

## PRIEST — PRIESTHOOD

THE REVEREND WILLIAM H. BATES, D.D.  
WASHINGTON, D. C.—GREELEY, COLO.

THE dictionary definition of priest is "one who officiates at the altar, or who performs the rites of sacrifice; one who acts as mediator between man and the divinity or the gods in any form of religion." Scripture says that "every high priest taken from among men, is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins" (Heb. v. 1). The same would be true of the lesser priests.

### PRIESTHOOD UNIVERSAL

Previous to the Mosaic economy, so far as the history appears in Scripture, there was no priestly "caste."<sup>1</sup> The patriarchs—Noah, Abraham, Jethro, etc.—offered their own sacrifices. The fathers were priests of their own families. Priesthood was universal.

This condition might have continued, for God bade Moses tell the children of Israel: "Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, . . . ye shall be unto me a *kingdom of priests* and an holy nation" (Ex. xix. 5, 6). All should have equal access to God, each one being his own priest.

### PRIESTHOOD LIMITED

What was thus offered conditionally, was, alas, rescinded, because the covenant they entered into (Ex. xix. 8; Deut. v. 2) with God they broke; they disobeyed. Some other plan must be devised.

<sup>1</sup>So far as priestly caste may be found outside, in Babylonia, Egypt, or elsewhere, it was manifestly a usurpation; for, from the fact that Cain and Abel offered their own sacrifices—(presumably Adam, too, since it must have been from him that his sons received their teaching)—it is plain that the divine intent was that priesthood should be individualistic and not the prerogative of only a sacerdotal class apart from other men.

On account of Israel's sad failure, God instituted the Aaronic or Levitical priesthood, and approach to Him must henceforth be through this mediating class. But as we now know, that scheme was provisional, temporary, and its rites were typical. In the course of time the primal condition was to be restored, and a universal priestly privilege and service be again the boon of all mankind.

#### PRIESTHOOD UNIVERSAL AGAIN

In the Epistle to the Hebrews (chaps. v.–x.) Christ is shown to have fulfilled and accomplished all that was typically and practically intended in the old-time priesthood, both that of Aaron and Melchizedek as well. He assumed both lines — that inside the Levitical cult and that outside — into his own priestly person, becoming thus the end of both, and thereby opening forevermore the way of access to all who would come unto God by him.

There is therefore no more need or place for any human or priestly "class" to mediate between man and God. Every believer in Christ now has "an high priest over the house of God," and he can himself "draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith" (Heb. x. 21, 22). Accordingly St. Peter says: "Ye also as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, *an holy priesthood* to offer up spiritual sacrifices. . . . Ye are a chosen generation, *a royal priesthood*, an holy nation" (1 Pet. ii. 5–9).

All Christians, therefore, are priests to God now; and to interject the offices of any earthly official between a soul and its Maker is an awful sacrilege. Again priesthood is universal.

#### NO "PRIESTS" IN THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH

It is most noteworthy that in the founding and foundation of the Christian church, as set forth in the New Testament, no human minister of religion is ever called a priest.

There were apostles, prophets, evangelists, teachers (Eph. iv. 11), elders (Acts xiv. 23; 1 Tim. v. 17; 1 Pet. v. 1),

overseers or bishops, deacons (1 Tim. iii. 1, 10; Phil. i. 1), but priests never, never!

To import that term into the church, as a class distinction, is therefore entirely unscriptural and unwarrantable, and to credit or invest any man, or set of men, with a priestly or sacerdotal function, is to dishonor the great High Priest of our profession, and rob each priest-believer of his spiritual birthright.

#### THE TRUE ORIGIN OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC PRIESTHOOD

It may be asked, then, Where does the Roman Catholic Church get its Priesthood? This question may be answered both negatively and positively.

**NEGATIVELY.** That it has no Scripture warrant or authority has just been made to plainly appear. To be sure, Roman Catholics claim Bible authority for it; but their claim is a foisted fake pure and simple, as will be at once clearly shown.

At the family worship in the home of the writer, both the Protestant and Catholic Bibles are used. One morning James v. 14 was read: "Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church, and let them pray over him," etc. But the Catholic version gives it thus: "Is any sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the church, and let them pray over him," etc. The difference between these two renderings led to questionings which resulted in what has been presented thus far in this disquisition and in what is further to be presented.

