

ROMAN CATHOLICISM



H. M. Riggle

Roman Catholicism

**In the Light of Their Own
Scriptures and Authorities**

**By
H. M. Riggle**

Digitally Published by
THE GOSPEL TRUTH
www.churchofgodeveninglight.com

Originally Published by
Gospel Trumpet Company
1915

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Origin of the Church of God.....	7
Is the Church of Rome the Primitive Church?	11
The Primitive Church and the Church of Rome Compared	12
Humble Equality of the Primitive Ministry	20
How the Papacy Rose	28
Supremacy of the Pope	33
Rome's Claim to Infallibility.....	39
Is Peter the Foundation?	46
Was Peter Ever Bishop of Rome?	54
Is the Church of Rome the True Catholic Church?	64
The Unity of the Church of Rome	69
Infant Damnation	77
Transubstantiation	80

Mass, as Observed in the Roman Catholic Church.....	90
Idolatrous Worship	95
Penance—Absolution—Auricular Confession.....	102
The Doctrine of Purgatory	113
The Gospel to the Dead	119
The Church of Rome Described in Daniel’s Prophecy	123
The Papacy Portrayed in the Revelation.....	126
Babylon the Great	131
The Call to Leave Babylon	136

Introduction

What is contained in the following pages has been written in a spirit of Christian love and courtesy toward the millions of Roman Catholic friends in all parts of the world. I grant that the majority of the worshipers and devotees of the Church of Rome are as zealous, earnest, and sincere as any people on earth. When it comes to the strict observance of church doctrines and traditions, I believe they rank first among all denominations. But sincerity alone is no proof of orthodoxy. No one will question the fact that millions of Mohammedan worshipers are honest in their convictions as to what is right. The same may be said also of pagan worshipers. But we who stand in the light of Christianity know that they are wrong and deceived.

Truth and error are opposites. The truth alone can save. Light and darkness cannot exist in the same place at the same time. The only safe rule is to keep our hearts open to the truth, always ready to receive the light of God. This sometimes has to be done at the cost of traditions and teaching that we may have imbibed in childhood. I am well aware that it is not so easy to cast away those teachings that we received at Mother's knee. The religious beliefs of our fathers and mothers hold a sacred place in our hearts, and our reverence for them makes it hard to give them up. Paul was brought face to face with this same problem in his own life. From childhood he was

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

catechized in the Jewish religion. He was a member of the strictest sect—the Pharisees. He says that he profited in that religion “above many of his fellows.” As touching the righteousness of the law, he was blameless. And yet with all this, he finally woke up to the fact that he was lost and fighting against God. What an example he sets before us, willingly discarding the traditions of his fathers, forsaking his sect, and embracing the true religion of Jesus Christ in all its purity! Of course, in doing so he suffered loss. He says, “The things that were gain to me, the same I have counted loss for Christ. Furthermore I count all things but loss for the excellent knowledge of Jesus Christ my Lord; for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and count them but as dung that I may gain Christ” (Phil. 3:7, 8).

To our Catholic friends, I wish further to state that I have not written this book from the Protestant point of view, neither have I quoted Protestant authors in order to set forth Romish doctrines and standards. No Protestant sect is the orthodox church any more than is the Church of Rome. I have written from the standpoint of pure, primitive Christianity, as revealed in the New Testament. I have written as a representative of the divine ecclesia, the pure Church of God, which has Christ as its true, and only, living head and includes in its membership all the redeemed in heaven and in earth.

In the preparation of this work, the reader will observe that I have not followed in the rut of those who have inaugurated a tirade of abuse against the Church of Rome.

In this treatise I have quoted from the acknowledged standard works of the Church of Rome. Our Catholic friends, as well as all others, will see that this is fair. Mr. Chas. Butler, in the book that he wrote in reply to Southey’s book of the Roman Catholic Church, says, “It is most true that the Roman Catholics believe the doctrines

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

of their church to be unchangeable; and that it is a tenet of their creed, that what their faith ever has been, such it was from the beginning, such it now is, and such it ever will be.” “No doctrine should be ascribed to the Roman Catholics as a body, except such as is an article of their faith.”

The articles of faith of the Roman Catholic Church are to be found in its accredited creeds, catechisms, formularies, and decrees, as propounded by popes and General Councils. Thus in our setting forth of their doctrines, I have adduced the standards which are acknowledged by them. In doing this, no one can accuse me of misrepresenting.

Since Romanists reject the Protestant versions of the Bible, I have made all Scripture quotations from their own Bible, known as the Douay-Rheims Version. The Old Testament of this version was first published by the English College at Douay, A. D. 1609; and the New Testament, by the English College at Rheims, A. D. 1582. This entire Bible is commonly referred to as the Douay Version. The particular edition from which I quote is published by the John Murphy Company, of Baltimore and New York, with the approbation of His Eminence James Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore, and that of His Eminence John Cardinal Farley, Archbishop of New York.

But so far as the Scripture quotations in the present work are concerned, the differences between the Douay Version and the Authorized, or King James Version are for the most part unimportant. Wherever there is an important discrepancy, I have quoted from both versions so that the rendering would be familiar to both Catholic and Protestant readers. The two greatest variations are:

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

1. Instead of the term “elder,” as in the Authorized Version, the Douay Version has “priest” or “ancient” in the following texts: Acts 14:23 (Douay 14:22); 15:2, 4, 6; 20:17; Tit. 1:5; 1 Pet. 5:1.

2. Instead of “repentance,” as in the Authorized Version, the Douay Version has “penance” in the following texts: Luke 24:47; Acts 2:38; 20:21.

So far as the terms “elders” and “priests” are concerned, it is evident from the Scripture texts cited that the persons thus designated were simply Christian ministers; and their callings and offices must not be confounded with the special functions of the priesthood of later ages. In fact, it is certain that the primitive church did not specifically designate its ministry as a priesthood, as is implied in the sixteenth-century translation of the Rheims Version of the New Testament; for originally all the faithful were considered priests, and prayer their offering. This is proved by their own Bible. Jesus Christ “hath made us a kingdom, and *priests* to God and his father” (Apoc. [Rev.] 1:6). “And hast made us to our God a kingdom and priests” (chap. 5:10). “Be you also as living stones built up, a spiritual house, a holy *priesthood*, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ” (1 Pet. 2:5).

This idea of a universal priesthood, or a “congregation of priests,” was a favorite one in the ancient church and was advanced as proof of the superiority of Christianity, as can be seen by consulting Justin Martyr: *Trypho*, CXVI; Irenaeus: *Haer.*, Book IV, Chap. VIII, sec. S; Tertullian: *De exhortations castitatis*, VII; Origen: *On Prayer*, XXVIII, 9; Augustine: *Civitas Dei*, XX, 10, and others. Gradually, however, the idea of a universal priesthood was lost sight of, and then it became customary to designate bishops and presbyters as “priests.” Until in the time of Cyprian these ministers were represented as “priests” who offered sacrifices to God and

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

filled a mediatory office; and the Old Testament passages pertaining to the Levitical priesthood were assumed to be applicable to them. But there can be no particular objection to the rendering “priests,” in the texts quoted, if we bear in mind the class of officers in the primitive church referred to by the sacred writers.

In substituting the word “penance” for “repentance” there is also the same tendency to throw back upon the original text of Scripture a peculiar tenet and practice of the church of later ages. This is shown by the translation of the Greek word *metanoeo* in Matt. 3:2—“Do *penance*, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand”—taken in connection with Dr. Challoner’s footnote attached: “Do *penance*. Which word, according to the use of the Scriptures *and the holy fathers*, does not only signify repentance and amendment of life, but also punishing past sins by fasting, and such like penitential exercises.”

That the meaning of this Greek word is “repent” is shown by the fact that the Douay translators themselves frequently render it thus. For example, I cite the following texts: “The time is accomplished, and the kingdom of God is at hand; *repent* [*metanoeo*], and believe the gospel” (Mark 1:15). “If thy brother sin against thee, reprove him: and if he do *penance* [*metanoeo*], forgive him. And if he sin against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day be converted unto thee, saying, I *repent* [*metanoeo*]; forgive him” (Luke 17:3, 4). In this text they were obliged to translate it “repent” in order to avoid a ridiculous rendering. “Be *penitent* [*metanoeo*], therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out” (Acts 3:19). “I gave her a time that she might do *penance* [*metanoeo*], and she will not *repent* [*metanoeo*] of her fornication” (Apoc. [Rev.] 2:21).

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

Metanoya, another form of the same Greek word, is also translated “penance” in Luke 24:47: “And that *penance* and remission of sins should be preached in his name, unto all nations.” However, the Douay translators, conscious of the real meaning and force of the original word, could not uniformly render it thus. “Him hath God exalted with his right hand, to be Prince and Savior, to give *repentance* [*metanoya*] to Israel, and remission of sins” (Acts 5:31). “God then hath also to the Gentiles given *repentance* [*metanoya*] unto life” (Acts 11:18). “If peradventure God may give them *repentance* [*metanoya*] to know the truth” (2 Tim. 2:25). “He found no place of *repentance* [*metanoya*]” (Heb. 12:17).

It is an evident fact, and one well known to these translators, that “penance” does not express the real force of the original Greek word, which signifies a *change of character, a permanent alteration of the disposition and habits*. Furthermore, in the teaching of Christ and of his apostles there is nothing agreeable to the later practice of performing certain works of penance in order to receive forgiveness. That practice grew up by degrees during the apostasy. It was first applied to those who, after having fallen away and brought scandal upon the church, desired to be readmitted into fellowship.

In the preparation of this work, I have made a few choice selections from *Delineation of Roman Catholicism*, by Rev. Chas. Elliott, D. D.

With a prayer that the truths contained in this little volume may lead some honest souls into the light of truth, I remain,

Yours in Christian love,

H. M. Riggle
Akron, Indiana
December 29, 1915

Origin of the Church of God

The New Testament church is a divine institution. Her inception was coeval in the mind of God with that of the plan of salvation. Her origin, being the result of redemption, was inseparable from it. This beautiful church, redeemed through the blood of the Lamb, stood before the Father's mind parallel with the gift of his Son. God cast upon the earth a beautiful shadow of that holy institution, in the form of the temple and all its contents. And after "Moses was verily faithful in all his house as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after," in due time "Christ, as a Son over his own house," appeared and built this beautiful church of the living God. He adorned her foundations and walls with the pure gold of his heavenly light, and set them with the precious stones of his graces and gifts; he draped her pillars with the robes of his righteousness; and he shed in her the light of his own glory. She is from heaven, "the city of my God, the new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God" (Rev. 3:12). Along with Christ her builder, she is the gift of infinite love.

She is "God's building," chosen of him for his own dwelling-place—"built together into an habitation of God in the Spirit" (Eph. 2:22). Here the Lord spreads a continual feast of love for all his heaven-born children. She is the "true tabernacle" of the present divine testimony, which "*the Lord hath pitched, and not man*"

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

(Heb. 8:2). As the house of God, he that buildeth all things in her, is God (Heb. 3: 4); as the beloved city, she “hath foundations whose builder and maker is God” (Heb. 11:10); as a visible working force, she is a kingdom set up by the God of heaven, which shall never be destroyed (Dan. 2:44). Her foundation is Jesus Christ, the divine Savior—“for other foundation can no man lay, but that which is laid; which is Jesus Christ.” Her life and light is the “eternal spirit,” and her creed is the pure Word of God. God’s church is a “spiritual house,” and to her is given the spiritual law. All her ordinances and observances are divine, and found in the New Testament.

The government of the Church of God is divine, not only in its legislative department, but also in its judicial and executive departments. “The government is upon his shoulder” (Isa. 9:6). “He is the head of the body, the church . . . that in all things he may hold the primacy” (Col. 1:18). “The same God who worketh all in all” (1 Cor. 12: 6). This is truly “the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood” (Acts 20:28).

God, having purchased, founded, and built the church, claims in her the exclusive right of proprietorship. She is not, then, “our church,” the Church of Rome, or any Protestant sect, but “God’s building,” divinely owned; and “his glory he will not give to another.” Jesus himself said, “Upon this rock I WILL BUILD MY CHURCH, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it” (Matt. 16:18).

From the foregoing we learn that the New Testament church was built by Christ; that he built but one church; that this one church, which he denominates “my church,” belongs exclusively to him; and that it shall stand forever.

The work of organizing and establishing this church began under the labors of John the Baptist, and was continued under the

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

personal ministry of Christ. From the days of John “men pressed into the kingdom.” But during that time there was a lapping-over of dispensations. The law was still in force, while the principles of the gospel and the truths of the New Testament were being introduced and taught. At the death of Christ, the law dispensation properly ended and the gospel fully came into force. The question arises, At what particular time was the New Testament church fully organized as a distinct institution, a visible, living, moving, working force? When were the words of Jesus strictly fulfilled wherein he said, “I will build my church”?

By a careful reading of 1 Corinthians 12 it will be seen that the work of organizing the church, forming it into due parts and furnishing it with organs, belongs to the Spirit. Just such a work was fully accomplished on the day of Pentecost, when the gift of the Holy Ghost was poured out upon the one hundred and twenty believers who were assembled in Jerusalem. They began to speak forth the wonderful works of God, “as the Spirit gave them to speak.” Under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost the gospel was preached, which resulted in the conversion of three thousand souls. The rite of baptism was administered to these converts. “And there were added in that day about three thousand souls. And they were persevering in the doctrine of the apostles.” “And all they that believed were together.” From this time on, it is said, “The Lord increased daily together such as should be saved.” “THE LORD ADDED TO THE CHURCH daily such as should be saved.” See Acts 2.

Thus the first Christian church was planted at Jerusalem. This took place, it is supposed, in the year A. D. 33.

The Church of Rome has always claimed to be the first church. Even many Protestants believe her to be the first. But this claim is

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

disproved by the clear testimony of the Word of God that the first Christian church was planted in Jerusalem, not in Rome. A careful reading of the Acts clearly shows that Jerusalem was the headquarters of the work for many years after it was fully established. The apostles remained there. Even during the great dispersion, when the saints “were all dispersed through the regions of Judea and Samaria,” because of the persecution that arose about Stephen, the apostles remained at Jerusalem (see Acts 8:1; 11:19-22). The prophet had declared that “the law shall go forth from Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.” Jesus said that “penance [repentance] and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all nations, *beginning at Jerusalem*”; and again, “Ye shall be witnesses unto me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and Samaria, and even to the uttermost part of the earth.” When congregations were raised up in Samaria, Antioch, and other cities round about, as the truth spread from place to place, it was from Jerusalem that apostles and ministers were sent forth to establish and confirm the brethren. It is not certain who carried the gospel to Rome; perhaps it was the “strangers of Rome” who were at Jerusalem on Pentecost (Acts 2:10). Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans about A. D. 58, which was about five years before he went there personally. But one thing is certain, the primitive congregation of God’s people to whom Paul addressed his epistle was vastly different from the present Romish hierarchy, or papacy.

Is the Church of Rome the Primitive Church?

On a number of points we hold common ground with our Catholic friends. That the Christian church is a divine institution, that there is but one true church, that there must be unity of faith and practice, and that sects and schisms are condemned by the Word of God, we agree. But the Romanists' claim that they are this one exclusive and primitive church is without Scriptural warrant.

In A. D. 32 Jesus said, "I will build my church." In A. D. 33 "the Lord increased daily together such as should be saved" (Acts 2:47). "The Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved," A. V. The fact that people were being added to the church proves that it was already built. The complete organization of the Church of God dates from Pentecost. The Church of Rome came into existence since A. D. 33, therefore it cannot be the true primitive church. Thus her claim of being the first church and mother of all churches is false. I repeat, since the true church dates from the day of Pentecost, it follows conclusively that later institutions (including the Church of Rome) cannot be that church. It is the true; they are the false. It is the real; they are substitutes. It is the genuine; they must be counterfeits. We, as the saints of the Most High, discard the latter and abide in the former. We cling to the Church of God and reject all sects. Are we not orthodox in so doing? Who can deny it?

The Primitive Church and the Church of Rome Compared

The true church is characterized by its receiving and retaining the doctrine and faith of the apostles. It is “built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone” (Eph. 2:20). “And they were persevering in the doctrine of the apostles” (Acts 2:42). The church must hold the same doctrines which the inspired apostles and prophets taught, and which are contained in the Holy Scriptures. This is the test laid down by Jesus himself: “My sheep hear my voice: . . . and they follow me”; “A stranger they follow not.” Hear the apostle on this point: “Whosoever revolteth, and continueth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that continueth in the doctrine, the same hath both the Father and the Son.”

It is not, then, the sentiments of fathers, or pontiffs, or bishops, or councils, but only those of prophets and apostles, that constitute the foundation of the church’s faith. Its apostolic doctrine is the first test of the church, which is emphatically entitled “the pillar and ground of the truth.” If this quality is wanting, nothing else can avail.

The Church of Rome fulfils the prediction of Paul that “some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to spirits of error, and doctrines of devils” (1 Tim. 4:1). She has departed from the apostolic doctrine that salvation is obtainable through repentance

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

and faith alone (Mark 1:15; Rom. 4:16; Rom. 10:9; Eph. 2:8, 9) and substituted a religion of works, including indulgences, the confessional, mass, extreme unction, purgatory, etc. Not a single one of these has any foundation in Holy Writ.

She has departed from the apostolic doctrine of holiness of heart and life (Matt. 5:8; Tit. 2:11, 12; Luke 1:74, 75; 1 John 4:17; 1 John 3:3, 6) and substituted a mere external holiness, which she has restricted to certain orders and individuals, such as monks, nuns, sisters of charity, prelates, and popes; thus has come the appellation, "His Holiness the Pope." In the primitive church all the brethren were holy, because they were saved from sin.

She has departed from the apostolic doctrine of a sinless life (1 John 3:6, 8, 9; 1 John 5:18), and in the following quotations from her standard authors acknowledges and teaches that her members are full of sin. In fact, a sinless life is nowhere taught by the priesthood of Rome.

Moreover, manifest sinners, as well as concealed heretics and infidels, pertain to the external and visible church of Christ. . . . The sanctity, such as Christ wills to exist in the church in this earth, does not exclude wicked men and sinners. —Lieberman: *Institutions Theologies*, p. 177.

In the one true and Catholic church of Christ, there are not only the imperfect, but also great sinners, and that not only concealed, but manifest.—Bellarmine: *De Eccles*, C, 9.

These statements are selected from thousands by which it can be shown that the Church of Rome has departed from the primitive faith. This proves her to be an apostate church, instead of the primitive Church of God.

Holiness is a distinguishing feature of the true church. Accordingly, we read that "holiness becometh thine house, O Lord,

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

unto length of days” (Psa. 92; 5—93: 5, A. V.). The members of this church are called “saints,” which signifies holy persons, or those who have been saved from their sins and who live righteously and godly in this present world. It is through the new birth that people enter the kingdom, or church, of God, and “whosoever is born of God, committeth not sin” (1 John 3:9). The Church of God is the body of Christ, and the mere profession of Christianity makes no one a member of Christ. All true members of the Church of God are born of God by the Spirit, and are therefore the sons of God. Christ is the door of this church, and he says, “By me if any man enter in, he shall be saved” (John 10:9). Of the church in her primitive glory it is said, “They were all filled with the Holy Ghost” (Acts 2:4). “And when they had prayed, the place was moved wherein they were assembled; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they spake the word of God with confidence. And the multitude of believers had but one heart and one soul: . . . and great grace was upon them all” (Acts 4:31-33). “But of the rest no man durst join himself unto them; but the people magnified them. And the multitude of men and women who believed in the Lord, was more increased” (Acts 5:13, 14).

Another picture of the ideal primitive church is given in Eph. 5: 25-27—“Christ also loved the church, and delivered himself up for it: that he might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life: that he might present to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy, and without blemish.” Thus we see that the spiritual character of the true Church of God is holiness of heart and a sinless life, in all its members.

When we contrast this with the teaching and lives of those who constitute the Church of Rome, there is no identity. They do not

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

teach a Spirit-filled and sinless life, nor do their members claim to practice such. Roman Catholics teach that open and notorious sinners, infidels and heretics, are members of the church.

Moreover, manifest sinners, as well as concealed heretics and infidels, pertain to the external and visible church of Christ. Sinners, with other infidels, are joined in the profession of the same Christian faith, and communion of the same sacraments, and are held under the name government of legitimate pastors. Therefore, they have all things which are required for a member of the church.—Lieberman.

The sanctity, such as Christ wills to exist in his church in this earth, does not exclude wicked men and sinners.—Id.

The church is constituted not only of the perfect and just, but it hath mixed the wicked and sinners, even notable and wicked sinners.—Bailly.

Open transgressors are members of the church.—Dens.

In the one true and Catholic Church of Christ, there are not only the imperfect, but also great sinners, and that not only concealed, but manifest.—Bellarmine.

If wicked members were not true members of the church, a wicked pope could not be the head of the church.—Id.

I deem the foregoing quotations from standard authors in the Church of Rome sufficient proof that it has no identity whatever with the primitive Church of God. From their own lips we judge them. The most flagrant transgressors, such as drunkards, swearers, adulterers, yes, “**GREAT SINNERS,**” wicked men, “not only concealed, but manifest”—“open transgressors”—are acknowledged members of the Roman church. Such may live and die accredited members of their church. In no other point does the apostasy of the Church of Rome appear more striking and evident than in her permitting the wicked to remain church-members. Since

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

Jesus said that a bad tree cannot bring forth good fruit, and that a tree is known by its fruit, the Church of Rome must be a corrupt tree. To quote their own authors:

Many popes were men of the most abandoned lives. Some were magicians; some were noted for sedition, war, and slaughter; for profligacy of manners, for avarice and symony.—Gerhard: *De Eccles.* sec. 263, p. 438.

The cardinals were also noted for pride, luxury, avarice, and other crimes.—*Id.*, sec. 264, p. 430.

The morals of the bishops, priests, and other clergy were equally depraved.—*Id.*, p. 440.

Is this a picture of the New Testament church, which Paul declared to be “a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy, and without blemish”? Surely in the Church of Rome is fulfilled the prediction of Paul that an apostasy, or falling away, would come.

The Church of God is the body of Christ. “His body, which is the church” (Col. 1:24). “He is the head of the body, the church” (v. 18). “The church, which is his body” (Eph. 1:22, 23). These texts are conclusive; the church is Christ’s body. This body is composed of all the saved. “You are the body of Christ, and members in particular.” (1 Cor. 12:27). All Christians belong to the Church of God. You cannot be a Christian without being a member of Christ’s body, and this is the church. Thus, it includes in its membership every saved man in heaven and on earth. Paul denominates it “all paternity in heaven and earth” (Eph. 3:15). “The whole family in heaven and earth,” A. V. Nothing less than this can be the Church of God. Reader, observe well this truth. Since the Church of God includes the entire host of redeemed souls in heaven and on earth, it is not a sect; it is the whole.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

The Church of Rome, in order to be God's church, must include in her membership all Christians. In the creed and oath of Pope Pius IV, which is a standard document of Roman Catholic faith, Article 15, is this statement: "This true Catholic faith, out of which none can be saved, I now freely profess and truly hold," etc. This virtually states that all outside of the Church of Rome are lost. This, of course, would include the hosts of redeemed souls who constituted the Church of God before the Church of Rome was established, the millions of faithful souls who lived during the reign of popery and never submitted to the supremacy of the Roman bishop, the added millions of Protestants who have thrown off the yoke of the papacy, and the innumerable company of the redeemed in the paradise of God. Yet everyone who has been saved through the blood of the Lamb is a member of Christ's church. Judged by this infallible rule, the Romish church cannot be the church that God established.

