of the Sabbath is cessation from bodily labor and business. The Sabbath we observe fully and perfectly when we afford to God the duties of piety and religion. The proper meaning of the Fourth Commandment tends to this: That a man give himself up at some fixed time, so that, disengaged from bodily labor and business, he may piously worship and adore God.”

And as the church has made Sunday that “fixed time” for worship, and has made that “the proper meaning of the Fourth Commandment,” there you have it.

And thus Sunday was made “the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment.”

All of the foregoing system of decrees of councils and popes, of papal kings and emperors, in be-

half of Sunday, pervaded England. Indeed no small part of it was directly of England; because England was a part of the papacy.

And after England was separated from the Pope, the same thing was continued; because, though England was divorced from the Pope, in more ways than one she was not divorced from the essential papacy.

In 1533 Henry VIII cut loose England from the dominion of the Pope, and *himself* became "supreme head on earth of the church of England:" and so all his successors to this day. With the exception of the king as a pope in the place of the Pope, nothing was changed.

In 1554 and onward was the rise and reign of the Puritans. They maintained that the church of England "retained many human inventions and popish superstitions," and insisted that all these should be abandoned and "the Word of God alone" be followed.

Their special contention was against the "habits, ceremonies, and discipline of the church" of England: whether the clergy should wear vestments; whether the church should be governed by bishops; whether there should be cathedrals, with their arch-deacons, deans, canons, and other officials; whether there should be church festivals and holy-days, the sign of the cross, god-fathers, god-mothers, etc.

The church of England held that:—

“Though the Holy Scriptures are a perfect standard of **doctrine**, they are not a rule of discipline and government: nor is the practice of the apostles an invariable rule or law to the church in succeeding ages; because they acted according to the circumstances of the church in its infant and persecuted state. Neither are the Scriptures a rule of human actions so far as that whatsoever we do in matters of religion without their express direction is sin; but many things are left indifferent.”

Summarized, the respective positions were—

Church of England: Whatever the Scriptures do not plainly *forbid* in matters of church discipline, order, and government, may be commanded by the church and practiced by believers, without sin.

The Puritans: In all church discipline, order, and government, as well as doctrine, the Scriptures are the perfect and only rule of human actions. Therefore in all things pertaining to religion, whatever is *not commanded* is vanity and cannot be practiced without sin.

Accordingly the Puritans denounced as popery all church festivals, holy-days, habits, and ceremonies; and charged the Episcopalians with “popish leaven and superstition, and subjection to the ordinances of men” in their practice of such things.

As evidence that ought to convince the Puritans that the church has liberty and authority in

things not commanded, the Episcopalians held up the fact that the observance of Sunday is only an ordinance of the church and rests only upon the authority of the church.

They urged that the Puritans were inconsistent, self-contradictory, and arbitrary, in continuing the observance of Sunday while denouncing the authority of the church, the only authority upon which rests that day and its observance as a religious day.

This put the Puritans in a box. They were keeping Sunday as the Sabbath. The only authority that they could produce for it from all the ages, was church authority: and the papal church at that.

What could they do?!

Any authority of the church they would not allow: for that would be to recognize popery.

Scripture command or authority for Sunday observance they could not find: for there the only command or authority for a day of weekly rest or worship is the Fourth Commandment, which specifically designates the seventh day and not the first day of the week.

Obey the plain and simple command of God they would not: for that would be confession that they had been wrong, and this would be to confess that they were not infallible, did not know everything, and could actually learn something.

To continue to observe the Sunday only on the authority which they most of all denounced, while pressing upon the Episcopalians that there must be a plain command of *God* for *everything* that should be done in religion, was to take the whole ground from under their own feet and leave themselves no standing at all.

There was great perplexity. There were great searchings—not of *heart*, but for something, *anything*, to save them *in* palpable error, not *from* it.

At last in 1594 "Rev. Nicholas Bownde (or Bound), D. D., of Norton in the county of Suffolk," England, found their way out. He wrote a book setting forth the following curious invention:—

It is not the definite seventh day, but "a seventh part of time" that is required by the Fourth Commandment to be kept as the Sabbath.

It is "not the seventh day from creation; but the day of Christ's resurrection, and the seventh day **from that.**"

"The seventh day is **genus**" in the Fourth Commandment, so that "the seventh day from creation, and the day of Christ's resurrection and the seventh day from that" are "both of them comprehended in the Commandment even as **genus** comprehendeth both his species."

Thus the Fourth Commandment was made to require the observance of the seventh day from creation until the resurrection of Christ, and the first day from that time onward!

That book of Dr. Bownde's "had a wonderful spread among the people. All the Puritans fell in with this doctrine, and distinguished themselves" in their devotion to Sunday observance.

And thus the papal Sunday as the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment, became the Puritan Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment. For the use of the word "Sabbath" as applying to Sunday "became in that age a distinctive mark of the Puritan."

In 1584 the Puritan influence in Parliament caused the passage of "a bill for the better and more reverent observation of the Sabbath"—Sunday. But Queen Elizabeth "refused to pass it" because she would not consent that Parliament should "meddle with matters of religion, which was her prerogative" as head of the church.

In 1603 King James VI of Scotland became James I of England. In his progress through England he saw the people restricted to narrow and listless limits by the Sunday laws pressed upon them by the narrower clergy.

Upon complaint of the people of Lancashire, King James as "supreme head on earth of the church of England," with the advice of his prelates, issued May 24, 1618, "The King's Majesties Declaration to his Subjects concerning Lawful Sports to be used" on Sundays after evening prayers.

This "Declaration" was called the "Book of Sports." The provisions of it were drawn up by Bishop Morton, and it was issued, not by Parliament, but solely by James as "head of the church." It allowed dancing, archery, leaping, vaulting, may-games, church-ales,* morrice dances, setting up of may-poles, and "other sports therewith used."

James was not particularly notable for kindness of heart. The "Book of Sports" was issued to rasp the Puritans. For at his very council-table James had declared that "his mother and he from their cradles had been haunted with a Puritan devil which he feared would not leave him to his grave."

The Puritan opposition to the "Book of Sports" was intense. A great controversy arose. On all sides the Puritan application of the word "Sabbath" to Sunday was disputed and ridiculed.

For instance: A bill having been introduced in Parliament "for the better observance of the Sabbath, usually called Sunday." One of the members, a Mr. Shepherd, remarked upon it, "As Saturday is *dies Sabbati*, this might be entitled 'A Bill

* Church-ale itself is "A strong ale of good quality brewed especially for a church-festival, and broached only on the day of the feast in question."

Celebration of church-ale is "A convivial meeting on the occasion of a church-festival, at which the ale specially brewed was served."

for the observance of Saturday, commonly called Sunday.' ”

Mr. Shepherd's remark was so pointedly pertinent that it was held to be contemptuously impertinent, and “He was reprimanded on his knees and expelled from the House of Commons.”

In the House of Lords the words “the Lord's day” were substituted for the word “Sabbath,” and the bill was sent down with the remark that “People do now much incline to the words of Judaism.”

However James asked Parliament not to pass the bill, because “it was so directly against” his “Declaration,” and the matter as in the Parliament stopped there for the time.

In the reign of Charles I, “at the request of the justices of the peace,” the lord chief justice and another judge jointly issued an order for the suppression of the excesses indulged in the “sports.” But they were reprovved by the archbishop who was sustained by the king, and were required to revoke their order; because of their “invading and usurping the episcopal jurisdiction.”

Oct. 18, 1633, at the instance of the archbishop, Charles I reissued the “Book of Sports.” “The court had its balls, masquerades, and plays,” on Sunday evenings, “while the people in the country enjoyed their morrice-dances, may-games, church-ales, and other diversions.”

All this time there went steadily on the controversy over the Puritan application of the word "Sabbath" to Sunday. In 1628 Theophilus Bradbourne, a clergyman, published a book pleading for the acceptance and observance of the Lord's Sabbath as it is given in the Commandment—"the seventh day"—as "the Christian Sabbath." But all who recognized the real Sabbath of the Lord and of the Fourth Commandment "suffered great persecution" from all sides.

April 6, 1644, the Long Parliament enacted that "all persons should apply themselves to the sanctification of the Lord's day by exercising themselves in the duties of piety and true religion, publicly and privately; and that no person should publicly cry, show forth or expose to sale, any wares or merchandise, etc.; or, without reasonable cause, travel, carry burdens, or do any worldly labor or work;" the provisions of the "Book of Sports" were abolished, the "Book" itself was commanded to be burnt by the common hangman; also that there should be burnt "all other books and pamphlets against the morality of the Fourth Commandment or of the Lord's day."

In the reign of Charles II the church of England again came into power. And the bishops used their power to the fullest.

By the "Act of Uniformity," 1662, "the crowning measure of ecclesiastical polity"—

Knight; by the “Conventicle Act,” 1664, “devised for the extirpation of all public worship not within the walls of a church,”—*Brooks*; the “Oxford Five-Mile Act,” 1666, intensified in 1670; all religious preaching and teaching, and all worship and assembly for worship, was confined only to that “allowed by the liturgy and practice of the church of England.”

And this was in order “that every person within this realm may certainly know the rule to which he is to conform in public worship.”

The effect of that legislation was to exclude all dissenters in the realm from all places or assemblies of worship: for they would not go to the places of worship of those who were making such laws as these.

But that was not what those acts were for. The one purpose of them all was to make the worship of the church of England the only worship in the realm, and this worship to be attended by every person in the realm.

Then and *therefore*, in 1676 there was enacted the Sunday law of Charles II requiring everybody to “repair to the church” on Sunday. This statute commands:—

“For the better observation and keeping holy the Lord’s day, commonly called Sunday: be it enacted . . . that all the laws enacted and in force concerning the observation of the day, and repairing to the church thereon, be carefully put in execution; and that all and

every person and persons whatsoever shall upon every Lord's day apply themselves to the observation of the same, by exercising themselves in the duties of piety and true religion, publicly and privately; and that no tradesman, artificer, workman, or other person whatsoever, shall do or exercise any worldly labor or business or work of their ordinary callings upon the Lord's day, or any part thereof (works of necessity and charity only excepted),” &c.

In England that statute compelled everybody to go to the places of worship of the church of England. The clause “repairing to the church” meant only the church of England; for all other places had been prohibited by the preceding acts.

In the colonies in America it was used to compel the people to go to their respective places of worship. And as it embodied the principal provisions word for word of the Puritan statute of 1644 in England and enforced them all, the Puritans in America came into their own again.

That Statute of Charles II is the original and the model of all the Sunday laws in all the States of the United States since the original thirteen. And it is confessedly “the model” of the Senate Sunday bill that is now before Congress, and that is urged by the Federal Council of churches.

Here then is the genealogy of all the Sunday laws in all the States of the United States: The Sunday laws of the later States are only the extension or repetition of the Sunday laws of the original States, which were the identical Sunday

laws of the colonies, which were the Sunday laws of England. which were the Sunday laws of papal Rome.

And from their original in Rome to their final in these latest States, in every generation they have been nothing else than exclusively religious and ecclesiastical both in origin and intent.

And in completion of the story the Federal Council of churches in its Philadelphia meeting, Dec. 2-8, 1908, officially repeated and confirmed the action of both the Puritan and the papal theocracies in making Sunday the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment.

In that meeting of the Federal Council the Committee on "Sunday Observance" said:—

"We have no objection to reading the Commandment: 'Remember that you keep holy one day in seven. Consecrate this day unto the Lord as the Lord's. Let it be unlike other days. Sanctify it.'"

When the report was under discussion a member of the Council offered this resolution:—

"It is not our intention that anything shall be done to interfere with the convictions of those brethren represented with us in this Council who conscientiously observe the seventh instead of the first day of the week as a day of rest and worship."

That resolution was overwhelmingly rejected with loud and prolonged "No-o-o-o!!"

That shows unmistakably that the statement of

the Council that they have no objection to their own proposed reading of the Commandment "that you keep holy one day in seven" *is not true*—except as that "one day in seven" is and shall be Sunday.

Also it is thus demonstrated that they will not allow *anybody but themselves* to read the Commandment the way that they have said: and that they themselves will read it in that way, only with reference strictly and specifically to Sunday.

And that is how by the Federal Council Sunday, the first day of the week, became the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment which says that it is the seventh day of the week.

There, then, by the indisputable evidence of history, fact, and law, is the true story of just how Sunday, the first day of the week, became, to the Congress and courts of the United States, the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment of "an all-wise God," who Himself said that it is the seventh day of the week.

And from the beginning to the end of it the conception, the invention, the process, and the whole procedure were absolutely of the church, by the church, and for the church.