The apparent Biblical authority which the Roman Catholic English (Douay) version gives for "priest" is unwarrantably brought in by a mistranslation.

In the New Testament the Greek word *πρεσβύτερος*, *presbuteros*, elder, occurs, substantively, 62 times. Originally it denoted seniority in age, but afterward it became a term of rank or office, and now, in church usage, it is popularly so understood. Often "elders" are young men.

In the Latin Vulgate—the authoritative Bible of the Roman Catholic Church—the word is simply transferred

from the Greek, *presbuteros*, and is never translated by "sacerdos," the Latin word for priest.

In the Italian version it is always translated by *anziano*, the officer-word, and never by "sacerdote," the Italian word for priest.

In the Spanish version it is *presbiteros*, and never "sacerdote."

In the French version it is *ancien* or *pasteur*, and never "sacrificateur" or "pretre."

In the German version it is *aeltesten*, never "priester."

In the Protestant English version it is always translated, as it should be, *elder*, and never "priest."

In the Romish English version, always, except six times, it is translated "ancient" (their word for elder), but in these sextuple instances, where for no other reason than to make an ecclesiastical and sectarian point for Romanism, it is rendered priest!

Although *presbuteros* had occurred 29 times up to Acts xiv. 23, not until then do Romanists translate it priest: "Ordained to them priests in every church," instead of "elders in every church," as it should be. The next instance is Acts xv. 2, "apostles and priests," instead of "apostles and elders" as the Greek requires; yet two verses farther on (ver. 4) it is not translated "priest," but "ancient." The other flagrant instances of like mis-translation are 1 Timothy v. 17, 19; Titus i. 5; and James v. 14. And such is Roman Catholic Biblical authority for "Priest"!

Says Hastings's Bible Dictionary:—

"'Priest' (Gr. *hierous*) is employed in the New Testament to denote anyone whose function is to offer a religious sacrifice. . . . The New Testament never describes the *Christian ministry* as a priesthood, or the individual minister as a priest, except in the general sense in which these terms are applied to all believers. . . . The two terms 'presbyter' (*presbyteros*) and 'priest' (*hierous*) which came to be confounded by and by, were at first kept absolutely apart" (pp. 754, 755, one vol. ed.).

The attempt to connect the Romish priesthood with the Jewish priesthood, and so give it semblance of Scripture warrant, is entirely gratuitous; for, as every one knows or ought to know, the Jewish priesthood — typical — was fulfilled and came to an end in Christ. There is therefore no sacerdotal or priestly office in the church.

POSITIVELY. Says J. Garnier in the second volume of his "The True and the False Christ":—

"The priesthood of Rome claims to be the successors of the apostles, but they have been the chief opposers of the truth taught by the apostles, and the chief agents in resuscitating the idolatry which Christ came to destroy. On the other hand, they have a true and just claim to be *the successors of the pagan priesthood*. For not only are the title and office of Pontifex-Maximus, and orders, offices, sacerdotal dresses, symbols, doctrines, sorceries and idolatries of Rome *directly derived from the priesthood of paganism*, but they are the rightful and direct successors of the supreme pontiffs and priesthood of *ancient Babylon and pagan Rome*."

Says the Roman Catholic Cardinal Newman in his book, "An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine":—

"We are told in various ways by Eusebius, that Constantine, in order to recommend the new religion to *the heathen, transferred into it the outward ornaments to which they had been accustomed in their own*. It is not necessary to go into a subject which the diligence of Protestant writers has made familiar to most of us. The use of temples, and these dedicated to particular saints, and ornamented on occasions with branches of trees; incense, lamps and candles; votive offerings on recovery from illness; holy water, asylums; holidays and seasons, use of calendars, processions, blessings on the field; sacerdotal vestments, the tonsure, the ring in marriage, turning to the east, images at a later date, perhaps the ecclesiastical chant and the Kyrie elieson, *are all of pagan origin*." (The italics in both these quotations are ours.)

Says Pember, in his "Earth's Earliest Ages," "Popery is nothing but Paganism under a changed name, and covered with a gauzy veil of Christianity" (p. 368).