The church is one body; hence it has but one living head. The Scriptures nowhere teach that the Pope of Rome is the head of all Christians, and of the church, but on the other hand, they positively contradict it. "Which he wrought in Christ, raising him up from the dead, and setting him on his right hand in the heavenly places . . . And he hath subjected all things under his feet, and hath made him head over all the church, which is his body" (Eph. 1:20-23). "And he is the head of the body, the church . . . that in all things he may hold the primacy" (Col. 1:18). "Christ is the head of the church" (Eph. 5:23). None other is the "prince of pastors"—"chief Shepherd," A. V.—but Christ alone (1 Pet. 5:4). Hence the apostolic and primitive church acknowledged no Roman pontiff as the head of the church, but gave this honor to Christ alone, who supplied life and spirit to the entire body (Col. 2:19).

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

Membership in the Church of God is obtained through salvation. Jesus said, "I am the door. By me if any man enter in, he shall be saved" (John 10:9). "And the Lord increased daily together such as should be saved" (Acts 2:47). "And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved," A. V. "Those that were being saved," R. V. "But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body as it hath pleased him" (1 Cor. 12:18). "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of the Son of his love" (Col. 1:13). Taking members into the church does not belong to any man, but is the work of God. The Lord, not Roman priests, added the members to the primitive church. These were added by their obtaining salvation. Thus we learn that the moment an individual is saved, he is a member of the Church of God.

Obtaining salvation makes no one a member of the Church of Rome. Millions have been saved through the blood of the Lamb who never acknowledged the supremacy of the Roman pontiff. Were a heathen to become sufficiently enlightened to repent and believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, he would be saved, and thus made a member of the New Testament church. But such a one does not become a member of the Church of Rome until he has submitted to certain external rites and ceremonies, and declared his allegiance to the Roman bishop. Thus you see there is no identity between the two churches.

The following is the definition given by Rome as to who constitutes a member of their church:

The church is an assembly of men, united in a profession of one and the same Christian faith, and in the communion of the same sacraments, under the government of their lawful pastors, as especially of the Roman pontiff.—Bellarmine.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

Christian experience and a holy life count little in Rome. A mere profession of faith, observance of sacraments, and submission to the government of the Pope, are all the essentials of membership. How different from the primitive church!

Those who separate themselves from Christ, but not from the Pope of Rome, cease to be members of the true church, because Christ, not the Pope, is the head of the church. "If anyone abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch" (John 15:6). "Every branch in me, that beareth not fruit, he will take away" (John 15:2). The Lord said to Moses, "He that hath sinned against me, him will I strike out of my book"; so the moment people sin against God, they cease to be members of his church. Not so with the Church of Rome. Their standard authorities acknowledge her to be filled with "manifest and great sinners, heretics and infidels." From the Pope down, none of them claim to live above sin. This is why they have instituted their very sacraments and the confessional, and why they teach a future purgatory. John says, "He that committeth sin is of the devil" (1 John 3:8). Since the Church of Rome is a church of sinners, and harbors within her fold "wicked men, heretics, and infidels," judged by the standard of eternal truth she cannot be the Lord's church. Her members, from the Pope down, they themselves acknowledge to be wicked men and sinners. The Church of Rome pronounces outside of the church of Christ all who are not subject to the See of Rome. It is a well-known fact that she never expels wicked or profane persons from her pale, provided they acknowledge the authority of the Pope and the clergy. And should the most pious person in the world deny clerical authority, in Rome's sense of it, he must be expelled from the Romish church. Many have separated themselves from the Pope who were, nevertheless, members of the true church.

Humble Equality of the Primitive Ministry

That the Church of Rome is not the true church is also shown by the inequality in rank of her priesthood, as compared with the humble equality of the primitive ministry. To the first ministers Christ said, “Be not ye called Rabbi. For one is your Master; and all you are brethren” (Matt. 23:8). “Neither be ye called masters; for one is your Master, Christ. He that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be humbled: and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted” (Matt. 23:10-12). “And there was also a strife amongst them, which of them should seem to be the greater. And he said to them: The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them; and they that have power over them are called beneficent. But you not so: but he that is the greater among you, let him become as the younger; and he that is the leader, as he that serveth. For which is greater, he that sitteth at table, or he that serveth? Is not he that sitteth at table? But I am in the midst of you, as he that serveth” (Luke 22:24-27).

Oh, what humbleness is here taught! “Ye are brethren.” “No one among you is higher than another or can possibly have from me jurisdiction over the rest. Ye are, in this respect, perfectly equal.” Christ showed his disciples how the Gentiles exalted some above others, but said that it should not be so among them.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

“The ancients therefore that are among you, I beseech, who am myself also an ancient, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ: as also a partaker of that glory which is to be revealed in time to come: feed the flock of God . . . neither as lording it over the clergy, but being made a pattern of the flock from the heart” (1 Pet. 5:1-3); “The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: feed the flock of God . . . neither as being lords over God’s heritage, but being ensamples to the flock,” A. V. The following are extracts from Adam Clark’s comments on these verses:

In this place, the term “presbuteros,” elders, or presbyters, is the name of an office. They were as pastors, or shepherds, of the flock of God, the Christian people among whom they lived. They were the same as bishops . . . and teachers. . . . That these were the same as bishops, the next verse proves. “Who also am an elder,” “sum-presbuteros,” a fellow elder, one on a level with yourselves.

“Neither as being lords over God’s heritage.” According to him [Peter] there are to be no lords over God’s heritage; the bishops and presbyters, who are appointed by the head of the church [Christ], are to feed the flock; to guide and to defend it; not to fleece and waste it: and they are to look for their reward in another world, and the approbation of God in their consciences. And in humility, self-abasement, self-renunciation, and heavenly-mindedness, they are to be ensamples, “tupos,”—types—to the flock; molds of a heavenly form, into which the spirit and lives of the flock may be cast, that they may come out after a perfect pattern. We need not ask, Does the church that arrogates to itself the exclusive title of catholic, and do its supreme pastors, who affect to be the successors of Peter, and the vicars of Jesus Christ, act in this way? They are in every sense the reverse of this. But we may ask, Do the other churches

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

[meaning the Protestant sects], which profess to be reformed from the abominations of the above, follow the advice of the apostle in their eye? Have they pastors according to God's own heart, who feed them with knowledge and understanding (Jer. 3:15)? Do they feed themselves and not the flock? Are they lords over the heritage of Christ, ruling with a high ecclesiastico-secular hand?

The above cuts a clear line of distinction between the modern lords of Babylon and the humble, equal ministry of the early church. The apostle Peter placed himself on a common level with the local presbyters, and also stated that he was a fellow presbyter. In the New Testament, "bishop" and "elder" are terms used interchangeably and applied to the same class of officers—the ministers.

"Bishop." In the primitive church, a spiritual overseer; an elder or presbyter; one who has the pastoral care of a church.—Webster.

The same persons are called elders and presbyters, and overseers and bishops.—Scott: Com.

Till the churches were multiplied [and apostatized], the bishops and presbyters were the same.—Id.

Both the Greek and Latin Fathers do, with one consent, declare that bishops were called presbyters and presbyters bishops in apostolic times, the name being then common.—Whitbey.

It appears that those who are called elders in this place [Tit. 1:5] are the same as those termed bishops in verse 7. We have many proofs that bishops and elders were of the same order in the apostolic church, though afterward they became distinct.—Adam Clark.

The rulers of the church were called their presbyters or bishops, which two titles are, in the New Testament, undoubtedly applied to the same order of men. . . . Let no one

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

confound the bishops of this primitive and golden period of the church with those of whom we read in the following ages. For, though they were both distinguished by the same name, yet they differed extremely, and that in many respects. — Mosheim, Vol. I, p. 99.

It is also true that in the earliest government of the first Christian society, that of Jerusalem, not the elders only, but the “whole church” were associated with the apostles; and it is even certain that the terms “bishop” and “elder” or “presbyter” were, in the first instances, and for a short period, sometimes used synonymously, and indiscriminately applied to the same order in the ministry.—Waddington: Church History, Part I, p. 41.

The earliest Christian communities appear to have been ruled and represented, in the absence of the apostle who was their first founder, by their elders, who are likewise called bishops, or overseers of the church.—Millman: History of Christianity, p. 194.

To aid them in their work, or to supply their places in their absence (Acts 14:23), the apostles ordained rulers in every church, who bore the common name of “elders” from their dignity, and of “bishops” from the nature of their office. That originally the elders were the same as the bishops, we gather with absolute certainty from the statements of the New Testament and of Clement of Rome, a disciple of the apostles. [See his first Epistle to the Corinthians, chaps. 42, 44.] The presbyters are expressly called bishops—compare [the Greek especially] Acts 20:17 with verse 28, and Tit. 1:5 with verse 7. 2. The office of presbyter is described as next to the highest after that of apostle (Acts 15:6, 22). Similarly, the elders are represented as those to whom alone the rule, the teaching, and the care of the church is entrusted (1 Tim. 5:17; 1 Pet. 5:1, etc.). . . . In [several] passages of the New Testament and of Clement we read of many bishops in one and the same church. In the face of such indubitable evidence, it is difficult to account for the

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

pertinacity with which Romish and Anglican theologians insist that these two offices had from the first been different in name and functions. . . . Even Jerome, Augustine, Urban II (1091), and Petrus Lombardus admit that originally the two had been identical. It was reserved for the Council of Trent to convert this truth into a heresy.—Kurtz: Church History, pp. 67, 68.

The church was in the beginning a community of brethren, guided by a few of the brethren. All Christians were priests of the living God, with humble pastors as their guides.—D’Aubigne: History of the Reformation, Vol. I, pp. 35, 50.

To the above we heartily agree. Bishop and elder were the same till the “mystery of iniquity” began to work. The traveling preachers were bishops. “For it is written in the book of Psalms, Let their habitation become desolate, and let there be none to dwell therein. And his bishopric let another take” (Acts 1:20). A bishopric is the office of a bishop. Judas, then, was a bishop, but by transgression he fell. So Matthias was chosen to take his bishopric—his office of bishop. This proves beyond question that all the Twelve were properly called bishops. This included Peter and John, who also were called elders, or ancients (1 Pet. 5:1; 2 John 1; 3 John 1). So the terms “bishop” and “elder” were used interchangeably, and applied to all the traveling ministers. All the local preachers were bishops. “Paul and Timothy, the servants of Jesus Christ; to all the saints in Christ Jesus, who are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons” (Phil. 1:1). Thus when Paul wrote to the church at Philippi, he addressed all the saints, “with the bishops and deacons.” He did not say with bishops, elders, and deacons; but recognized only two classes of officers—bishops and deacons.

A plurality of priests (elders, A. V., Acts 14: 23) were ordained in “every church” (Acts 14:22). Paul terms these elders, “bishops”; “bishop” and “elder,” then, are the same in Scripture. There were

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

but two classes of officers in the church at Philippi: bishops, the ministers of the word of truth and overseers of the flock; and deacons, the ministers of the temporal affairs of the church. To have anything more than this is apostasy.

On Phil. 1:1 Adam Clark remarks:

“Bishops and deacons”; the overseers of the Church of God, and those who ministered to the poor, and preached occasionally. There has been a great deal of paper wasted in the inquiry, “Who is meant by ‘bishops’ here, as no place could have more than one bishop?” . . . This is the extravagance of trifling. I believe no such officer is meant as we now term bishop.

This is clear. Adam Clark readily admits that New Testament bishops were only overseers—common preachers. He further states that it is a waste of paper and “the extravagance of trifling” to try to prove that there can be only one bishop in an assembly. He understood that the modern office of bishop was unknown in the apostolic church. These are his words: “I believe no such officer is meant as we now term bishop.”

The very language of Tit. 1:4-7 proves that priests (elders, A. V.) and bishops were the same. “To Titus, my beloved son, according to the common faith, grace and peace from God the Father and from Christ Jesus our Savior. For this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain priests [“elders,” A. V.] in every city, as I also appointed thee: if any be without crime, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot, or unruly. For a bishop must be without crime, as the steward of God: not proud, not subject to anger, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre.” Language could not be plainer. Paul left Titus in Crete to ordain priests (elders) in every city. He says, “If any be without crime,” “for a bishop must

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

be without crime.” When Paul sent to Ephesus, he did not call the bishop and his presbytery, but simply called “the ancients [“elders,” A. V.] of the church” (Acts 20:17). Then in speaking to these men, he says: “Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops, to rule the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood” (Acts 20:28). In this verse those who were called “ancients,” or “elders,” in verse 17 are termed “bishops.” Paul puts all the ministers of the church at Ephesus on a common level—bishops; and this text further proves that there were a number of bishops in the Ephesian church. When the apostles set churches in order, they did not ordain one bishop and his presbytery, but simply “ordained priests [“elders,” A. V.] in every church” (Acts 14:22). Paul did not instruct Titus to ordain one bishop and a presbytery of elders for his sanhedrin in every city in Crete, but left him to simply “ordain priests [“elders,” A. V.] in every city.” At Philippi there was no such thing as a single bishop, a lower class called elders, and a still lower class called deacons; but there were only two classes of officers—bishops and deacons (Phil. 1:1). Did the church at Antioch send Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem to consult the bishop, the apostles, and the elders about circumcision? No; they simply sent them “to Jerusalem unto the apostles and priests [“elders,” A. V.] about this question” (Acts 15:2). Nothing is said of the bishop. When they reached Jerusalem, “they were received by the church, and by the apostles and ancients” (v. 4). The bishop was left out. Why? They did not have such a high officer over them. That church was pure from the mystery of iniquity. “But,” says one, “James was a bishop.” James was an apostle (Gal. 1:19); hence he was no more a bishop than was Peter or any other of the apostles. Who came together to consider the matter? The bishop (James), the apostles, and the elders? No; it does not read that way. “And the apostles and ancients [“elders,” A. V.]

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

assembled to consider of this matter” (Acts 15:6). No mention is made of a bishop presiding in this apostolic assembly. Only apostles and ancients (elders) are mentioned. As before proved, all the apostles were bishops, and all the ancients, or elders, were bishops. The apostles were the traveling elders, or bishops, while the others were the local elders, or bishops. Peter and James spoke in this assembly, as they were looked upon by the church as “pillars” (Gal. 2:9). But James was only an apostle, or elder, in the church at Jerusalem. He probably was a senior elder, as is inferred from Acts 21:18.

“But,” says one, “was not the angel of the church at Ephesus a bishop over the rest?” (Rev. 2:1). No; for when Paul called the ministers together, as recorded in Acts 20, he addressed them as bishops. They were all bishops—overseers. No doubt there was, however, one among them who especially ministered the word and took the special care of the church upon himself; but there was not a bishop who had authority over the rest, for they were all on the same level. This humble equality of the early ministry lasted but a very short time.

How The Papacy Rose

We have already seen the humble equality of the apostolic ministry. As the saints began to fall away and drift from the primitive faith, they lost sight of this humble equality and began to exalt men, as seen in Second Thessalonians. Paul said that the mystery of iniquity was already working. The spirit of it was then manifest in some persons. In the Third Epistle of John it is evident that three elders of the church are spoken of; namely, Gaius, Demetrius, and Diotrephes. The first two John commended. They were straight, humble men. But Diotrephes loved to have the preeminence among them. He no doubt wanted to be a bishop, to be higher than the common presbytery. He did not want to receive the apostle John (v. 9), for he knew that John was against any such exaltation. But John comforted Gaius by saying, “If I come, I will advertise his works” (v. 10). Here is the first mention in Scripture of one man seeking preeminence above the other elders in the local assembly—seeking a position over the others. This was A. D. 90. Just as soon, however, as we pass beyond the sacred writings, in the second century, we find a man exalted to a higher office—a bishop over the common presbyters or elders. This was apostasy already at work.

I will here quote from the Church Fathers to show that in their early day one man had been already exalted above the rest. Instead

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

of elders and deacons, as the New Testament reads, it was one bishop, elders, and deacons—three classes of officers instead of two—one over the others.

Wherefore it is fitting that ye should run together in accordance with the will of your bishop, which thing also ye do. For your justly renowned presbytery, worthy of God, is fitted as exactly to the bishop as the strings are to the harp.—Ignatius to the Ephesians, Chap. IV.

Since, then, I have had the privilege of seeing you, through Damas your most worthy bishop, and through your worthy presbyters Bassus and Apollonius, and through my fellow servant the deacon Sotio.—Ignatius to the Magnesians, Chap. II.

There is but one altar for the whole church, and one bishop, with the presbytery and deacons.—Ignatius to the Philadelphians, Chap. IV. Give heed to the bishop, and to the presbytery and deacons.—Chap. VII.

The bishop, and the presbyters, and the deacons.—Ignatius to Polycarp, Chap. VI.

These quotations from Ignatius, who wrote in the first part of the second century, show that at that early date the humble equality of the apostolic order was already changed and a third office created by exalting in each local congregation one man as bishop over the common elders, or presbyters. How different are the above quotations from the sacred Scriptures! At Philippi, Paul addressed the bishops and deacons, but Ignatius taught that at the time of his writing there was “*one bishop*, with the presbyters and deacons.” When Paul sent to Ephesus and called together the local ministry, he called the “ancients [elders] of the church”; but when Ignatius wrote, he would have had to call the bishop and the elders. When Paul left Titus in Crete, he was to ordain priests (elders) in every city; but when Ignatius wrote, he would have had to ordain “a bishop

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

and elders.” Ah, beloved reader, this is the working of the “mystery of iniquity.” It was the first big step toward the man of sin. As soon as this third office was created, and in each assembly one bishop was set up over the elders and the deacons, the next step was to confer great honors upon him and to exalt him high above all others. Ignatius, in the latter part of his ministry, was drunk on this spirit.

I will again quote:

As therefore the Lord does nothing without the Father . . . so do ye, neither presbyter, nor deacon, nor layman, do anything without the bishop.—Ignatius to the Magnesians, Chap. VII.

In like manner, let all reverence the deacons as an appointment of Jesus Christ, and the bishop as Jesus Christ, who is the Son of the Father, and the presbyters as the sanhedrin of God, and assembly of the apostles. Apart from these there is no church.—Ignatius to the Trallians, Chap. III.

And do ye also reverence your bishop as Christ himself. . . For what is the bishop but one who beyond all others possesses all power and authority, so far as it is possible for man to possess it, who according to his ability has been made an imitator of the Christ of God? And what is the presbytery but a sacred assembly, the counselors and assessors of the bishop?—Chap. VII.

“Reverence your bishop as Jesus Christ” and “do nothing without the bishop”—that is getting him pretty high. But such was the spirit then at work. In the early church, the presbytery was an assembly of ministers. If a number of local preachers assembled, they constituted a presbytery; and a gathering of both traveling and local elders, as at Jerusalem (Acts 15), was properly termed a presbytery; but when Ignatius wrote, the presbyters were common elders who served as counselors and assessors of the bishop. Oh, how changed! Humble equality was lost sight of.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

Let governors be obedient to Caesar; soldiers, to those that command them; deacons, to the presbyters, as to high priests; the presbyters, and deacons, and the rest of the clergy, together with all the people, and the soldiers, and the governors, and Caesar [himself], to the bishop.—Ignatius to the Philadelphians, Chap. IV.

If this was not making great strides toward popery, I cannot understand language. The bishop was exalted above all “the clergy,” even above Caesar himself, and this in the second century. Such was the teaching of Ignatius. Surely the great apostasy came early. Of course the bishop had not, in reality, yet reached such a high place, but the people were working hard to get him there, and Ignatius’ writings show that he believed such was the bishop’s place.

Again we quote:

See that ye all follow the bishop, even as Jesus Christ does the Father, and the presbytery as ye would the apostles; and reverence the deacons, as being the institution of God. Let no man do anything connected with the church without the bishop. Let that be deemed a proper Eucharist, which is [administered] either by the bishop, or by one to whom he has entrusted it. Wherever the bishop shall appear, there let the multitude [of the people] also be; even as, wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic church. It is not lawful without the bishop either to baptize or to celebrate a love-feast; but whatever he shall approve of, that is also pleasing to God.—Ignatius to the Smyrnaens, Chap. VIII. He who honors the bishop has been honored by God; he who does anything without the knowledge of the bishop, does [in reality] serve the devil. . . . Nor is there anyone in the church greater than the bishop. . . . He who honors the bishop shall be honored by God. . . . Let the laity be subject to the deacons; the deacons to the presbyters; the presbyters to the bishops.—Chap. IX.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

If he reckon himself greater than the bishop, he is ruined. But it becomes both men and women who marry, to form their union with the approval of the bishop.—Ignatius to Polycarp, Chap. V.

Thus we have given a few quotations from the early writings to show how soon the humble equality of the apostolic ministry was overthrown and man exalted. This kept working more and more. The bishop was lifted up higher and higher, until about the third century; then a higher office was created. After that date we have a class of officers called archbishops—bishops over other bishops. Sometimes one bishop would rule over the bishops of a score of churches. This was forming the man of sin. In the Church of God there is but one chief shepherd, one chief bishop—Christ—but at that date there was an exalting of man to this lofty position. This kept on working and fomenting, man being exalted higher and higher until finally the pope was elected head of the church—so-called. Instead of Christ working all in all, in all the members, man-power ruled the church.

Supremacy of the Pope

The following quotations from standard Catholic authors set forth their belief in the supremacy of the pope:

St. Thomas affirms that the pope, by divine right, hath spiritual and temporal power, as supreme king of the world; so that he can impose taxes on all Christians, and destroy towns and cities for the preservation of Christianity.—Acquinas: *Rule of Princes*, as quoted by Bellarmine in *De Pontiff*, V. 5.