However, let no one think for a moment that what has here been presented is all the evidence that there is in the case. Not at all. This narrative has been purposely limited to the one pivotal

feature of the subject—the Sunday and the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment.

Around, between, and along with, the facts herein set forth there were scores upon scores of acts and decrees promoting the observance of Sunday itself as such—fretting, fretting, fretting, for more than sixteen hundred years, like the single but continual dropping of water that melts stone, wearing down both mind and spirit to dull and enslaved submission or conformity to the ecclesiastical tyranny that was the inspiration and impetus of it all.

And such a thing as that—a thing composed only of such stuff and nonsense and iniquity as all that—is seriously proposed by a Senator of the United States as the thought of the Fourth Commandment of “an all-wise God,” and to be enacted into law under the Constitution that declares that Congress shall make “no law” on any such subject!

And in the present insistent and persistent ecclesiastical pressure of federation, confederation, and “forward movement” backward, in an ever-increasing tide upon Congress and all this land, perpetually demanding Sunday legislation, and ever more Sunday legislation—in all this what observant person can fail to see that history is being repeated unto the very living likeness of the original?

To see how *on principle* The Reformation stands toward all this, read again the first paragraph on page 28 of this book.

What more Satanic thing could ever be invented, what thing more suicidal to the State or more demoralizing to society, than the making of idleness compulsory and universal, and honest industry a crime to be punished by fine and imprisonment?

Industry, not idleness, is the life of the State and the stay of Society. Gen. 2:15; 3:17-19; John 5:17; Rom. 12:11.

And now will Congress and the courts allow the people of the District of Columbia and of the United States to deal with their *human law* in the like manner as they themselves thus deal with the *divine law*?

When this very Sunday bill now before Congress shall become law, expressing their thought of "the Fourth Commandment," will they allow you and me to observe the *seventh day* of the week in fulfillment of *their law* enjoining the *first day* of the week, as they offer to "an all-wise God" the observance of the *first day* of the week in fulfillment of the *divine law* that enjoins the *seventh day* of the week?

If not, why not? Upon what ground can they refuse such action on the part of the people here?

What ground, indeed, other than the implica-

tion that they and their *human law* are superior to “an all-wise God” and His divine law?

Wouldn't it be interesting to know just what “an all-wise God” and infinitely just Judge really does think of all this ecclesiastical, legislative, and judicial, fantastic fiddling with His law?

Finally, when the Congress and the courts of the United States, and the Federal Council, shall enforce upon the people any law requiring the observance or recognition of Sunday as the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment, then that will be, *not* the Fourth Commandment as *God gave it*, but only that commandment as the *Church of Rome* has *changed it*.

And that will be the enforcement, *not* of the will of God, *but* of *the will of the Church of Rome*.

Sabbath observance, according to the Fourth Commandment, as God gave it, means worship—the worship of God.

“Sabbath” observance of the “Fourth Commandment,” *as Rome has changed it*, just as certainly means worship—the worship of Rome: and the worship of Rome as God in the place of God.

And when Congress and the courts of the United States, or of any State, enforce the observance or recognition of the “Fourth Commandment” *as Rome has changed it*, that is nothing else than the enforcement of the *worship of Rome* as God in the place of God.

In this connection recall from page 16 of this book, The Reformation principle that "Subjection in the spiritual world constitutes worship."

There are just three specific characteristics that distinguish the papacy :

1. A human theocracy: a false kingdom of God.
2. The "Christian" religion by force: by law and governmental power of both State and church.
3. Infallibility in the humanly constructed church: which is but human infallibility.

The institution of Sunday as a day or the day of assembly, or of worship, or of rest, or of refraining from labor, *for anybody*, is the pivot upon which turns each of these three specific characteristics of the papacy.

The papacy is man in the place of God, and *above God* in doing as God what God could not do.

Of His purpose and in His wisdom God occupied six days in creating, and chose the seventh day to be the Sabbath. By resting, blessing, hallowing, and sanctifying, this day, He made it the Sabbath of the Lord "for the man."

It is not too much to say that He *could* have created all things in *five* days, if in His wisdom He had so chosen; and could have rested, blessed, hallowed and sanctified, the *sixth* day, and so made it the Sabbath.

Or He could have occupied *four* days in crea-

ting, and made the *fifth* day the Sabbath; or *three* days in creating, and made the *fourth* day the Sabbath; or *two* days in creating, and made the *third* day the Sabbath; or *one* day in creating, and made the *second* day the Sabbath.

But *that* is as far as even God could go. For He could not have occupied the first day in creating, and *also* have occupied it in *resting*. He could not call that His *rest* day in which He had *worked*; for “it is impossible for God to lie.” Therefore the Creator Himself could not make the *first day* the Sabbath.

And by the same token it is demonstrated that the *men* who *have* set up Sunday, the *first day* of the week, as the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment, in so doing *have gone beyond what God Himself could do*: and so have not only put themselves in the place of God, but above God.

And it would be impossible for men so effectually to do this in any other way. Therefore, Sunday as the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment, or as the rest day to God, is transcendently the sign of man in the place of God and above God *which is the specific distinguishing thing* that marks the papacy—“the beast” of Revelation 13.

And thus it stands plain and certain that the Sunday institution as the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment is “the mark of the beast” designated and denounced in Revelation 13 and 14.

And now all of the Roman federations, special and general, are urging Sunday observance and ever more Sunday observance *by law*.

The Pagan governments of China and Japan are definitely committed to it, *by law*.

And all of the federations, denominational and Federal, of false Protestants are committed to Sunday observance *by law*.

All of these are being combined in every possible way and by any possible means to bring about the enforced observance of Sunday as the one day for worship of *all the world*.

It is only the truth to say *all*. For there is not a single denomination that is not committed to Sunday observance *by law*. Even the denominations that profess to keep the true Sabbath—the Seventh-Day Baptists and the Seventh-Day Adventists—are committed to it.

The Seventh-Day Baptist denomination is definitely and actively a working part of the Federal Council of Churches which is pre-eminently devoted to universal Sunday observance *by law*. And beyond all question this commits that denomination to it.

But in addition to that, one of the delegates of that denomination is actually a consenting member of the Council's "Commission on Sunday Observance!"*

* See "Sabbath Recorder," April 21, 1913, page 487.

By their supremely authoritative word the Seventh-Day Adventists are committed to it. That word to that denomination gives the following specific and full instructions as to "Sunday observance" when it is "enforced" *by law*:—

"The light given me by the Lord . . . was that when the people were moved by a power from beneath to enforce Sunday observance, Seventh-Day Adventists were to show their wisdom by—

"refraining from their ordinary work on that day, "devoting it to missionary effort."

"House to house work can be done."

"Whenever it is possible, let religious services be held on Sunday."

"On that day open-air meetings and cottage meetings can be held.

"Make these meetings intensely interesting.

"Sing revival hymns and speak with power and assurance of the Saviour's love.

"Speak on temperance and on true religious experience."

"Make no demonstration on Sunday in defiance of law."

"Give them no occasion to call you law-breakers."

—"Testimonies for the Church," No. 37, pp. 232-3.

And now in order that the situation shall be accommodated to both of these denominations of professed Sabbath-keepers, and to make it perfectly easy for them to occupy their false position all the way, the arrangement is being made to have *both Sabbath and Sunday* to be rest-days *by law*.

The Federal Council actually proposes, advo-

cates, and works for, *not* merely a Saturday *half*-holiday, *but* the Saturday *whole*-holiday: in the "hope" that—

"the time may come when hand and brain toilers shall have for their own use both Saturday and Sunday, one being a day of social recreation and the other a day of worship."

At the Chicago meeting of the Council it was said in a report that this scheme "gives to the workingman a privilege that he never had before—a day for worship, *and* a half-day or a *whole*-day for preparation:" that the Saturday whole-holiday should be spent in "rest and recreation and in sports and games, as a *preparation* for Sunday as the *day of worship*."

Both in committee and on the floor of the Council this arrangement as to the two days was agreed to by the delegates of the Seventh-Day Baptist denomination; and it fits exactly the already arranged procedure of the Seventh-Day Adventist denomination. So certain it is that denomination-ism wherever found is essentially papal.

Read again the words of Pope Gregory "the Great" on page 378, that "Antichrist, when he comes, will cause the Sabbath day as well as the Lord's day to be kept free from all work."

If it can be supposed that Antichrist knows his own mind and purpose, then this arrangement of *all denominations* for *both these days* "to be kept

free from all work'' is unquestionable evidence that the time of the ultimate Antichrist is now upon the world; and that through denominational, national, and international, federation and confederation he is already carrying things his own way in that aim and purpose.

“And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, *whose names are not written in the Book of Life* of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. If any man have an ear, let him hear.”

Thus by the Federal Council, by Congress, and
by Courts;
by Federation and Confederation, denomina-
tional, national, international, and world;
by the combine of all worldly power, false
Protestant, pagan, and papal;
there is forced upon every soul the reign of
Rome against The Reformation.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE REFORMATION AND THE SABBATH.

No fault can ever be found with any of the Reformers because they did not see the true Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment.

No one of the Reformers can even be charged with inconsistency in this. It would be inconsistent for anybody to require or to expect that *in their circumstances* they should see everything.

They were awakened in the deep darkness of the papal night. They were awakened by a great light, it is true: and that light was the true Light.

Yet even then they could not be expected to see everything. They *could not* see everything *at once*, and could not *live long enough* to see *all*.

But they did see the fundamental truths. They did see the *principles* in which everything is embraced; in which lies all that should ever follow.

And they were perfectly consistent in those principles. Indeed it is marvellous how clearly and fully they distinguished the divine principles, and with what perfect precision in these principles they held the straight course.

Those wonderful men never can be too highly honored for what they did. It is not too much to say that without The Reformation the world could not have lived till now.

But it is not true honor to the Reformers for *those who have come after* to see only what they saw and as they saw it, and to hold only what they held and as they held it.

For people to dwell in, and have the full benefit of, all the light that broke upon the world by the Reformers, *and not see more than they saw* is to see *less* than they saw: is to be less than they were: and is to *dishonor* instead of to honor them.

The light of God ever shines "more and more" onward "unto the perfect day." And those who come after must stand in all the light that shone before, and *also in the "more"* that shines because of that which has shone before.

The Reformers are not in any wise to be held at fault for not seeing the true Sabbath. But when *their successors* came in *as heirs of The Reformation*, and Rome picked up that very truth of the Sabbath and brought it home to them, and spread it out before their eyes, and laid it down at their feet, then *these* were decidedly and guiltily inconsistent not to follow up the fundamental principles of The Reformation in the acceptance of that truth.

And when that has ever been continued by Rome, and in the progress of The Reformation has been repeated by others over and over, *these to-day* are *still more inconsistent* with the Spirit of Truth, they still more dishonor the Reformers

and deny The Reformation, when they refuse to accept God's Sabbath and honor Him and The Reformation by the observance of it.

Every principle of The Reformation demands the recognition and observance of the Sabbath of the Lord.

The Sabbath of the Lord is the complement of each principle of The Reformation and of all of them together. Whereas by each and every principle of The Reformation the Sunday is excluded.

Take for instance the principle of "The Word of God." There is the Word of God for the Sabbath. There is no word of God for the Sunday.

Take the principle of "The whole Word of God." The whole Word of God from beginning to end is for the Sabbath. From beginning to end there is no word of God for the Sunday.

Take the principle of "Nothing but the Word of God." With nothing but the Word of God the Sabbath stands in its full glory and majesty. With nothing but the word of God the Sunday has no standing at all.

Take the principle of Righteousness *by faith*: "By the obedience of One shall many be made righteous." It is only by the obedience of Christ that any soul can ever be made righteous with the righteousness of God.

There is obedience of Christ His whole life-time in Sabbath observance, to make every soul

righteous in that. And so Sabbath-keeping can be, and it is, altogether of the works of God and of the righteousness of God which is by faith.

There is *no* obedience of Christ in Sunday observance, ever to make any soul righteous in that. And so Sunday observance has to be, and it is, altogether of man's own works and never can be of faith.

Therefore Sunday observance never can be of The Reformation nor of Christianity; while on every principle Sabbath observance is required by The Reformation and Christianity.

Take the principle that All duty is commanded: and no man can do more than duty.

Sunday observance is nowhere commanded. To do it is to do more than duty.

To be able to do more than duty in what is *not* commanded would enable a man to balance up on his failures to do in all things what *is* commanded, and so to save himself.

And this is precisely the doctrine of Sunday observance. Read again the words of Pope Gregory on page 379. And *there* is exactly where Sunday observance belongs, and not with The Reformation nor with Christianity.