Space does not permit the overwhelming adduction of

proof of the allegations in the foregoing. It is said that the ancient pagan augurs could not meet on the streets of Rome without laughing each other in the face, such arrant hypocrites and frauds did they know themselves to be. Well may priests of Rome do the same thing.

Let it be understood, then, that the Roman Catholic priesthood is not of Christian origin, but is of pagan derivation. Any hierarchical claim, therefore, whose validity is assumed or presumed to rest on any scriptural warrant or authority, is utterly fraudulent and false. There is nothing in it.

When the Church in England under Henry VIII. (1533) separated from Rome and set up for itself, it was as much Roman Catholic in doctrine as it had been before, and it carried with it the unscriptural priestly cult. In the reforms that followed, it is to be regretted that the "priest" order was not reformed out. Its retention by the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country is one of the elements that is likely to abort all its attempts at union with other denominations.

#### PRIEST-BELIEVER TRUTHS REASSERTED

It is high time that these Scriptural truths were iterated and reiterated, when an ecclesiastical hierarchy (*hiereus*, priest; *arche*, rule), claiming rightful dominance over all mankind, is, with blatant and insolent intrusion, thrusting itself so unblushingly into the face and eyes of American Christendom, and even in Washington, the capital of this great nation, is virtually compelling officialdom, in some ways, from the President down, to yield to its warrantless priestly pretensions.

The truth of the common priesthood of all believers, now so much obscured, is no new notion. It was set forth by the earliest Church writers, like Justin Martyr (105-165), Irenæus (115-190), Tertullian (160-240), and others. More yet, the Roman pontiff, Pope Leo I. (440-461), called "Leo the Great," dwelt on the same truth.

## THE TRUTH PERVERTED

But at an early date, in imitation of Old Testament usage, there was a beginning of calling the clergy "priests," for which, as we have seen, there is not a particle of Scripture authority. In the third century the offering of the Eucharist, which is a thank offering—such was the growth of the priestly idea—began to be regarded as made *in behalf* of the people instead of *by* the people.

The countries about the Mediterranean were distributed for the purposes of ecclesiastical administration, into five patriarchates, named from their civic centers: Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, Jerusalem, and Rome. These were at first of equal<sup>1</sup> and coördinate standing, neither one claiming any supremacy over the other. But about the middle of the fifth century, Leo I., mainly for political reasons,—such was the coalition between popes and emperors,—began to advance the ambitious and usurping idea of the primacy of Rome. This idea was pushed until in the eleventh century (1054) there resulted the Great Schism, or separation of Christendom into two parts: the Roman or Western Church, and the Greek or Eastern Church. Of course the great body from which this cutting-off was made was no less church, qualitatively, than it was before, nor was that which by its excising act became the Roman Church any more church, either qualitatively or quantitatively, than it had been hitherto. It may therefore be said, in passing, that there was no such thing as a distinctive Roman Catholic Church until after this wicked schismatic eleventh-century event.

Involved in this deplorable contention was the upspringing and growth of the hierarchy (priest rule), which became a most powerful adjuvant to pontifical pretensions and projects. With equal step, the concept of the Eucharist as a thank offering gave place to that of *a sacrifice*,

<sup>1</sup> White, in his *Eighteen Christian Centuries* (chapter on the 5th century), says: "The Roman Bishop had not yet asserted his supremacy over the Church. Each prelate was sovereign Pontiff of his own see, and his doctrines for a long time regulated the doctrines of his flock" (p. 116).

for which a priestly function was indispensable. And, as "The Catholic Encyclopedia" says: "The essential correlative of priesthood is sacrifice" (vol. xii. p. 400). The common priesthood of believers was displaced by the priesthood of an official caste. When in the thirteenth century the doctrine of Transubstantiation (that is, changing the bread and wine of the Eucharist into the veritable body and blood of Christ!) was fixed, the sacrificial character of the elements, or mass, was determined by Thomas Aquinas (1227-74), and Albert the Great (1193-1280); was formally adopted by the Council of Trent (1545-63); and was made the central idea of the Romish priest-system.

"PRIESTHOOD" EXEMPLIFIED — THE "PRIEST" AT WORK

The Roman Catholic teaching in regard to the power of the priest is superabundantly set forth in their writings. Just now we are concerned with their eucharistic work.