The pope is of such dignity and highness, that he is not simply man, but, as it were, God and the vicar of God. Hence the pope is of such supreme and solemn dignity that, properly speaking, he is not merely constituted in dignity, but is rather placed on the very summit of dignities. Hence also the pope is father of fathers; and he alone can use this name, because he only can be called father of fathers, since he possesses the primacy over all, and is truly greater than all, and the greatest of all. He is called most holy, because he is presumed to be such. On account of the excellency of his supreme dignity, he is called bishop of bishops, ordinary of ordinaries, universal bishop of the church, or diocesan of the whole world, divine monarch, supreme emperor, and king of kings. Hence the pope is crowned with a triple crown, as king of heaven, of earth, and of (infernum) hell. Nay, the pope's excellence and power is not only above heavenly, terrestrial, and infernal things, but he is also above angels, and is their superior; so that if it were possible that angels could err from the faith, or entertain sentiments

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

contrary thereto, they could be judged and excommunicated by the pope. He is of such great dignity and power, that he occupies one and the same tribunal with Christ; so that whatsoever the pope does, seems to proceed from the mouth of God, as is proved from many doctors. The pope is, as it were, God on earth, the only prince of the faithful of Christ, the greatest king of all kings, possessing the plenitude of power, to whom the government of the earthly and heavenly kingdom is entrusted. Hence the common doctrine teaches, that the pope hath the power of the two swords, namely, the spiritual and temporal, which jurisdiction and power Christ himself committed to Peter and his successors, Matthew 16: "To thee will I give the keys to the kingdom of heaven," etc.—where doctors note that he did not say key, but keys, and by this comprehending the temporal and spiritual power: which opinion is abundantly confirmed by the authority of the holy fathers, the decision of the canon and civil law, and by the apostolic constitutions; so that those who hold to the contrary, seem to adhere to the opinion of the heretics, reprobating by Boniface VIII. . . . If a king becomes heretic, he can be removed from his kingdom by the pope, to whom the right of appointing a successor belongs. . . . Hence it is not wonderful, if to the Roman pontiff . . . to whom supreme authority and power are given, not only by the spiritual, but also by the material unsheathed sword for just cause, of transferring empires, breaking scepters, and taking away crowns. Which plenitude of power, not only once, but often, the popes used, whenever it was necessary, by binding, most courageously, the sword on their thigh, as is sufficiently manifest not only from the most ample testimonies of theologians, the asserters of pontifical and regal right, but also of innumerable historians of undoubted credibility, as well profane as sacred, as well Greek as Latin.—Ferraris Ecclesiastical Dictionary, art. 2. (Used as a standard for Roman Catholic divinity.)

"All power in heaven and earth" was given to the pope . . . for the pope is greater than man, as saith Hostensius, but less

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

than an angel, because he is mortal; but greater in authority and power. For an angel cannot consecrate the body and blood of Christ, nor absolve or bind, the jurisdiction of which exists in a plenary manner in the pope; nor can an angel ordain, grant indulgences, or any such thing. He is crowned with glory and honor; the glory of commendation, because he is not only called blessed, but most blessed, as saith the canon law. Who can doubt that he is holy, whom the summit of such great dignity hath exalted! He is crowned with the honor of veneration, that the faithful may kiss his feet; for greater honor cannot exist than that mentioned by the Psalmist: "Adore his footstool." Psa. 98 [99:5, A. V.]. He is crowned with the greatness of authority, because he judges all persons, and is judged of none, unless he is found an apostate from the faith. Hence also he is crowned with a triple crown. And is constituted over all the works of his hands, to regulate concerning all inferiors; he opens heaven, sends the guilty to hell, confirms empire, orders the clerical orders.—Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, part 2, tit. 22, c. i. sec. 1.

The pope is the head of all heads, and the prince, moderator, and pastor of the whole church of Christ which is under heaven.—Benedict XIV: *De Synodo*, Lib. ii, cap. 1.

The Roman pontiff is called by this name, not only because he has the supreme honor and dignity in the church, but especially, because he hath the supreme and universal authority, power, and jurisdiction over all bishops and the universal church.—Peter Dens: *Eccles.* 90 tom. ii, p. 430.

All the faithful, also bishops and patriarchs, are bound to obey the Roman pontiff. . . . The pope has not also only a directive, but also a coactive power over all the faithful.—Dens: *Id.* 94, p. 439.

The pope of Rome hath the supremacy over all the earth; that he is the successor of St. Peter, the prince of the apostles, and the head of the church, the father and teacher of all Christians; and that Jesus Christ hath given him, in the person of

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

St. Peter, the power to feed, rule, and govern the Catholic Church, as it is explained in the acts of ecumenical councils and in the holy canons.—Decision of the Council of Florence, July 5, 1439. Du Pin: *Ec. Hist.*, Vol. III, p. 35.

I have quoted at some length from these Catholic authorities, to show the blasphemous claims of Romanism. Surely this fulfils what is said in Revelation 13 of the leopard beast, that “there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things, and blasphemies.” “And he opened his mouth unto blasphemies against God, to blaspheme his name.” Think of it! They say of the pope: “He is not simply man, but as it were God”; “Placed on the very summit of dignity”; “He is truly greater than all, and the greatest of all”; “Called most holy”; “Divine monarch”; “Supreme emperor, and king of kings”; “King of heaven, of earth, and of hell”; “Above heavenly, terrestrial, and infernal things”; “Above angels, and their superior”; “Angels . . . could be judged and excommunicated by the pope”; “The pope is, as it were, God on earth”; “The only prince of the faithful in Christ, the greatest king of all kings”; “All power in heaven and earth is given to the pope”; “The pope is greater than man”; “Adore his footstool”; “He judges all persons, and is judged of none”; “He opens heaven, sends the guilty to hell”; “The pope is the head of all heads.” Thus is fulfilled to the letter the prediction of St. Paul in 2 Thessalonians 2, that after the “revolt” (“falling away,” A. V.) the man of sin would be revealed, “the son of perdition, who opposeth, and is lifted up above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself as if he were God.”

When we consider the above claims of the Church of Rome in the light of the fact that they themselves admit that many of their popes were the basest of criminals and the enemies of all godliness,

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

notoriously wicked, and heretics, we see most clearly her utter corruption, and that she is truly the apostate church.

The concubinage of the clergy is known to all, and cannot be denied by any, with any modesty.—Gerhard: *De Ecclesia*, sec. 251, p. 425.

They have encouraged frauds and thefts.—Id., p. 426.

Many popes were men of the most abandoned lives. Some were magicians; some were noted for sedition, war, and slaughter; for profligacy of manners, for avarice and simony.—Id., sec. 263, p. 438.

The cardinals were also noted for pride, luxury, avarice, and other crimes.—Id., sec. 264, p. 439.

The morals of the bishops, priests, and other clergy were equally depraved.—Id., sec. 265, p. 440.

The morals of the people correspond to those of the clergy. This is not marvelous, seeing they are deprived of the Scriptures, are not instructed in the principles of the word of God, and are the dupes of ignorance and superstition.—Id., sec. 268, p. 441.

These quotations from Roman authorities, we deem sufficient proof of the corruption of that church from her head down through the clergy, and throughout the general membership.

As before stated, many of the popes are acknowledged by Rome to have been rank heretics. “Zepherinus was a Montanist.”—*Tertul. adv. Prax*, “Marcellinus was an idolator.”—*Damasus in Pontif.* “Liberius was an Arian; Anastasius was a Nestorian; Vigilius a Eutychian; Honorius was a Monothelite; Sylvester was a Magician.”

Thus we see that men of the most infamous moral character, guilty of almost every mortal sin, have filled St. Peter’s (?) chair. Is it possible that such monsters of wickedness are the representative heads of the pure Church of God—that church which St. Paul

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

informs us is “a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle,” but is “holy, and without blemish”? No. Judged by their own admissions, the Roman Catholic Church is herself in the very depths of apostasy.

As to their claim that the pope has power to wield the temporal sword over kings and rulers, history attests the fact that this authority was exercised on many occasions. In the year 730, Gregory II excommunicated the emperor Leo Isaurius, because he was against the worship of images. Gregory VII, who was made pope in 1073, deposed Henry IV in the year 1075. In the year 1239 Gregory IX excommunicated the emperor Frederick II, absolving his subjects from their oaths of allegiance. Pope Innocent IV both held and exemplified the same doctrine, declaring the same Frederick II to be his vassal. Pope Paul II, in 1535 and 1538, excommunicated, cursed, deposed, and damned Henry VIII, of England, and all who adhered to, favored or obeyed him. Pope Pius V, in the year 1570, in his bull against Elizabeth, says, “The damnation and excommunication of Elizabeth, queen of England, and her adherents.” These are but a few examples of many that could be cited.

Rome's Claim to Infallibility

It has always been the claim of the Church of Rome that she is infallible. As to just where this infallibility lies there is some difference of opinion among the Roman doctors. In the Episcopal oath of the highest clergy, every archbishop, bishop, and dignitary elect, swears: From henceforth he will be faithful and obedient to his lord the pope; will defend the regalities of St. Peter against all men; will endeavor to preserve, defend, increase, and advance his right, honors, privileges, and authority, and to his power hinder the contrary.

In the creed and oath of Pope Pius IV, all the clergy swear:

I acknowledge the holy Catholic and apostolic Roman church, the mother and mistress of all churches; I promise and swear true obedience to the Roman bishop, the successor of St. Peter, the prince of the apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ.—Article 13.

The pontiff cannot err in any case, when he teaches the whole church in those things which belong to faith.—Bellarmine: *De. Pontifice* iv, 3.

This same champion of the Romish church further says in the next chapter of his work:

The pontiff cannot err by judicial error; that is, when he judges and defines a question of faith. But this one church,

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

because governed by the Holy Ghost, cannot err in faith and morals, it necessarily follows that all other societies arrogating to themselves the name of church, because guided by the spirit of darkness, are sunk in the most pernicious errors, both doctrinal and moral.—Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 100.

The pope of Rome hath the supremacy over all the earth; that he is the successor of St. Peter, the prince of the apostles, and the head of the church, the father and teacher of all Christians; and that Jesus Christ hath given him, in the person of St. Peter, the power to feed, rule, and govern the Catholic church, as it is explained in the acts of Ecumenical councils and in the holy canons.—Decision of the Council of Florence, Du Pin, Eccl. Hist., Vol. III, p. 35.

Jesus Christ has granted to St. Peter and his successors, as often as they speak in the chair, *ex cathedra*, the same infallibility which he had himself. . . . There is in the Roman church an infallible judge of controversy, even excluding a general council, as well in questions of right as those of fact.—Du Pin, Eccl. Hist., cent. 17, p. 147.

The judgment of the apostolic see, with a council of domestic priests, is far more certain than the judgment of a universal council of the whole earth without the pope.—Barrow on Supremacy, p. 395.

We confess and believe that the pope of Rome is the head of the church, and that he cannot err.—Confession of faith drawn up by the Jesuits, 19th century, art. 2.

A general council, with the pope at its head, or the pope himself issuing a doctrinal decision, which is received by the great body of Catholic bishops, is secure from error.—End of Controversy, p. 84.

This well sets forth Rome's position on infallibility as expressed by her standard writers. This notion they base principally on the words of Jesus, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

A careful analysis of the text, however, proves that Christ did not promise infallibility, but perpetuity, to the church. He did not say that the church should not err, but that it should not perish.

These infallible (?) popes have contradicted each other! Gregory the Great, of the sixth century, says: "I confidently say, that whosoever calls himself the universal priest, or desires to be so called, in his arrogance is a forerunner of antichrist."—*Greg. Max. Ep., Lib. vi, op. 30*. Many popes since Gregory's time have declared that the Roman pontiff is universal bishop. Gregory VII declares "that the Roman pontiff alone can be properly called universal."—*Ep., lib. ii, ep. 55*. Again Innocent I and his followers, till Pope Gelasius, asserted the communion of infants as necessary; but this was condemned by the subsequent pope. Popes Leo and Gelasius condemned communion in one kind, while all modern popes enjoy it. Gregory the Great condemned the worship of images and the canonicity of the books of Maccabees. These have been adopted by the subsequent popes. Stephen VI, in a provincial council held at Rome, annulled all the acts of Formosus, one of his predecessors. John IX, his successor, in a council held at Ravenna, annulled Stephen's acts with respect to Formosus. Sergius annulled the acts of Formosus a second time. All this was with respect to matters of faith and practice in the church, in which things Rome teaches that the bishop cannot err. You see that the facts of history prove the claims of Rome to be entirely baseless.

A number of these so-called infallible popes have erred and were condemned as heretics by the church. Pope Vigilius erred, as pope, in first condemning and then approving a decision of the fifth general council, held A. D. 553. (*Du Pin, Ec. Hist., Vol. I, p. 709.*) Pope Liberius, in the fourth century, erred, as pope, in condemning Athanasius, and consented to the heretical faith of the Arians, and

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

holding communion with them. On this account he was anathematized by Hilary. (*Du Pin, Vol. I, p. 190.*) Honorius, who was made pope in 626 and died in 638, became a Monothelite, that is, he believed there was in Christ but one will and one operation. Forty-two years after his death he was condemned in the Council of Constantinople, held A. D. 680, and he must of consequence have been a heretic, if it be true that a general council cannot err. The most celebrated Roman doctors acknowledge the heresy of Honorius.

The Council of Basil pronounced Pope Eugenius, a pertinacious heretic, deviating from the faith. (*Concil. Basil., Sess. 24*) There is one crime of which many popes have been guilty, and it is called by Gregory VII the heresy of simony. (*Ep., lib. iii, 7.*)

If it be said these were no popes, be it so. Then there were no true popes for centuries, and therefore no infallibility nor head to the church.

Again, what becomes of the infallibility of popes when, as we shall prove, there were two or three popes at the same time, each excommunicating the others and claiming at the same time to be infallible?

And again, “many popes were extremely wicked men.”—*Ousley, 5th ed., p. 107. Du Pin, Ec. Hist., Vol. II, p. 176.*

Reader, mark well the fact that these Roman bishops who contradicted each other in matters of faith—many of whom were condemned by general Roman councils as heretics and in error, a number of them guilty of simony, some of them extremely wicked men, sometimes as many as three of them claiming to be pope at the same time, each condemning the other—are the very men Rome

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

claims as her living, visible head, her infallible teachers in matters of faith.

The General Councils of Rome have contradicted each other, which proves their fallibility. The Council of Nice, in 325, and of Ephesus, in 431, decree with an anathema “that no new article for ever shall be added to the creed or faith of Nice.” But the Council of Trent, more than twelve hundred years after, added twelve new articles to this very creed, pronouncing an anathema on all who will not embrace them.

The Council of Laodicea, in 360 or 370, and the Council of Trent, in 1545, have decided in direct opposition to each other respecting the canon of Scripture. The former decided on the canon which Protestants acknowledge, rejecting the apocrypha, and the latter pronounced the apocrypha to be canonical.

The Council of Constantinople, in 754, unanimously decreed the removal of images and the abolition of image-worship; but the second Council of Nice, in 787, decreed that image-worship should be established.

Respecting the supremacy of the pope, councils have differed. The first Council of Nice, canon sixth, decreed that the bishop of Constantinople should possess equal privileges with the bishop of Rome. Everyone knows how this has been since contradicted, by both councils and popes. (*Du Pin, Vol. 1, p. 600.*)

In the year 1215 the fourth Council of Lateran decreed that the bread and wine in the sacrament of the eucharist underwent a physical change, which they termed transubstantiation. This Council received positive historical evidence that during the first five centuries, at least, the Catholic church, so far from teaching the doctrine of a physical change, positively, explicitly, and

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

controversially denied such a change. Thus it is manifest, since the Catholic church at one period denied the doctrine of transubstantiation and at another time maintained it, it is impossible that she should be infallible.

Besides, how can we believe in the infallibility of assemblies that taught doctrines at once unjust and subversive of society, and in which the adulation of the pope is carried even to blasphemy? Could the fourth Council of Lateran be infallible, in which the pope was acknowledged to possess the power of disposing of the temporalities of sovereigns, of depriving them of their crowns, and of delivering their subjects from the oath of allegiance? Could the fifth Council of Lateran be infallible, which, in its first session, gave to the pope the appellation of “prince of the universe” and praised Boniface VIII for having taken the kingdom of France from Philip the Fair? which, in its second session, called the Roman pontiff a priest and king, who is to be adored by all people, and who is very like unto God? which, in its fifth session, spoke of Leo X in these terms: “Weep not, daughter of Zion, for behold the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David; behold God hath raised thee up a Savior”? Thus they applied to a sinner the prophetic words which designate the Savior of the world. Could the Holy Spirit inspire such blasphemies as these?

The thirteenth session of the Council of Trent declares that the bread becomes *only* the body, and the wine becomes *only* the blood of Christ: “There becomes a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood.” But the twenty-first session of the same Council declares that under *one* kind only *the whole and perfect Christ* and true sacrament is taken: “If anyone shall deny that the whole and entire Christ, the

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

fountain and the author of all grace, is received under the species of bread alone, let him be accursed.” Thus the Council of Trent contradicts itself, and therefore cannot be infallible. The decisions of this Council are the standard for Roman belief.

Since the General Councils, as well as the popes of Rome, contradict each other, which the pages of history and the standard Catholic authorities clearly attest, we are forced to conclude that all their boasted claim to infallibility is baseless. Thus we remove one of the main pillars that supports the entire Roman structure.

Is Peter the Foundation?

The whole Roman contention that the Church of Rome is the primitive church rests on the assumption that Peter was selected by the Lord to be the foundation upon which the Christian church was built; that to him were delivered the keys of the kingdom; that Peter set up his See at Rome, and became the first universal bishop of the church. The above supposition, however, is without any support in the Word of God. Peter did not possess or exercise a primacy of superiority, in power, command, or jurisdiction over the other apostles; and Peter had not, by our Lord's appointment, or by divine right, supremacy over the other apostles. It is probable that he excelled some of the other apostles in personal endowments and ability. He was a man of quick apprehension, bold spirit, activity, industry, and zeal, and he was closely attached to Christ. But to say that the Lord conferred upon him the position of universal bishop, or pope, over all the rest, is false.

“And Jesus came into the quarters of Caesarea Philippi; and he asked his disciples, saying: Whom do men say that the Son of man is? But they said: Some John the Baptist, and others Elias, and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets. Jesus saith to them: But whom do you say that I am? Simon Peter answered and said: Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answering, said to him: Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona: because flesh and blood hath

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven. And I say to thee: That thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven” (Matt. 16:13-19). The greatest advocates and writers of the Church of Rome acknowledge that this is the principal text upon which they rely for infallibility in their church and for the supremacy of the pope. If this fails them, their structure must fall.

On this text, as far as pertains to the present subject, we remark: When Jesus asked the important question, “Whom do you say that I am?” Peter, who was impulsive and always quick to act and speak, answered, “Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.” But all the other disciples made the same confession of faith. “And they that were in the boat came and adored him, saying: Indeed thou art the Son of God” (Matt. 14:33). “And we have believed and have known, that thou art the Christ, the Son of God” (John 6:69). Nathaniel, as well as Peter, had this fact revealed to him—“Thou art the Son of God” (John 1:49). “Thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church.” The construction of the original plainly distinguishes between Peter and the rock. If it were written, “Upon this Peter I will build,” then, of course, the Apostle would be referred to. “Peter” is from the Greek *petros*, which means strictly a piece of a rock—a stone. To suit the Catholic contention, the construction of the text must be: “Thou art *petros* [stone], and upon this *petros* [stone] I will build my church.” But such is not its construction. “Thou art *petros* [a little stone], and upon this *petra* [rock] I will build my church.” The dignity of the real foundation, expressed by the figure of *petra*, or rock, is superior to that expressed by the word *petros*, or stone. “Peter” does not mean “a rock,” though it has a relative meaning to

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

that word. The one is masculine, the other feminine. Nothing less could be understood by *petra*—rock—than our Lord’s divine dignity, as declared by Peter in the preceding context, “Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.” I affirm that our Lord referred to this declaration of Peter, relating to his own divine dignity, as being the true rock upon which he would build his church, and this is established by the clear distinction made by Christ between the stone—*petros*—and the rock—*petra*, and by the accurate grammatical manner in which both the words are used. Christ was superior to Simon as a solid rock is superior to a movable stone.

On this important point, however, we have the unmistakable testimony of the Scriptures. “The Lord is my rock, and my strength, and my savior. God is my strong one, in him will I trust” (2 Kings 22:2, 3—2 Sam. 22:2, 3, A. V.). Even the Old Testament saints, in type and shadow, “all drank the same spiritual drink; and they drank of the spiritual rock that followed them, and the rock was Christ” (1 Cor. 10:4). “Other foundation no man can lay, but that which is laid; which is Christ Jesus” (1 Cor. 3:11). Here we have the positive testimony of Scripture that Jehovah alone is the rock upon which we build, and that the New Testament church rests on Jesus Christ. He is its underlying rock.

The whole structure of Christianity rests upon “Christ, the Son of the living God.” To apply the title “rock” to Peter, in Matthew 16, is inconsistent with the plain reference to the preceding context made by our Lord in the beginning of this verse—“*And I say to thee*”— which points to our Lord’s dignity in the preceding sentence, “*Thou art Christ*,” the true foundation, or rock, on which alone the true Church of God is built. Our faith in Christ, “the Son of the living God,” is the only security, or rock, of our salvation. True faith, predicated on this foundation, is secure; the gates of hell

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

can never prevail against it. Thus he who hears the sayings of Christ and does them, builds upon an eternal rock. (See Matt. 7:24, 25.)

It may be objected that Christ is sometimes also termed a stone. To this I reply: That whenever the figurative expression “stone”—*lithos*—is applied to Christ, it is always with such a clear distinction of superiority over all other figurative stones as will not admit the idea of any vicarial stone in his place. For example, “Behold I will lay a stone in the foundations of Sion, a tried stone, a *corner-stone*, founded in the foundation” (Isa. 28:16). “The stone which the builders rejected; the same is become the *head* of the corner” (Psa. 117: 22—118:22, A. V.). Peter himself quotes these scriptures and applies them exclusively to Christ. He terms Christ the “chief cornerstone,” “head of the corner” (1 Pet. 2:6, 7). The whole argument of Peter clearly shows that there can be no other head of the church than Christ himself.

It is pretty clear that the epistle of Peter from which the above quotation is taken was written about A. D. 60. According to Roman Catholic computation, Peter had already been sitting seventeen years upon his papal throne at Rome as universal bishop and head of the church. But Peter’s language clearly shows that he knew nothing of the appointment of any vicar on earth to represent that rock, or eternal head of the church. Peter further says that all Christians are “as lively stones built up, a spiritual house” (1 Pet. 2:5).

That Peter constituted a foundation-stone in the building we do not deny. But all the other apostles held the same position. The church is “built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone” (Eph. 2:20). John, in speaking of the church in the apocalyptic vision of the new Jerusalem, says, “The city had twelve foundations, and in them, the

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

twelve names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb” (Rev. 21:14). The apostles were termed “foundation-stones” because upon their testimony concerning the person, life, death, and resurrection of Christ the faith of all Christians is grounded. This truth was maintained and propagated by their preaching, by their holy practice, and by their miraculous performances. We believe on Christ through their word (John 17:20). Thus in reality the gospel of Jesus Christ constitutes the great foundation of our Christian faith, and Christ is the underlying rock upon which the gospel rests. The blood of his atonement and his triumphant resurrection from the dead is the power, theme, and inspiration of the gospel. Remove this, and the whole structure of Christianity falls to the ground. Thus we see the truth of Paul’s statement that “other foundation no man can lay, but that which is laid; which is Christ Jesus.” But the gospel has come to us through the apostles’ inspiration and writing. It is upon their testimony we rely. This is the sense in which they constitute foundation-stones in this building.

