

## **Some Earnest Considerations for Serious Roman Catholics.**

**I**F you say, the actual body of the Lord Jesus is present in that which claims to be the Lord's Supper, do you affirm it is His living body, or His dead body? If His living, resurrection body, how could He have given THIS, to His disciples before redemption's **WORK WAS FINISHED**,—before He died? If His living body, moreover, how can the Holy Spirit say, “Ye do shew the Lord's **DEATH**,”—and add “**TILL** He come!” If you reply “His dead body,” what do you understand by the words, “Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more” (Rom. 6. 7)?

You say there is no “certainty” outside the “Catholic Church.” The first step of every convert, therefore, was an **UNCERTAIN** one, and all the other steps rest on this. Is not such a position a proof that **SOMETHING IS WRONG**?

Why does Peter the apostle address believers generally as a “royal priesthood?” Young believers seem to be included, “As new born babes, desire the sincere milk of the Word,” occurs in the same chapter (1 Peter 2). Is there any Scripture for a **CLASS** of sacrificing priests, in the New Testament?

I can rightly call a map of Palestine **BOTH** Palestine **AND** a map: but I cannot call Palestine itself by **BOTH** names, it is only “Palestine.” The Holy Spirit speaks both of “eating the **BREAD**” (1 Cor. 11. 27, 28), **AND** records the words, “This is **MY BODY**.” If we have a type, (as the map), **BOTH** names **ARE** applicable: if it is the Antitype, would not only one name seem fitting? (In like-

manner we have TWO descriptions in Matthew 26. 28, 29).

HOW do you know, (as you say you know), that your church is the true one? If you refer me to the New Testament, then you must LET THAT CHURCH BE TESTED BY THE NEW TESTAMENT. Is this not fair? If you do not refer to the New Testament, what other ground have you? If you come back to your "feeling," and personal decision that this is the church, how does this differ from the private judgment you condemn? If you say, "The Holy Spirit's guidance," why do you assume you have that guidance, and deny that I have? Is there not a continual uncertainty, unless GOD'S WRITTEN WORDS are recognized as the touchstone for truth? THESE never put aside the Holy Spirit, but they show if the claim of any to be led by the Holy Spirit is true, or not. That is all the difference.

You say that Peter is the Rock? How do you know this? You refer me to Matthew 16. 18. Christ COULD easily have said that Peter was the Rock but He did not, if you accept the words of the HOLY SPIRIT. Is it not a fact that the Holy Spirit expressly uses the Greek name "Peter," and then ALTERS the ending of the word for "Rock," so as to suggest relationship, not identity? And this is vital. Christ is the Rock, and Peter was brought into relationship to Him. In 1 Peter 2. 4, 5 the apostle shows this clearly. Why do you reject HIS inspired explanation? Is not the Rock a Name for God (e.g. Deut. 32. 15, 18, 30, 31,—observe, accordingly, contrasted reference to idols—"THEIR rock"), and thus to transfer it from its simple appropriateness here to Christ Himself, just after the mention of His DEITY would be a tremendous strain on credulity.