St. Alphonsus Liguori, whose standing, according to "The Catholic Encyclopedia," "allows confessors to follow any of St. Alphonsus's own opinions without weighing the reasons on which they are based," in his "Dignity and Duties of the Priest," says:—

"With regard to the power of priests over the real body of Jesus Christ, it is of faith that when they pronounce the words of consecration, the Incarnate Word has obliged himself to obey and to come into their hands under the sacramental species. In obedience to the words of his priests — *Hoc est corpus meum* [this is my body] — God himself descends on the altar, comes wherever they call him, and as often as they call him, and places himself in their hands, even though they should be his enemies. . . . As in creating the world it was sufficient for God to have said, Let it be made, and it was created, so it is sufficient for the priest to say, 'Hoc est corpus meum,' and behold the bread is no longer bread, but the body of Jesus Christ. 'The power of the priest,' says St. Bernardine of Sienna, 'is the power of the divine person; for the transubstantiation of the bread requires as much power as the creation of the world.' Thus the priest may, in a certain manner, be called the creator of his Creator."



At the opening of the Eucharistic Congress at Cincinnati, Ohio, September 29, 1911, Archbishop Ireland preached a sermon upon the Eucharist, in which he is reported to have said:—

“Priests of the Holy Catholic Church, you celebrate your mass. At the moment of the consecration you repeat the words of Jesus—‘This is my body, this is the chalice, the new testament in my blood’—the bread is changed into his body, and the wine into his blood: Jesus is on the altar, fully man, fully God.”

In the *Western Watchman* of St. Louis, June 10, 1915, the Editor, “Father” Phelan, printed his sermon for the next Sunday, in which, with brutal frankness, he said:—

“I never invited an angel down from heaven to hear mass here. The only person in heaven I ever ask to come down here is Jesus Christ, and him I command to come down. He has to come when I bid him. I took bread in my fingers this morning and I said, ‘This is the body and blood of Jesus Christ,’ and he had to come down. That is one of the things he must do. He must come down, every time I say mass, at my bidding.”

Here, surely, is priesthood exemplified and the priest very much at work. And such a blasphemous farce, on Thanksgiving days beginning with 1909, at the Pan-American mass in St. Patrick’s Church, Washington, D. C., have such men as Presidents Taft, Wilson, members of their cabinets, judges of the Supreme Court, and many other high public functionaries, been constrained to witness!

In the Catechism officially prepared and enjoined by the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore (1884), in answer to questions, we are told that “Christ gave his priests the power to change bread and wine into his body and blood when he said, ‘Do this for a commemoration of me’” (Q. 891). This claim is not true, of course, but utterly false, for the simple reason that Christ does not have any clerical “priests,” and no person has any such power.

Again: “The bread and wine are changed into the body and blood of Christ at the consecration of the mass” (Q.

916). This is not true, but utterly false, for the simple reason that no such change takes place or has ever taken place in priestly or any other consecration.

To the retort, "Oh, assertion" — which may be thrust equally in turn at either side — we submit that the Roman Catholic Church should accept the oft-made challenge, *herewith renewed*, to submit any quantum they please of the alleged changed elements to the scientific and truthful determination of a competent chemical analysis, and so prove whether their transubstantiation claim asserts what is a fact or is a falsehood. In the September, 1914, number of *The Protestant Magazine*, published at Takoma Park, D. C., a challenge to such an analysis was in most respectful terms formally made to Mgr. W. T. Russell, pastor of St. Patrick's, but it was not accepted. On the contrary, compliments were paid to the Editor, by the Catholic press, that were not altogether gracious! Why not make the test? for surely it would certify if bread becomes flesh and wine becomes blood; and, if true, the Catholic faith would be incontrovertibly confirmed and the unbelief of the Protestant world be forever confuted. Certainly, let the test be made. Thus would be demonstrated either an article of faith or an — arrant fraud.

