**“Seeing the Invisible. How Ritualism Denies Faith” The Present Truth 11, 23, pp. 355, 356.**

**HOW RITUALISM DENIES FAITH**

LAST week we studied scriptures showing that if men are to see the things of God they must use the instruments which God has provided for seeing the invisible. {PTUK June 6, 1895, p. 355.1}

We have read that “the Comforter,” “the Spirit of Truth,” “which is the Holy Ghost,” the world cannot receive “because it *seeth Him not*, neither knoweth Him.” And further, on this it is written that “we receive the promise of the Spirit *through faith*.” Galatians 3:14. That is to say, therefore, not only that the world cannot receive the Spirit of God because it *seeth* Him not, but that the world *sees* Him not because it does not believe. Instead of *believing*, in order that it may *see*, the world wants to see in order that it may *believe*. But to those who believe and therefore do receive Him, Jesus says, “Ye *know* Him, for He dwelleth with you and shall be in you;” and, “Ye *see* Me;” and “I will manifest Myself to him.” So that it is literally true that *by faith* we know God and the things of God, and *see* the invisible things of God. {PTUK June 6, 1895, p. 355.2}

**BY FAITH WE SEE**

IT was “by faith” that Moses endured “as seeing Him who is invisible.” Hebrews 11:27. It is written that “the pure in heart shall see God;” and He purifies the heart “by faith” (Acts 15:9); and therefore it is by faith that men see Him who is “the invisible God.” Colossians 1:15. And in order that all men may see “the invisible things of Him,” and “Him who is invisible,” “God hath dealt to *every* man *the measure of faith*.” Romans 12:3. Faith is “the gift of God.” Ephesians 2:8. {PTUK June 6, 1895, p. 355.3}

It is not the gift of God in the sense that the natural faculties, as reason, might, hearing, etc., are the gifts of God, so that it should be of ourselves. It is the gift of God in the sense that it is from above and beyond ourselves, a supernatural faculty bestowed since sin entered, and acting only at the free choice of the individual himself. “For by grace are ye saved, *through faith*, and *that not of yourselves;* it is the gift of God.” “Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God” (Romans 10:17); and the word of God is able to make things to be seen which before did not appear, and which indeed were not; so that faith, acting through the word of God, sees in very truth, and sees clearly, the invisible things of God. {PTUK June 6, 1895, p. 355.4}

**HOW TRUE FAITH ACTS**

TRUE faith, the faith that is the gift of God, the faith of which Christ is the Author, the faith of which the Word of God is the channel—this faith hears the Word of God and depends upon the Divine power of that word itself to accomplish the thing which that word says. For when the centurion came to Jesus asking that his servant should be healed, he said to the Lord, “Speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed.” Thus he expected the word of the Lord itself to accomplish that which it said when the Lord should but speak the word. And this the Lord pronounced not only “faith” but “great faith:” even such as He had not found in Israel. And this, too, in the face of the fact that the Scripture, upon the knowledge of which Israel was greatly priding itself, had long before plainly stated this very thing, in these words: “As the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater; *so shall my word be* that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but *it shall accomplish that which I please*.” Isaiah 55:10, 11. {PTUK June 6, 1895, p. 355.5}

To expect the word of God to do the thing which that word says, and to depend wholly upon that word itself to do it, this the Lord Jesus pronounces faith. This is true faith. This is the faith by which men can see the invisible thing of God as certainly and as easily as by the telescope and the microscope they can see the invisible things of the natural order. This is the faith *which works* by love purifies the heart, so that he who is thus “pure in heart shall see God,” *invisible* *though He be*. For this is the faith by which he who exercises it sees the invisible. This is the faith which, working through the word of God, accomplishes the new birth (1 Peter 1:23) by which a man is enabled to see the kingdom of God, which “except a man be born again *he* cannot see” at all. {PTUK June 6, 1895, p. 356.1}