Take the principle of the exposure of Antichrist. The Word of God in the prophecy relating to that power gives as one of its chief features that "he should think to change the Law" of the

Most High. And the whole career of the development and reign of the papacy presents as one of its chief features the change of that precept of the Law touching the Sabbath: changing it from God's thought to man's: putting the day of the man of sin, in the place of the day of the God of righteousness.

The plain record is that for more than sixteen hundred years there was carried on continuously and persistently by the great antagonist of God the set purpose to put away from the knowledge of men the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment. That itself is evidence that in the Sabbath of the Lord there is truth that is of the greatest value.

What then is the Sabbath of the Lord? what does it mean to men? what is its meaning to the universe?

The word "Sabbath" is Hebrew, and signifies *rest*. As "the Sabbath of the Lord thy God" it is *rest* of the Lord thy God.

Therefore the Sabbath is *God's* rest, not man's. It is God's rest for man: not man's rest for himself. To keep the Sabbath is to find and to keep God's rest.

God is only Spirit. His rest is only spiritual. To keep the Sabbath is to find and to keep spiritual rest on the Sabbath *day*.

God is only "the eternal God." His rest is only eternal rest. In the Sabbath day for man,

God has put His own rest which is eternal to be to man in *time* the foretaste and earnest of God's rest in *eternity* that waits for man, and to revive and cheer man on the way through this world to "the world to come."

Jesus said, "The Sabbath was made for man." Mark 2: 27.

Strictly and literally what Jesus said is this: "The Sabbath was made for *the* man."

The phrase "the man" is the exact translation in Greek and English of the Hebrew word "Adam."

This is confirmed beyond all possibility of question by a comparison of the Septuagint, the King James, and the Revised, versions of Genesis 1: 27 to 5: 2.

In the Hebrew there the word Adam is used twenty-five times. The Septuagint continues the word Adam eighteen times, translates it "the man" six times, and "man" once.

The King James version continues the word "Adam" thirteen times, translates it "the man" eight times, and "man" four times: with margin, "Adam" once, and "the man" once.

The Revised version continues the word "Adam" only three times, translates it "the man" eighteen times, and "man" four times: with margin, "Adam" once, and "man" once.

This makes it plain that the phrase "the man"

is strictly and preferably the translation of the word "Adam."

Therefore, what Jesus said in Mark 2: 27 is, "The Sabbath was made for Adam."

And it was made for "Adam—the man"—while he was yet God's man: "the man" of God's "eternal purpose" concerning mankind and the world.

This "eternal purpose" was "purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." Eph. 3: 11. And thus Christ was the Surety of that purpose, that it should be accomplished.

Therefore when the first Adam failed and threw all away, it was only the effecting of the original purpose when Christ took that Adam's place, and Himself, as "the last Adam," carried through the eternal purpose that was invested in the first Adam.

When the first Adam failed, he ceased to be "the man" of the eternal purpose. He was no more the true Adam, and never will be.

When Christ as "the last Adam" took the place that had been vacated by the first Adam, He then became "the man" of the eternal purpose. And thus He became the only true Adam that is or ever will be.

The Sabbath was made for the Adam of God's eternal purpose. It was made for that Adam while he was yet in God's eternal purpose. Therefore

the Sabbath is inseparably of God's eternal purpose, and so is an eternal institution.

The Sabbath was made for the Adam of God's eternal purpose. Both in the surety and in the fact, *Christ* is that *Adam*. Therefore the Sabbath was made for Christ, and is as eternal as is He in the effecting of that purpose.

The Adam for whom as God's man the Sabbath was made was the head and fountain of the mankind who in God's eternal purpose should be the inhabitants of this earth.

Christ only, as "the last Adam," is the One who as God's man is in surety and in fact the Head and Fountain of the mankind who in God's purpose shall inhabit this earth.

Therefore the Sabbath was made for Christ, and *in Him* for all who in that eternal purpose will be His: that is, for all Christians.

Accordingly, in Christ, and in Him only, is to be found the Sabbath of the Lord as it is in the truth of God's thought and purpose.

The life of Jesus is the Way *for* all mankind, and the Way *of* all Christians.

It is the life of Jesus that saves sinners. Rom. 5:10. It is the life of Jesus that is to be manifested in Christians: even "in our mortal flesh" while we are in this body. 2 Cor. 4:10, 11; Gal. 2:20; Col. 1:27; Rom. 5:19.

The Sabbath of the Lord, in the very truth of

it, and in the perfect truth of the keeping of it, is essentially a part of the life of Jesus. For Jesus kept the Sabbath during His whole life on earth.

Therefore the Sabbath and the keeping of it belongs essentially in the life of every Christian. The life of Jesus in the Christian never can be perfected without the Sabbath in the keeping of it.

Without this, the life of the believer is unlike the life of Jesus. And wherein any life is unlike the life of Jesus, just to that extent it comes short of being the true Christian life.

This forever fixes it that the Sabbath of the Lord is the only true day of rest, or of worship, or of refraining from labor for Christians.

It is written: "Hallow my Sabbaths, and they shall be a sign between Me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God." Eze. 20: 20.

It is a sign by which "ye may *know*." It is therefore a *way to knowledge*. It is a means of finding knowledge from God: and thus it is a means of *revelation, from God and of God*.

That one thing alone, even if that were all there were of the Sabbath, would be enough to make it of infinite worth and eternal standing.

But that is not all. For note:

It is not a sign between me and you, only that I am, *but* "that ye may *know* that I am."

It is not a sign only that I am the Lord, *but* "that ye may *know* that I am the Lord."

It is not a sign only that I am the Lord your God, *but* “that ye may know that I am the Lord your God.”

The Sabbath, therefore, to *him who hallows it*, is a sign by which he knows God *by personal acquaintance*.

But “*no man knoweth . . . the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him.*” Matt. 11: 27.

When no one knows God except as He is revealed in Christ; and when the Sabbath is a sign by which he who hallows it may *know* that the Lord is his God; then it follows that the certain truth of that Scripture is just this: “Hallow my Sabbaths, and they shall be a sign between Me and you, that ye may know that I, *as I am revealed in Christ Jesus the Lord*, am the Lord your God.”

“And this is *life eternal* that they might know *Thee* the only true God and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.” And so the Sabbath of the Lord is the God-given sign by which may be found the *knowledge of God* and of Jesus Christ whom He hath sent, that is the very certainty of *life eternal*.

For when the Sabbath is “a sign” that *he who hallows it* may know that the Lord *as revealed in Christ* is his God, then it is certain that *in* the Sabbath He has put the reflection, the impress, of *Himself* as He is *revealed in Christ* to the believer in Him.

What then is the Lord thy God, and what the manifestation of Him, *to man, in the Sabbath of the Lord as made for and given to the man, as a sign by which he may know that the Lord is his God?*

First of all He is Creator: for if there had been no *creation* there never could have been any Sabbath. The *Creator* manifested in *creation* is the first and fundamental essential to there being the Sabbath—the *rest*—of the Lord thy God. And so the Sabbath is the reminder, the memorial, of the *Creator* in His *Creation*.

Next, in the Sabbath He is Rest: for, “God did *rest* the seventh day from all His works;” and “the seventh day is the *rest* of the Lord thy God.” Heb. 4: 4.

Next, in the Sabbath, He is Blessing: for “God blessed the seventh day,” “*for the man.*”

Next, in the Sabbath He is Holiness: for “the Lord *hallowed*”—made *holy*—the Sabbath day.” “Call the Sabbath . . . the *holy* of the Lord.” Isa. 58: 13.

Next, in the Sabbath He is Sanctification: for He “sanctified”—*set apart* to Himself *for purposes of holiness*—the seventh day, which is the Sabbath. And it is “a sign . . . that they might *know* that I am the Lord that *sanctify* them.”—Eze. 20: 12.

All of that *from God*, and God as all of that, is

in the Sabbath as made for the man. And it took all of that to make it the Sabbath *for man*.

Therefore, in the Sabbath of the Lord thy God there is the *impress*, the *revelation*, of *Himself* to man as

his Creator,
his Rest,
his Blessing,
his Holiness,
his Sanctification.

And all of that is exactly what *He is in Christ* to the *believer* in Him: and in *exactly that order*.

The first of all things that God is in Christ to anybody or anything is Creator: for “without Him was not anything made that was made.”

But sin undid all of *that*. And now what is God in Christ first of all to the sinner who believes in Him?

First of all in Christ to the sinner who believes in Him, as in the Sabbath to him who hallows it, God is *Creator*: for “We are His workmanship, CREATED *in Christ Jesus* unto good works which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.” Eph. 2: 10.

Next, in Christ to the believer as in the Sabbath to him who hallows it, God is *Rest*: for “We which *have believed* do enter into REST;” and “he that is *entered* into *His REST*, hath *ceased* from *his own works*, as God did from His.” Heb. 4: 3, 10.

The sinner, longing to *cease* from the short-coming—the sin—of his own works and to “do better,” has *labored* hard and long to do the good that he knows, and so to find *rest* of heart, soul, and spirit, in good works *accomplished*: but all in vain. And in discouragement he cries out, “O! wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of death?” Rom. 7: 14-24.

To every such soul the divine answer is: “I thank God there is deliverance through Jesus Christ our Lord,” who says to all, “*Come unto Me* all ye that *labor* and are *heavy laden*, and I will *give* you *rest*.”

The sinner accepts the heavenly invitation, and *believes* on Him. Instantly the divine power of the *creative Spirit creates* him *anew* in Christ Jesus *unto* the very *works of God*—the *righteousness of God* which is by *faith of Jesus Christ*—which He hath before ordained that we should walk in, but which we all missed and turned to our own way and works of our own righteousness which are only the filthy rags of sin.

And through entering into the *works of God* in Christ, the believer enters into the *rest of God* in *Christ*.

And thus the first and fundamental essential to God’s *rest* in Christ, is God’s *work* of the new *creation* in Christ.

If there be no new *creation* in Christ, there

can be no *rest* in Christ. But thank the Lord there is ever God's new *creation* for every soul; for He is the same yesterday and today and forever.

And the believer *hath* ceased from *his own* works, by entering, *through God's new CREATION* in Christ, into *God's good works* of the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ *unto* all and *upon* all them that *believe*: for there is no difference: for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God.

And so, to the believer in Jesus, the Sabbath—the *rest*—of the Lord thy God is the reminder, the memorial, of the *Creator* in *HIS CREATION* of us in Christ Jesus *unto God's good works* through which alone we have *God's blessed rest*.

Next, in Christ to the believer, as in the Sabbath to him who hallows it, God is *Blessing*: for he "*hath BLESSED us* with all spiritual *blessings* in heavenly places *in Christ*." And "God, having raised up His Son Jesus, *sent Him to BLESS you*, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." Eph. 1: 3; Acts 3: 26.

The blessing of God in Christ to the believer, is *not* only in saving him from the sins that he *has* committed; *but in turning him away* from committing sin: turning his back upon it: *turning him away* so that he *goes now* in the *opposite direction*—in the way of *righteousness* instead of in the way of *sin*.

And this has been *always* the purpose and the power of God's *blessing*, as manifested in Christ in His *blessed day*. This is made plain and certain in His word concerning the Sanctuary and its ministration: for He says that His purpose in that, is, "to *finish* transgression, to make *an end* of sins, to make *reconciliation* for iniquity, and to *bring in* EVERLASTING righteousness." Dan 9: 24.

"God, having raised up His Son Jesus, sent Him to *bless* you in *turning away* every one of you from his iniquities" to just that glorious extent:

that in your life transgression is FINISHED, so that there is no more of it there:

that in your life *an end of sins* is MADE, so that you are *done with it*:

that in your life reconciliation—atonement—for iniquity *is accomplished*, so that you are free from it all:

And that, in your life, "*everlasting righteousness*" is *brought in*, to *abide* and *reign* there.

That is the *blessing* that *God is* in Christ to the *believer in Jesus*; and *that* is just the *meaning* of the *blessing* that *God is* in the Sabbath, to *him* who, through the faith of Christ and in the Spirit of God, *hallows the Sabbath*.

Next, in Christ to the believer, as in the Sabbath to him who hallows it, God is *Holiness*: for when in His blessing to us by His Son Jesus, He has finished transgression, and made an end of

sins, and made reconciliation for iniquity, in our lives, and has *brought in* everlasting righteousness to abide and reign there, *this is* “*unto HOLINESS.*”

Next, in Christ to the believer, as in the Sabbath to him who hallows it, God is *Sanctification*: for to the preacher of the gospel, he says: “I send thee to open their eyes to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan *unto God*, *that* they may obtain forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them that are SANCTIFIED by *faith that is in Me.*”

And so, in the revelation of God *in the Sabbath* to man, and in the revelation of God *in Christ* to man, there stands this perfect parallel:

In the Sabbath He is—	In Christ He is—
Creator,	Creator,
Rest,	Rest,
Blessing,	Blessing,
Holiness,	Holiness,
Sanctification.	Sanctification.

