

speaking of God's watching over the gospel writers, he says: "What prevents Him from watching over the Pope's public and official utterances in matters of faith and morals, so as to prevent them from error and heresy? It is precisely this vigilance exercised by Jesus Christ over the Pope that constitutes the Pope's infallibility." Here then we have the *Sentinel's* definition of the Pope's infallibility. He was infallible in the same sense as the apostles! Meeting the *Sentinel* on his own field, we have now come to the main proposition. Hence we demand the proof of such infallibility of the Pope. Here our friend will find some work. There are many reasons why Jesus Christ does not watch over the utterances of the Pope as he did over his apostles. Is the Pope an inspired man? Can he speak with new tongues? Can he prophecy? Can he take up serpents as did Paul, and drink deadly poison without harm? Can he heal the sick, cleanse the leper and raise the dead? If the Pope can not do these things, what becomes of his infallibility in the light of the *Sentinel's* definition? Or if the Pope is infallible, how are we to know it? Such a person as the Pope of Rome is unknown to the Bible except as "that man of sin" who sits in the temple of God, "showing himself that he is God," and whose end is everlasting destruction; and the groundless claim that Jesus Christ is watching over such a person and preventing him from falling into doctrinal error, needs a little proof. The *Sentinel* now has a fine chance of making good the claims of his Church if such a thing can be done, for we promise him as good and intelligent hearing as he ever had.

Now it must be remembered that the *Sentinel* also contends for an infallible Church. But will he tell us what constitutes the infallibility of the Church? Does the infallibility of the Pope make the Church infallible? If so, why was not the Church of Jesus Christ infallible before the first Pope was born? And if it was, then what use have we for an infallible Pope now? Is not Christ still the Head of his Church, and as He is infallible, why have another infallible head? Can not the Church understand and obey Jesus Christ as well as she can the Pope; or is the Pope wiser than He? Again we ask, if the Catholic Church is infallible, what makes her so?

The *Sentinel* admits that the Church has changed immersion as commanded by Christ to sprinkling, but calls this a mere matter of discipline. This is the example we had before us when we impeached the infallibility of the Pope and the Church. We argued that either Christ made a mistake or the Pope made one; for Jesus commands immersion and the Pope and the Church say it is not best adapted to the people. Then either Jesus did not know what was needed, or he failed to ordain that which was best adapted to the wants of the people. Which is infallible, the Pope or Jesus Christ? And again, if such a positive ordinance is a mere matter of discipline and needs no infallibility to care for it, then can not all the other commands of the Bible be managed in the same way? If this is not a part of the doctrine of Christ, why not? Will the *Sentinel* tell us what constitutes the doctrine of Christ on the one hand, and the matters of discipline on the other? The Catholic Church has a smart way of managing things. When she wishes to make some infallible change in some essential ordinance of Christ, she just places it over among the matters of discipline, and this preposterous farce has gone on till she has converted the simplicity of Apostolic Christianity into a huge bundle of blasphemous superstitions from top to bottom.

Selections and Comments.

LYING.—We have heard some people quote the Old Scriptures to justify them in lying under some circumstances, such persons would do well to read this note from the *Sunday School Times*:

There is a smack of satisfaction in the way The Independent asks the question, "Has not the Interior the fear of The Sunday School Times before its eyes when it goes to justifying Rahab for her lies?" and follows its question with a corroboratory quotation from The Interior. It would be a good deal better for any religious paper to have a little of the fear of the Lord before its eyes, when it goes into the business of defending anybody's lying. So far as The Interior is concerned, in its saying, of Rahab's lie, that "Paul and James, in A. D. 1, said it was right," it misrepresents and perverts both the facts and the teaching of Scripture; and it incidentally shows more sympathy with the prevalent practices of Rahab's day, than with the principles which Paul and James declared for their day and for all days

The Bible is sound on this lying question—sound from Genesis to Revelation—without a single word in its pages in approval of a lie, in practice or in precept; of a lie at any time, for any purpose, by anybody.