This is why it is that “whatsoever is not of faith is sin.” Faith is of God, and whatsoever it works is the work of God; while whatsoever is not of faith is not of God, but is of the world. And all that is in the world is not of the Father, but is of the world. 1 John 2:16. Whatsoever is not of faith is of the world, is of the nature of the world, and is of the way of the world, and perverts the way of God to the ways of the world, and demands that God shall accommodate himself to the world and accept a worship that is altogether of the nature and spirit of this world. {PTUK June 6, 1895, p. 356.2}

**CATHOLICISM DEMANDS THE VISIBLE**

NO STRONGER proof, therefore, could possibly be given, of the absolute falsity, the sheer worldliness, and the utter naturalness, of any system of religion, than that it must needs avail itself of *visible* representations of the object of its worship. And of all the systems of religion that are in the world, there is no one which insists more upon the *visible* and upon seeing the visible than does the Roman Catholic system. It is essential to that system that it shall have “*a visible head*.” It must needs have a *visible* kingdom. It must have a *visible* sacrifice. Professing to worship the Crucified One, the Catholic Church must have *visible* “crucifix” by which to do it. Professing to glory in the cross of Christ, she must have a multitude of *visible* crosses of her own by which to do it. There must be a *visible* interpreter of the Scriptures. And for all the worshippers according to that system, there must be *visible* representations of the object worshiped, in the shape of images and pictures. Throughout the whole system the one chief essential is the seeing of the *visible*. {PTUK June 6, 1895, p. 356.3}

In an encyclical of Leo XIII., “On the Rosary of the Blessed Virgin,” describing the purpose of the rosary, that is, of the beads which are used by Catholics in their prayers, he says: “The rosary is arranged not for the consideration of dogmas of faith and questions of doctrine, but rather for putting forth facts to be perceived *by the eyes* and treasured up in the memory.” Even though it be recognised that the invisible exists and is to be worshipped, yet it can be comprehended and worshipped only through, and by the aid of, *the visible*. This is the characteristic of all heathenism and of all idolatry. And this is only to say that by this characteristic the Catholic system of religion is demonstrated to be essentially heathenish and idolatrous. {PTUK June 6, 1895, p. 356.4}

**WHAT RITUALISM SIGNIFIES**

WE know full well of the plea that is made in defence of the use of images, pictures, etc., in the worship of the Roman Catholic Church; that is, that “the honour which is given them is referred to the originals which they represent, so that by the images which we kiss, and before which we uncover our heads or kneel, we adore Christ and venerate His saints, whose likeness they represent;” and “the bowing before an image outside of us is no more to be reprehended than the worshipping before and internal image in our own minds; for the external image does but serve the purpose of expressing visibly that which is internal.”—*Faith of Our Fathers, pp. 285, 287*. But if they only saw Him whom they profess to worship, they would not need any image of Him, either external or internal, nor any representation of Him either visible or otherwise. They could then be true worshippers, worshipping Him who is invisible, in spirit and in truth. {PTUK June 6, 1895, p. 356.5}

This plea that is made in justification of the use of images and of the visible, is in itself the greatest condemnation of the use of images and of the whole system of Roman Catholicism; for it is a confession of inability to see the invisible, and therefore a confession that the whole system is destitute of true faith and a stranger to the new birth, and altogether without God. {PTUK June 6, 1895, p. 356.6}

The Catholic system being confessedly unable to see the invisible, is clearly not of faith. And as whatsoever is not of faith is sin, it is perfectly clear that the whole Catholic system is a system of sin. And the professed Protestantism that panders to it, that compromises with it, that courts it, and that is “wheeling into line with it,” is simply like unto it. The one is “the man of sin,” “the son of perdition,” “the mystery of iniquity,” “the beast;” and the other is “the image” of it. {PTUK June 6, 1895, p. 356.7}

A. T. JONES.

**“The Papacy and Civilisation” The Present Truth 11, 25, p. 390.**

**INFLUENCE IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE**

IT is claimed and urged on behalf of the Papacy that she is the best promoter of a proper and “Christian” civilisation. {PTUK June 20, 1895, p. 390.1}