And in perfect demonstration this certifies—

that, in the Sabbath of the Lord, God has put the very reflection and impress of Himself as He is revealed in Christ;

that, only in the faith of Christ is the Sabbath of the Lord truly and fully found, and only in the Sabbath of the Lord *as it is in Spirit and in truth* is Christ truly and fully found;

and that, thus each is the complement of the other *forevermore*, in the faith of Christians and in their *knowledge* and *service* and *worship* of the only true God and Jesus Christ whom He hath sent.

The “shew-bread” in the sanctuary was literally the “bread of the presence” and signified the “Presence,” with God’s people, of that true “Bread of God” which cometh down from heaven and giveth life unto the world. John 6:33-35, 48-51.

That bread of the Presence in the sanctuary was renewed *fresh-baked* at the beginning of each succeeding Sabbath day. This was the revelation of the mighty truth that at the beginning of each succeeding Sabbath day the Presence of Christ the true Bread is renewed in fresh and living experience to every true worshipper who hallows the Sabbath. Ex. 33:14.

“Keep My Sabbaths, and reverence My Sanctuary: I am the Lord.” Levit. 19:30.

That is what the Sabbath is, and *that* is what the *keeping* of the Sabbath *is*, and what it means.

And “*there remaineth*” THIS “keeping of a Sabbath to *the people of God.*”

For it stands written: “There remaineth therefore a rest—keeping of a Sabbath [margin], a Sabbath rest [Rev. Ver.]—to the people of God.” Heb. 4:9.

This keeping of Sabbath that remaineth, this

Sabbath that remaineth to be kept, is the Sabbath of "the seventh day." V. 4.

It is the same day in which God rested when He finished His works at the foundation of the world; and that has remained ever since for mankind to enter into. Vs. 3-6.

It was there for the first Adam to enter into, but he failed to enter into it.

It remained for Israel to enter into, when they were brought out of Egypt in God's purpose to fulfill His oath to Abraham. Heb. 3: 7-11, 16-19; Ex. 6: 3-8; 15: 13, 17; Ps. 81: 13-15; Gen. 50: 24, 25; Ex. 13: 19.

Israel failed to enter into it then, and it remained for them to enter into in the days of Solomon when God would fulfill His oath to David. Heb. 4: 6, 7; Ps. 95: 7-11; 72: 1-17; 1 Kings 10: 1, 24; Ps. 89: 19-37.

Again Israel failed to enter into it, even Solomon himself taking the lead away from God. 1 Kings 10: 26; 11: 1-13; Deut. 17: 16, 17. But still that rest of God, that keeping of a Sabbath, "remained to the people of God."

Then came the Lord Jesus, "the man" of God's eternal purpose, "the last Adam," "the Seed of Abraham," and "the Son of David." And *He did not fail.*

He entered into God's rest in the keeping of the Sabbath, which from the foundation of the

world had remained for that purpose, *and* he entered into God's rest in "the world to come," of which God's rest in the Sabbath is the beginning and foretaste.

And He showed the way, He consecrated the way, He *is the Way*, into God's rest in this world, and through God's rest in this world into God's rest in "the world to come."

And that is the established and the consecrated and the unfailing Way into and *in* God's rest here and hereafter forevermore.

And that blessed rest—that holy, that consecrated, "keeping of a Sabbath"—still "remaineth to the people of God."

And all the time from the foundation of the world to the end of the world, it is first God's rest *in the Sabbath of the Lord* into which men are to enter through faith on Christ and in which we are to abide *as the foretaste and earnest* of God's rest in the land of promise—"the world to come."

For, the way that men will use God's rest *given* to them through Christ in the Sabbath, is the test and proof of just how they would use God's rest that is *promised* to them in the world to come, if that were now given to them.

In entering into this rest we cease from our own works "as God did from His." In ceasing from His own works "God did rest the sev-

enth day." In ceasing from our own works we can not do it "as God did" without doing it *as He did* and "rest the seventh day."

Not to cease from our works on the seventh day "as God did from His," but to cease some other day, is not to do "as God did;" but is to do as somebody else did. And *that* is to enter neither God's works nor God's rest; but is to enter into both the works and the rest of some one who is neither God nor of God; but who would put himself in the place of God and pass himself off for God.

By the plain Word of God, therefore, "there remaineth the keeping of a Sabbath to the people of God;" and this Sabbath is "the seventh day" on which "God did rest from all His works."

What then is the keeping of the Sabbath? The life of Jesus is the answer to this question.

"His custom was" to go to the place of assembly of the worshippers of God. "Custom" is "the frequent repetition of the same act or thing." The Sabbath is the day of the worship of God. Isa. 66: 23.

He declared the true principle of Sabbath-keeping to be "mercy, and not sacrifice." Matt. 12: 7. Whatever contravenes mercy, whether to man or to beast, and makes the Sabbath a burdensome or sacrificial thing, is Sabbath-breaking and not Sabbath-keeping.

Whatever is done on the Sabbath day in mercy and kindness to man or beast that is in need, or that is done in the worship and service of God according to His word, is Sabbath-keeping. Matt. 12: 3-13.

Accordingly, to the scandal and indignation of the Pharisees, Jesus made the Sabbath especially a day of healing and blessing. Luke 6: 6-10; 13: 10-17; 14: 1-6; John 5: 5-16; 7: 23, 24; 9: 13-16; 34-38.

Therefore, according to the Scriptures and the Life and Spirit of Jesus, the keeping of the Sabbath that "remaineth to the people of God," and that can be kept *only by the people of God*, and no other, means this:

To cease from our own works and all that is
our own.

To hallow the Sabbath.

To meet God in Christ anew by faith. To meet
Him in His

Creative power and His

Renewing grace, in His

Rest, in His

Blessing of turning us from sin to His

Everlasting righteousness, unto

Holiness, and

Sanctification.

To worship Him in Spirit and in truth.

To go to the assembly of worshippers.

In mercy to do good to the needy, to the distressed, to the sick and the helpless, of man or beast.

The consequence of the life and teaching of Jesus as to the Sabbath and the keeping of it, is manifest in the lives of Christians all through the New Testament after His death and resurrection and ascension.

The first thing that occurred in the life of believers in Him, after His death, was the keeping of "the Sabbath day according to the Commandment." Luke 23: 55, 56.

Thus the first thing that occurred after the finishing of Creation, was God's resting on the seventh day; and the first thing that occurred after Jesus declared "It is finished" in Redemption, was the resting on the seventh day of the truest believers in Him: the blessed women "who were last at the cross and first at the tomb."

That was in A. D. 33. Then in A. D. 45 it was the Sabbath day when Paul and Barnabas preached to the Gentiles at Antioch in Pisidia. Acts 13: 42-49.

In A. D. 53 it was the Sabbath day when Paul and Silas and their company at Philippi went to the place of worship outside the city. Acts 16: 12-15.

In A. D. 53 again it was the Sabbath day when Paul preached at Thessalonica *as his custom was*:

that is, the frequent repetition of the same act or thing. Acts 17: 1-4.

In A. D. 54 it was the Sabbath day when Paul preached at Corinth, still, like his divine Master, in the frequent repetition of the same act or thing. Acts 18: 4, 9-11.

In A. D. 64 it was the Sabbath day—God’s rest of the seventh day—that Paul set down in the plain Word of Inspiration as the Sabbath the keeping of which “remaineth to the people of God.” Heb. 4: 4, 5, 9.

And since this Sabbath day was the only regular day of assembly ever known to *the Hebrews*, it would again be impressed upon them in the instruction “not to forsake the assembling of themselves together.” Heb. 10: 25.

In A. D. 67 it was the Sabbath day which Jesus required His disciples to keep in remembrance when should come the time of their flight from Judea. Matt. 24: 20.

In A. D. 96 it was the Sabbath day—the Lord’s holy day—when John was “in the Spirit” on the Isle of Patmos and received the Revelation of Jesus Christ for all time. Rev. 1: 10; Isa. 58: 13.

In A. D. 100-120 it was the Sabbath day when the epistle of Ignatius said, “Let every one of you keep the Sabbath.” “And after the observance of the Sabbath let every friend of Christ keep the Lord’s day.”

It is true that by many eminent scholars this writing of the supposed Ignatius is held to be a forgery. But as evidence on this question it matters not whether it be a forgery or not. Its value and weight as evidence rests in the record as such, and not upon who might be the person who wrote it.

It was written by some one who was interested in exalting Sunday as "the queen and chief of all the days."

If it be genuinely of the real Ignatius it proves that the Sabbath was being observed by those whom he would have to receive the Sunday as this "queen and chief;" and that the observance of the Sabbath was so fixed in their Christian life that he did not so much as even hint at any such thing as their accepting the Sunday *in place* of the Sabbath, but actually directed that "every one of you keep the Sabbath," and "*after* the observance of the Sabbath" *then* keep the Sunday "as a festival," etc.

If it be a forgery, then it certifies that "the observance of the Sabbath" was so universal and so fixed in the Christian life of the time, that even a rascal in the very practice of his chicanery could not dare to question it or to offer Sunday as a substitute for it; but only to offer the Sunday as an additional day.

And than this there could not be stronger evi-

dence that "the observance of the Sabbath" was a settled and universal practice in the Christian life: even among those who had "lost their first love," and who to some extent had fallen away from the pure truth of the Gospel.

In the two hundred years of the "Apostolic Constitutions," to 326, it was the Sabbath in the authoritative "discipline" of the rising false Catholic church.

In the time of Athanasius, to 373, it was the Sabbath; for he said, "We assemble on Saturday, *not* that we are affected with Judaism, but only to worship Jesus the Lord of the Sabbath."

It was the Sabbath in 364 when the Council of Laodicea put a curse on those who would keep it, and yet had still to recognize *the fact* of its observance.

It was the Sabbath in 416 when Pope Leo "the Great" likewise must recognize the fact of its observance, but would turn it to "a fast day" while Sunday was made to be "a *most festive* day."

It was "the Sabbath of every week" in 439 when Socrates must bear witness that "almost all churches throughout the world" observed it, but that "Alexandria and Rome have ceased to do this."

Note that these had "*ceased* to do this." They could not have "ceased to do" what they had

never done. This shows that even in those cities they had formerly done "this" as in the time of Leo, 416; but since then they had "ceased" to do it.

It was the Sabbath in 460 when Sozomen must record that "The people of Constantinople and everywhere assemble together on the Sabbath . . . which custom is never observed at Rome or at Alexandria."

It was "the Sabbath day" in 602 when Pope Gregory "the Great" denounced as "preachers of Antichrist" those who taught its observance.

It was the Sabbath among the Briton Christians 596-664, and then was still so with those who withdrew to the Isle of Iona and to Ireland rather than to submit to the laws commanding and enforcing Sunday observance.

It was the Sabbath in 791 when the Council of Friuli witnessed to its observance still, even though only by "our rustics."

It was the Sabbath in 858-867 when it was still observed to such an extent that Pope Nicholas I found it necessary to denounce its observance as "the doctrine of Antichrist."

In 1069 it was still "the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment" in Scotland when Queen Margaret's "newest Roman type" of religion must crush it out.

Thus it is the Sabbath from the beginning to

the end of the Bible; from the finishing of Creation to the finishing of the written Revelation; and was still so among Christians for more than a thousand years after the Bible was closed.

It was the Sabbath in the life of Jesus; in the lives of Christians throughout the New Testament; in the lives of those who to the best of their ability would be Christians against the power of Rome, for nearly eight hundred years; and in the lives of Christians who were outside the jurisdiction of Rome and beyond her power, for more than a thousand years.

For more than a thousand years after the ascension of Christ, *everywhere* the Sabbath was originally observed by the Christians in all countries, and even in the cities of Alexandria and Rome.

In Rome and Alexandria, spiritual Babylon and Egypt, the observance of the Sabbath first "ceased" among Christians, and then from there this cessation was gradually spread as the power of Rome grew. Wherever that power came, and to the extent that it could be exerted, the observance of the Sabbath was caused to cease and to be crushed out.

But it never was completely obliterated. Always there have been faithful and true witnesses for God against Rome. And there always will be.