WELL SAID.—We commend the following extract from Bro. Henry Shadle's sermon on last Lord's day, reported in the *Oregonian*, to our friend of the *Advocate*, in Portland. The *Advocate* will be careful and not reply to this, for it would be contrary to his "well understood course":

Here follows some alleged reasons why there cannot be one catholic brotherhood: (1.) The necessity, by Christ's teaching, of the "branches." This, however, has no reference to churches as branches, and cannot remain as an objection. (2.) The perfect adaptation of denominationalism to the wants and opinions of all classes. It must be admitted that the religion of Jesus Christ contains, without a single article, creed, or confession, that element which is preeminently adapted to every age, race and clime; that in the Apostolic age, and for centuries, there was one brotherhood, governed and controlled by the principles of Christ's religion.

THEOLOGICAL PENS.—The following query and answer we clip from *Zion's Watch Tower*, and we give the answer as expressing our conviction of Sectarianism as it stands in opposition to New Testament Christianity; and yet there are men among us who are in the fogs of Babylon to such an extent as to believe and teach that divisions among God's people are right and Scriptural:

Q. You say that you are not a sect—that you claim no name but that of Christ, and object not to be called Christians, though not of the denomination so called. But are you not as much of a sect as any of the others, only without a name and without a limited and written creed?

A. No, the word *sect* means a *division*, or a separation. Every *sect* separates itself from all other Christians by a doctrinal fence or creed. Any who would be of them must go inside *their pen*, believe what they believe, deny what they deny, and be called by their sectarian name. This practice has become so common that many suppose it to be God's arrangement: and any one found outside all of these numerous pens, is supposed to be an *enemy* of God and of truth.

We are opposed to these pens, but love the many children of God whose growth in grace, and *knowledge*, and love, is hindered by these restraints. We are opposed to these sectarian pens, because they are not

of Jesus, nor of the apostles, but of Satan and Anti-Christ. They prevent the Lord's sheep from feeding in the green pastures of truth which the true Shepherd has provided.

We stand outside of all these fences and recognize the Lord's sheep, whether in or out of the nominal churches, as our brethren and sisters; and we urge all in the name of our Master to come out—jump the fence or break it down, and come out into the liberty where with Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled with any yoke of bondage. Thus free, we find his yoke easy and our burden light. If all denominational lines and fences and names were obliterated, all Christians would stand just where we stand now, each taught of God through his Word, and each one a *brother* who exhibits the Spirit of the Head.

All of these sects are condemned to destruction, and the hour of their downfall has come. It will cause pain and distress to all who are worshiping and serving these systems of men, instead of God; but it will be a blessing in disguise, for thus they will be liberated and brought to a refreshing knowledge of God. "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not her plagues." Rev. 18: 4.

Thus you see we are not a sect, and that if all Christians would do as we do in this matter, all sects (divisions) would disappear, and we would be all one in Christ. Soon under the lead of one Master and Teacher, Jesus, we should all come to see things from his standpoint.

A CARD.—The following card from a boy of some sixteen years who became a Christian under our preaching just before we started for Oregon and also our name-sake, is of sufficient interest to us to print here: Maitland, Halt Co., Mo., Jan. 20, 1883:

Dear Uncle and Aunt:

I will write you a few items of news. We are all well as common. It is very cold here now, 20 degrees below zero, and plenty of snow for sleighing. A protracted meeting has just closed here with 15 additions; 8 by immersion, 5 from the Baptists, and 2 from the Universalists.

Fraternally,
J. F. MERCER.

We think it would now be a good plan to hold another meeting in Maitland and convert some of our own members to Jesus Christ and his cause, for when we held a meeting there a few months ago we found more sectarianism among some of them than among the Baptists and Universalists. We have but little trouble with avowed sectarians; but Lord, deliver us from soft shell Campbellites!