As the basis and sufficient proof that the Papacy is the source and stay of a “Christian” civilisation, there is presented by both Catholics and “Protestants,” and not less by “Protestants” than by Catholics, the stupendous “fact” that she civilised the barbarians of the fifth century and the middle ages, who annihilated the Roman Empire. This theory the late Dr. Philip Schaff constantly affirmed, though it clearly contradicted and undisputed and indisputable facts of the history which he himself had written. The truth is that there never was a clearer {PTUK June 20, 1895, p. 390.2}

**HISTORICAL FRAUD**

put forth than this claim that the Papacy civilised the barbarians who destroyed the Roman Empire, and occupied Western Europe in the middle ages. {PTUK June 20, 1895, p. 390.3}

It must not be forgotten that the Papacy had possession of the Roman Empire itself, with all the power of the empire at her command, for nearly a hundred years before the barbarians ever entered the Western Empire with any intention to stay, and more than a hundred years before she had any chance to “civilise” them. It must be remembered, too, that her alliance with the empire, and her securing possession of it, were for the express purpose of assuring to it the benefits of a “Christian civilisation” and consequent “salvation.” Surely here was ample time to test her powers in this direction, before she was ever called upon to “civilise” the barbarians. {PTUK June 20, 1895, p. 390.4}

What, then, was the result? It was this: When, by the union of Church and State, church membership became a qualification for political as well as every other kind of preferment, hypocrisy became more prevalent than ever before. This was bad enough in itself, yet the hypocrisy was voluntary; but when through the agency of her Sunday laws and by the ministration of Theodosius the church received control of the civil power to compel all without distinction, who were not Catholics, to act as though they were, {PTUK June 20, 1895, p. 390.5}

**HYPOCRISY WAS MADE COMPULSORY**

and every person who was not voluntarily a church member was compelled either to be a hypocrite or a rebel. In addition to this, those who were of the church indeed, through the endless succession of controversies and church council, were forever establishing, changing, and re-establishing the faith; and as all were required to change or revise their faith according as the councils decreed, all moral and spiritual integrity was destroyed. Hypocrisy became a habit, dissimulation and fraud a necessity of life; and the very moral fiber of men and of society was vitiated. {PTUK June 20, 1895, p. 390.6}

All the corruptions that had characterised the earlier Rome was thus reproduced and perpetuated *under a form of godliness* in this so-called Christian Rome, the Rome of the fifth century. Bower says of this time:— {PTUK June 20, 1895, p. 390.7}

The primitive rigour of discipline and manners was utterly neglected and forgotten by the ecclesiastics of Rome. The most exorbitant luxury, with all the vices attending it, was introduced among them, and the most scandalous and unchristian arts of acquiring wealth universally practised. They seem to have rivaled in riotous living the greatest epicures of Pagan Rome when luxury was there at the highest pitch. For Jerome, who was an eyewitness of what he writ, reproaches the Roman clergy with the same excesses which the poet Juvenal so severely censured in the Roman nobility under the reign of Domitian. {PTUK June 20, 1895, p. 390.8}

The only possible result of such a course was constantly to increase unto more ungodliness, to undermine every principle of the foundation of society, and really to {PTUK June 20, 1895, p. 390.9}

**HASTEN THE DESTURCTION**

of the empire. The pagan delusions, the pagan superstitions, and the pagan vices that had been adopted and brought into the Catholic Church by her apostasy and clothed with a form of godliness, wrought such infinite corruption that the society of which it was the greater part could no longer exist. It must inevitably fall by the weight of its own corruption, if from nothing else. {PTUK June 20, 1895, p. 390.10}

Dr. Schaff says in his “History of the Christian Church:”— {PTUK June 20, 1895, p. 390.11}