All the power of federation and confederation

of both Rome and Puritanism could not stop it; and now all the power of federation of Rome and the Federal Council combined, and with all the power of all the nations in their hands, cannot cause it to cease

By the whole record on this question it is certain that both the papacy and the Federal Council of Churches have assumed prerogative and have exercised authority to *change the Law of the Most High*, from His thought and word to their own. And they both deny the right of any one to observe that Law *as the Most High Himself* has spoken it and written it.

And than in this it were impossible for even them more fully to manifest the spirit of independence of God and of exaltation above Him.

It is a principle in governmental procedure, recognized in law, and regarded in history, that for a subordinate community to re-enact, especially with changes, a law made by the supreme authority for the government of the subordinate community, is "tantamount to a declaration of independence."

In illustration, a fact from history may help to appreciate the infinite principle here involved. In 1698, as now, Ireland was a possession of Britain. The English colonists in Ireland were the ruling power there, and had a parliament—Lords and Commons—of their own: a sort of home rule.

This local parliament, "the Irish Lords and Commons, had presumed not only to re-enact an English act passed expressly for the purpose of binding them, but to re-enact it *with alterations*. The alterations were indeed small; but the alteration *even of a letter* was tantamount to a declaration of independence.

"The colony in Ireland was emphatically a dependency: a dependency, not merely by the common law of the realm, but by the nature of things. It was absurd to claim independence for a community which could not cease to be dependent without ceasing to exist."*

It is in view of this very principle that the word of God in Matt. 5: 17-19 and Dan. 7: 25 was spoken and stands written.

Therefore, on this question of Sabbath or Sunday as the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment of the Law of the Most High, the real issue is the simple but mighty one of

Loyalty to God,
or
Independence of God.

And in this time of the *finishing of all*, according to God's eternal purpose, in the finishing of the Mystery of God, His own divine sign of His finished work, the Holy Sabbath, will arise and live, and *will be known and worn* as the distin-

* Macaulay's "History of England," chap. xxiii, par. 62.

guishing badge of all those who, against all the power and deception of the ultimate Antichrist, will be loyal and true to God *alone* in His Creative power and in His Redeeming grace as revived for the world in The Reformation preparatory to the great day of the glorious Presentation at the finishing of the Mystery of God.

Now, in this final time of entering into God's rest in eternity, there remaineth the keeping of the Sabbath to the people of God.

And now it will live as in the beginning when it "was made for the man;" as it lived in the redeeming when it was kept by "the Man;" and *as it will live* in the eternity of "the world to come" where it belongs: when "from one Sabbath to another shall all flesh come to worship before Me saith the Lord." Isa. 66: 23.

And thus by the loving kindness of the Gracious
God,
by the High-priestly intercession of the Divine
Christ,
by the gentle pleading and persuasion of the
Holy Spirit, and
by the pure principles of the Word of God,
there is brought to the conscience and laid upon
the conviction of every soul the ever
blessed choice of

The Reformation against Rome.

CHAPTER XIX.

THAT WOMAN JEZEBEL.

The Ten Tribes of Israel had fallen away from the true way and pure worship of God.

The original Jezebel was a heathen sun-worshipping woman who through marrying King Ahab came into the kingdom of Israel.

She soon dominated the king and ruled in the kingdom. And when the evil that she would do was more than the king could have the heart to compass, she would do it herself in the king's name and by the power of the kingdom and would be merry in it all. 1 Kings 21: 5-16.

She would make her religion to be the religion of the kingdom and of every soul in the kingdom. She brought with her eight hundred and fifty "prophets" of her religion. She was the personal patron of them all. They all "ate at Jezebel's table." 1 Kings 18: 19.

She deliberately set herself to abolish all the religion and all the worship of God, and to establish solely her own in all the kingdom. She systematically broke down all the altars of the worship of God in the land. She compelled all to conform to her form of sun-worship. 1 Kings 19: 10, 14.

And whosoever would not do this in some way—by sacrificing, by bowing the knee in a genuflexion, or by kissing the hand to throw a kiss to Baal—was outlawed and had to find refuge in dens and holes and caves of the earth. 1 Kings 18: 4, 13.

So thorough-going was she in this that though there were seven thousand persons who would worship God only and serve Him alone, they were so scattered and hunted that each one thought that he was the only one left.

Even Elijah was sure that he only was left. And they sought his life to take it away. And he was delivered from the wrath of Jezebel by being translated from the world. "There appeared horses of fire and chariots of fire, and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven." 1 Kings 16: 30 to 19: 21; 2 Kings 2: 1-11.

In the Scriptures there is another Jezebel. She is described in the Book of Revelation. Her career is in Christian times. Rev. 2: 20-29.

Among the people of Christ who had left their first love and had fallen away from the true Way and pure worship of God, there came in heathen sun-worshippers bringing with them all their native characters and dispositions and ways.

There were so many of these that they became a heathen sun-worshipping church professing the Christian name. This sun-worshipping

church secured an alliance with the imperial Roman State.

She dominated the imperial power and ruled in the empire and all the kingdoms of Europe. To please her all emperors and kings had to be worse than they otherwise would have been.

She would make her heathen naturalistic religion to be the religion of every kingdom and of everybody in all the kingdoms. She set herself against all the true worship of God. She compelled all to conform to her worship, which was but a form of heathen sun-worship with the *Sun day* the grand token as "queen and chief of all the days."

Whosoever would not conform to this worship in some way was outlawed and hunted and persecuted, and had to find refuge in dens and holes and caves of the earth.

In The Reformation and its splendid fruit in the establishing of the American Nation with perfect Religious Liberty, God sent to mankind deliverance from this Jezebel.

Yet the world is not done with "that woman Jezebel." She still lived, and with the same determination to rule mankind. Since The Reformation by this New Nation had delivered the world from her rule, she would defeat The Reformation and regain a wider influence and rule by drawing into her toils the New Nation.

To her aid in this, more than all else in the world, has come the Federal Council of Churches embodying her vital principles and repudiating The Reformation. Thus will the power and working of "that woman Jezebel" be restored.

National, international, and world, federation of papal and false Protestant will elevate her again to the place and position where she can congratulate herself, "I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow." Rev. 18: 7.

And again she will reign and rage, only more widely and more fiercely. Again all must conform to the worship dictated by her. Under the alternative of a general and universal boycott, and at last even death, as in the time of Elijah, all must worship as she dictates. Rev: 13: 14-17.

And all that dwell upon the earth shall so worship, whose names are not written in the Book of Life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. Rev. 13: 8; 17: 12, 13, 17.

And here, by "that woman Jezebel," "the beast," the ultimate Antichrist accomplishes the crowning work of iniquity. This is brought about in the following way:

It is "to the people of God" that there remains the "keeping of a Sabbath." It was made for "the man" of God's eternal purpose. And none but those who are "the people of God" in this purpose can possibly keep the Sabbath.

One who is not of the people of God could not keep the Sabbath, even if he were to try. Such persons may do no work on the seventh day of the week, or on the first day of the week, or on both of them together; they may find their own or somebody else's rest on either or both of these days, they may do this all their lives, and yet never keep the Sabbath.

To keep the Sabbath, to celebrate the Sabbath, is to keep and celebrate *God's rest*, not our own nor that of somebody else. This rest is the gift of God in Christ. And it is received and kept and enjoyed only by the individual upon his own personal choice in personal faith. Rom. 14: 5.

And the inevitable consequences and rewards of personal faith and true worship *prevent its being* in any sense a *day of idleness*, and cause it to be only a day of blessing and delight.

This truth exposes the awful iniquity of all church-rules and all State legislation compelling men to observe a day of rest. It forces irreligious and unchristian men into the form of a religion and of a rest that cannot possibly be had without personal faith in Christ and God; and thus forces them into only a day of idleness with its consequent mischiefs and iniquities.

And now in this time of the ultimate Antichrist he doubles up on his abominations by making *both Sabbath and Sunday* to be days of en-

forced idleness and of consequent mischief and iniquity.

In this course of abomination there is *yet another step to finish* the mystery of iniquity. And it will be taken.

God can consistently and righteously require a day of rest from all temporal occupations; *because, with the rest, He* can supply the *religion* and the *worship* which alone can prevent its being a day of idleness and mischief. And only *He* can possibly do this. 2 Cor. 3: 18.

That woman Jezebel undertakes to require her Sun day as a day of rest of all from all work and from every honest occupation, *for worship*. Through the power of the State she makes this compulsory upon all. But the State *cannot supply* the religion and the worship which alone can prevent this day of enforced idleness from being a day of *mischief and iniquity*.

Then and therefore the church which has caused the State to enforce that day of idleness, must also cause the State to enforce the religion and the worship which the church shall prescribe as the *preventive* of that *day of idleness* being only a *day of iniquity*.

But true religion and true worship cannot be enforced. This never can be a matter of law. So the church never can prescribe to the State, or in any connection with force or law, any religion or

worship *that is true*. It is only false religion and false worship, it is only the *form* which is abomination, that can possibly be so prescribed or enforced.

Therefore the only religion and worship that can possibly be supplied and enforced to prevent this day of enforced idleness from being only a day of iniquity, is a religion and worship that is utterly false—an abomination—and so only deepens unto perfection the scheme of iniquity in the false worship of the beast and his image.

Thus by means of denominational, national, international, and world federation, with its “pressure” upon city, county, State and National authorities, enforcing a day of universal idleness *as the means and necessity* of enforcing the universal false religion and worship of the beast and his image, the ultimate Antichrist is enabled to bring all to the full reflection of his own image, and so to finish the mystery of iniquity.

For it is the sober truth, deliberately stated upon an analysis of more than a thousand cases, that “Nearly every prosecution under our Sunday laws is the result of petty spite, meanness and malice.”

To save all from this crowning evil the Lord in mercy sends to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, His solemn warning against it all, and His gracious call away from it all *unto*

the true worship of Him only, in the keeping of the Commandments of God and the Faith of Jesus.

Here is the warning: "If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of His indignation; . . . and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name." Rev. 14: 9-11.

Here is the call, by "the everlasting Gospel:" "Fear God and give glory to Him; for the hour of His judgment is come: and *worship Him* that made Heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters. . . . Here is the patience of the saints. Here are they that keep the Commandments of God and the Faith of Jesus." Vs. 7, 12.

And in this is the finishing of God's work in effecting His eternal purpose in Creation, in Redemption, and in The Reformation, all summed up in the finishing of the Mystery of God according to the eternal purpose which He purposed in Jesus Christ our Lord.

And of all this the Sabbath of the Lord in Spirit and in truth is the crown and seal as God's own divinely ordained sign of His own finished work.

In this final and *finishing* conflict again all who will be true to God, all who will worship Him only in the keeping of the Commandments of God and the Faith of Jesus, will be outlawed, hunted, and persecuted, and will have to find refuge where they may.

At first there will be "as the shaking of an olive tree, and as the gleaning grapes when the vintage is done:" "two or three berries in the top of the uppermost bough, four or five in the outmost fruitful branches thereof." "These shall lift up their voice, they shall sing for the majesty of the Lord." Isa. 24: 13, 14; 17: 6.

But the pressure will be so persistent that at last there will not be even two or three here or four or five there. But again just as in Elijah's time these will be so scattered that one will not know that there is another. Again each one will think that he only is left. And he will *know* that they seek his life to take it away. Rev. 12: 17; Micah 4: 6, 7.

Yet each one where he is will be a true worshipper of God, and will have it settled that so long as he is in the world God shall have a worshipper who will worship Him only, and will serve Him alone: Jezebel or no Jezebel. Isa. 41: 17; 33: 16, 17.

And while these stand thus true and faithful to God, with "that woman Jezebel" venting all

her wrath, "the great trumpet shall be blown," and "ye shall be gathered *one by one*, O ye children of Israel." Isa. 27: 12, 13.

"For the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain, [as Elijah] shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord." 1 Thess. 4: 16, 17.

"And I saw a sea of glass mingled with fire; and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass having the harps of God."

CHAPTER XX.

THE TWO WOMEN OF REVELATION.

In the Book of Revelation there are two remarkable women.

The one, the heavenly woman, so pure and true that only heaven is worthy of her, and even there only the very galaxy of the heavens worthy to be her adorning. She is clothed with the sun; the moon is under her feet; and she is crowned with the stars. Rev. 12: 1.

Through pain and travail she brings into the world the Son of God, the Saviour of men. Her child is caught up unto God, and to His throne. Vs. 2, 5.

Through deadly peril and persistent persecution unto the end of the world this heavenly woman holds in the world the true and pure worship of God in the preaching of the Gospel of Salvation and the keeping of the Commandments of God and the Faith of Jesus. Rev. 12: 11-17.