As to the keys of the kingdom delivered to Peter, it is true that he was specially chosen of the Lord as the apostle to the circumcision. On the memorable day of Pentecost, when the Christian church was fully organized, Peter was the instrument used in preaching the gospel, and at that time thousands of the Jews were converted to God. Also the Lord made choice that by him the Gentiles should hear the glad tidings. Thus by Peter was opened the door through which the Gentiles, as well as the Jews came into possession of the blessings of the kingdom and into membership in the Church of God. In connection with the delivery of the keys of the kingdom, Jesus said, “Whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven,” etc. This binding and loosing is effected by the preaching of the gospel. By reference to Matt. 18:18 it will be seen that this same power to bind and to loose was

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

bestowed upon all the apostles, and no doubt applies to the entire ministry in the Christian dispensation.

It is clear that neither Peter nor the rest of the apostles understood the words of Jesus as promising to Peter a supremacy over the others. Would they have contended among themselves which should be the greatest, had they understood, as the Romanists claim, that this was already settled by our Lord? Christ rebuked this very spirit by calling attention to the way the Gentiles exercised lordship over each other, and said, "But it is not so among you." It was after this that he told them, "Be not you called Rabbi. For one is your master; and all you are brethren." Lordship and domination are an abomination in the sight of God.

Paul never recognized the supremacy of Peter, for he says, "I suppose that I have done nothing less than the great apostles" (2 Cor. 11:5). "I am not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles," A. S. V. In the discharge of his office, immediately after his call and commission from Christ, without consulting or taking license from any man, he applied himself to his work. "Immediately I condescended not to flesh and blood. Neither went I to Jerusalem, to the apostles who were before me" (Gal. 1:16, 17). "For I have no way come short of them that are above measure apostles" (2 Cor. 12:11). This positively denies the Romish doctrine of Peter's supremacy over the others. There is as much ground to say that Paul was the universal bishop of the church as to claim such an office for Peter; for Paul says that there came upon him daily "the solicitude for all the churches." He speaks of James and John as equal pillars in the church with Peter (Gal. 2:9). While the gospel of the circumcision was in a special manner bestowed upon Peter, the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto Paul. The field of the latter was much larger than that of the former. Paul, in speaking

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

of the other apostles, Peter included, says “What they were some time, it is nothing to me, God accepteth not the person of man” (Gal. 2:6). On one occasion, Paul withstood Peter and reproved him before all, “because he was to be blamed” (Gal. 2:11-14). All this proves that the contention for Peter’s supremacy over the rest is a mere invention of the Church of Rome and that such a thing was not known or recognized by the primitive church and ministry. In the church at Corinth there were several parties—“I indeed am of Paul; and I am of Apollo; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ” (1 Cor. 1:12). If it were so, that Peter was sovereign of the apostles, is it not remarkable that any Christian should prefer any other apostle to him? Is it not strange that Paul did not here say something with reference to Peter’s supremacy? Ah, the fact is he knew of no such thing; in fact, he taught the very contrary: “Let no man therefore glory in men” (1 Cor. 3:21).

When the great controversy arose over circumcision and other matters, there was no recourse to Peter as the supreme head or judge of controversies. The brethren sent to the apostles and priests (elders) to inquire about the question (Acts 15:2). When they arrived, “they were received by the church, and by the apostles and ancients [elders]” (v. 4). “And the apostles and ancients [elders] assembled to consider of this matter” (v. 6). Peter did not call, convene, or summon this council, or assembly, for they met by common agreement; neither did he preside in the meeting. It is evident from a careful reading of Acts 15 that James, who was a senior elder and no doubt the recognized pastor of the church at Jerusalem, presided at this great meeting. Though Peter spoke, he did not preside here; and mark the fact that this was the first great ecclesiastical council of the church on record. This proves that that great assemblage of primitive ministers and apostles did not recognize Peter as the vicar of Christ on earth nor as the visible head

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

of the church. Nor did Peter send his legates to Antioch, to signify what he and his council had done; but “then pleased it the apostles and ancients [elders], with the whole church, to choose men of their own company, and to send to Antioch” (v. 22). Nor was the decree sent in the name of Peter. “The apostles and ancients [elders], brethren, to the brethren of the Gentiles that are at Antioch, and in Syria and Cilicia, greeting” (v. 23).

Instead of Peter having supremacy over the rest, the record proves him to have been subject to their judgment and direction. “Now when the apostles, who were in Jerusalem had heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John” (Acts 8:14). There were times when the other ministers called Peter to account for his action (see Acts 11:2, 3). How different the actions of the Church of Rome, who say of their bishop “that he was to judge all men, and none him; nor was he to be reproved by any mortal man, though by his impiety and ill example he carried thousands to hell with him.”—*Si. Papa., dist. 40.*

Was Peter Ever Bishop of Rome?

This point is vital, for the papacy is practically built upon the assumption that Peter went to Rome, set up his See there, and became the first bishop. On this supposition, Peter Dens bases his argument that the church of Rome is the true apostolic church.

Because it hath a legitimate and uninterrupted succession of bishops, especially in the very seat of Peter . . . or to the Roman seat founded by Peter.—Dens: *De Eccles.*, No. 78, p. 402.

It is apostolical on account of the ministry, whose pastoral order, commenced by the apostles, has succeeded to our time without intermission.—Baillly: *De Apostolicity Ecclesia*, p. 356.

You see Romanists lay great stress on this point, for everything depends upon it. If they fail here, all is lost. In this chapter I will present the following facts and truths, which completely overthrow and demolish the underlying rock and foundation of the papacy.

First, The continuation of this succession is attended with great difficulties.—“Tertullian places Clement after Peter. Jerome does the same, and this opinion is supported by the canon law. But Optatus places Linus after Peter, and makes Clement third. Augustine does the same. Irenaeus places Linus after Peter, then Cletus, and in the fourth place, Clement.” Others of these Catholic Fathers arrange them still differently. This proves that there was a

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

great deal of guesswork about the matter of succession. On this guesswork rests the papacy.

Second, This supposed succession of popes was interrupted by repeated vacancies.—The Roman Catholic Platina is authority for the statement of the fact that “after John III, the Roman seat was vacant ten months and three days; after Pelagius II, six months and twenty-eight days; after Gregory, five months and nineteen days; after Fabian, eleven months and twenty-six days; after Boniface III, six months and twenty-five days; after Severinus, four months and twenty-nine days; after Martin I, fourteen months; after Vitalianus, four months and fifteen days; after Paul, one year and one month; after Nicholas I, eight years, seven months, and nine days,” etc. This makes several big gaps in Rome’s uninterrupted succession.

Third, Rome’s succession of bishops was interrupted by various schisms among the popes themselves.—Roman authorities admit twenty-eight schisms that happened in the Roman seat. The twenty-seventh schism, between Urban VI and Clement VI, lasted thirty years. Catholic historians admit that there were times when as many as three popes, all claiming supremacy at once, excommunicated and cursed one another in a shocking manner. It is preposterous to attempt to trace the succession of bishops through those centuries. Yet this supposed succession is what Rome depends on to prove that she is the apostolic church.

Fourth, Many of these popes were pronounced rank heretics by Roman Catholic councils.—Zepherinus was a Montanist; Marcellinus was an idolator; Liberius was an Arian; Anastasius was a Nestorian; Vigilius an Eutychian; Honorius was a Monethelite; Sylvester was a Magian. This being true, the supposed Roman succession has come down through a line of bishops that Rome herself admits were rank heretics. In all candor and reason I ask,

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

Does this prove that the Church of Rome is orthodox? In the fear of God I affirm that this is positive proof of the heterodoxy of this institution.

Fifth, Men of the “most infamous moral character, guilty of almost every mortal sin, have filled St. Peter’s chair.”— (In previous chapters of this work I have quoted standard authors of the Church of Rome who admit this fact.) It is upon these monsters of wickedness that Rome depends for the apostolicity of her church. In all the above, Rome clearly fulfils Paul’s prediction that “after my departure, ravening wolves will enter in among you”; and Jesus’ prediction that “many false prophets shall arise . . . and because iniquity hath abounded, the charity of many shall grow cold.” In the light of the facts of history and the admission of the writers of the Roman church, we are forced to conclude that she constitutes the great apostasy of the Christian era.

Sixth, Peter never was bishop of Rome.—This I will show. There is absolutely no Scriptural authority for such a belief. In fact, it cannot be proved from Scripture that Peter was ever at Rome.

It may well be asked, then, Upon what rests the belief that Peter established his See at Rome and became universal bishop of the church? I answer, *Upon tradition*. This tradition, like most of the traditions that have come down to us, will not stand the test of a strict and impartial historical examination.

The incident at Antioch, recorded in Gal. 2:11-14, is the last that is certainly known of Peter. The next historical mention of him is made by Clement of Rome. However, we have traditional accounts of the Apostle until the time of his death, and we may accept as altogether probable that some of these traditions are built around a nucleus of fact. But we have two distinct streams of tradition to consider. The one represents Peter’s work in the West,

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

and the other his work in the East. Certain early writers, as Clement of Rome and Ignatius, *may be* understood to imply that Peter suffered martyrdom at Rome. Clement, however, though mentioning both Peter and Paul, seems to make it a *distinguishing* circumstance that Paul preached both in the East and in the West, which would imply that Peter never preached in the West. Papias, Justin Martyr, Dionysius of Corinth, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria all accept the tradition of Peter's being at Rome. On the other hand, the other stream of tradition (for which it is difficult to account if the first had been uniform) to the effect that Peter labored at Antioch, in Asia Minor, in Babylonia, and in the "country of the Barbarians" on the northern shores of the Black Sea. Now while there is no Scriptural warrant for the first line of tradition, there are Scriptural evidences in support of the latter, for it is in harmony with the geographical details of the first of the two epistles which bear his name. The first epistle is addressed to "the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia" (1 Pet. 1:1). The "Babylon" from which it was obviously written (chap. 5:13) is best understood literally, like the other geographical names of the epistles in the New Testament, and as signifying the Chaldean Babylon. This is the opinion held by Dr. Adam Clark, Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown, and other able commentators. According to the historians Philo and Josephus, Babylon contained a great many Jews in the apostolic age; whereas Josephus represents the number of Jews in Rome as comparatively few, about eight thousand. Josephus lived in the time of Peter, and with reference to Babylon, he says that Hyrcanus, the Jewish high priest, was banished by the king of Parthia and was given "permission to live in Babylon where there were many Jews and that all of the Jews who dwelt in Babylon and in the country as far as the Euphrates acknowledged Hyrcanus as their high priest."

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

Peter was the apostle of the circumcision as Paul was of the uncircumcision. How natural, then, that Peter should go to the people of his own nation! At that time the Parthians were masters of Mesopotamian Babylon, and it was Jewish “Parthians . . . dwellers in Mesopotamia” that the apostle had so successfully addressed on the day of Pentecost. His other converts on that occasion, Jewish ‘dwellers in Cappadocia, Pontus, Asia, and Phrygia,’ he addresses by letter, while he ministers in person to the Parthians in Mesopotamia, sending salutations from them to their brethren scattered abroad.

To accept the Romanist position that Peter was bishop of Rome for twenty-five years would mean to set aside his extensive work in the East, a work which undoubtedly rests upon a Scriptural foundation. On the other hand, to take the positive position that Peter never was in Rome would mean to ignore the direct statements of a considerable number of early writers. It is not easy to impeach the testimony of writers regarding statements of fact, although around an original fact may grow up a vast body of traditions, which are often wholly unreliable; such as the legendary story of Peter’s controversy with Simon Magus in Rome, as set forth in the Pseudo-Clementine epistle. No early writer suggests any other place than Rome as the scene of Peter’s death, and all agree that he suffered martyrdom. But it was not until the middle of the third century that Peter was definitely claimed as bishop of Rome (Cyprian Epist. 55:8, 59:14). It remained for later writers to develop this claim and to give it its prominent standing in the Romish church.

Although Roman Catholics are required to accept the claims of Peter’s episcopacy in Rome and to swear by it, the claim rests upon such an uncertain basis in fact that even some of their own number have felt obliged to repudiate it. Chas. Du Moulin, a great

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

ecclesiastical lawyer of the sixteenth century, whom Father Calmet mentioned as a *stedfast Roman Catholic*, says:

Even when after the breaking-up of the empire the bishops of Rome began to extend their authority over other churches, they never alleged or put forth this story of Peter's being at Rome; the story, I suppose, not having yet been invented.—*Mission and Martyrdom of St. Peter*, Vol 4, p. 460.

Ellendorf, Roman Catholic professor at Berlin, *Bib. Sac.*, January 1859, 105, says: "Peter's abode at Rome can never be proved." Father Hardouin, a French Jesuit; Frances Turretin; De Cormeniu in his *History of the Popes*, and other Catholics, admit the same thing.

Again we will appeal to the Bible and show that its evidences are directly opposed to the idea of Peter's long residence in Rome, as claimed by the Catholics.

From what Luke says, it is evident that Peter continued in Judea till the council met at Jerusalem (see Acts 15) to consider the question concerning circumcision and the ceremonial law, for he was present at the time. This was in the year 51, according to Bellarmine, Baronius, and others; or in the year 49, according to Valesius; some place it at 52.

It is further evident that Peter was not at Rome when the council sat at Jerusalem, whether in 49 or 52; for at this time he was at Jerusalem. Paul tells us that three years after his conversion, which occurred about 37, he went to Jerusalem to see Peter, and found him there. And fourteen years after, or about the year 51, he went to Jerusalem again, and then found Peter there. According to the Roman Catholic computation, in the year 51 Peter had sat eight years as bishop of Rome. And yet Paul neither sought nor found him at Rome, but at Jerusalem.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

Neither Peter nor any of the sacred writers give us the least hint that Peter was ever at Rome. We are told of his being at Antioch, Jerusalem, Corinth, Babylon, etc., but there is no mention of his being at Rome, the great seat of the empire.—Elliott.

The silence of Paul in particular must be a convincing proof that Peter was never bishop of Rome.

In Paul's Epistle to the Romans, there is no mention made of Peter. From Rome, he wrote to the . . . Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Timothy, and Philemon, without ever mentioning Peter.

According to the accounts of the papal doctors, Peter was bishop of Rome twenty-five years, from the year 42 to the year 67.

Now, there are recorded seven incidents in Paul's life connected with Rome during that period—once he wrote to the church at Rome, five times he wrote from Rome, and once he dwelt there at least two years.

There is yet no hint given that Peter was there during any of these times; and it would be hard to suppose he was there and that Paul would take no notice of him. This will appear not only extraordinary, but even incredible, if we will only examine the circumstances of these visitations, and the language which Paul uses on these occasions. . . .

He and Timothy join in the address to the Colossian church (Col. 1:1, 2). Surely some regard would have been paid to Peter had he been there.

About the year 58 he wrote his Epistle to the Romans. And though he salutes numbers of persons, and those, too, of highest repute, Peter is never mentioned (see Rom. 16:3-16). Now, had Peter been at Rome at this time, as the angel, or bishop, or minister in pastoral charge of the church of Rome, surely some

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

mention had been made of him; especially as Paul salutes so many, even calling twenty-five of them by name, with several households, and others not named. This is the more strange, as the custom was to salute those persons of greatest note, especially ministers of the word.

Besides, in the Epistle to the Romans there is no reference made to the presence of Peter at Rome previous to the year 58, though, according to the Roman Catholic account, he had been already fifteen years bishop there. Nor is there anything said in reference to his coming to or being at Rome at any future time, as head of the church, or in any other capacity. Hence the inference is that Peter never was at Rome. [Or, at any rate, that he was not there during the time of Paul's experience with that church.]

In the Epistle to the Ephesians, written at Rome about 61 [or 64], there is no mention that Peter ever had been at Rome or that he was there then. . . .

About the year 62 [or 64] Paul wrote to the Philippians. But though he associates Timothy with himself in saluting the Philippian church in the beginning of his epistle, and associates with himself, in the salutations at the close of the epistle, the brethren that were with him, especially those of Caesar's household, there is, nevertheless, not one word about Peter.

Paul wrote to the Colossians about the year 62 [or 64]. Peter was not there then, when Paul, after mentioning Tychicus, Onesimus, Aristarchus, Mark, and Justus, adds, "These only are my helpers in the kingdom of God; who have been a comfort to me" (Col. 4:11). It is evident, therefore, that Peter was not then at Rome, else he certainly would have been mentioned in the list.

In the Epistle to Philemon, written from Rome about A. D. 62, no mention is made of Peter.

We find when Paul appealed to Caesar, and had been sent to Rome, he tarried two full years in that city preaching the

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

gospel, or from years 63 to 65. Nevertheless, there is no account of Peter's being there on his arrival, nor during his two years' ministry, or at his departure from there (see Acts 28).

The Second Epistle to Timothy was written about the year 65 or 66. Paul says [after mentioning by name certain ministers who had either forsaken him or departed to other fields of labor], "at my first answer, no man stood with me, but all men forsook me" (2 Tim. 4:6-16). Surely had Peter been there, he would not have forsaken him. This, too, was immediately before the death of Paul. . . .

Here are six distinct times in which Paul was at Rome, or wrote to or from Rome. In one year he wrote three times from Rome. At another time he remained two full years preaching. From the first to the last time was a period of thirteen or fourteen years. Nevertheless, he gives no account that Peter had been expected there subsequent to any of his visits, that he was there before his arrival, or during his stay. Yet he governed the affairs of the church of Rome, gave directions for their conduct, and mentioned by name, in his salutations, all the principal Christians at Rome, whether men or women. And still he says not one word about Peter, who, according to the Romanists, had his throne at Rome, and governed the church there, previous to Paul's arrival, during his stay, and after his departure. Surely, if Peter ever had been at Rome, there would be some mention made of it by Paul. . . . And, as it cannot be proved that he ever was bishop or pope of Rome, the keystone of the supremacy is taken out, and the entire fabric falls to the ground. For it must appear there is no proof . . . that he ever wrote from Rome or was bishop there. . . .

Besides, the traditionary account of Peter's being at Rome is not only contrary to the authentic account of him which we have in the New Testament, but it is inconsistent with itself.—
Delineation of Roman Catholicism.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

Concerning the time of his coming to Rome the ancient writers do not agree. Eusebius saith it was in the time of Claudius; but by Hierom, who saith he sat there twenty-five years, until the last year of Nero, it must follow that he came thither the second or third of Claudius: yet Damascus saith he came to Rome in the beginning of Nero's empire, and sat there twenty-five years; whereas Nero reigned but fourteen years. He saith also that his disputation with Simon Magus was in the presence of Nero the emperor. Eusebius reporteth it under Claudius. Anterius, bishop of Rome, as Nicephorus testifieth, did write that Peter was translated from Antioch to Rome, and from thence he passed to Alexandria, because he might more profit the church there.—Fulke.

Had there been any solid foundation for the assumption that Peter was bishop of Rome, such confusion and contradiction of the subject would not exist.

A careful, unbiased consideration of all the facts and traditions bearing on this subject leads me to the conclusion expressed by a certain writer, that “while it is admitted as *certain* that Peter suffered martyrdom, in all probability by crucifixion, and also *probable* that this took place at Rome, it has nevertheless been made pretty clear that he never was for any length of time resident in that city, and morally certain that he never was bishop of the church there.”

Is the Church of Rome the True Catholic Church?

Thus Bellarmine defines the church:

The church is an assembly of men, united in the profession of one and the same Christian faith, and in the communion of the same sacraments, under the government of their lawful pastors, as especially of the Roman pontiff.—Vide Lieberman, *Theol.*, p. 45.

This true Catholic faith, out of which none can be saved.—Article 15, Creed and oath of Pope Pius IV.

The above defines the Roman position. Submission and obedience to the government “of the Roman pontiff”—the pope—is essential to membership in the Church of Rome, and this they define as the “true Catholic faith, out of which none can be saved.” This virtually teaches that all who do not submit to the supremacy of the bishop of Rome are lost. So they teach:

It necessarily follows that all other societies arrogating to themselves the name of church, because guided by the spirit of darkness, are sunk into the most pernicious errors, both doctrinal and moral.—Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 100.

The word “catholic” signifies (1) Universal, or general. The Christian church is catholic in that it includes all true believers in all places and at all times. It consists of “every tribe, and tongue, and

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

people, and nation” (Rev. 5:9). (2) Orthodox, because it preserves the true faith, the universal faith of the gospel, which was once delivered to the saints.

It is unscriptural to use the term “catholic” to designate the name of the church, as the “Catholic Church.” The word “catholic” is not found anywhere in the Scripture as applied to the church. The name given to the church is “THE CHURCH OF GOD.” (See Acts 20:28; 1 Cor. 1:2; 2 Cor. 1:1; 1 Cor. 10:32; 1 Cor. 11:16, 22; 1 Cor. 15:9; Gal. 1:13; 1 Thess. 2:14; 2 Thess. 1:4; 1 Tim. 3:5; 1 Tim. 3:15.) The first time we have the term “Catholic Church” is in the so-called Apostles’ Creed, which was not composed by the apostles at all, but was a later production.

By affixing the name “catholic” to herself does not in the least prove that the Church of Rome is the orthodox, or apostolic, church. The Jews called themselves “the sons of God,” and the “seed of Abraham” (John 8:33), but Jesus proved that they were not the true seed. Paul said that false apostles would call themselves ministers of Christ and transform themselves into apostles of Christ. Ascribing to themselves such titles did not make them such. So with the Church of Rome.

Even in the nominal sense the Church of Rome cannot be said to be the catholic, or universal, church. It can be clearly sustained by history that down through the ages there have been thousands and millions of religious people whose piety rated to the highest standard of any found in Rome, who did not bow to the supremacy of the Roman bishop. Many millions of these were put to death by the command of the temporal kings who obeyed the injunction of the pope. While the Western churches acknowledged the Roman supremacy, the Eastern churches did not. These latter were just as pious and God-fearing as the former. The Roman church, then, has

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

never been truly catholic. She is not the catholic church, though she has assumed the name.

Look at the figures today. The Church of Rome numbers between 175,000,000 and 200,000,000. The Protestant churches number about 150,000,000. The Greek church, which is bitter against the Roman supremacy, numbers about 90,000,000. Thus the Protestant churches and the Greek church together number about 240,000,000, or at least 40,000,000 more than the Church of Rome. Judged by their morals, the Greeks and Protestants are as much entitled to the name Christian as are the devotees of the Romish church. Thus by incontrovertible facts we prove that Rome does not represent the catholic church.

How much more is this true when we judge her in the light of the New Testament and primitive Christianity! She cannot, without absurdity or impiety, be called the true catholic church. She is no more the universal church than the Roman jurisdiction is all heaven and earth. The Church of God contains all true believers. As salvation constitutes men members of it, all the saved are its members. No one can be a Christian outside of the divine church. The church is the body of Christ, and the body of Christ includes all the redeemed in heaven and on earth.