The uncontrollable progress of avarice, prodigality, voluptuousness, theatre going, intemperance, lewdness; in short, of all the heathen vices, which Christianity had come to eradicate, still carried the Roman Empire and people with rapid strides toward dissolution, and gave it at last into the hands of the rude, but simple and morally vigorous, barbarians. {PTUK June 20, 1895, p. 390.12}

And onward those barbarians came, swiftly and in multitudes. They came, a host, wild and savage, it is true; but whose social habits were so far above those of the people which they destroyed, that, savage as they were caused fairly to blush at the shameful corruptions which they found in this so-called Christian society of Rome. {PTUK June 20, 1895, p. 390.13}

A writer who lived at the time of the barbarian invasions, and who wrote as a Christian, Salvian, gives the following evidence as to the condition of things:— {PTUK June 20, 1895, p. 390.14}

“The church, which ought everywhere to propitiate God, what does she but provoke Him to anger? How many may one meet, even in the church, who are not still drunkards, or debauchees, or adulterers, or fornicators, or robbers, or murderers, or the like, or all these at once, without end? It is even a sort of holiness among Christian people to be less vicious.” From the public worship of God, and almost during it, they pass to deeds of shame. Scarce a rich man but would commit murder and fornication. We have lost the whole power of Christianity, and offend God the more, that we sin as Christians. We are worse than the barbarians and heathen. If the Saxon is wild, the Frank faithless, the Goth inhuman, the Alanian drunken, the Hun licentious, they are, by reason of their ignorance, far less punishable than we, who, knowing the commandments of God, commit all these crimes. {PTUK June 20, 1895, p. 390.15}

And Dr. Schaff remarks of this very period, and the consequences of this effort of the Papacy at the civilisation of the Roman Empire: “Nothing but the Divine judgment of destruction upon this nominally Christian but essentially heathen world, could open the way for the moral regeneration of society.” This is precisely how the Papacy gave “Christian civilisation” and “salvation” to the Roman Empire, when she held full and undisputed possession of it for more than a hundred years. And her work of civilising the barbarians (which we shall consider another week) was after precisely the same order. Indeed, how could it be otherwise, when she assures us that the Catholic Church “is in this world the one thing that never changes.” {PTUK June 20, 1895, p. 390.16}

A. T. JONES.

**“The Papacy and Civilisation” The Present Truth 11, 26, pp. 405, 406.**

LAST week, in considering the claims of the Papacy to having been the great civilising force in early times, we showed its utter failure to do anything for the Roman Empire. It had so corrupted society that when the empire was overturned by the barbarians the victors were shocked at the corruptions which they found. The influence of the Papacy on the barbarians was after the same order. {PTUK June 27, 1895, p. 405.1}

**THE FIRST “CONVERTS”**

THE Burgundians were the first of the barbarian nations to be “converted” to the Catholic Church; and through them she “converted” the Franks. An account of this matter will illustrate the powers and efficiency of the Papacy in the work of civilising the barbarians. {PTUK June 27, 1895, p. 405.2}

The Burgundians were settled in that part of Gaul which now forms Western Switzerland and that part of France which is now the province and district of Burgundy. As early as A.D. 430, the Huns, making inroads into Gaul, severely afflicted the Burgundians, who, finding impotent the power of their own god, determined to try the Catholic god. They therefore sent representatives to a neighbouring city in Gaul, requesting the Catholic bishop to receive them. The bishop had them fast for a week, during which time he catechised them, and then baptized them. Soon afterward the Burgundians found the Huns without a leader, and, suddenly falling upon them at the disadvantage, confirmed their conversion by the slaughter of ten thousand of the enemy. Thereupon the whole nation embraced the Catholic religion “with fiery zeal.” Afterward, however, when about the fall of the empire, the Visigoths asserted their dominion over all Spain, and the greater part of Gaul, and over the Burgundians too, they deserted the Catholic Church, and adopted the Arian faith. {PTUK June 27, 1895, p. 405.3}