And by this she incurs the perpetual enmity of "that old serpent called the Devil and Satan," who uses against her in succession all the power of the dragon, the beast, and the false prophet or image of the beast.

The other, the earthly woman, is so vicious and degraded that her worthy place is to sit only on

“a scarlet colored beast *full* of names of blasphemy:” she herself an ugly drunken harlot, “arrayed in purple and scarlet color, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, and having in her hand a golden cup *full* of abominations and filthiness of her fornication.” Rev. 17: 3, 4.

She invites all the nations to her drunken, lascivious banquet; and the kings and inhabitants of the earth are made drunk with the wine of her fornication; and she herself is drunken with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus. And on her forehead is a name written:

“Mystery.

“Babylon the Great.

“The Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the Earth.” Rev. 17: 2, 5, 6.

This woman is so admired by “that old serpent called the Devil and Satan” that he welcomes her into his palace, seats her on his own throne, and gives her his own power and great authority. Rev. 13: 2, 4.

The heavenly woman has just one Son.

The earthly woman has just one son.

The heavenly woman has just the one Son,
the Son of God.

The earthly woman has just the one son, the
son of Perdition.

The heavenly woman has the one Son, the Son of God and Saviour of men and the world.

The earthly woman has the one son, the son of Perdition and destroyer of men and the world.

The heavenly woman has just the one Son, and *no daughter at all*.

The earthly woman has just the one son, but *many, many daughters*.

The heavenly woman has the one Son, and no daughter at all: yet she has a great multitude of children: but they are all born of God, and are hers only by adoption.

The earthly woman has the one son, and many, many, daughters; and these are all her very own by natural birth.

The heavenly woman has the one Son, and no daughter at all; yet a great multitude of children, all born of God, and hers by adoption; and *all of these* are partakers of the divine nature, and have God's character and Christ's disposition.

The earthly woman has the one son, and many, many, daughters, all her very own by natural birth; and *all of these* are partakers of their mother's nature, and of her harlot character and Jezebel disposition.

The heavenly woman has just the one Son, the Son of God and Saviour of men and the world; no daughter at all, yet a great multitude of children, all born of God and hers by adoption; are all partakers of the divine nature, and of God's character and Christ's disposition; and *these* "are not defiled with women." Rev. 14: 4.

The earthly woman has just the one son, the son of Perdition and the destroyer of men and the world; has many, many, daughters, all her very own by natural birth; all partakers of their mother's nature, and of her harlot character and Jezebel disposition; and *all of her children are defiled with these women.*

In which company are you?

In this time of the finishing of all mysteries, this awful woman "Mystery, Babylon the Great," rises again to place and "power over men" and nations. Rev. 17: 12, 13, 17.

To her all prospects then seem so pleasing that she proudly congratulates herself, "I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow." "I shall be a lady forever." Rev. 18: 7; Isa. 47: 7, 8.

Again her alluring banquet is spread. The kings of the earth are invited to the feast, and live

deliciously with her. But in the midst of the revellings, even while the golden cup is in her hand, her peace is disturbed. Isa. 47: 11; Rev. 18: 9.

“Suddenly,” “in one hour,” her judgment falls. Desolation overtakes her. “With violence” she is “*thrown down*, and shall be found *no more at all.*” Rev. 17: 8, 16; 18: 10, 17, 19, 21.

Before this comes, as in the broad and busy street of ancient Babylon, in the busy streets of this final Babylon the word of God will be read proclaiming her doom and warning all to “Flee out of the midst of Babylon” and “Let Jerusalem come into your mind.” Jer: 50: 1-; 51: 58, 61-64; Rev. 18: 1-23.

“And I heard a voice *from heaven* saying,
“Come Out of Her My People.”

And “*ye are come* unto
“Mount Zion, and unto
“The City of the Living God,
“The heavenly Jerusalem, and to
“An innumerable company of angels, to
“The General Assembly and Church of the
 Firstborn, which are written in heaven,
 and to
“God the Judge of all, and to
“The spirits of just men made perfect, and to

“Jesus the Mediator of the New Covenant,
and to

“The Blood of Sprinkling, that speaketh better
things than that of Abel.”

“Be glad then, ye children of Zion, and rejoice
in the Lord your God; for He hath given *you* the
former rain moderately, and He will cause to come
down *for you* the rain—the former rain *and the
latter rain.*” Joel 2: 23.

“*When* I have bent Judah for me, and filled
the bow with Ephraim, and *raised up thy sons, O
Zion, AGAINST thy sons, O Greece,* and made thee
as the sword of a mighty man. [Pp. 190, 253.]

“And the Lord shall be seen over them, and
His arrow shall go forth as the lightning; and *the
Lord God shall blow the trumpet,* and shall go with
whirlwinds of the south.

“*The Lord of Hosts shall defend them;* and
they shall devour and subdue with slingstones; and
they shall drink, and make a noise as through
wine, and they shall be filled like bowls, and as the
corners of the altar. Eph. 5: 18; Acts 2: 13, 16, 17.

“And the Lord their *God shall save them in
that day* as the flock of His people; for they shall
be as the stones of a crown, lifted up as an ensign
upon the land.” Zech. 9: 13-16.

CHAPTER XXI.

THE CHRISTIAN AND REFORMATION RELIGIOUS LIBERTY OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT.

[The matter that composes this chapter was originally a speech that was delivered by the author of this book, in Washington, D. C., Jan. 6, 1912, and was published in the daily Washington Herald, Jan. 7, 1912. There was no thought then that this book should ever be written. Yet no more fitting close of the book could be made than is already supplied in the speech. It is therefore inserted exactly as it was made.]

In preceding speeches I have made perfectly clear the church origin, the religious and ecclesiastical character, and the un-American and unconstitutional standing, of all Sunday laws in the United States.

In this speech I shall make just as clear the truth that by the National Constitution, and particularly by the Fourteenth Amendment, in its certain intent and plain provisions, every citizen of the United States is entirely free from every Sunday law in every State in the United States.

The particular provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment that I shall discuss are contained in the first two sentences of Section 1:—

“All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States, and of the State in which they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States.”

“Before this amendment was adopted, pri-

marily there was no such thing as citizenship of the United States. Men were first citizens of their respective States; and as a consequence, or by inference, were citizens of the United States.

This was because of the fact that the thirteen original States were all here as independent States before the National government was formed. In the then situation, citizenship of the United States was both indefinite and precarious.

The Fourteenth Amendment completely reversed that order of things. It makes citizenship of the United States both primary and paramount. It also makes this citizenship definite, and certain, and secure, everywhere in the Nation, by prohibiting every State from ever making any law, or enforcing any law already made, that abridges the privileges or immunities that pertain to this now and forever primary and paramount citizenship of the United States.

Before, all that any man could be certain of, as to his citizenship, was that he was a State man. Since, in his citizenship every man knows that he is absolutely and irrevocably a National man.

There has been gained the impression that the Fourteenth Amendment was framed with particular reference to the race that lately had been emancipated. However that may be as to the other sections of this Amendment, it is not in any sense true as to the first section.

Nothing can be more certain than that the first section was designed as an original measure, and on original ground, to remedy the long-existent defect as to citizenship of the United States; and to make effective to “the whole people of the United States” the full intent of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

This was expressly declared by Thaddeus Stevens, John A. Bingham, James G. Blaine, and others, to be the intent of the first section.

Thaddeus Stevens, as Chairman of the Committee, had charge of the Resolution in the House, where it originated. Speaking directly of the First Section, he said: “Our fathers had been compelled to postpone the principles of the Declaration [of Independence], and wait for their full establishment till a more propitious time. . . . I can hardly believe that any person can be found who will not admit that every one of these provisions is just. They are all asserted in some form or other in our Declaration or organic law. But the Constitution limits only the action of Congress, and is not a limitation on the States. This Amendment supplies that defect.” “The public mind has been educated in error for a century. How difficult, in a day to unlearn it.”—*Cong. Globe, May 8, 1866, P. 2459.*

Mr. Miller said: The First Section “is so clearly within the spirit of the Declaration of In-

dependence of the 4th of July, 1776, that no member of this House can seriously object to it.”—*Id.*, May 9, P. 2510.

John A. Bingham closed the debate on the Resolution in the House. He said: “There was a want, hitherto, and there remains a want now, in the Constitution of our country, which the proposed Amendment will supply. What is that? It is the power of the people, the whole people of the United States, by express authority of the Constitution, to do that by Congressional enactment which hitherto they have not had the power to do, and have never attempted to do: that is, to protect by national law the privileges and immunities of all the citizens of the Republic, *and the inborn rights of every person* within its jurisdiction, whenever the same shall be abridged or denied by the unconstitutional acts of any State.”

He said that no State ever had *the right* to do these things, yet that “many of them have assumed and exercised *the power*, and that without remedy.” “Many instances of State injustice and oppression have already occurred in the State legislation of this Union, of flagrant violations of the guarantied privileges of citizens of the United States, for which the National Government furnished and could furnish no remedy whatever. . . . That great want of the citizen and the stranger, protection by National law from unconstitutional

enactments, is supplied by the First Section of this Amendment.”—*Id.*, May 10, Pp. 2542, 3.

James G. Blaine also had a material part in it all. And in his history of it he says that it “establishes American citizenship upon a permanent foundation, which gives to the humblest man in the Republic ample protection against any abridgment of his privileges or immunities by State law, which secures to him and his descendants the equal protection of the law in all that relates to his life, his liberty, or his property. The first section of the Constitutional Amendment which includes these invaluable provisions, is in fact *a new charter of liberty* to the citizens of the United States.”—“*Twenty Years of Congress*,” Vol. II, P. 312.

What then are the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, that no State shall abridge? In the Senate, Senator Howard, of Michigan, had charge of the Resolution. In answer to this direct question, he said that they are “the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States” as in Section 2 of Article IV of the National Constitution; and that *now*, “to these should be added the personal rights guarantied and secured by the first eight Amendments to the Constitution.”—*Cong. Globe*, May 23, 1866, P. 2765.

Further authority in answer to this question is,

“Whatever one may claim as of right under the Constitution and laws of the United States by virtue of his citizenship, is a privilege of a citizen of the United States. Whatever the Constitution and laws of the United States entitle him to exemption from, he may claim an exemption in respect to. And such a right or privilege is abridged whenever the State law interferes with any legitimate operation of Federal authority which concerns his interest, whether it be an authority actively exerted, or resting only in the express or implied command or assurance of the Federal Constitution or law.”—Cooley, “Principles,” P. 247.

The privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States specifically and by direct statement include “The personal rights guaranteed and secured by the first eight amendments of the Constitution.”

The very first *privilege* assured in the first eight amendments, is the first one in the First Amendment: that of absolute individuality in religion. And the very first *immunity* is also the first one in that First Amendment—that of absolute exemption from any and all legislative or other governmental cognizance in, or connection with, religion or things religious.

For Madison said: “There is not a shadow of right in the general government to intermeddle with religion. Its least interference with it would be a most flagrant usurpation.”

This, then, is the very first and the very certain privilege and immunity of every citizen of the United States. And by express intent and explicit

statement this privilege and immunity of every citizen of the United States is by the Fourteenth Amendment extended to, and is made absolute in, every State in the Union. So that now every citizen of the United States is just as free from religion or religious things by law, in any and every State, as he is under national jurisdiction alone.

If there were no States at all, but there were only the one solid National government everywhere over all the land, then beyond all question absolute exemption from all governmental cognizance in or of religion or things religious, would be a privilege and an immunity of every citizen of the United States everywhere in all the land. Yet under the Fourteenth Amendment the existence of all the forty-eight States affects not to a scintilla the universality of this privilege and immunity of every person born or naturalized in the United States.

Whatever pertains to the citizen of the United States, as a citizen of the United States, is of itself National, primary, and paramount; and is secured to him by the guaranty of the national power.

Absolute exemption from any and all governmental cognizance in or of religion or things religious, is indisputably an immunity of every citizen of the United States.

Therefore, it follows inevitably that when and

wherein the Fourteenth Amendment declares that “No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States,” it specifically and authoritatively extends this privilege and immunity of every citizen throughout all the several States, and prohibits any and every State from making any law, and from enforcing any law already made, in furtherance of the old order of things of religion or religious things recognized and enforced by law.

This is the unescapable logic of the Fourteenth Amendment itself, *and* of the plain words of those who made it expressing its intent. Yet we are not left to the logic of it, sure as this is. We have the plain declaration that just that was intended to be its scope and force.