This is one of the principal distinguishing features between the true church and the false, between the divine ecclesia and man-made institutions. This one truth, the catholicity of the Church of God, locates every sect. The Church of God includes the family of God, and it is but one family in heaven and on earth; therefore it includes in its membership every Christian—all the redeemed in paradise, and all the saved on earth. Including all Christians, it is not a sect, but is the whole. Now, a church that does not include in its membership all Christians in heaven and on earth cannot be God's

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

church, hence it is a sect. This rule applies to the Church of Rome as well as to Protestant sects. Before any of these institutions arose, there were millions of Christians. It is clear that the Church of God was geographically distributed in large and flourishing congregations at Jerusalem and throughout all Judea, Samaria, and no doubt in Asia Minor, long before there was a church at Rome. The primitive church numbered into millions before there was even a universal Roman pontiff. All these lived and died without knowing of the idolatry and superstition of the Roman Catholic Church.

None of the blood-washed saints in paradise are now members of any of these earth-born institutions; and right here upon earth there are tens of thousands of happy saints in robes of righteousness who have come out and now stand clear of creed-bound churches, and there are many thousands of others who are saved from sin and have never joined any sectarian institution. Therefore all denominations put together, Roman, Greek, and Protestant, do not constitute the universal church, but are only sects.

In holding membership in the one universal church and in no other, we stand clear of the sin of division and are members of no sect, but members of that church to which all the saved in heaven and earth belong. This is the one and only catholic church. The Church of Rome has long laid claim to the title, Catholic Church, but in doing so they have assumed a title that does not belong to them. They are a sect—a sect, too, that includes very few real Christians. The Church of God is catholic not only in that it includes all Christians, but also in that it is destined to fill the whole earth. “And that the kingdom, and power, and the greatness of the kingdom, under the whole heaven, may be given to the people of the saints of the most High” (Dan. 7:27). “But the stone that struck the statue, became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth”

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

(Dan. 2:35). These texts have direct reference to the universality of the Church of God.

Moreover, the religion of the Church of God will apply to all men of all nations. The Church of God gathers into her fold the rich and the poor, the educated and the illiterate, the high and the low; in short, all classes of men. These, when saved, are on one common level of equality. Many of the religions of the world are local in their nature and apply only to certain classes. These have adopted peculiar customs, manners, and styles of dress. But Christianity, the religion of the Church of God, is not local in any sense. It is the one universal religion, the one religion that will apply to all classes of men. It imposes no peculiar local customs of manners or dress. Thus we see again the catholicity of the Church of God.

The Church of Rome cannot be properly called catholic in regard to place, time, or faith. It was at first confined to the city of Rome, and afterwards to the Roman states. It is a particular and not a universal church. Their proper name should be *Papists*, because they follow the pope.

The Unity of the Church of Rome

It has long been the claim of the Church of Rome that she is apostolic because she is one in faith and doctrine. Her doctors are bold in declaring that Protestant sects are not the true church, but heresies, because of their divided condition. I heartily agree that the church is one. She is “one body in Christ,” “one family in heaven and earth,” one household, one bride —“the Lamb’s wife”—one “true tabernacle, which the Lord hath pitched, and not man.” The burden of Christ’s prayer recorded in the seventeenth chapter of John was that his church in all future ages “all may be one.” Of the primitive church it is said, “And the multitude of believers had but one heart and one soul” (Acts 4:32). In the New Testament, divisions are condemned in the very strongest terms. “Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no schisms among you; but that you be perfect in the same mind, and in the same judgment” (1 Cor. 1:10). Here is a direct prohibition of all schisms, or divisions, in the body of Christ. By the standard of truth, all divisions among Christians are sinful. “Now I beseech you, brethren, to mark them who make dissensions and offences contrary to the doctrine which you have learned, and avoid them. For they that are such, serve not Christ our Lord, but their own belly; and by pleasing speeches and good words, seduce the hearts of the innocent” (Rom. 16:17, 18). “But there were also false prophets among the people, even as there

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

shall be among you lying teachers, who shall bring in sects of perdition” (2 Pet. 2:1-3). In Gal. 5:20 “sects” (heresies, A. V.) are declared to be the works of the flesh and are classified with idolatry, fornication, murders, drunkenness, and such like.

But unity alone in a body of people is not sufficient to prove that that body is the true church. It is necessary that unity be joined with faith and doctrine. Yet mere unity of faith and doctrine is not a mark of the true church; it must be unity of *true* faith and *true* doctrine. “If you continue in my word, you shall be my disciples indeed” (John 8:31). Adhesion to the pope of Rome is no proper part of Christian unity. There is no Scriptural proof that the pope is the head of all Christians and the one with whom they are to be in communion. Time and again Christ alone is declared to be the living head of his church.

The New Testament basis of unity and that of the Roman church are in no sense identical. In the former, it is found in Christ alone. “That they all may be one, as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee; that they also may be *one in us*” (John 17:21). “For you are all one in Christ Jesus” (Gal. 3:28). “So we being many, are one body in Christ” (Rom. 12:5). “You are filled in him” (Col. 2:10). “Ye are complete in him,” A. V.

Measured by the standard of all the foregoing scriptures, the Church of Rome is as truly a sect as the Protestant denominations which she condemns. In matters of faith and doctrine, she is as much divided as they. The same scriptures with which she condemns Protestantism will condemn her. Were we to listen to the pretensions of Romanists, we would suppose that their church was one in doctrine, while the fact is, it has always been divided by a multitude of controversies. The clergy among them are much divided in matters of religion. They have had several schools of theology

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

differing as widely from each other as any of the Protestant sects. The Lombardic theology arose in 1150 A. D. This system taught that justification arose from grace and works. The Scholastic theology arose about a hundred years later. They taught that justification and salvation are to be obtained by human works alone. There are a number of distinct sects of the Scholastics, differing from each other, such as Thomists, Scotists, Occamists, etc. Then, there is the Monastic theology, which teaches that salvation is to be expected through papal indulgence, from works of supererogation, and from will-worship. They teach that images are to be adored, that confidence is to be placed in saints, that pilgrimages to holy places are to be undertaken, monastic orders entered on, that funeral masses are to be bought. They introduce the legends of the saints and feigned miracles into their sermons. The fourth is the Intermediate theology. This system admits that we are justified by faith in Christ, springing from love. It concedes that by the merits of Christ alone we can be saved, but adds that good works are necessary to salvation. It admits that the mass is not a sacrifice propitiatory, but adds that it is applicatory, by which the merits of Christ are at length applied to us. Next in order is the Jesuitical theology. The sum of its doctrine on justification is, that habitual righteousness, or justice before God, consists of an infused habit, but actual justice in the merit of good works. Thus on justification the schools of theology in the Church of Rome differ as widely as do the Protestant sects. In the light of 1 Cor. 1:10, where Paul enjoins that we "all speak the same thing," the Church of Rome stands condemned.

The Franciscans and Dominicans are ever contending about several points of doctrine and discipline. The Scotists and Thomists have been always at war. The Jesuites were continually at variance with the Dominicans, Benedictines, and other orders; and almost ruined them, especially the Benedictines. The theological colleges

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

debate concerning almost all the doctrines of Christianity. Ever since the time of the Council of Trent controversies of great importance have arisen, which divided and still divide the Church of Rome.

Considerable dissension exists in the Church of Rome respecting their rule of faith. The true source, or foundation, of divinity is the Word of God alone, as it is contained in the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments. The Council of Trent adds Tobias, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and the two Maccabees. But Cardinal Cajetan follows Jerome, who rejects them from the canon. Arias Montanus, whom Gregory XIII calls his own son, in his Hebrew Bible, with interlineary translation, approved by the Louvain doctors, says concerning the apocryphal books: "The orthodox church, following the Hebrew canon, numbers these among the apocryphal books." Antoninus, archbishop of Florence, referring to the sentiment of Jerome, that the apocryphal books were inferior to the canonical, says: "And the same also saith Thomas Aquinas and Nicholaus de Lyra on Tobias, namely, that these are not of so great authority that they can be efficaciously used in argument in those things which concern faith, as the other books of Holy Scripture."

The fearful schisms which took place in the popedom, the boasted seat of unity, for the space of fifty-one years, namely, from 1378 to 1429, and afterward between Eugenius IV and the Council of Constance, is a plain proof of the want of that unity of which Romanists so loudly boast.

At the commencement of the popedom of Clement V, in 1305, the seat of the pope was removed to Avignon in France, where it remained for seventy years. At the death of Gregory XI, March 27, 1378, the citizens of Rome, fearing lest a Frenchman should be chosen, came tumultuously to the conclave, and

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

demanded that an Italian should be made pope. The cardinals, terrified by this uproar, chose Urban VI, a Neapolitan. Some of the cardinals withdrew from Rome to Fondi, where they elected to the pontificate Robert, count of Geneva, who took the name of Clement VII, and declared the election of Urban unlawful, because they were compelled by violence to the choice.

Which of these two was the lawful pope is to this day doubtful; nor will the records and writings alleged by the contending parties decide the controversy. Urban remained at Rome, and Clement took up his residence at Avignon. Thus the union of the Latin church under one head was destroyed, and succeeded by that deplorable schism, known by the name of the Great Western Schism. "Christendom was divided," says Du Pin, the Roman Catholic: "divers kingdoms continued under the obedience of Urban, and others acknowledged Clement. This caused a bloody schism in the church."

On the death of Clement, which happened in the year 1394, Benedict XIII was chosen pope by the French cardinals. Though before his election he took an oath to vacate the popedom, provided the cardinals desired it, yet after he was chosen he refused to do so at their request, and thus perjured himself. The Gallican church, displeased at the proceedings on both sides, withdrew obedience from both popes in 1397, at a council held at Paris.

On the death of Boniface, the Roman party, in 1404, chose Innocent VII, who was succeeded in 1406 by Gregory XII.

The cardinals of Gregory and eight or nine of the cardinals of Benedict called a council, to meet at Pisa. The council excommunicated both these popes for schism, perjury, and contumacy, and elected Alexander V. But the decrees of the council were treated with contempt by both the pontiffs, each of whom performed the functions of the papacy in his respective bounds. Thus the Western church was divided into three great

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

factions by three contending popes, who loaded each other with curses, calumnies, and excommunications.

The great end in view by the Councils of Constance and Basil was the reformation of the church in its head and members. The popes were looked upon as the head, and the bishops, priests, and monks as the members, both being exceedingly corrupt. Martin opposed the reformation to the utmost. However, five years after the Council of Constance, in consequence of frequent remonstrances by pious persons, he called a council to meet at Pavia, whence it was removed to Sienna, and thence to Basil. He died about the time on which the council met. The council met July 23, 1431, and seriously went about the work of reformation. Eugenius IV opposed reform by every possible means. For though he at first approved of the assembling of the council, he afterward opposed it. The council deposed Eugenius, who in 1438 collected another council at Ferrara, which was afterward transferred to Florence, and at the second session thundered out an excommunication against the fathers assembled at Basil, and afterward sentenced them to hell and damnation, and declared their acts null and their proceedings unlawful. The council, in 1439, chose Felix V pope in the place of Eugenius. By this means that deplorable schism which formerly rent the church was again revived, with additional aggravations; for the contest was not only between two rival popes, but also between the contending councils of Basil and Florence.

The foregoing accounts of these papal schisms were taken principally from Du Pin's Ecclesiastical History.

The calamities of these times are indescribable. The church had two or three different heads at the same time; each forming plots and pronouncing curses upon his competitors and followers. The princes of Europe were involved in wars on this account. Many lost their lives and fortunes in the struggle. In most places, all sense of religion was lost; and profligacy of

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

manners prevailed almost everywhere, both among clergy and laity.—Delineation of Roman Catholicism.

The limits and extent of the pope's power and jurisdiction is a subject warmly debated in the Church of Rome. On the subject of the pope's authority, Bellarmine, the great writer and defender of Rome, definitely points out four varieties of opinion in the church. The first he pronounces heretical; the second, "bordering on heresy"; the third, "probable"; and the fourth, "most certain."—*Bellarmino: De Pontif, Lib. IV, c. 2. Gerhard: sec. 242.*

On the subject as to where the infallibility in the church lies, whether in the pope, general councils, etc., there is a great variety of opinion among the Roman clergy. A careful reading of their standard writings clearly reveals this.

The church has been much divided respecting the doctrines of grace, predestination, and original sin. The Dominicans, Augustins, and Jansenists, with several other doctors, in the main adopt the doctrine of Augustine (the view also held by Calvin) on these subjects. The Jesuits maintain the opposite side of the question; or they are the Arminians of the Romish church, who embrace also a considerable portion of Pelagius's creed, especially respecting the depravity of our nature and human liberty. With respect to the administration of the sacraments and their effects, especially those of penance and the eucharist, there is a wide difference of opinion between the Jesuits and other theological branches. The supremacy of the pope is a subject of considerable controversy among the Roman doctors.

If space would permit, I could prove from their own writers that on nearly all the vital points of faith, doctrine, and practice, they are greatly at variance among themselves. From the foregoing any candid reader can readily see that the Church of Rome is as much in

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

a state of discord as the Protestant sects, which she denounces as pernicious heresies. If the divided condition of Protestantism constitutes it heretical, then for the same reason the Church of Rome must be heretical. The only unity existing in the Roman church is the acknowledgement of the supremacy of their pontiff.

Infant Damnation

The Council of Florence on the effects of baptism decided:

The effect of this sacrament is the remission of all original and actual guilt; also of all punishment which is owed for any guilt.

That the law of baptism, as established by our law, extends to all, insomuch that, unless they are regenerated through the grace of baptism, be their parents Christians or infidels, they are born to eternal misery and everlasting destruction.—Catechism, pp. 162, 163.

If, then, through the transgression of Adam, children inherit the stain of primeval guilt, is there not still stronger reason to conclude that the efficacious merits of Christ the Lord must impart to them that justice and those graces which will give them a title to reign in eternal life? This happy consummation baptism alone can accomplish.—Id., p. 163.

Infants, unless baptized, cannot enter heaven.—Id., p. 164.

Whosoever shall affirm that baptism is indifferent . . . that is, not necessary to salvation; let him be accursed.—Council of Trent, canon 4.

Whosoever shall deny that the guilt of original sin is remitted by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, bestowed in baptism; . . . let him be accursed.—Id., canon 5.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

Baptism washes away the stains of sin.—Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 152.

The above sets forth the teaching of the Church of Rome on this important point. Children without baptism “are born to eternal misery and everlasting destruction.” They “cannot enter heaven.” Against this cruel, unreasonable doctrine I present the following facts:

First, There is absolutely not one text in the New Testament that teaches infant baptism. It is purely a rite invented by the Romish church during the Dark Ages.

Second, Infants are in a state of innocency before God, having never transgressed his law. Not being transgressors, they cannot come under condemnation nor guilt. Jesus said, “Of such is the kingdom of God.” He also taught that conversion restores the adult to the childhood state of innocency (see Matt. 18:1-3).

Third, Though infants are born into the world in possession of a sinful nature (Psa. 50:7—51:5, A. V.), they are not responsible for this, because it came through the fall of Adam (Rom. 5:12). Infants do not become responsible to God until they are old enough to receive a knowledge of the commandments of God. Paul, in speaking with reference to this point, said, “I lived some time without the law. But when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died” (Rom. 7:9, 10). The time when he lived without the law was the state of innocent childhood. When he became old enough to receive a knowledge of the law, he became responsible to God, and then died a spiritual death; that is, he was cut off from favor with God and came under guilt. As to those who die in infancy, the blood of Christ has atoned for them, and they are passive through it, and thus they enter pure into the presence of the Lord. “Christ died for

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

all.” “He tasted death for every man.” From all this we rightly conclude that all children who die in infancy are saved.

Fourth, The Bible plainly teaches that the Holy Spirit may be given before baptism, as in the case of Cornelius and his friends (Acts 10). Then we rightly conclude that eternal life may be had without water baptism.

Fifth, If all children dying without baptism are lost, then it follows that an infinite number of innocent babes are barred out of heaven forever, without their fault. This is absurd in the extreme.

Sixth, This teaching of Rome, which has been copied by a few Protestant sects, makes the salvation of mankind dependent upon an external rite administered by man. According to the Bible, no external rite administered by anyone upon another, can cleanse from sin. The blood of Christ is the only clement of cleansing. It is man’s moral nature that is affected by sin, and only a moral cleansing can fit him for heaven. This the blood of Christ alone can effect.

Seventh, The Romish doctrine of infant damnation is cruel, inhuman, and contrary to the law of a just and merciful God. It virtually debars from heaven all the myriads of innocent children who did not happen to be born of Romish parents, and were not favored (?) with a few drops of water administered by one of their priests.

May God help all honest men and women to renounce such doctrine and teaching and to embrace the plain truth of the gospel instead.

Transubstantiation

The words, “This is my body”; “This is my blood”; employed by our Savior when he instituted the Lord’s Supper, have been used by thousands of religionists as the foundation for much erroneous teaching and rank heresy. Upon them is built the Catholic absurdity of transubstantiation, and also the Protestant idea of forgiveness of sins through the sacrament. It is our object in this chapter to set the matter forth in its true light and at the same time to refute the erroneous ideas handed down to the people from the dark ages of superstition and apostate night.

I insert the following from the Catholic catechism:

Q. What is the holy eucharist?

A. It is a sacrament, which contains the body and blood, the soul and divinity of Jesus Christ, under the form and appearances of bread and wine.

Q. Is it not bread and wine which is first put upon the altar for the celebration of the mass?

A. Yes; it is always bread and wine till the priest pronounces the words of consecration during the mass.

Q. What happens by these words?

A. The bread is changed into the body of Jesus Christ, and the wine into his blood.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

Q. What is this change called?

A. It is called Transubstantiation; that is to say, a change of one substance into another.

The Council of Trent, at its thirteenth session, passed the following canons, which are supremely authoritative with Roman Catholics:

Canon 1. Whosoever shall deny, that in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist there are truly, really, and substantially contained the body and the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, together with his soul and divinity, and consequently Christ entire; but shall affirm that he is present therein only in a sign and figure, or by his power; let him be accursed.

2. Whosoever shall affirm that in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist there remains the substance of bread and wine, together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; and shall deny that wonderful and peculiar conversion of the whole substance of the bread into his body, and of the whole substance of the wine into his blood, the species only of bread and wine remaining, which conversion the Catholic Church most fitly terms transubstantiation; let him be accursed.

3. Whosoever shall deny that Christ entire is contained in the venerable sacrament of the eucharist under each species, and under every part of each species when they are separated; let him be accursed.

4. Whosoever shall affirm that the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are not present in the admirable eucharist, as soon as the consecration is performed, . . . and that the true body of our Lord does not remain in the hosts or consecrated morsels which are reserved or left after communion; let him be accursed.

In the third chapter of the same session the council declares:

Immediately after the consecration, the true body of our Lord, and his true blood, together with his soul and divinity, do

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

exist under the species of the bread and wine. . . . For Christ, whole and entire, exists under the species of bread, and in every particle thereof, and under the species of wine in all its parts. The eucharist also contains Christ our Lord, the true grace, the source of all heavenly gifts.—Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 194.

Christ whole and entire is contained in the sacrament.
—p. 212.

The decision of the Council of Trent further states, “that the body, blood, bones, sinews, etc., of Christ, his soul and Godhead, are contained in either the bread or the wine; and after the words of consecration, it is the very God himself.” This in brief sets forth their doctrine, for I have quoted verbatim from their own standard works.

In the first place, this doctrine and practice is superstitious. The Catholic priest takes a part of something that is grown in the field, that the farmers’ horses, cows, swine, and chickens eat, that which constitutes a portion of our common food—bread baked from the flour of wheat—and lays it upon the altar, pronounces the words of consecration over it; and, according to Roman Catholic doctrine, suddenly it becomes God, and contains the body, soul, blood, bones, and sinews of Jesus Christ. He then kneels before it and worships it, after which he holds it between his two fingers before the congregation, saying in Latin, “Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world.” Then all the congregation bow their heads and worship it. There never was any mystery in any religion, pagan or Mohammedan, more unintelligible, more inconceivable, and more against both reason and sense as this is.

The Romanists eat their god. The rankest pagan in the world would not do such a thing. The Catholics’ god is a piece of bread; and, to add to their idolatry and blasphemy, they call that bread, “the very Christ.” It virtually makes the Catholics to be worshipers of a

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

piece of bread, for that is all it is. “Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat.” What Christ took he broke, what he broke he blessed, and what he blessed was distributed, and what was distributed was eaten. Bread, then, was taken by Christ, therefore bread, and not flesh was eaten. The same is true of the cup which contained the fruit of the vine. Paul makes this clear in 1 Cor. 10:16, 17: “The bread, which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord? . . . For we . . . all partake of one bread.” “For as often as you shall eat this BREAD, and drink the chalice [cup, A. V.], ye do show the death of the Lord, until he come. Therefore, whosoever shall eat this BREAD, or drink the chalice [cup] of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord. But let a man prove himself: and so let him eat of that BREAD, and drink of the chalice [cup]” (1 Cor. 11:26-28).

The Lutherans hold that Christ’s presence is in the communion. They differ from the Catholics in that they do not believe it is the literal body and blood of Christ that they eat. The Lutheran doctrine is as follows: The bread and the wine still remain such, but the Word connects with the bread and the wine the presence of Christ himself; and those who partake of the communion, partake spiritually of the body and the blood of the Lord, and in so doing, receive remission of past sins.

Most sects teach that when the bread and the wine are consecrated, or blessed in prayer, there is a supernatural presence of Christ in them, and that special blessing is conferred on the partakers. “Jesus took bread, and *blessed*, and broke: and gave to his disciples” (Matt. 26:26; Mark 14:22). It is held that by the term “blessed” is meant that Jesus somehow changed the bread, consecrated it, or connected his spiritual presence therewith, and

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

that in partaking of it grace is ministered. Thus, about all sects hold that the sacrament is a special means of grace.

Beloved reader, this is attaching more to the communion than the Lord ever intended. There is no foundation in the Scriptures for such notions. The word “blessed” in the above texts means no more than that Christ gave thanks.

Matthew and Mark say that he blessed the bread; while Luke, recording the same event, says, “And taking bread, he *gave thanks*, and brake” (Luke 22:19). Many Greek copies of Matt. 26:26 read “*gave thanks* instead of “blessed.” “The Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and *giving thanks*, broke, and said, Take ye, and eat” (1 Cor. 11:23, 24). “Jesus took bread, and blessed, and broke: and gave to his disciples” (Matt. 26:26). “Jesus taking a loaf, and giving praise, he broke, and gave it to the disciples” (Matt. 26:26, Emphatic Diaglott). This clearly disproves the idea that Jesus conferred any special virtue to the communion bread. He simply broke a loaf and “gave thanks.” “In like manner also the chalice [cup].” “And taking the chalice [cup], he gave thanks, and gave to them” (1 Cor. 11:25; Matt. 26:27). It remained bread in his hands after he had given thanks. “Jesus took bread,” “gave thanks, and brake,” and “gave to his disciples.” After thanks has been offered, it is only “bread, which we break” (1 Cor. 10:16). This fact is further proved by Christ’s own words: “I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I shall drink it new in the kingdom of God” (Mark 14:25). The thing, then, that we drink is “the fruit of the vine.” Bread and wine constitute the communion, or Lord’s Supper—just simply bread and the juice of the grape.