Still further from the Catechism: "The mass is the bloody sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ" (Q. 917). "The mass is the same sacrifice as that on the cross" (Q. 920). This is untrue, for these statements atrociously contradict the Epistle to the Hebrews, where it tells of "the offering of the body of Jesus Christ *once for all*" (x. 10). "This man after he had offered *one sacrifice for sins forever*, sat down on the right hand of God" (x. 12). "For by *one offering* he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified" (x. 14). "This he did *once for all*, when he offered up himself" (vii. 27). "There remaineth *no more a sacrifice for sins*" (x. 26), and "apart from shedding of blood there is *no remission*" of sins (ix. 22).

No wonder Cardinal Bellarmine, in his treatise on the Eucharist, admits that the dogma of transubstantiation

cannot be proved from the Scriptures (bk. iii. chap. 23), and he quotes the assertion of John Duns Scotus, the well-known Roman theologian, that "before the Lateran Council [1215] transubstantiation was not a dogma of faith." Without a shred of Biblical authority, it is simply a conceit of errant human concoction. And it is to be noted that in the Authorized Catechism, from which these quotations are taken, there is not a single Scripture reference in proof of the statements made. And, we may ask, why should there be, if, as Cardinal Manning, in his book "Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost," says: "We neither derive our religion from the Scriptures, nor does it depend upon them" (p. 176)? And the editor of a leading English Roman Catholic journal says: "It is strange that any reasonable man in the present day can imagine for a moment that Almighty God intended the Bible as a text-book of Christian doctrine" (*The Month*, Dec. 1888). According to Romanist teaching, the Bible rests on the Roman Catholic Church, not the church on the Bible. What "the Church" says must therefore be true, Bible or no Bible!

And when we are also told that "mortal sin is a grievous offense against the law of God" (Q. 280), and that "it is a mortal sin not to hear mass on Sunday or on a holiday of obligation, unless we are excused for a serious reason" (Q. 1329), it does seem as if priestcraft had gone the limit in "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men" (Matt. xv. 9).

The mass is central in the Roman Catholic system of worship. "The Catholic Encyclopedia" says:—

"That the Mass . . . is the central feature of the Catholic religion hardly needs to be said. During the Reformation and always the Mass has been the test. The word of the Reformers: 'It is the Mass that matters,' was true" (vol. ix. p. 800).

It is plain to every careful student that this Church must stand or fall with the mass. And what is its foundation? Simply the false interpretation given the passages of Scripture (Matt. xxvi. 26-29; Mark xiv. 22-25;

Luke xxii. 19, 20; 1 Cor. xi. 23-25) which recount the institution of the Lord's Supper, or indeed to a single text, the words *Hoc est meum corpus* (This is my body) which the priest uses in the consecration of the bread and wine. Before me lies a disquisition on "Tropes and Figures of Rhetoric." A trope is the turning of a word from its original and customary meaning, and a rhetorical figure is a mode of expression different from the direct and simple way of expressing the same sense. Thirty-five tropes or figures are named, among them the common figure called *metonymy*, which is the substitution of the name of an object for that of another to which it has a certain relation, as the cause for effect; sign for the thing signified; container for the thing contained; material for the thing made from it; property for the substance; parts of the body for certain affections; place for the inhabitants; etc. For instance, if it be said that Rome is loyally Catholic, the place would, by metonymy, be used for the inhabitants, for not Rome the material city is intended, but the people thereof. Why, we can hardly speak without using this figure, or some other. When Christ said, "I am the door; by me if any man enter" (John x. 9), he did not mean that he was literally a material, rectangular, paneled frame with hinges, knob, lock and key, but, by a metonymy, that he was as a door figuratively, a means, avenue, way of entrance. When, speaking of the bread, he said, "This is my body," he could not have meant that that broken piece of kneaded, baked dough had been transubstantiated into his literal body—else there would have been two Christs there, one the speaker and the other the element which he was handling!—but that it stood for, represented, his body which was to be broken in sacrifice on the cross; and so the wine represented his blood which was to be shed. And when he said, "This cup is the new testament in my blood, drink all ye of it," he did not mean that they should drink the literal cup, as the Roman Catholic principle of interpretation would require—twelve men could hardly have swallowed one and the same piece of crockery or

metal!—but, using the figure of the container for the thing contained, he meant that they should drink the contents of the cup. We refrain from characterizing as it deserves such a rhetorical crime against all interpretative rules of sane exegesis. Mass—metonymy: let an unimpeachable chemical analysis prove whether it rests upon fact, or only upon a figure of speech.