As already stated, James G. Blaine was one of those who had a material part in making the Amendment. He also wrote the history of it. Whoever is most acquainted with the whole story, will most readily perceive that Mr. Blaine’s history and exposition of the Amendment is practically a digest of the debates on the resolution in the House and the Senate. Of the religious liberty feature of this Amendment he says:—

“The language of the Fourteenth Amendment is authoritative and mandatory. No State shall make or enforce any law abridging the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States. . . . Under the force of

these weighty inhibitions, the citizen of foreign birth cannot be persecuted by discriminating statutes. . . . Nor can the Catholic, or the Protestant, or the Jew, be placed under ban or subjected to any deprivation of personal or religious right. The provision is comprehensive and absolute, and sweeps away at once every form of oppression and every denial of justice. It abolishes caste and enlarges the scope of human freedom. It increases the power of the republic to do equal and exact justice to all its citizens, and curtails the powers of the States to shelter the wrongdoer, or to authorize crime by a statute.”—“Twenty Years of Congress,” Vol. II, Pp. 313, 314.

It makes absolutely void and of no effect every one of those provisions, whether of statute or of constitution, of the old systems of church and State or established religion, that are still nursed in Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Georgia, the Carolinas, Delaware, Pennsylvania, or any other of the original States; and everything of like nature in any other State.

The privileges and immunities of every citizen of the United States on the subject of religion in law or by law are clearly defined and fixed in the National Constitution. And these privileges and immunities of the citizen of the United States are primary and paramount in all the States, all those lingering, nursed, and coddled provisions of the decrepit old church and State systems to the contrary notwithstanding for a moment. They were all quenched more than forty years ago.

And this includes every Sunday law in every

State or municipality throughout the whole nation. In the preceding speeches I have given the indisputable evidence that all Sunday legislation ever in the world has been and is exclusively religious and ecclesiastical; that Sunday, being an institution and an observance wholly of the church, its recognition or incorporation in the law of any State is of itself the union of church and State; and that the enforcement of any Sunday law ever, anywhere, is the enforcement of a religious idea, and of submission to the institution and authority of the church, and that the church of Rome.

All Sunday legislation, being only religious and ecclesiastical, is positively excluded from the cognizance of the government of the United States, and explicitly from that of Congress: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

In truth, in principle, in intent, and in fact, that provision of the Constitution prohibits every phase or thought of Sunday legislation as certainly as if it read, "Congress shall make no Sunday law."

That this inhibition was intended to include Sunday laws is certain—

First, from the notorious fact that the Sunday laws of the original States that took part in the making of the Constitution, were so essentially of the established religions of those States that it

was impossible to discriminate them from those establishments of religion.

Secondly, from the fact that *then* there had not been evolved the judicial casuistry that without a twinge or a blush can turn an avowedly religious statute into a "mere civil regulation;" and

Thirdly, from the fact that in all the States that had any part in making the Constitution except Virginia, there were nothing but established religions; and there was neither thought nor room for thought on the part of anybody, that Sunday laws were or could be anything else than essentially of those State establishments of religion.

The National Constitution was intended to cause the National government and the American people to stand forever free from every vestige of that old order of things; of which all those *national men* had had experience enough. This is the one thought of every word of that clause of the first amendment, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Those were intentionally pregnant words telling to all people that none of those old establishments of religion, nor anything pertaining to them, that had characterized the States and cursed the people, should ever have any recognition or place in the National government; and should no more afflict any citizen of the United States.

Yet to make the National government itself thus free was all that the makers of the Constitution could just then actually do. The Fourteenth Amendment, however, does accomplish *in all the States*, and for all the people of the United States, what originally could be done only for those under the National government: and so completes the splendid design which the national fathers originated but could not then perfect—full and complete Religious Liberty throughout all the land to all the inhabitants thereof.

Finally: That the inhibition of the First Amendment includes Sunday legislation is certain from the fact that we know that this was the direct intent of the makers of the Constitution in the making of it.

The famous letter of George Washington, Aug. 4, 1789, on Religious Liberty, is well known. But there is not well known *the fact* that in this justly famous letter, Sunday laws are directly involved.

The known facts are these: In Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Virginia, there were Sabbath-keeping Christians, Seventh-Day Baptists. These were all staunch friends of liberty.

In several ways, and especially by the German Sabbath keepers of the Community at Ephrata, Pa., these had come most favorably within the personal knowledge of Washington. They were sub-

jected to harass and persecution through the State Sunday laws that were essentially of the established religions of the States.

When the National government was formed some of these people addressed Washington to inquire whether the Religious Liberty of the Constitution would extend to them, or whether this Constitution also would allow persecution by statute.

The particular "right" that with these people was endangered was their right *not to observe Sunday by law*. The "liberty of conscience," of which they were necessarily solicitous, was the enjoyment of liberty of conscience *unmolested and unendangered by Sunday laws*.

With these fundamental facts in mind, it is easy to discern the pointed clauses in Washington's letter, that runs as follows :

"If I had had the least idea of any difficulty resulting from the Constitution adopted by the convention of which I had the honor to be president when it was formed, so as to endanger the rights of any religious denomination, then I never should have attached my name to that instrument. If I had any idea that the general government was so administered that the liberty of conscience was endangered, I pray you be assured that no man would be more willing than myself to revise and alter that part of it, so as to avoid all religious persecution. You can, without any doubt, remember that I have often expressed as my opinion that every man who conducts himself as a good citizen is accountable alone to God for his religious faith, and

should be protected in worshiping God according to the dictates of his conscience.”

And the further fact that *this letter was used by courts* as a defense against Sunday law prosecutions, is full confirmation of the foregoing presentation as to the original intent of the letter.

An instance in point is the fact that in 1798 one of these people in New Jersey was prosecuted for the violation of the State Sunday law. In the justice's court he was convicted. He appealed, and secured a new trial in a higher court.

In the higher court the judge read to the jury Washington's letter, and the accused was instantly acquitted.

And now the crowning fact of it all is that Washington's letter is *an exposition of the Constitution* as regards the Religious Liberty contemplated in the Constitution, *by him who presided over* the making of it, and who was then, the unanimously chosen first Executive to administer it. Than this there could not possibly be any higher or purer expression of the intent of the Constitution.

And by that which called forth the letter, by the letter itself, and by the general and even judicial use of the letter while Washington was yet alive the demonstration is perfect that the Religious Liberty intent of the Constitution was and is

absolute freedom from the force and effect of all Sunday laws.

Therefore, beyond all question or subterfuge, by the express intent of the makers of the Constitution, absolute liberty from all Sunday legislation is a privilege and an immunity of every citizen of the United States. And in the provision that "No State shall make or enforce any law abridging the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States," the Fourteenth Amendment makes this liberty absolute in all the States.

Thus by every evidence of language, logic, law, and intent, the Religious Liberty of the Constitution as a whole, and of the Fourteenth Amendment in particular, includes Religious Liberty from every vestige of every phase of Sunday legislation everywhere throughout the United States and in every State.

And by this complete and unvarying evidence of the language, the logic, the law, and the intent, of the Constitution as a whole, and of the Fourteenth Amendment in particular, every Sunday law in every State in the United States is made absolutely void and of no effect.

And that has been true all over this broad land for more than forty years. And yet all this time legislatures, executives, and courts, State and National, have gone steadily along in the same old

way, just as if the Fourteenth Amendment had never been heard of.

In many—in any that chose—of the States, the highest and most explicit privilege and immunity of citizens of the United States, have been not only abridged, but absolutely disregarded. Citizens of the United States have been deprived of property, of liberty, and indirectly of life, by the enforcement of State Sunday laws that were openly declared by United States courts to be “most certainly religious,” and by procedure recognized by the same courts as “persecutions,” just as if the Fourteenth Amendment had never existed.

Is, then, the Fourteenth Amendment, in truth, “a new charter of liberty?” Does it really “enlarge the scope of human freedom?” Does it make effective the “full intent of the Declaration and the Constitution?”

Is that all true, as those who made it said? Or is the Fourteenth Amendment a tantalizing figment?

It is all true, eternally true. The Fourteenth Amendment stands full and true in all its life and power and majesty to every citizen of the United States, and in every square foot of every State. And under it, no State shall make or enforce any Sunday law.

However, this long lapse of time, and the actual experiences in so many places painfully felt in this

time, since the Fourteenth Amendment was ordained and established, have conclusively demonstrated that no legislature, no court, and no executive, State or National, can ever be expected to take the initiative in making effective to the citizens of the United States the guaranties of that Amendment against the abridgment by any State, of this supreme privilege and immunity of citizens of the United States.

What then? Shall this constitutional guaranty go utterly by default? Nay, nay; never! The people, the people of these United States, "We, the people," have ordained and established this Constitution, and it is ever the original and un-failing prerogative of "We, the people," to proclaim and maintain all the provisions and guaranties of the Constitution which "We, the people," have ordained and established.

As the appointed and sworn agencies of the people, it is the part and place of legislatures, courts, and executives, State and National, to do this. All of these agencies are pledged by oath to do it. But when these all fail, as in this plain matter of the Religious Liberty of the Fourteenth Amendment they all for more than forty years have most dismally failed, *then* this prerogative, right, and power, "incapable of annihilation," rests by additional tenure with *the people*.

Here I am on ground, that though not at all

uncertain, is to most people unfamiliar. I therefore present authority.

James Wilson, of Pennsylvania, from beginning to end, was a master spirit in the making of the Constitution. He said: "*The supreme power resides in the people, and they never part with it. There can be no disorder in the community but may here receive a radical cure. . . . In this Constitution all authority is derived from the people.*" —*Bancroft, "Hist. Const.," II, P. 245.*

John Dickinson was another of these. In a pamphlet on "The Federal Constitution," in 1788, he said: "It must be granted that a bad administration may take place. What then is to be done? The answer is instantly found. Let the Fasces be lowered before *the supreme sovereignty of the people*. It is *their duty* to watch, and *their right* to take care, that the Constitution be preserved; or, in the Roman phrase on perilous occasions, to provide that the republic receive no damage.

"When one part [of the government] without being sufficiently checked by the rest abuses its power to the manifest danger of public happiness, or when the several parts abuse their respective powers so as to involve the commonwealth in like peril, *the people must restore things* to that order from which their functionaries have departed. If *the people suffer this living principle of watchfulness and control* to be extinguished among them,

they will assuredly, not long afterward, experience that of their temple there shall not be left one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down.”

James Bryce, at present British Ambassador in this Capital City, discussing this very principle of our government, says: “There stands *above* and behind the legislature, the executive, and the judiciary, *another power*, that of public opinion. The President, Congress, and the courts are all, the two former directly, the latter practically, amenable to the people.”—“*American Commonwealth*,” chap. xxxiii, pars. 20-22.

And Abraham Lincoln said: “I insist that if there is anything which it is the duty of *the whole people to never intrust to any hands but their own*, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity of their own liberties and institutions.”

“The people, *the people* of these United States, are the rightful masters of both Congresses and courts: not to overthrow the Constitution, but to overthrow the men who pervert the Constitution.”

There is abundance more, but these are sufficient here. It is, therefore, certain that it is the undeniable prerogative of the people, at all times, to proclaim *and maintain* the Constitution which they have ordained and established.

And now, because of the complete failure of their own sworn agencies, legislative, judicial, and

executive, State and National, to maintain the Constitution, in its plain language and certain intent touching the highest privilege and immunity of citizens of the United States, it is now the bounden duty, no less than the supreme prerogative, of *the people of the United States*, ourselves personally, and each in his place, perpetually to proclaim and to maintain, this Constitution in all its guaranties and its intents, of liberty, religious, as well as civil. And this, still, in order that "government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

The situation demands it. The necessity is upon us. No man can evade it and still be free. Meet it we must. Then let us meet it as men, as manly men. Yes, as American, Constitutional, Christian men!

And the way to do this is all plain before us. It is plain by virtue of unquestionable principle; it is plain by the authority of unquestionable and actual practice.

Originally, in the States there were the twin despotisms of *slavery* and *enforced religion*. The National Constitution and government were established without either; and it was intended to lead all away from both. Both despotisms resisted this intent of the National power, and aimed both to become national.

The crisis came first as to the nationalization of

the despotism of *body* slavery. A decision of the National Supreme Court was rendered setting forth principles which, carried to their logical as well as apparently intended conclusion, accomplished the nationalization of the civil despotism of slavery.

Under God and the splendid leadership of Abraham Lincoln, that crisis as to civil slavery issued in the total abolition, by the Thirteenth Amendment, of slavery even *in the States* where it had held sway.

In this issue of that crisis as to that civil despotism, the *twin despotism* of the *soul slavery* of established religion was also abolished by the Fourteenth Amendment.