But why did Christ say, “This is my body; this is my blood”? I answer, He spoke by figure. The bread and the wine are *symbols*, or *emblems*, of the broken body and the shed blood of Christ. It is the

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

height of folly to put any other construction upon Christ's words. He could not have meant his literal body, for the following reasons:

1. At the time when he spoke these words, he was alive and in the presence of the disciples. It is impossible that they could have believed they were eating the body of Christ when they saw that body before them. He held the broken loaf in his own hands. With their eyes they looked upon his fleshly body at the table with them. How could they have believed that they were drinking his blood, when, as they knew, it was still in his veins? Incredible!

2. How could they have been persuaded to drink the literal blood of their Lord or to eat human flesh—to swallow their Lord and Master down their throats? Such teaching is ridiculous in the extreme.

3. It could not have been his body broken and his shed blood that they partook of; for he was at that very time alive before them. His body had not yet been given, sacrificed, or broken, for them. This shows that it is impossible to take these words of our Savior literally. Catholics say that the bread and the wine contain the body, soul, blood, and divinity of Christ. How, I ask, could the loaf of bread in Jesus' hand have contained his blood and soul, when his blood was yet coursing through his veins and not one drop had been shed?

4. Their own sense of taste would have convinced them that it was not literal flesh that they were eating nor literal blood that they were drinking.

Our Savior spoke by figures; and such figures as are very common. The bread and the wine are symbols, or emblems, of the broken body and shed blood of Christ. How can it be otherwise? When Christ instituted this ordinance he held a loaf in his hand. He

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

blessed it, broke it, and gave it to the disciples. He said, This is my body, broken, or sacrificed, for you. At this very moment his real body—bones, sinews, blood, and soul—the Christ whole and entire, stood before them. Their eyes beheld him. His real body was not yet broken. Not a drop of his blood was at that time shed. Holding the bread in his hands, he said, This is my body. Of the cup he said, This is my blood which shall be shed for many. If, therefore, we are to understand the words of Christ literally, as Roman Catholics would have us, we must admit one of the grossest contradictions in the world. We must believe that Christ's body was both alive and dead at the same time. Is it possible that the disciples understood that they were not eating bread, but really eating flesh, and really drinking blood—the flesh and blood of Christ's dead body—when as yet he was not crucified, and his living person was there with them, visible to their natural eyes? Incredible! Preposterous! If they did not literally eat the flesh, bones, and sinews, and swallow down the blood and soul of Christ, neither do we today. Mark well this fact, for it forever demolishes the superstitious and unreasonable Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation.

Wine, by way of figure, is called “the blood of the grape” (Gen. 49:11; Deut. 32:14), How fittingly, then, it represents the blood of Christ! But someone will ask, “Is the sign of a thing ever called by the same name as the thing it signifies?” Certainly. It is so in our common language. In my room is an enlarged picture of my father and mother, who are now dead. Pointing to the picture, I say to a friend, “This is my father and mother.” Who would be so stupid as to believe the picture to be really my father and mother—their actual body, blood, and soul? Who would believe them to be literally or even spiritually? The picture is only a representation of them. I say of a map hanging on the wall, “This is the United States.” Who would understand it to be the real country itself? Nobody. It is only

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

a representation of it. Just so, Jesus took a loaf of bread, broke it, and said, "This is my body." That bread was no more his spiritual or literal body than the portrait on the wall is the real persons themselves. The bread simply *represented* his body.

The very mode of expression Jesus used is the common language of Scripture. I will here cite a few examples of its use. "The seven beautiful kine, and the seven full ears, are seven years" (Gen. 41:26). While it is plainly said that seven kine and seven ears are seven years, it is clear that the meaning is that the kine and the ears represent years. Again, "The three branches are yet three days" (Gen. 40:12). "The three baskets are yet three days" (v. 18). The branches and the baskets represent days. "Thou therefore art the head of gold" (Dan. 2:38). That is, the head of gold represented Nebuchadnezzar and the great kingdom of Babylon. "These four great beasts are four kingdoms, which shall arise out of the earth" (Dan. 7:17). Who believes that real beasts were once kings of the earth? Yet the language is as positive as Jesus' language in the institution of the communion. "These four great beasts are four kingdoms." The beasts represent kingdoms. "The ten horns" "shall be ten kings" (Dan. 7:24). "The rock was Christ" (1 Cor. 10:4). "The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches. And the seven candlesticks are the seven churches" (Rev. 1:20). "The seven heads are seven mountains" (Rev. 17:9). "I am the vine, you the branches" (John 15:5). In all these the sign has the name of the thing signified. Parallel with all the above figures, are Christ's words when he instituted the Communion Supper. The bread, when broken, represents the broken body of our Savior; the blood of grapes represents his shed blood. The whole is a remembrancer of his death.

Again, the body of Christ is not now a natural body, but a spiritual body. This spiritual, glorified body is now in heaven at the

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

right hand of the Father. Christ is now wholly an infinite being. His body cannot be broken. There is no more blood to shed. We cannot with our literal mouths eat an infinite being. The Catholics would have us believe that Christ, who is an infinite being with a glorified body in heaven, has at the same time a physical being with natural flesh, bones, sinews, and blood, with his soul, here on earth; and this latter being they declare is “Christ, whole and entire.” The priest himself makes this earthly Christ, by the words of consecration, out of a piece of bread and a cup of grape-juice. After making what they are pleased to term “the very God himself,” and worshipping him, they put him in their mouths, chew him between their teeth, and swallow him into their stomachs. In this we boldly charge them with a practice that is blasphemous.

Peter Dens, who is a standard Catholic author and a teacher of theology, says, “A mouse or a dog, eating the sacramental species, does not eat them sacramentally; yet this proves that the body of Christ *does not cease to exist* under the species *as long as they exist.*”—*Catechism of the Council of Trent, No. 50; p. 347.* This virtually declares that a mouse or a dog eating the consecrated bread also eats the body, blood, bones, and sinews, soul and divinity of Christ, but not sacramentally as man eats it. This author further says that if “a sick person vomits the sacred host,” “they are to be reverently collected, and afterward received.” “But if nausea prevent that, then they are cautiously separated from the filth, and deposited in some sacred place, and afterwards buried in the graveyard.”—*Id., No. 65; p. 373.* Surely this is enough to show the blasphemous and sacrilegious practices of this apostate church.

The story is told of a certain Protestant lady who married a Catholic. The priest paid them frequent visits, endeavoring to persuade her to accept the Catholic doctrine and join the church of

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

her husband. Among the religious topics that she frequently discussed with him was this doctrine of transubstantiation. At length the husband fell sick, and during his affliction the priest recommended the holy sacrament. He requested the wife to prepare bread and wine for the solemn occasion, which she did. On presenting them to the priest, she said:

“These, sir, you wish me to understand, will be changed into the real body and blood of Christ after you have consecrated them?”
“Most certainly,” he replied.

“Then sir,” she rejoined, “it will not be possible after the consecration for them to do any harm to the worthy partaker.”

“Assuredly not,” answered the priest. “They cannot do harm to the worthy receivers, but must communicate great good.”

The ceremony was proceeded in; the bread and wine were consecrated, and the priest was about to take and eat the bread and then give the same to her husband, when the lady interrupted him, saying;

“I mixed a little arsenic with the bread, but as it is now changed into the real body of Christ, it cannot, of course, do you any harm.”

The priest’s faith was not sufficiently firm, however, to enable him to eat it. Confused, ashamed, and irritated, he left the house, and never more ventured to enforce on that lady the absurd doctrine of transubstantiation.

Mass, As Observed in the Roman Catholic Church

The Church of Rome holds that the sacrifice of mass is a propitiatory offering of Christ, the same as his offering upon the cross of Calvary; that in it they offer up Christ to God as a propitiatory sacrifice for both the living and the dead, and in as true a manner as he was offered on the cross at Jerusalem; and that it is equally meritorious with his first sacrifice. Here are three canons of the Council of Trent:

Canon 1. If anyone shall say, that a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God in the mass; or that what is to be offered is nothing else than giving Christ to us to eat; let him be accursed.

2. If anyone shall say, that by these words, "Do this for a commemoration of me," Christ did not appoint his apostles priests, or did not ordain that they and other priests should offer his body and blood; let him be accursed.

3. If anyone shall say, that the mass is only a service of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice made on the cross, and not a propitiatory offering; or that it only benefits him who receives it, and ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities; let him be accursed.

Catholics contend that Christ is offered daily in the mass sacrifice. This has no foundation whatever in Scripture, and is

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

directly contrary to it. Nothing that Christ said in connection with the institution of the Lord's Supper has any reference whatever to the sacrifice of mass. The same is true of what Paul says in 1 Corinthians 11. Not in a single text that has the least bearing on the subject is there a hint that Christ would offer up himself, or ever commanded his church to offer him up to God the Father, in this ordinance. "Did our Savior, at his last supper, offer up himself, body, soul, and divinity, a true sacrifice to God, or did he not? If he did not, how shall we dare to offer him up in our observance of the rite? If he did, as the Roman Catholics say he did, to what purpose did he afterwards offer himself upon the cross?"

In their pretended offering up of Christ in the sacrifice of mass, the priests of the Romish church squarely contradict the New Testament teaching. "For by one oblation [offering, A. V.] he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified" (Heb. 10:14). "Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holies, every year with the blood of others; For then he ought to have suffered often from the beginning of the world: but now once at the end of ages, he hath appeared for the destruction of sin, by the sacrifice of himself. . . . So Christ was offered once to exhaust the sins of many" (Heb. 9:25-28). There was but ONE offering of Christ for remission. He was never to be offered as a propitiatory offering but once; yet in direct contradiction to this fact, the priests of Rome claim to offer him up a thousand times every day.

It was not needful that he should "offer himself often . . . for then he ought to have suffered often" (Heb. 9:25, 26). "Without shedding of blood there is no remission" (Heb. 9:22). From this we learn that Christ cannot be offered without suffering. If the sacrifice be true, then Christ must often suffer; for if he should offer himself often, then must he have often suffered. If the Catholic mass is real,

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

Romanists put Christ to death every day, and that in thousands of different places. Thus they cause him to pass through untold sufferings. This practice virtually makes them as guilty of crucifying the Lord of glory as were the Jews and Roman soldiers. Since the Romish claim is that in the mass a propitiatory offering and sacrifice of Christ is made, “for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities,” and since Paul declares that “without shedding of blood there is no remission” of sins, it follows either that the sacrifice of the mass must be a bloody sacrifice, and so Christ’s blood must be shed as often as he is offered in the mass; or else it is no propitiatory offering, and grants no one remission of sins, the very thing for which they claim the sacrifice of mass is made.

In one breath they deny a bloody sacrifice in the mass, and in the other they say that in every crumb of the bread, and in every drop of the wine, “there is contained *the blood*, as well as the body, soul, and divinity of Christ”; and whosoever does not believe these two contradictory doctrines is cursed by the Council of Trent.

The sacrifice of mass is utterly and forever overthrown by the positive words of Scripture: “By one oblation he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified”; and “where there is a remission of these, there is no more an oblation for sin” (Heb. 10:18). The fact is when he had by himself purged our sins, and this by “one offering,” he ascended into heaven, where he is always living to make intercession for us.” Thus he “is able also to save them forever that come to God by him.” After we are saved through the one sacrifice Christ made on the cross, “there is no conscience of sin any longer.” Our sins are remembered no more. Grace is given to live ever after above sin. For, says the apostle, “we know that whosoever is born of God, sinneth not” (1 John 5:18). “Whosoever abideth in him,

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

sinneth not” (1 John 3:6). Since the Romanists have never found this full salvation in Christ Jesus, they have invented the ridiculous sacrifice of the mass.

The following extract from the Roman Missal sets forth the shocking profanation and superstition of this practice.

If, after consecration, a gnat, a spider, or any such thing, fall into the chalice, and if it produces nausea to the priest, let him draw it out and wash it with the wine; and when mass is concluded, let him burn it, and let him throw the ashes and the washings into a sacred place. But if there is no nausea, and he fears none, let him swallow it with the blood.

If poisonous matter should fall into the cup, or anything that would cause a vomiting, let the consecrated wine be put in another cup, and other wine with water be again placed to be consecrated; and when mass is finished, let the blood be poured on linen cloth or tow, and remain till dry, and then let the two be burned, and the ashes cast into a holy place.

If any poisonous matter touches the consecrated host, then let the priest consecrate another and receive it in the proper manner, and let the poisoned one be preserved in a box, in a separated place, until the species be corrupted, and then let the corrupted species be thrown into a sacred place.

If in winter the blood be frozen in the cup, put warm clothes about the cup; if that will not do, let it be put into boiling water near the altar till it be melted, taking care it does not come into the cup.

If any of the blood of Christ fall on the ground or table by negligence, it must be licked up with the tongue, the place must be thoroughly scraped, and the scrapings burned; but the ashes must be buried in holy ground.

If the priest vomit the eucharist, and the species appear entire, they must be reverently swallowed unless nausea prevent;

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

and in that case the consecrated species must be cautiously separated from the vomit, and laid by in some sacred place until they be corrupted, and afterward they are to be thrown into a sacred place; but if the species do not appear, the vomit must be burned, and the ashes thrown into a sacred place.

Idolatrous Worship

We have already shown the absurdity of the doctrine of transubstantiation, and the blasphemous character of the sacrifice of mass. We now come to consider the idolatrous worship connected therewith. The Catholic authorities admit that “it is eating of the very God we worship.” The priest takes a part of a substance which the farmer grows in his field, lays it upon an altar, pronounces a few words of consecration over it, and suddenly it turns into a god! There is no bread nor wine left on the table after the words of consecration. It is now Christ—“Christ entire,” “the body, soul, blood, and divinity of Jesus Christ.” Next, the priest falls before it and worships it, then holds it up before his congregation, saying to them in Latin, “Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.” Then they all bow their heads in reverence and worship. After this the priest and people eat it—chew it between their teeth and swallow it down into their stomachs. In all history, who ever heard of even the pagans making a god, then worshipping it, and afterwards eating it? But this is the Catholics’ practice, and they cannot deny it.

The devotees of the Church of Rome worship the wafer in the sacrament with the same honor with which they worship God. This is virtually worshipping a piece of bread. Papal Rome is but a continuation of pagan Rome, under a Christian garb. The papal beast

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

of Revelation 13 is the offspring of the great red dragon—pagan Rome—of Revelation 12.

After the Council of Trent plainly declared that after the consecration the bread and the wine in the sacrament are changed “into our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man,” it decided:

There is, therefore, no room to doubt but that the faithful of Christ should adore this most holy sacrament with the highest worship due to the true God, according to the constant usage of the Catholic Church. Nor is it the less to be thus adored, that it was instituted by Christ our Lord to be eaten.—Third Sess. XIII, e. 5, can. 6.

If anyone shall say that this holy sacrament should not be adored, nor solemnly carried about in procession, nor held up publicly for the people to adore it . . . let him be accursed.—Id.

From the above we see that Romanists worship the round wafer not only at the time of receiving it, but also when it is carried about in the streets. At the sound of a bell all persons are admonished to worship the passing god. Those who refuse to do so, or dare to say the practice is wrong, are pronounced accursed by the great Roman Council of Trent. Thus under the threat of a curse, the Romanists are commanded to offer supreme adoration to a piece of bread, which a mouse may run off with and eat, or, as the Roman Missal says, “The priest himself may eat and vomit, and then eat again.” This is rank idolatry, and really worse than can be found among the pagans.

The primitive church had no such practice. It was not until 1215 A. D. that the Council of Lateran, under Pope Innocent III, made transubstantiation an article of faith. In the year 1216 A. D. Pope Honorius ordered that the priest, at a certain part of the mass service, “should elevate the host, and cause the people to prostrate themselves in worshipping it.” In thus adoring the consecrated bread

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

with the worship that is due to God only, these people make themselves idolaters as much as the heathen. It is rank idolatry to worship that for God which is not God. Then all who worship the wafer are idolaters. That which they worship we have clearly proved is not God, but a mere wafer—a piece of bread.

The following from *Delineation of Roman Catholicism*, by Chas. Elliott, sets forth the idolatry in the worship of the host:¹

All the marks that the Scriptures give us of an idol, and all the reproaches they cast upon it, do as well suit the popish god in the sacrament, and as heavily light upon it, as anything that was worshiped by the heathen. It is the mark and reproach of a heathen idol that it was made by men. And is not the god in the mass as much the work of men's hands as any of the pagan idols were! Let none be offended when we say the Romanists make their god, or make the body and blood of Christ, for it is their own word, and solemnly used by them. And one of the greatest reasons for which they deny the validity of Protestant ministers is, because in their ordination they do not pretend to confer a power of making the body of Christ.

Moreover, the Scripture not only describes an idol, but also exposes it to laughter and contempt, by reckoning up the many outrages and ill-usages it is obnoxious to, and from which it cannot rescue itself. Now there is no abuse of this kind which they reckon up, but the god which the Roman Catholics adore in the mass is as subject to as any pagan idol ever was. If Laban be laughed at for serving gods which were stolen away (Gen. 31:30), are they not as much to be laughed at whose god has been so often in danger of being stolen by thieves, that they have been

¹ This text is from the Authorized Version Instead of the Douay, because Mr. Elliott has so quoted it. There is no material difference between the two versions in their rendition of this text.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

forced to make a law for his safe custody! If men are reproached for worshiping what at last may be cast to the moles and bats (Isa. 2:20), are not the Romanists equally censurable for worshiping that which may become the prey of rats and mice, etc.! If it was a sufficient proof that the Babylonian gods were idols because they were carried away captive, will it not be as good an argument to prove the host of the mass to be an idol! For they carry it about from place to place to be worshiped, and there is one day in the year set apart for that purpose, namely, Corpus Christi Day. And if we may believe history, this host has been likewise taken from the Christians and carried away captive by the Mohammedans.

In the forty-fourth chapter of Isaiah we have the following description of an idol: "The smith with the tongs both worketh in the coals, and fashioneth it with hammers, and worketh it with the strength of his arms. . . . The carpenter stretcheth out his rule; he marketh it out with a line; he fitteth it with planes, and he marketh it out with the compass, and maketh it after the figure of a man, according to the beauty of a man; that it may remain in the house. . . . He burneth part thereof in the fire; with part thereof he eateth flesh: . . . and the residue thereof he maketh a god, even his graven image: he falleth down unto it, and worshipeth it, and prayeth unto it, and saith, Deliver me, for thou art my god." The parallel between this and making the host and its worship is very striking.

The farmer soweth wheat, it grows, it ripens, is reaped, and is threshed; it is ground at the mill, it is sifted with a sieve; with a part thereof the fowls and cattle are fed; another part is taken and baked by the baker, yet it is no god; it is brought forward and laid on the altar, and yet it is no god; the priest handles and crosses it, and yet it is no god; he pronounces over it a few words, when instantly it is the supreme God. He falls down before it and prays to it, saying, "Thou art my God." He lifts it up to the people, and cries, "Ecce Agnus Dei, qui tollit mundi peccata"—"Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world."

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

The whole congregation fall down and worship it, crying, “Mea culpa, mea culpa, mea maxima culpa”—“My fault, my fault, my very great fault.” How exact the parallel between popish and heathen idolatry!

The idolatry of the Romish church is more flagrant than that of the heathen. The latter do not hold that the images before whom they fall and worship are the real gods, but only representations of the real deities they worship; whereas the former believe that the wafer (bread) “is the very God himself,” “contains the body, blood, soul, and divinity of the very Christ.” And they worship it and adore it, believing it to be the Deity himself. They make a Savior out of bread, worship it, then eat it. Cicero, who was a pagan himself, expressly says “that among all the religions of his time, there was no man so foolish as to pretend to eat his god.”—*De Nat. Deorum, lib. iii.*

In every mass, as soon as the priest has consecrated the bread and the wine, with bended knees he adores the sacrament. He worships that very thing which is before him upon the paten and in the chalice. With his head and soul bowing toward it, he prays to it as to Christ: “Lamb of God, who takest away the sin of the world, have mercy on us.”—*Roman Missal, p. 219.* These words he repeats three times. Thus he gives the supreme worship of both body and mind to it, as to God or Christ himself. When the wine is consecrated, the priest, in like manner, “falling on his knees, adores it, rises, shows it to the people, puts the cup in its place, covers it over, and again adores it.” Thus they worship and offer prayer to what Paul terms “BREAD,” and what Jesus himself said is “the fruit of the vine.”

The Roman “Litany of the Blessed Sacrament,” which is found in most of their books of devotion, shows that they actually worship and offer prayer to the consecrated bread.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

O living bread, which came down from heaven, have mercy on us.

O wheat of the elect, have mercy on us.

O wine, which makest virgins to spring forth, have mercy on us.

O bread which is fat, and yieldeth dainties to kings, have mercy on us.

Continual feast, have mercy on us.

Clean oblation, have mercy on us.

Food of angels, have mercy on us.

Hidden manna, have mercy on us.

Supersubstantial bread, have mercy on us.

Chalice of benediction, have mercy on us.

Bread, by the omnipotence of the word, changed into flesh, have mercy on us. Etc.

I again quote from the Council of Trent to emphasize this point.

IF ANYONE SHALL SAY THAT THE SACRAMENT IS NOT TO BE WORSHIPED BY A PECULIAR FEAST, NOR TO BE SOLEMNLY CARRIED ABOUT IN PROCESSIONS, ACCORDING TO THE LAUDABLE AND UNIVERSAL MANNER AND CUSTOM OF THE HOLY CHURCH; NOR TO BE PUBLICLY PROPOSED TO THE PEOPLE, THAT IT MAY BE ADORED BY THEM; . . . LET HIM BE ACCURSED.

Thus the Roman Catholics address prayers and hymns to the sacrament as if it were the living God.

This emblem, composed of bread and wine, they honor, pray to, and trust in.

O my Catholic friends, who have been ignorantly led into such idolatrous worship, for the sake of your soul's eternal welfare, flee idolatry by forever renouncing the apostate Church of Rome, and abide only in Christ, worshiping only the true and living God.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

Space will not permit a consideration of image-worship practiced in the Romish church. This fact, and also the worship of saints, is well known to all. The creed of Pope Pius IV says:

Likewise, that the saints reigning together with Christ, are to be honored and invocated, that they offer prayers to God for us; and that their relics are to be venerated.

The Council of Trent, in its twenty-fifth session, decreed:

The saints, who reign together with Christ, offer their prayers to God for men: that it is a good and a useful thing suppliantly to invoke them, and to flee to their prayers, help, and assistance.

To honor the saints who sleep in the Lord, to invoke their intercession, and to venerate their sacred relics and ashes . . . tends considerably to increase the glory of God.—Id., p. 329.

It is an undeniable fact that these worshipers bow to the image of Mary, adore her, and offer prayers to her. I have before me a number of the forms of prayer used by the Catholics, in which they beseech this “holy mother of God” to deliver them, and to grant them help such as God alone can give.