**HOW THE FRANKS WERE WON**

YET Clotilda, a niece of the Burgundian king, was educated in the profession of the Catholic faith. She married Clovis, the pagan king of the pagan Franks, and strongly persuaded him to become a Catholic. All her pleadings were in vain, however, till A.D. 496, when, in a great battle with the Alemanni, the Franks were getting the worst of the conflict, in the midst of the battle Clovis vowed that if the victory could be theirs, he would become a Catholic. The tide of battle turned; the victory was won, and Clovis was a Catholic. Clotilda hurried away a messenger with the glad news to the Bishop of Rheims, who came to baptize the new convert. {PTUK June 27, 1895, p. 405.4}

But after the battle was over, and the dangerous crisis was past, Clovis was not certain whether he wanted to be a Catholic. He must consult his warriors. He did so, and they signified their readiness to adopt the same religion as their king. He then declared that he was convinced of the truth of the Catholic religion, and the “new Constantine” was baptized Christmas Day, A.D. 496. The Pope sent Clovis a letter congratulating him on his conversion. The Bishop of Vienne also sent a letter to the new convert, in which he prophesied that the faith of Clovis would be a surety of the victory of the Catholic religion; and he, with every other Catholic in Christendom, was ready to his utmost to see that the prophecy was fulfilled. {PTUK June 27, 1895, p. 405.5}

**WAR BY THE BISHOP’S BLESSINGS**

THE Catholics in all the neighbouring countries longed and prayed and conspired that Clovis might deliver them from the rule of Arian monarchs; and in the nature of the case, war soon followed. Burgundy was the first country invaded. Before the war actually began, however, by the advice of the bishop of Rheims, a synod of the orthodox bishops met at Lyons; then with the Bishop of Vienne at their head, they visited the king of the Burgundians, and proposed that he call the Arian bishops together, and allow a conference to be held, as they were prepared to prove that the Arians were in error. To their proposal the king replied, “If yours be the true doctrine, why do you not prevent the king of the Franks from waging an unjust war against me, and from caballing with my enemies against me? There is no true Christian faith where there is rapacious covetousness for the possessions of others, and thirst for blood. Let him show forth his faith by his good works.” {PTUK June 27, 1895, p. 405.6}

The Bishop of Vienne dodged this pointed question, and replied, “We are ignorant of the motives and intentions of the king of the Franks; but we are taught by the Scripture that the kingdoms which abandon the Divine law are frequently subverted: and that enemies will arise on every side against those who have made God their enemy. Return with thy people to the law of God, and He will give peace and security to thy dominions.” War followed, and the Burgundian dominions were made subject to the rule of Clovis, A.D. 500. {PTUK June 27, 1895, p. 406.1}

The Visigoths possessed all the southwestern portion of Gaul. They, too, were Arians; and the mutual conspiracy of the Catholics in the Gothic dominions, and the crusade of the Franks from the side of Clovis, soon brought on another holy war. At the assembly of princes and warriors at Paris, A.D. 508, Clovis complained, “It grieves me to see that the Arians still possess the fairest portion of Gaul. Let us march against them with the aid of God; and, having vanquished the heretics, we will possess and divide their fertile province.” Clotilda added her pious exhortation to the effect “that doubtless the Lord would more readily lend His aid if some gift were made;” and in response, Clovis seized his battle-ax and threw it as far as he could, and as it went whirling through the air, he exclaimed, “There, on that spot where my Francesca shall fall, will I erect a church in honor of the holy apostles.” {PTUK June 27, 1895, p. 406.2}

**THE CHURCH ENCOURAGED SAVAGERY**

WAR was declared; and as Clovis marched on his way, he passed through Tours, and turned aside to consult the shrine of St. Martin of Tours, for an omen. “His messengers were instructed to remark the words of the psalm which should happen to be chanted at the precise moment when they entered the church.” And the oracular clergy took care that the words which he should “happen” to hear at that moment—uttered not in Latin, but in language which Clovis understood—should be the following from Psalm 18: “Thou hast girded me, O Lord, with strength unto the battle; thou hast subdued unto me those who rose up against me. Thou hast given me the necks of mine enemies, that I might destroy them that hate me.” The oracle was satisfactory, and in the event was completely successful. “The Visigothic kingdom was wasted and subdued by the remorseless sword of the Franks.” {PTUK June 27, 1895, p. 406.3}