In spite of this, however, the despotism of enforced religion has persisted in *its* determination to become National. A decision of the National Supreme Court has been rendered, declaring that "This is a Christian nation," and that "the establishment of the Christian religion" is within the meaning of the Constitution.

As certainly as that declaration shall be followed up, it logically and inevitably will lead to the nationalization of religious despotism. And the church federations and other religious combines are all diligently following it up, and pressing it to exactly that conclusion.

Thus there has now come the crisis as to the nationalization of religious despotism.

Upon the vantage ground of the Constitution as a whole, and of the Fourteenth Amendment in particular, *we* have the high honor to meet the crisis of this despotism of soul slavery, as Abraham Lincoln and they with him met that crisis of body slavery: and with the hope that this crisis shall issue as did that—in the total abolition of all religious despotism, even in the States where at first it held sway.

And the course of Abraham Lincoln and those who stood with him in that crisis, which carried them to that glorious issue, has not merely “blazed the way,” but has established a solid and a broad highway over which we with all confidence can proceed unto an issue as much more glorious as Religious Liberty surpasses civil liberty.

First, it is ours to say in the very words of Abraham Lincoln himself, “We have to fight this battle upon principle, and upon principle alone. So I hope those with whom I am surrounded have principle enough to nerve themselves for the task, and leave nothing undone that can fairly be done to bring about the right result.”

When we shall be charged, as was he, with “resistance to the decisions of the Supreme Court,” we can answer in his own words, as truly and as fitly spoken: “I do not resist it. All that I am

doing is refusing to obey it as a political [a religious] rule. But we will try to reverse that decision. Somebody has to reverse that decision, since it was made; and we mean to reverse it, and we mean to do it peaceably."

When the promoters of despotism shall charge us, as they did him, with inciting "anarchy, violence, and mob law," we can give his own answer: "By resisting it as a political [a religious] rule, I disturb no right of property, create no disorder, excite no mobs. It is not resistance; it is not factious; it is not even disrespectful; to treat it as not having yet quite established a settled doctrine for the country."

When we shall be denounced, as was he, only because of "the monstrous revolutionary doctrines" with which we are "identified," and that we are "determined to carry out," we can reply as did he, "I am fighting upon these original principles—fighting in the Jeffersonian, Washingtonian, and Madisonian [and Lincolnian] fashion."

When we shall be flouted, as was he, because of some of "the company" in which we may find ourselves, we can make true and confident reply, as did he: "Stand with anybody that stands right. Stand with him while he is right, and part with him when he goes wrong. To desert such ground because of any company is to be less than a man, less than an American"—yea, less than a Christian.

And, finally, in Lincoln's noble words, we may exactly say: "Neither let us be slandered from our duty by false accusations against us, nor frightened from it by menaces of dungeons to ourselves. Let us have faith that right makes might; and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

Thus, then, individually and from free choice and mastering conviction, standing upon original ground and original principles; free in the religious liberty, Christian, American, and Constitutional, which in fullest meaning of the term is ours—standing thus free, we possess, and must proclaim, and maintain, in the full and certain nature of it as *doubly* an "inborn right," and upon positive guaranty of the Constitution, this privilege and immunity of citizens of the United States: this *full and complete Religious Liberty from all Sunday laws everywhere.*

It is the very principle of the emancipation proclamation. By that noble document every slave was free. Those who were interested in his being a slave, did all that they could to persuade him that he was not free. And some were so persuaded, and so could not enjoy the liberty that was surely theirs. But all who stood up free, and proclaimed it, were free.

It is the very principle of the Gospel. By the redemption fully provided in Christ, every soul is

free. By the Author of that redemption and that freedom, the proclamation has gone forth of "liberty to the captives and opening of prison to them that are bound." The arch-despot of enforced religion continues to do all that he can to convince men that they are not free. Many allow themselves to be so convinced; and so never know the blessed liberty that has been provided and ordained and established, and that is theirs. But all who accept the provision and the guaranty, and stand up free and proclaim it, are free.

Here, then, by the National Constitution every citizen of the United States is absolutely free from all Sunday laws, as from every other form of enforced religion. The remnants, relics, and representatives of the old religious despotisms still try to persuade free citizens of the United States that they are not free. Who will any longer allow himself thus to be hoodooed out of his assured liberty?

Citizens of the United States are thus assuredly free. The people of the United States have ordained and established it. The Constitution declares and guarantees it. Let the people of the United States now and forever stand up and proclaim and maintain it, and be free.

Then all will be free. There is no other way. And there cannot be any other way; for there is

no power in the government or the Constitution above that of *the people*.

There is yet a deeper sense in which this issue is the principle of the Gospel. It was "upon the principles upon which the Gospel was first propagated" that this American, Constitutional, and Christian Religious Liberty was founded. Jefferson, Washington, Madison, and their compatriots, who made the nation, expressed it thus:—

"Religion or the duty which we owe to our Creator and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence; and is nowhere cognizable but at the tribunal of the Universal Judge. Therefore, to judge for ourselves, and to engage in the exercise of religion agreeably to the dictates of our own consciences, is an unalienable right, which upon the principles on which the Gospel was first propagated and the Reformation from popery carried on, can never be transferred to another."

As related to God and religion, the principle on which the Gospel was first propagated is: "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things which are God's." "If any man hear my word and believe not, I judge him not." "So then, every one of us shall give account of himself to God."

In this matter of the observance or regard of a day, the principle upon which the Gospel was first propagated is: "One man esteemeth one day above another, another esteemeth every day alike.

Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day to the Lord he doth not regard it.”

“In his own mind”—mark it. “Fully persuaded in his own mind;” not by governmental force; not by Congressional or legislative enactments; not by judicial decisions; not by police; not by prosecution, nor by persecution. But only “in his own mind,” by his own personal choice, and his own free thinking, upon his own personal and free faith, and *unto God only*.

That is the principle of the Gospel as to the observance or regarding of a day. And that is the Religious Liberty that is the privilege and immunity of every citizen of the United States, ordained and established in the Constitution; and now to be proclaimed and maintained everywhere throughout all the land by all the inhabitants thereof. It is all of God, and is eternally right.

Through its Sunday laws this principle of the Gospel was repudiated, and this liberty blotted out in all Europe by the world despotism of the papacy that sunk the Roman Empire and carried the world to the brink of perdition. In the Reformation God again rescued mankind, and called men to the principles of Religious Liberty upon which the Gospel was first propagated. But not till the planting of this Newest Nation did these

principles ever find any place of recognition in government.

The principles had always been there for recognition by every government. The principles were ordained of God for the recognition of governments and of men everywhere. But to this Nation alone in all the world befell the splendid distinction of taking this divinely ordained way of genuine Religious Liberty as a fundamental governmental principle.

And this *Religious Liberty* has assured in this land *civil liberty* in higher degree and larger measure than was ever known before on earth. And by these two great principles of Religious Liberty and civil liberty this Nation has led the whole world out of the darkness and into the light.

And here she is, Columbia, Queen of the nations; glorious in her goodly apparel, and majestic in her beautiful form.

And now who wants to see her with troubled countenance and tear-stained face, with bowed head and disheveled hair, and her fair limbs marred with manacles, at the tail end of a dismal, mewling procession ecclesiastically led, trailing along the old and hateful paths of despotism, back and down into the dark valley of the humiliation and despair of mankind and the world?

No, no, no! Let her be devoutly kept and sacredly guarded *free*—body, soul, and spirit, *for*—

ever free. And she with noble head erect, and her face to the light; her countenance radiant and eyes sparkling; her glorious tresses joyously tossing in the bracing breezes of Religious Liberty; and she herself leading the grand march of mankind and the world upward and onward to the sublimest heights of the divine destiny.

Why not? And if not, then what? Can the divine call, these divine principles, and this divine opportunity and destiny, all be disregarded with impunity?

All that all of this means to any individual, it means to the Nation. All that it means to the Nation it means to the whole world.

With before them the open book of the awful story of the world religious despotism of the papacy, if the people of these United States allow an officious, meddling ecclesiastical combine of false Protestantism to turn this model free Nation into a religious despotism in the living likeness of, and even in alliance with, that identical original one, then what possible language could too severely reproach that crowning folly of the ages?

Should or *could* it then be thought strange if the divine judgment stored up for that great original should burst upon both together, in the vials of unmingled wrath poured out to the very dregs? Read Revelation, 13 to 16, inclusive.

But, and if in the blindness of men that awful

perversion must be wrought, and the supremacy of spiritual despotism and evil must again seize sway, then only *the more* does it devolve upon *all who will be free*, either now or then, to hold up so high, so openly, so fully, and so true, all these divine principles that have been committed to this Nation in trust for the world: so that only in the very desperation of defiant despotism can that perversion be made to prevail.

Conclusion.

And now all of this means you; each one of you, whoever you may be. This appeal is to you. Will you stand up free, and be free, in this blessed liberty, wherewith Christ has made us free; and which, in the providence of the God of nations, has been made, ordained, and established, as American and Constitutional?

Standing up thus free and being free, will you proclaim and maintain this Religious Liberty throughout all the land to all the inhabitants thereof?

There are already a few so doing. There may be more. There may be fewer. But whether there shall be more, fewer, or any other, I personally know one who stands and who purposes ever to stand precisely in the way and upon the principles indicated in this speech.

Do you personally know one such? If you think that you do, then just fairly face yourself before God and in the light, and see if you can recognize him. And if you really and confidently can, then come along. There is plenty of room, and sore need, for all such. Come along.

Whosoever will, let him come; with fully enlisted will and energies, body, soul and spirit; with all his powers, moral, mental, and spiritual; and all his influence, religious, social, and financial—all enlisted and employed in this splendid and crowning contest of all the ages.

Whosoever will,
Whosoever will,
Send the proclamation
Over vale and hill;
Let this ransomed army,
Like a mighty sea,
Sound aloud this Jubilee.

APPENDIX

It is but fair to all that they should be informed as to what denominations they are whose "membership of more than 17,000,000" was professedly represented in that notable action of the 319 delegates at Chicago. They are the following:—

Baptists—Northern Convention
Baptists—National (African) Convention
Christian Church
Congregational Churches
Disciples of Christ
Evangelical (German) Synod of N. America
Evangelical Association
Free Baptists
Lutheran (except Swedish Lutheran)
Mennonite Church
Methodist Episcopal Church
Methodist Episcopal Church South
African M. E. Church
African M. E. Zion Church
Methodist Protestant Church
Colored M. E. Church in America
Primitive Methodist Church (Have since withdrawn)
Moravian Church
Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.
Presbyterian Church in the U. S.
The Protestant Episcopal Church, U. S. A.
Reformed Church in America
Reformed Church in the U. S.
Reformed Presbyterian Church
Cumberland Presbyterian Church
Seventh-Day Baptist Church
Society of Friends
United Brethren in Christ
United Evangelical Church
United Presbyterian Church of N. America
Welsh Presbyterian Church

It now remains to be seen whether the "more than seven-teen millions" of the membership of these churches were really represented in that vote repudiating the word "Protestant."

And if any of these were NOT truly represented in that action of the three hundred and nineteen delegates, then it is urgent upon each one of them just now to wake up and speak out and let it be known that there is at least one Protestant yet alive.

The price of this book—“**THE REFORMATION**”—is \$2.00 in cloth; in paper, \$1.00.

Any reader of this book who may wish to follow further the study of The Priesthood and Sanctuary of Christ, can do so in—

“**The Consecrated Way to Christian Perfection.**”
130 pages. Cloth, 50 cts.

Or to follow the study of The Church and Federation, can do so in—

“**The Christian Church and Church Federation.**”
208 pages. Paper, 35 cts.

Or to follow the study of Individuality, can do so in—

“**The Divine Right of Individuality in Religion.**”
155 pages. Paper, 25 cts.

Or the Federal Council of Churches, in—

“**Church Federation and The Kingdom of God.**”
192 pages. Paper, 25 cts.

Any who would like to know why Turkey is such a trouble to the nations, may learn by reading—

“**The Turkish Tangle: How It Came: What It Means.**” Paper, 25 cts.

Any who would like to have a brief general view of the wealth of the Bible, can get it in—

“**The Place of The Bible in Education.**”
250 pages. Paper, 40 cts.

Address, **Alonzo T. Jones, Battle Creek, Mich.**

Date Due

APR 23 '42

F 11 '48

MAY 11 '48

MR 2 '53

MAY 11 '54

MAY 11 '57

~~DEC 2 '59~~

~~MAY 11 '60~~

~~MAY 11 '61~~

~~MAY 11 '62~~

~~MAY 11 '63~~


~~MAY 11 '64~~

Ⓢ

BW1840 .J76

The reformation 14th-16th century : what

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00035 1116