Penance—Absolution-Auricular Confession

Space will not permit a thorough discussion of the doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome relative to penance, absolution, and auricular confession; but I will endeavor briefly to set them and their absurdities before the reader.

The Roman church calls repentance “penance.” This they say is a sacrament. I quote from their standard of doctrine, the Council of Trent, fourteenth session:

If anyone says that the Catholic Church penance is not truly a sacrament, instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, to reconcile the faithful to God, as often as they sin after baptism; let him be accursed.—Can. 1.

If these [baptized persons] afterwards defile themselves by any transgression, it is not his will that they should be cleansed by a repetition of baptism, which is on no account lawful in the Catholic Church, but they should be placed as offenders before the tribunal of penance, that they may be absolved by the sentence of the priests, not once only, but as often as they flee thereto, confessing their sins.—Can. 2.

Though the priest’s absolution is the dispensation of a benefit which belongs to another, yet it is not to be considered as merely a ministry, whether to publish the gospel or to declare the remission of sins, but as the nature of a judicial act, in which

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

sentence is pronounced by him as judge; and therefore the penitent ought not to flatter himself on account of his faith, for faith without penance cannot procure remission of sins.—Can. 5.

Whosoever shall affirm that the priest's sacramental absolution is not a judicial act . . . let him be accursed.—Can. 9.

The Council further teaches, that even those priests who are living in mortal sin exercise the function of forgiving sins, as the ministers of Christ, by the power of the Holy Spirit conferred on them in ordination; and that those who contend that wicked priests have not this power, hold very erroneous sentiments.—Can. 6.

Whosoever shall affirm that priests living in mortal sin have not the power of binding and loosing, or that priests are not the only ministers of absolution, etc.; let him be accursed.—Can. 10.

A wicked priest can validly absolve.—Peter Dens.

Our sins are forgiven by the absolution of the priest. The voice of the priest, who is legitimately constituted a minister for the remission of sins, is to be heard as that of Christ himself.—Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 239.

The absolution of the priest, which is expressed in words, seals the remission of sins, which it accomplishes in the soul.—Id., p. 240.

Unlike the authority given to the priests of the old law, to declare the leper cleansed from his leprosy, the power which the priests of the new law are invested is not simply to declare that sins are forgiven, but, as the ministers of God, really to absolve from sin.—Id., p. 242.

There is no sin, however grievous, no crime, however enormous, or however frequently repeated, which penance does not remit.—Id., p. 243.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

Without the intervention of penance we cannot obtain, or even hope for pardon.—Id., p. 244.

The penitent must also submit himself to the judgment of the priest, who is the vicegerent of God.—Id., p. 245.

The form of absolution used by the priest is:

I absolve thee from thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.—Peter Dens.

I judicially bestow on thee the grace of the remission of all thy sins, or grace of itself remissive of all thy sins.—Id.

Reader, observe that the priests of Rome claim the power to “*judge*” the souls of men, and by “a judicial act” absolve from all sin. The voice of the priest in this “is to be heard as that of Christ himself.” Every priest “is the vicegerent of God,” and “there is *no sin*, however grievous, *no crime*, however enormous,” but what he has power to forgive, or absolve from. Even priests guilty of “mortal sin” have this power. These claims the Romish church unblushingly makes. What further proof is needed that she is the great Antichrist that Christ and the apostles foretold would come? The Romish church thus fulfils to the very letter the prediction of Paul in 2 Thess. 2:3, 4: “Let no man deceive you by any means, for unless there come a revolt first, and the man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth, and is lifted up above all that is called God, or that is worshiped, so that he sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself as if he were God.” Every priest of Rome, in his claim that there is “no sin, no crime, however enormous,” but what he has power to absolve, exalts himself above all that is called God; for God himself declares there is one sin for which there is no forgiveness. In fact, every priest, in claiming power to judiciously absolve from guilt and judge the souls of men, “sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself as if he were God.”

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

The means of salvation as clearly set forth in the New Testament, is “penance TOWARD GOD, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ” (Acts 20: 21). “Repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ,” A. V. None can forgive sins but God alone (Mark 2:7). “Bless the Lord, O my soul, and never forget all he hath done for thee. Who forgiveth all thine iniquities” (Psa. 102:2, 3—103:2, 3, A. V.). “In whom we have redemption through his blood, the remission of sins” (Eph. 1:7). “I am, I am he that blot out thy iniquities for my own sake, and I will not remember thy sins” (Isa. 43:25). “To the Lord our God belong mercy and forgiveness” (Dan. 9:8, 9). “Even as God hath forgiven you in Christ” (Eph. 4:32).

“If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just, to forgive us our sins” (1 John 1:9). These, with a multitude of other texts, clearly teach that to God alone belongs the power to absolve from guilt and sin.

John 20:23 was never understood by the primitive ministry and church as the Romanists now interpret it. Christ made clear his meaning in the final commission which he gave to his ministry: “Preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned.” “That penance [repentance, A. V.] and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all nations” (Luke 24:27). Thus on the day of Pentecost Peter preached, “Do penance [repent, A. V.], and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins” (Acts 2:38). “Be penitent [repent, A. V.], therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out” (Acts 3:19). “By his name all receive remission of sins, who believe in him” (Acts 10:43). Paul was sent to the Gentiles “to open their eyes, that they may be converted from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins,

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

and a lot among the saints, by the faith that is in me” (Acts 26:18). “To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith which is in me,” A. V. These texts clearly set forth the apostolic manner of remitting and retaining sins. It was through the ministry of the Word. Thus “it pleased God, by the foolishness of our preaching, to save them that believe” (1 Cor. 1:21). The gospel message was: “Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.” None of the primitive ministers claimed judicial power to remit or to retain sins, but fulfilled this statement of Jesus only declaratively or ministerially.

When we study the nature of sin, the absurdity of the Romish claim appears all the clearer. Sin is the transgression of God’s law, an offense against Jehovah himself. Being the transgression of an infinite and holy law, committed against an infinite and holy God, an infinite debt to divine justice is contracted. It is the case of an offending man against an offended God. How can a finite creature, who knows not the thoughts and hearts of his fellow men, and who himself is often “guilty of mortal sin,” assume the responsible position of absolving the guilty from their sins, which God alone can do? There were no confessionals in the primitive church. There is no record in the New Testament of any of the ministers claiming to exercise the judicial power of the Romish priesthood. They pointed men to Christ. “Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.” “Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unjust man his thoughts, and let him return to the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him, and to our God: for he is bountiful to forgive” (Isa. 55:7).

As to the confessional, the Catholics teach that we should not confess our sins direct to God, but privately to a priest, and this they

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

are pleased to call “auricular confession.” The Council of Lateran decrees:

That every man and woman, after they come to years of discretion, should privately confess their sins to their own priest, at least once a year, and endeavor faithfully to perform the penance enjoined on them; and after this they should come to the sacrament at least at Easter, unless the priest, for some reasonable cause, judges it fit for them to abstain for that time. And whoever does not perform this is to be excommunicated out of the church, and if he die, he is not to be allowed Christian burial.

The Council of Trent decrees, Sess. xiv:

Canon 6. Whoever shall deny that sacramental confession was instituted by divine command, or that it is necessary to salvation; or shall affirm that the practice of secretly confessing to the priest alone, as it has been ever observed by the Catholic Church, and is still observed, is foreign to the institution and commanded of Christ, and is a human invention: let him be accursed.

Canon 7. Whoever shall affirm that, in order to obtain forgiveness of sins in the sacrament of penance, it is not necessary by divine command to confess all and every mortal sin which occurs to the memory after due and diligent premeditation—including secret offenses, and those which have been committed against the two last precepts of the decalogue, and those circumstances which change the species of sin; but that such confession is only useful for the instruction and consolation of the penitent, and was formerly observed merely as a canonical satisfaction imposed upon him; or shall affirm that those who labor to confess all their sins wish to leave nothing to be pardoned by the divine mercy; or finally, that it is not lawful to confess venial sins; let him be accursed.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

Canon 8. Whoever shall affirm that the confession of every sin, according to the custom of the church, is impossible, and merely a human tradition, which the pious should reject; or that all Christians, of both sexes, are not bound to observe the same once a year, according to the constitution of the great Council of Lateran; and therefore that the faithful in Christ are to be persuaded not to confess in Lent; let him be accursed.

From the Catechism of the Council of Trent we take the following extracts:

Mortal sins, as we have already said, although buried in the darkest secrecy, and also sins of desire only, such as are forbidden by the ninth and tenth commandments, are all and each of them to be made matter of confession.—P. 258.

With the bare enumeration of our mortal sins we should not be satisfied; that enumeration we should accompany with the relation of such circumstances as considerably aggravate or extenuate their malice.— P. 259.

After censuring those who justify or extenuate their sins, the Catechism declares:

Still more pernicious is the conduct of those who, yielding to a foolish bashfulness, cannot induce themselves to confess their sins. Such persons are to be encouraged by exhortation, and to be reminded that there is no reason whatever why they should yield to such false delicacy; that to no one can it appear surprising if persons fall into sin, the common malady of the human race, and the natural appendage of human misery.—P. 264.

The following is the general form of confession:

I confess to Almighty God, to blessed Mary, ever a virgin, to blessed Michael the Archangel, to blessed John the Baptist, to the holy apostles Peter and Paul, to all the saints, and to thee, father, that I have sinned exceedingly, in thought, word, and

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

deed, through my fault, through my most grievous fault: therefore I beseech the blessed Mary, ever a virgin, the blessed Michael the Archangel, the blessed John the Baptist, the holy apostles Peter and Paul, all the saints, and thee, father, to pray to the Lord our God for me.

To enlightened minds, the above quotations are sufficient, without any comment, to show the blasphemous and idolatrous observance of Roman confession. They usually resort to Jas. 5:16, as an excuse for the practice. “Confess therefore your sins one to another.” “Confess your faults one to another,” A. V. But this passage says nothing about a confessional in which penitents are to enter, whispering their sins, even secret sins, into the ears of wicked priests who themselves are guilty of mortal sin. There is as much foundation in the text for the priest to confess his sins to the people as the people to the priest. Again, there is not a hint in the text about any absolution being granted by a priest.

Whoever read in the New Testament where Peter, Paul, or any of the other apostles set up a confessional of any kind, as installed in the Roman church? God alone is the one to whom confession is to be made. “I have acknowledged my sin to thee, and my injustice I have not concealed. I said I will confess against myself my injustice to the Lord: and thou hast forgiven the wickedness of my sin” (Psa. 31:5—32:5, A. V.). “Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy great mercy. And according to the multitude of thy tender mercies blot out my iniquity. Wash me yet more from my iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin. . . . To thee only have I sinned” (Psa. 50:1-6—51:1-6, A. V.). The cry of the publican was, “O God, be merciful to me a sinner” (Luke 18:13).

I will conclude this chapter with the following quotation from Elliott on Romanist, pp. 318, 319:

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

The instructions on this point given to Roman Catholic priests in some of their seminaries train them to falsehood; yea, more, their theology, as a system, insists upon perjury, and demands it of their confessors. This is a heavy charge, and the proof ought to be called for and produced. Here is the proof: Peter Dens, in his *Theology*, which is the class-book in the Maynooth College, in Ireland, and is generally used in most Roman Catholic theological schools, and is approved of by the dignitaries of the Church of Rome, teaches as follows what the duty of confessors is in reference to what is communicated to them in confession:

“Can a case be given in which it is lawful to break the secrecy of confession? Ans. None can be given; although the life or salvation of a man, or the destruction of the commonwealth, would depend thereon. For the pope himself cannot dispense with it; because the secrecy of the seal of confession is more binding than the obligation of an oath, a vow, a natural secret, etc.; and it depends on the positive will of God.

“What then ought a confessor to answer when interrogated respecting any truth which he knows only by sacramental confession? Ans. He ought to answer that he does not know it; and, if necessary, to confirm that by an oath.

“Obj. It is not lawful to lie in any case; but the confessor lies, because he knows the truth; therefore, etc. Ans. The minor proposition is denied: because such a confessor is interrogated as a man, and answers as man; but he does not know this truth as man, though he knows it as God; as St. Thoman Aquinas says, q. ii, art. 1, ad. 3: and this sense properly exists naturally in the very answer; for when he is interrogated or answers in other cases than confession, he is considered as a man.

“But what if the confessor is directly asked whether he knows that by sacramental confession? Ans. In this case he ought to answer nothing: so says Steyart with Sylvius. But such an interrogation is to be rejected as impious: or the confessor can

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

say absolutely, not relatively, to the inquiry, (Ego nihil scio,) I know nothing; because the word (Ego) I, refers to human knowledge. In like manner, if a confessor should be cited before a court for trial, that he might give a reason for the denial, he ought to contend that in this matter HE KNOWS NO SUPERIOR BUT GOD.”

From the foregoing, it follows that the Church of Rome teaches and practices that (1) what a priest knows in confession, he knows it not as man, but as God; (2) hence, if a priest hears a thing in confession, and if, being asked and sworn, he shall say he never heard such a thing, he neither lies nor is perjured; (3) it is not lawful to reveal anything that is told only in confession, though it be to avoid the greatest evil, such as the death of a man, his damnation, the destruction of the commonwealth, etc. Hence we infer, that should the life of the president of the United States be in danger, or should states be in danger of destruction, a priest must not reveal a secret obtained through confession, should the discovery save the life of the chief magistrate, or preserve the whole union from ruin.

Indeed, it would be difficult to find, in so many words, such a total disregard to truth, and such blasphemous assumptions, as are contained in this quotation from Dens. Here blasphemy is unblushingly taught; for the priest here affects to act as God, thereby making himself equal with God, and manifesting the marked character of antichrist, who “sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself as if he were God.” Here, too, a known and deliberate lie, according to this veracious Roman Catholic writer, may be told, and told by a preacher of religion, connected, too, with administering a sacrament, as they call it. To this is to be added perjury, in order to make the deliberate lie pass for truth. Besides, the life of a man, or even his salvation, or the destruction, “interitus reipublicae,” the overthrow of our republican government (to use the very words of

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

Dens), are considered small matters, if necessary to keep up the authority of the Roman Catholic priesthood! It is useless to inquire what kind of citizens Roman Catholic priests will make, when they are taught such horrible principles.

The Doctrine of Purgatory

The following presents the teaching of the Church of Rome concerning purgatory:

I constantly hold that there is a purgatory, and that the souls detained therein are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.—Creed of Pope Pius IV.

It is a place in which the souls of the pious dead, obnoxious to temporal punishment, make satisfaction.—Dens' Theology, No. 25.

Since the Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Spirit from the Sacred writings and the ancient traditions of the fathers, hath taught in holy councils, and lastly in this ecumenical council, that there is a purgatory; and that the souls detained there are assisted by the suffrages of the faithful, but especially by the acceptable sacrifice of the mass; this holy council commands all bishops diligently to endeavor that the wholesome doctrine concerning purgatory . . . be believed, held, taught, and everywhere preached by Christ's faithful.—Council of Trent, 25th session.

If anyone shall say that after the reception of the grace of justification the guilt is so remitted to the penitent sinner, and the penalty of eternal punishment destroyed, that no penalty of temporal punishment remains to be paid, either in this world, or in the future in purgatory, before the access to the kingdom of

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

heaven can lie open; let him be anathema.—Council of Trent, 6th session, Can. 30.

In the fire of purgatory, the souls of just men are cleansed by a temporary punishment, in order to be admitted into their eternal country.—Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 63.

Q. Whither go such as die in mortal sin? A. To hell, to all eternity. Q. Whither go such as die in venial sin, or not having fully satisfied for the punishment due to their mortal sins? A. To purgatory, till they have made full satisfaction for them, then to heaven.—Douay Catechism.

As to the location of this fictitious place, I quote from the orthodox Roman Catholic Dens:

Q. Where is purgatory? A. The ordinary place of purgatory, which properly and commonly is understood by that name, is under the earth, and adjoining to hell.—Dens, Purgatory, No. 27, Vol. VII, p. 400.

From the above-cited quotations it will be seen that the Church of Rome positively teaches that “under the earth, and adjoining to hell,” is a place which they are pleased to call purgatory. Into this place the dead in Christ, “just men,” whose “mortal sins were already pardoned,” and whose “venial sins” were atoned for in the sacrifice of mass, must go at death and suffer “a temporary punishment”; and this is a place of “fire,” in which “fire of purgatory, the souls of just men are cleansed,” “in order to be admitted into the eternal country.” The misery and suffering of these righteous souls in purgatory can be mitigated “by the suffrages of the faithful.” This they define as the procuring of masses to be said for the dead, procuring indulgences, votes of the faithful, variously given by prayers, offerings, purchasing masses, etc. These are all paid for by the living friends of the deceased; which is neither more nor less than paying money to the priests. Thus this fabulous Romish

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

story, which originated about the end of the sixth century under Pope Gregory the Great, is an amazing source of profit financially to the Roman clergy. In the fear of God, we affirm that this giving of money to the priests for the souls of the righteous who are supposed to be tormented in the fires of purgatory is a clear fulfilment of Peter's prediction that false prophets would bring in "sects of perdition" and "through covetousness shall they with feigned words *make merchandise of you*" "and their perdition slumbereth not" (2 Pet. 2:1-3). Rome is none other than the great Babylon of Revelation, which is said to make "merchandise" of the "souls of men" (Revelation 18).

This is another evidence that papal Rome is but a continuation of pagan Rome clothed in a Christian garb. Before Gregory the Great, the doctrine of purgatory was taught by no one but by heathen poets and philosophers. Cardinal Bellarmine admits this.—*Bellarmino: De Purg, lib. 1, c. 11*. Thus it will be seen that this unreasonable doctrine originated with the heathen and was copied by the Roman bishops. It truly can be said of it that it is heathenish.

It is squarely contrary to the plain teaching of Scripture. Saith the Lord, "I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more" (Jer. 31:34). "I am, I am he that blot out thy iniquities for my own sake, *and I will not remember thy sins*" (Isa. 43:25). "Their sins I will remember no more" (Heb. 8:12). "By his own blood, entered once into the holies, having obtained eternal redemption" (Heb. 9:12). "Now once at the end of ages hath he appeared, for the destruction of sin, by the sacrifice of himself" (Heb. 9:26). "For by one oblation he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified" (Heb. 10:14). "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin" (1 John 1:7). He hath "washed us from our sins in his own blood" (Rev. 1:5). "He became, to all that obey him, the cause of

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

eternal salvation” (Heb. 5:9). But why multiply texts? There is no other remedy for sin and its punishment but the blood of Jesus. There is no need of a purgatory. The blood now “cleanseth from all sin.” It purifies the heart. “Blessed are the clean of heart: for they shall see God.” When we are purged from all our sins in the blood of Jesus and cleansed from all sin’s defiling, we are said to be “perfected FOREVER,” sanctified, the possessors of “ETERNAL SALVATION.” Our past sins will be remembered no more. This leaves no place for purgatory. The righteous are said to possess “everlasting life” now, and how can this harmonize with a period of suffering in the fires of purgatory? Also, those who are saved are said to be possessed with “everlasting joy” now, and they are commanded to “rejoice evermore.” How can this harmonize with a period of torment awaiting us in purgatory?

“Being justified therefore by faith, let us have peace with God” (Rom. 5:1). “Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God,” A. V. This is a peace which Jesus said would abide. Such a state of peace with God cannot agree with purgatory. “There is now therefore no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus” (Rom. 8:1). And as far as the future is concerned, such “cometh not into judgment” (John 5:24).

If there is a purgatory of fire and torment awaiting “just men” after death, surely Simeon had a surprise awaiting him on the other side; for he said, “Now thou dost dismiss thy servant, O Lord, according to thy word in peace” (Luke 2:29). Paul said: “I am straitened between two: having a desire to be dissolved and to be with Christ, a thing by far the better” (Phil. 1:23); and again, “To die is gain.” If he woke up in the next world tormented “in the fire of purgatory,” to be “cleansed by a temporary punishment, in order to be admitted into the eternal country,” surely his surprise must have

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

been unbounded. There is no record of anyone's offering mass for the dead in those days, nor of the primitive saints' paying money to the priest for Paul's deliverance, therefore, according to Romish teaching, the Apostle had to remain in the fire until he himself "had paid the uttermost farthing." The unreasonableness of such a doctrine appears on the very face of it.

Everywhere the Scriptures teach that in time and life man is on probation, with the power to choose eternal life or eternal death. Provision has been made through the atonement of Christ to fully save every man from all sin and to preserve blameless every believer "unto His heavenly kingdom." The entire human family is now divided into two classes—the righteous, and the wicked. Only two destinies await these classes after death, and the same will be true beyond the great judgment-day. When men pass through the portals of death, they enter into eternity. In that future state we read of but two places or states. The just at death are carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom—the paradise of God (see Luke 16:23)—where, immediately after death, they are "comforted" (Luke 16:25). Jesus knew nothing of purgatory when he said to the dying thief, "Today thou shalt be with me in paradise." "Blessed are the dead, who die in the Lord. From henceforth, now, saith the Spirit, that they may *rest* from their labors" (Rev. 14:13). "There the wicked cease from tumult, and there the wearied in strength are at rest" (Job 3:17). How different the Scriptures sound beside the Romish teaching of a purgatory of fire and torment for just men after death! Paul positively teaches that when we are absent from the body, we are present with the Lord (2 Cor. 5:8).

Thousands of departing souls have testified that they heard the angels singing and were going to a place of rest and happiness. Is it possible that all these were mistaken, and that the Creator put it into

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

the hearts of his children, in the most solemn hour of their existence, to testify to a falsehood? Would men who would disdain a lie, be made to speak an unconscious one in the hour of death? Was Stephen mistaken when he looked up “stedfastly to heaven, saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God”? and a little later when he addressed his Savior thus: “Lord Jesus, receive my spirit”? Was the apostle Paul mistaken when he said, “We know” that when this earthly house, this mortal body, dissolves in death, we shall “be with Christ”—be absent from the body, and “PRESENT WITH THE LORD”?

The Gospel to the Dead

“For, for this cause was the gospel preached also to the dead: that they might be judged indeed according to men, in the flesh; but may live according to God, in the Spirit” (1 Pet. 4:6). “Because Christ also died once for our sins, the just for the unjust: that he might offer us to God, being put to death indeed in the flesh, but enlivened in the spirit, in which also coming he preached to those spirits that were in prison: which had been some time incredulous, when they waited for the patience of God in the days of Noe, when the ark was a building: wherein a few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water” (1 Pet. 3:18-20).

These two texts are the main ones relied upon for the erroneous doctrines of purgatory, saying masses for the dead, and praying for the dead. But I am sure that after a careful reading, it must take a great stretch of the imagination to read into these passages such doctrines as mass and purgatory. Nothing of the kind is even hinted.