#### PRIEST — PROPHET

At the outset we saw what the priest was and what his office. But the official priest proved inadequate and incompetent. More was needed. The priest functions, the rather, from man toward God. What became needful was one who should function from God to man. Hence the prophet.

The common conception of a prophet as simply a fore-teller of future events, is true only in part. Striking off the case termination of the Greek word *προφήτης*, *prophēt-ēs*, we have the English word prophet, and its derivation from *πρό*, *pro*, for, and *φημί*, *phēmi*, to speak, gives at once the clue to its signification. A prophet, then, is one who speaks for another, and in Scripture the prophet is one who speaks for God. So at first he is a forth-teller, and then, as occasion requires, a fore-teller.

A study of priest and prophet in the light of history—both Biblical and otherwise—is by no means altogether cheerful reading. We see that marked contrasts always distinguished them. The world has had little, if anything, to hope for from the priest, everything to hope for from the prophet. The priest, while performing proper functions it may be, has been a dead weight on true spiritual ongoing, reactionary, an obstructionist; the prophet has been a living force, progressive, a constructionist, speaking for God, a voice crying in the world's moral and spiritual desolation, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight."

Who was it that materialized Deity into a golden calf for the people to worship? It was priest Aaron (Ex.

xxxii. 4). Who was it that literally crammed the crass concept down their throats in his endeavor to lift to a higher, nobler, even a spiritual, conception of God? It was prophet Moses (Ex. xxxii. 20).

Who was it that led the first Jewish king from his low, perverted, priestly apprehensions of sacrifice up to a lofty and true idea of spiritual service and worship? It was prophet Samuel (1 Sam. xv.), the founder of the School of the Prophets. And it should not be forgotten that it was when, through priestly decline, the Urim and Thummim worn upon the high priest's breast ceased to be an oracle for revealing the Divine will (1 Sam. xiv. 37; xxviii. 6), that real prophecy, real mediatorship between Jehovah and his people, was set free from its connection with the priesthood, and Samuel instituted the discipline of the prophetic college.

Who was it that stood single-handed and alone against a court debauched and degraded by priestcraft, home and foreign? It was prophet Elijah (1 Kings xviii.).

Who was it when, by priestly ministrations, oblations to God had become "vain," incense an "abomination," appointed feasts hateful and fairly "wearying" to Him, sought to recover priests and people to a spiritual conception of Deity that has been the uplift and illumination of the ages? It was the prophet Isaiah (see chap. i. and all through his book).

But why go on and exhaust the catalogue of the prophets? for as to prophetic spirit they are pretty much all alike.

"The thing that hath been, is that which shall be; and that which hath been done, is that which shall be done." Prophets and priests are still abroad in the land. But a clear-cut line of demarcation cannot be drawn, and that which belongs to the prophetic placed all on one side, and all that belongs to the priestly on the other. These functions may, and sometimes do, have overlapping. A prophet may have a bit of priestly infection, and it is possible for a priest to have something of the prophetic spirit.

This much allowed, a great outstanding fact is that prophets, as such, belong to Protestantism, and priests to Romanism. Still, it ought to be said that, save for the priestliness that remains in the Protestant Episcopal Church, there are no "priests" in the Protestant denominations, while priests, wherever found, are so far Romanists. Go into a Protestant church, and always (save for the possible exception in the last sentence) you will find the pulpit—the rostrum from which the prophet speaks for God—physically, morally, spiritually central; go into a Romish church, the altar is central, and the pulpit off one side. Indeed, the physical construction of their Gothic cathedrals shows that they were not intended for instruction, but solely for ritual performances. The vacant space between the pews and the walls, usually separated by columns, was designed for the procession of priests carrying the "host," and the "ambulatory" was admirably fitted for this purpose, and he would consider himself very fortunately placed who was in a position to hear at all satisfactorily. The cathedral is as well-fitted for the mass as it is ill-fitted for the sermon, and it expresses in stone what the Catholic believes and what the Protestant repudiates.