Nor was the religious zeal of Clovis confined to the overthrow of the Arians. There were two bodies of the Franks, the Salians and the Ripuarians. Clovis was king of the Salians, Sigebert of the Ripuarians. Clovis determined to be king of all; he therefore prompted the son of Sigebert to assassinate his father, with the promise that the son should peaceably succeed Sigebert on the throne; but as soon as the murder was committed, Clovis commanded the murderer to be murdered, and then in a full parliament of the whole people of the Franks, he solemnly vowed that he had had nothing to with the murder of either the father or the son; and upon this, as there was no heir, Clovis was raised upon a shield, and proclaimed king of the Ripuarian Franks;—all of which, Gregory, Bishop of Tours, commended as the will of God, saying of Clovis that “God thus daily prostrated his enemies under his hands, and enlarged his kingdom, because he walked before Him with an upright heart, and did that which was well pleasing in his sight.” {PTUK June 27, 1895, p. 406.4}

**CATHOLICISM THE CORRUPTER OF THE BARBARIANS**

THUS was the bloody course of Clovis glorified by the Catholic writers, as the triumph of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity over Arianism. When such actions as these were so lauded by the clergy as the pious acts of orthodox Catholics, it is certain that the clergy themselves were no better than were the bloody objects of their praise. Under the influence of such ecclesiastics, the condition of the barbarians after their so-called conversion, could not possibly be better, even if it were not worse than before. To be converted to the principles and precepts of such clergy was only the more deeply to be damned. {PTUK June 27, 1895, p. 406.5}

Into the “converted” barbarians, the Catholic system instilled all of its superstition, and its bigoted hatred of heretics and unbelievers. It thus destroyed what of generosity still remained in their minds while it only intensified their native ferocity; and the shameful licentiousness of the papal system likewise corrupted the purity, and the native respect for women and marriage which had always been a noble characteristic of the German nations. {PTUK June 27, 1895, p. 406.6}

In proof of this it is necessary only to touch upon the condition of Catholic France under Clovis and his successors. {PTUK June 27, 1895, p. 406.7}

Dean Milman says in his “History of Latin Christianity:”— {PTUK June 27, 1895, p. 406.8}

It is difficult to conceive a more dark and odious state of society than that of France under her Merovingian kings, the descendants of Clovis, as described by Gregory of Tours.... Throughout, assassinations, parricides, and fratricides intermingle with adulteries and rapes. {PTUK June 27, 1895, p. 406.9}

The cruelty might seem the mere inevitable result of this violent and unnatural fusion; but the extent to which this cruelty spreads throughout the whole society almost surpasses belief. That king Chlotaire should burn alive his rebellious son with his wife and daughter, is fearful enough; but we are astounded, even in these times, that a bishop of Tours should burn a man alive to obtain the deeds of an estate which he coveted. Fredegonde sends two murderers to assassinate Childebert, and these assassins are clerks. She causes the Archbishop of Rouen to be murdered while he is chanting the service in the church; and in this crime a bishop and an archdeacon are her accomplices. {PTUK June 27, 1895, p. 406.10}

This did the Papacy for the barbarians which she “converted;” and such as she could not thus *corrupt* she destroyed. And this is how she “civilised” the barbarians. The truth is the barbarians were compelled, wearily, to drag themselves toward civilisation, weighed down and retarded by this terrible incubus. They were thus compelled to grope their way, and drag both themselves *and her* toward civilisation and Christianity instead of being helped by her in any sense. What she did with those whom she did within her own proper sphere in the way of civilisation, we shall consider further. {PTUK June 27, 1895, p. 406.11}

A. T. JONES.