As to the first of these texts, I will submit the following renderings: “For this indeed was the effect of the preaching of the gospel to the dead, that some will be punished as carnal men; but others lead a spiritual life unto God.”—*Wakefield*. “For this cause was the gospel preached to them that were dead; that they who live according to men in the flesh, may be condemned; but that they who live according to God in the Spirit, may live.”—*Knatchbull*.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

By “the dead” Peter evidently refers to those who had lived and died under the old dispensation, in counter-distinction to those who are now living under the gospel. “The most intelligible meaning (of 1 Pet. 3:18, 19; 4:6) suggested by the context is, that Christ by his spirit preached to those who, in the time of Noe, while the ark was preparing were disobedient, and whose spirits are *now* in prison abiding the general judgment.” In the text under consideration, however, special reference is made to the antediluvian world. When did these people have the gospel preached to them?

In Heb. 4:2 it is plainly taught that the gospel was preached to those under the Old Testament as well as to us under the New. To them, of course, it was preached in promise and prophecy, and demonstrated in type and shadow; but it was preached to them while they were living here upon the earth. The effect of the gospel was, in essence, the same to those under the Old Testament as to us under the New. To many of them the word preached “did not profit them, not being mixed with faith of those things they heard.” Such “will be punished as carnal men,” for they “who lived according to men in the flesh” will be “judged,” or “condemned.” But those who, like Abraham, believed God, and in type and shadow “drank of that spiritual rock that followed them” (Christ), shall “live according to God, in the spirit.” In other words, those who led “a spiritual life unto God” here below, will enjoy the bliss of eternal life beyond. The result of this preaching was that “eight souls were saved,” while the remainder “perished.”

Christ, “by the Spirit,” preached to those people through human instrumentality. Hence Noah is called by this same apostle “the preacher of justice” (2 Pet. 2:5). From Jude 14, 16 it is evident that Enoch also preached and warned the ungodly at that time. Methuselah was three hundred and sixty-nine years old when Noah

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

was born (see Gen. 5:25, 28). Noah was “six hundred years old, when the waters of the flood overflowed the earth” (Gen. 7:6). Methuselah lived to be nine hundred and sixty-nine years old (Gen. 5:27), and then died a natural death; but according to these dates, he lived until the year of the flood. Being the son of Enoch, who walked with God, he is classed with the “sons of God.” We would naturally infer that Methuselah also warned the disobedient people of his time.

Peter informs us in this same epistle that the Spirit that was in those ancient men of God was the Spirit of Christ (1 Pet. 1:11). Thus by the Spirit Christ strove with that ancient “world of the ungodly,” warned them by Noah and others, and “waited” long for their repentance. It may be objected that Christ preached to “spirits.” We read that the Lord is the “God of the spirits of all flesh” (Num. 16:22), and that he is “the Father of spirits” (Heb. 12:9), and in these texts reference is made to men who are yet in the flesh. The soul, or spirit, of man is the volitional part of his being. It is that part which sins and must be saved through the blood of Christ. This objection will be obviated, however, if we take into consideration the fact brought out by the context, that Christ preached by his Spirit to those who are now spirits in prison.

There is no indication in the Scripture under consideration that the antediluvians nor anyone else had another chance of salvation after death. The only preaching of Christ to them with the object of their salvation was that which was offered them “in the days of Noe, when the ark was a building.”

Even some Roman Catholic writers are forced to admit that 1 Pet. 3:18-20 is no good foundation for purgatory or masses for the dead.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

But we may doubt whether this be the meaning of St. Peter in this place.—Calmet.

He who, in our times, coming in the flesh, preached the way of life to the world, even he himself came before the flood, and preached to them who then were unbelievers, and lived carnally. For even he, by his Holy Spirit, was in Noah, and in the rest of the holy men which were at that time, and by their good conversation preached to the wicked men of that age, that they might be converted to better manners.—Bede.

The Church of Rome Described in Daniel's Prophecy

In Dan. 7:2-8 four great universal kingdoms, which ruled in succession in ancient times, are brought to view under the symbols of four beasts. An angel gave Daniel the following interpretation of the vision: "These four great beasts are four kingdoms, which shall arise out of the earth" (v. 17). These were the Babylonian, Medo-Persian, Grecian, and Roman kingdoms. The last one concerns us most. In the vision it was seen as "a fourth beast, terrible and wonderful, and exceeding strong, it had great iron teeth, eating and breaking in pieces, and treading down the rest with its feet: and it was unlike the other beasts which I had seen before it, and had ten horns. I considered the horns, and behold another little horn sprung out of the midst of them: and three of the first horns were plucked up at the presence thereof: and behold eyes like the eyes of man, were in this horn, and a mouth speaking great things" (vv. 7, 8). "I beheld, and lo, that horn made war against the saints, and prevailed over them" (v. 21).

This the angel interpreted: "And the ten horns of the same kingdom, shall be ten kings: and another shall rise up after them, and he shall be mightier than the former, and he shall bring down three kings. And he shall speak words against the High One, and shall crush the saints of the most High: and he shall think himself

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

able to change times and laws, and they shall be delivered into his hand until a time, and times, and the half a time. And judgment shall sit, that his power may be taken away, and be broken in pieces, and perish even to the end” (vv. 24-26).

This fourth kingdom was Rome. She devoured, broke in pieces, and crushed the nations with her iron rule. “Horn” denotes power. The ten horns are the ten kingdoms which grew out of the Roman Empire. Next came up a “little horn.” This was popery, which grew out of heathen Rome. Three of the ten—the Heruli, Ostrogoths, and Lombards—were plucked up by this one. His “mouth speaking great things,” “great words against the High One,” was fulfilled in the great assumptions of the pope. These have all been considered in previous chapters. “That horn made war against the saints, and prevailed over them”; and it was to “crush the saints of the Most High.” This was fulfilled in the long period of martyrdom, when millions were slaughtered because they would not accept the doctrines of the papacy. This horn (power) grew out of paganism. Though clothed in a Christian garb, it was the same persecuting power. Where heathen Rome slaughtered her thousands, Christian (?) Rome slaughtered her millions. The Romanists try to shift this responsibility to the temporal kings, but it must be remembered that during the dark ages of martyrdom, these kings were but the obedient servants of the pope. Changing times had a fulfilment under the papacy. When the pope takes ordinary time and makes *holy* time of it, he is assuming a right which belongs to God alone. In the preceding chapters it is abundantly shown that the Romish church has made null and void many of the fundamental truths of the Bible, and substituted in their stead human tradition. This is changing laws. The reign of this power is limited to “a time and times and the half a time.” This is the exact time the woman (church)

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

was to continue in the desert (Rev. 12:14). The reign of popery, then, covers the desert state of the church.

It is further said that “his power may be taken away, and be broken in pieces, and perish even to the end.” This is in perfect accord with Paul’s testimony in 2 Thessalonians 2, that the man of sin was to be killed with the spirit of the Lord’s mouth, and be destroyed with the brightness of his coming. This consuming began with the reformation, is continued in the evening light of this dispensation, and will reach its grand climax at the second advent of Christ. The present destruction is effected by the executing of the flaming judgments of truth against this false worship and false system of religion. From the Reformation until now, the temporal power of the papacy has been on a rapid decline. The very governments that once upheld her have turned Protestant. Rome never again will exercise universal dominion as she once did. This consuming of her power and influence is to continue “to the end.” Her final doom is foretold by the prophet in these words: “I saw that the beast was slain, and the body thereof was destroyed, and given to the fire to be burnt.”

The Papacy Portrayed in the Revelation

In Revelation 12 we have the symbol of “a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns: and on his heads seven diadems” (v. 3). This dragon represents Rome under the pagan religion. Rome was truly a dragon power. Its color—red—denotes its bloodthirstiness. Its seven heads represent the seven supreme forms of government that ruled successively in the empire—the regal power, the dictatorship, the decemvirate, the consular, the triumvirate, the imperial, and the patriciate. The ten horns of the dragon represent the ten kingdoms which grew out of the Roman empire—the Huns, the Ostrogoths, the Visigoths, the Franks, the Vandals, the Suevi, the Burgundians, the Heruli, the Anglo-Saxons, and the Lombards. The casting down of the stars doubtless refers to the thousands of bright luminaries who were martyred during the reign of paganism. Just as fast as men accepted the Christian faith the pagans were ready to devour them. Bloody were the days of the church under pagan Rome.

In this same chapter the church is seen in her primitive glory under the symbol of “a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars” (v. 1). Later this woman “fled into the wilderness,” where she remained in a state of obscurity for “a thousand two hundred sixty days”; “for a time

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

and times, and half a time” (vv. 6, 14). This covers a period of the great apostasy.

After the dragon—pagan Rome—was conquered by Christianity, it is said he was “angry against the woman [church]: and went to make war with the rest of her seed” (v. 17). This he could not do himself, for his power was broken. He accomplished his purpose, however, through his offspring and successor, “the beast.” Through this beast, war was made against the remnant of the seed of the woman—the few who stood true to God during the Dark Ages.

“And I saw a beast coming up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten diadems, and upon his heads names of blasphemy. And the beast, which I saw, was like to a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion. And the dragon gave him his own strength, and great power” (Rev. 13:1, 2). It will be seen that the beast resembles his parent, the dragon. The dragon had seven heads, so had the beast. The dragon had ten horns, so had the beast. But there was a difference. The dragon had his crowns upon his heads, while the beast had his crowns upon his horns. This beast is popery. Popery is a child of pagan Rome, the dragon. During the reign of the empire the seven heads, or forms of government, were the ruling powers; hence the crowns were upon his heads: but when popery arose, the ten kingdoms were the ruling power—the crowns were upon the horns.

This beast is identical with that of Rev. 17:2 and the “little horn” of Daniel 7. A leopard is a spotted animal, a type of sin. Since this beast was “like a leopard,” it represents a very sinful power; and such is the papacy. The resemblance of its feet to the feet of a bear signifies its crushing power. Its “mouth as the mouth of a lion”

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

symbolizes the devouring nature of the papacy. But where did popery get her power? “And the dragon gave him his own strength, and great power.” The ten kingdoms of Rome gave their strength and power to the beast (Rev. 17:13). Instead of popery receiving her power from above, she received it from paganism. The seat of pagan government—Rome—became the seat of papal rule.

“And he took me away in spirit into the desert. And I saw a woman sitting upon a scarlet-colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns” (v. 3). The solution of this will be given in our exegesis of Rev. 17:10, 11. The Roman empire had seven heads, or forms of government. The sixth of these was the imperial. This was the form of government under the heathen Caesars. The time came when the hordes of savages from the North swept over the empire and overthrew the imperial government (A. D. 476). It was wounded to death. Later the patriciate ruled the empire for a short time, after which, under Charlemagne, the imperial power revived as the Holy Roman Empire, controlled by popery. The wound was healed. Imperial Rome was the same under priestcraft and popery that it was under the Caesars. Under the Caesars it was clothed in heathen garb; under priestcraft, in Christian garb. Thus the beast (popery) constituted the eighth head of Rome and yet was one of the seven. “All the earth was in admiration after the beast.” Popery swayed universal dominion.

“And they adored the dragon, which gave power to the beast: and they adored the beast, saying: Who is like to the beast? and who shall be able to fight with him?” (Rev. 13:4). This was fulfilled by the continuance of the pagan worship in the papal age. The high priest of the pagan Romans was called their pontiff. It was customary among them to deify their great men after their death and

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

to make images of them and worship them. So also was it customary among the papists to make saints of their great men after their death by canonizing them. Papists pray to their saints, make images of them, and bow to them as the pagans did to their gods. Papists sprinkle their holy water as the pagans sprinkled their holy water. Papists advocate celibacy as did the pagans. In many other ways Roman Catholics have practiced heathen worship. Thus they have caused the people to worship the dragon.

“And there was given to him a mouth speaking great things, and blasphemies: and power was given to him to do two and forty months. And he opened his mouth unto blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven” (w. 5, 6). This is fulfilled in popery by the blasphemous claims of the pope, who claims various prerogatives of God. These we have already considered.

“And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them. And power was given him over every tribe, and people, and tongue, and nation. And all that dwelt upon the earth adored him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb, which was slain from the beginning of the world” (Rev. 13:7, 8). This was fulfilled in the great persecutions of the Christians under the reign of popery. Papal Rome glutted herself on the blood that heathen Rome only tasted. It is hardly necessary to refer to the bloody reign of the Dark Ages, for nearly all are well acquainted with the facts. I would simply refer the reader to such histories as Fox’s *Book of Martyrs*, *Christian Heroes and Martyrs*, *Martyr’s Mirror*, etc. All people worshiped popery except those whose names were in the book of life. These latter were the ones who suffered martyrdom at her cruel hands.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

In Rev. 13:10 we read: “He that shall lead into captivity, shall go into captivity: he that shall kill by the sword, must be killed by the sword. Here is the patience and the faith of the saints.” Ah! the patience and faith of the saints during that long, bloody night of papal darkness, was the assurance that the very beast-power which was leading them into captivity and killing them with the sword would sometime itself go into captivity and suffer death from the sword. Thank God, their prayers were answered and their hopes realized. In the sixteenth century, God began to raise up reformers, such as Zwingli, Melancthon, and Luther, who hurled the awful thunderbolts of heaven against the beast-power of popery. Truth, so long crushed, began to arise and triumph in the earth. The Reformation spread rapidly in every direction: watch-fires were kindled throughout all Germany and almost all Europe, and thousands threw off the galling yoke of popery and came out into clearer light. God’s kingdom, which was to conquer every opposing power, conquered popery.

The Reformation spread so rapidly and its power became so great that it cast its influence upon the rulers and kings of nations, who turned Protestant. The very rulers and kings that had so long upheld Catholicism now turned against her and gave their support to Protestantism. The sword was turned against the beast. There were thirty years of bloody war in Germany. The universal supremacy of the papal power was broken. That beast which had ruled the earth for 1260 long years was left bleeding and wounded, and it has been growing weaker ever since. It has now been entirely sheared of its temporal power. Thus the prayers of those millions who were slain during its long reign were answered; and the words of God in Rev. 17:16 were fulfilled, where he says that the very kings and rulers who supported the great harlot “shall hate the harlot, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and shall burn her with fire.”

Babylon the Great

As we have seen, the true primitive Church of God is brought to view in Revelation 12 under the symbol of a pure woman. After this the woman fled into the wilderness, or desert. Next, John was carried away in spirit “into the desert” (Rev. 17:3). What did he now see?

“And there came one of the seven angels, who had the seven vials, and spoke with me, saying: Come, I will show thee the condemnation of the great harlot, who sitteth upon many waters, with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication; and they who inhabit the earth, have been made drunk with the wine of her whoredom. And he took me away in spirit into the desert. And I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet-colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. And the woman was clothed round about with purple and scarlet, and gilt with gold, and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand, full of the abominations and filthiness of her fornication. And on her forehead a name was written: A mystery; Babylon the great, the mother of the fornications and the abominations of the earth. And I saw the woman drunk with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus. And I wondered, when I had seen her, with great admiration” (Rev. 17:1-6).

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

Oh, how changed! What a contrast! Instead of a pure woman, that chaste virgin, he now beholds a woman “with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication; and they who inhabit the earth, have been made drunk with the wine of her whoredom.” She holds a cup full of the “filthiness of her fornication.”

This woman is “drunk with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus.” No wonder John wondered with great admiration! Before the apostasy she stood upon the moon—the Word of God (12:1); now she sits “upon a scarlet-colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns.” Ah, beloved reader, this woman represents the apostate church. She is the Catholic church. The beast that carried her is imperial Rome under the popes and bishops. This is made clear by the angel’s interpretation of this marvelous vision.

“And the angel said to me: Why dost thou wonder? I will tell thee the mystery of the woman, and of the beast which carrieth her, which hath the seven heads and ten horns. The beast, which thou sawest, was, and is not, and shall come up out of the bottomless pit, and go into destruction: and the inhabitants on the earth (whose names are not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world) shall wonder, seeing the beast that was, and is not. And here is the understanding that hath wisdom. The seven heads are seven mountains, upon which the woman sitteth, and there are seven kings: Five are fallen, one is, and the other is not yet come: and when he is come, he must remain a short time. And the beast which was, and is not: the same also is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth into destruction. And the ten horns which thou sawest, are ten kings, who have not yet received a kingdom, but shall receive power as kings one hour after the beast. These have one design: and their strength and power they shall deliver to the beast. These shall fight with the

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them, because he is Lord of lords, and King of kings, and they that are with him are called, and elect, and faithful. And he said to me: The waters which thou sawest, where the harlot sitteth, are peoples, and nations, and tongues. And the ten horns which thou sawest in the beast: these shall hate the harlot, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and shall burn her with fire. For God hath given into their hearts to do that which pleaseth him; that they give their kingdom to the beast, till the words of God be fulfilled. And the woman which thou sawest, is the great city, which hath kingdom over the kings of the earth” (Rev. 17:7-18).

Here is a full explanation of the mystery. “The seven heads are seven mountains, upon which the woman sitteth.” This no doubt refers to the city of Rome, built upon seven hills, or mountains. Rome was the seat of both the pagan and the papal governments, and on her sat this woman and ruled, or reigned, over the kings of the earth. Thus she sat on seven mountains. But the seven heads have another signification. “And they are seven kings.” These refer to the seven supreme forms of government which the Roman empire had: (1) the regal, (2) the dictatorial, (3) the decemviral, (4) the consular, (5) the triumviral, (6) the imperial, and (7) the patrician. These were the ruling powers of the empire. The angel thus informed John: “Five are fallen, one is, and the other is not yet come: and when he is come, he must remain a short time.” That is, at the time John received this vision, the first five had already fallen. “One is.” The form of government ruling the empire in John’s time was the imperial, the sixth head of Rome. The rulers were the heathen Caesars. The other “not yet come” was the patrician, which had not yet developed at John’s time. It was to continue but “a short time.” Adam Clark says that the time during which the patriciate ruled the empire was limited to forty-five years. Some authorities say fifty-

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

one year; others twenty-six. This was a short period compared with the duration of several of the preceding forms of government.

Next the angel interprets the beast upon which the woman sat: "The beast, which thou sawest, was, and is not. . . . And the beast which was, and is not: the same also is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth into destruction." This beast upon which the woman sat is the eighth head of Rome, and yet it was one of the seven. This beast was popery, which was the eighth and last head of Rome. It is the same secular beast as seen in Rev. 13:1-11. "But," says one, "how was it one of the original seven?" Let us see. The sixth head of the empire was the imperial under the heathen Caesars. This imperial power was the persecuting power of Rome against the early Christians. Imperial Rome ruled the world. Thus "it was." But the time came when the hordes of savages from the North swept the empire and wounded the imperial head to death. The imperial government was overthrown, therefore "it was not." Later, as we have shown, the patriciate ruled the empire for a short time, being succeeded by New Rome, the imperial power revived under a cloak of Christianity. The same power that ruled under the Caesars in heathen garb, though wounded to death for a time, revived and ruled under the priests and popes in Christian garb. But it was the same persecuting power.

An apostate church, whose history can be clearly traced from about A. D. 270, grew up by degrees, and this apostate institution is what the woman, the great whore, represented. When the old persecuting imperial power revived, it gave its strength to this apostate institution under the popes and priests. It became the power that carried this apostate church. Thus the woman is represented as sitting upon this scarlet-colored beast. This beast was imperial Rome under popes and priests, but was virtually the same as heathen

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

imperial Rome. This makes clear why, in symbol, the same horns of imperial Rome under pagan rule served later as the horns of papal Rome. It was the same power, but clothed differently. These ten horns, as already noted in this chapter, signify the ten divided kingdoms of Rome. These were to give “their strength and power to the beast.” Thus they became his horns. The time was to come when these kings would ‘hate the whore, make her desolate and naked, eat her flesh, and burn her with fire.’ This no doubt was fulfilled when the very nations that had once supported popery turned against her and sheared her of all temporal power. Among others, England and Germany effected this, and became the horns, or powers, which supported Protestantism.

This beast ascended “out of the bottomless pit”—was of hellish origin. Such is the whole system of popery. It emanated from hell, and shall “go into destruction.” This very beast will finally be “cast alive into the pool of fire, burning with brimstone” (Rev. 19:20).

“And the woman which thou sawest, is the great city, which hath kingdom over the kings of the earth” (Rev. 17:18). This is Babylon the Great, the Roman Catholic sect. She is the great whore. She is guilty of “the blood of the saints, and of the martyrs of Jesus.” History shows that she glutted herself with the blood of nearly fifty million saints. The bride of Christ was clothed with the sun; she wore the robes of righteousness. But this woman “was clothed round about with purple and scarlet.” This apostate woman Christ never acknowledged as his bride.

The Call to Leave Babylon

We have seen that “Babylon the great” of Revelation 17 consists of a family, a mother and her harlot daughters. The mother is the Church of Rome, while the daughters are in particular the Protestant sects. This fraternity of so-called churches, from Rome down to the latest born daughter, does not represent the pure bride, “the Lamb’s wife.” Of his bride the Lord said, “Thou art all fair, O my love, and there is not a spot in thee.” “One is my dove, my perfect one is but one.” “And it is granted to her that she should clothe herself with fine linen, glittering and white. For the fine linen are the justifications of saints.” “That I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ.” God has but one family, his household. Since no man can rightly have two families, God has but one church, which is the holy family.

Ignorantly many honest souls, as well as true children of God, have been led to join these apostate institutions. We do not doubt that the Church of Rome holds within her fold many sincere and honest people whose hearts are longing for better things. We have a warm and tender feeling for these dear people. It is not them that we antagonize, but the apostate, corrupt religion and teaching that is destroying their souls.

“And another angel followed, saying: That great Babylon is fallen, is fallen; which made all nations to drink of the wine of the

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

wrath of her fornication. And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice: If any man shall adore the beast and his image, and receive his character in his forehead, or in his hand; he also shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God . . . neither have they rest day nor night, who have adored the beast, and his image, and whosoever receiveth the character of his name” (Rev. 14:8-11). “And after these things, I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power: and the earth was enlightened with his glory. And he cried out with a strong voice, saying: Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen; and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every unclean spirit, and the hold of every unclean and hateful bird. Because all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication; and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her; and the merchants of the earth have been made rich by the power of her delicacies” (Rev. 18:1-3). This language is similar to that of Rev. 17:2-5. Practically the same things that are said of the woman of Revelation 17 are here said of the great Babylon which is the habitation of devils. “And I heard another voice from heaven, saying: Go out from her, my people; that you be not partakers of her sins, and that you receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and the Lord hath remembered her iniquities” (Rev. 18:4, 5). A further description of her fall will be found by reading Rev. 18:8-19.

All this is present truth. The angel in these texts stands for the entire ministry of the present time. These flying messengers are God’s holy ministers, who are trumpeting to all nations the solemn warnings from heaven. This is a time of the Lord’s vengeance against all false religions of earth. He has set his hand to gather out his people, and to prepare his church, so that she may be presented holy, without spot or wrinkle, when he comes. A solemn *voice from heaven* says, “Go out from her.”

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

Dear reader, for the good of your soul, obey this solemn injunction from the Almighty. Tens of thousands have already done so, and are abiding in Christ alone, in his true church—the Zion of God. Have a part in this great gathering, which is the preparation of the bride for the coming of the Bridegroom.