The prophet's mind is alert, his ear audient, his attitude that of Habakkuk, "I will watch to see what he will say unto me" (ii. 1), and if a true prophet he will do as did Jonah (ii. 2-4), preach the preaching that God bids him; the priest ministers at an altar, according to a prepared non-brain-stimulating, cut-and-dried ritual,—a ceremony the performance of which tends to become merely mechanical, and the sermon is entirely secondary. Dean Goulburn of the Church of England describes or defines the sermon as "A homily delivered after service." What initiative, what liberty of thought,<sup>1</sup> what freedom of speech, what latitude for delivering a present-day message from God, by a ministry of which Fr. Phelan can say: "What the Pope says is accepted as the word of God; what the bish-

<sup>1</sup>Count di Campello of Rome, ex-Canon of St. Peter's, says: "The only crime a priest can commit in the eyes of his Church is to think for himself."

ops say is accepted as the word of the Pope; what the priests preach is accepted as the word of the bishops" (*Western Watchman*, Aug. 1, 1912). What mental barrenness, what extinguishing of prophetic appetency, must there be if it be true that "There is only one way for a man to be a Catholic, and that is to bend his knee in obedience to papal authority and accept unreservedly each and every article of belief enjoined by the same authority" ("Questions and Answers," Department of Truth [R. C.], May, 1913). And there is "Motu Proprio," with rescript of Pope Pius X. (1907) against modernism, with its brain-numbing, conscience-clamping, soul-shackling oath, which, within six weeks, it is said, was put up to every Catholic priest in the world to take, or leave the Church; and it is also said — a fact not reported in the secular press — that scores upon scores did leave it rather than bind themselves with an oath that would stultify their minds and render them either hypocrites or spiritual slaves.

And where are the contemporary priest-preachers that have won a place in the same class with Bishop Simpson, Spurgeon, Joseph Parker, Talmage, Henry Ward Beecher, Phillips Brooks, Jowett, and — "Billy" Sunday? not to mention a host of others.

In more than fifty years of parish experience we have never found a Catholic priest who would enter into united work for community civic, social, or moral betterment. Such work has always been carried on under Protestant leadership. Temperance forces have long had the slogan, "The saloon must go." There have been some grand, ringing words in behalf of temperance by Catholics, — Archbishops Ireland, Keene, and others. But really, we cannot help questioning how much these words mean. Lying on the desk where this writing is going on, is a copy of *The Baltimore Catholic Review* (May 23, 1914) — Cardinal Gibbons's organ — in which is an editorial on behalf of "The Saloon," having these sentences:—

"We have no patience with the effort of those who want to abolish saloons without restriction and discrimination. . . . Human nature remains the same always; the race will



get stimulants of some kind or other. . . . The majority of men need the saloon or something like it."

According to a press despatch in the *New York Times* of August 9, 1912, when the Convention of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union was in progress in Notre Dame, Indiana, its president, the Rev. Peter Callaghan of Chicago, announced that he had received a communication from the Pope commanding that the members of the Union have no connection with the Prohibition Party. A tremendous battle is being waged for a Constitutional Amendment that will make the United States "dry."<sup>1</sup> According to the newspapers, on February 5, 1918, Cardinal Gibbons issued a statement declaring himself opposed to the movement. "In strong and decisive language Cardinal Gibbons denounced the national prohibition amendment and declared that legislators of the states should not bow to the 'fanaticism that seems to be ruling us in this respect.'" In June Archbishop S. G. Messmer of Wisconsin, in a pastoral letter, said: "I hereby positively forbid all pastors of parishes in this archdiocese from allowing any prohibition speeches to be given on any premises, be it the church, the school, or a hall." When the temperance forces prevailed in Washington to make the capital city "dry," they got up a great Sunday jubilee meeting in one of the theaters. Multitudinous were the Protestant ministers abetting. The "wets" prepared at the same time a counter meeting, and among the speakers was Mgr. Russell — since made Bishop of Charleston — the one only clergyman to champion the cause of booze! In view of the foregoing, should we say, but from another standpoint, "Priesthood Exemplified — the Priest at Work"?

Priest — priesthood: let it be said as the final word and remembered forevermore, that each believer is, after Christ, his own priest, and that in Christ's Church there is no place for any other priesthood.

<sup>1</sup>Since this was written, an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States has been adopted by several more than the required (36) number of States, making the whole country legally "dry" January 16, 1920.