



THE BIBLE

VERSUS

ROMANISM

PART I RELIGIOUS AUTHORITY

PART II PRIMACY OF PETER

PART III ROMANISM FURTHER EXAMINED

BY

A. N. TRICE

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE
GOSPEL ADVOCATE COMPANY
PUBLISHERS

Copyright, 1928, by
GOSPEL ADVOCATE COMPANY
Nashville, Tenn.

PREFACE

In recent years Roman Catholics have been active in distributing literature in defense of their faith and practice and in an effort to proselyte others to their faith. A tract of this kind was handed the author by a Roman Catholic friend, with the request that he reply to it in some form. This tract has a wide circulation (90,000 claimed), and is intended specially for protestants. After much deliberation, this volume is issued as a reply not only to the tract, but covering other points where the author believes Roman Catholics are in error.

The author's aim has not been limited to the task of exposing error, but includes a constructive policy of establishing the truth in the place of error, always remembering the words of the Master: "Thy word is truth." (John 17:17.) Special care has been taken to fairly and correctly represent the position of the party criticized, quoting the very words of Roman Catholic authorities where there might be any doubt.

In exposing the errors and faults of Roman Catholics, the author does not mean to condemn them personally, nor does he mean to convey the impression that they possess no commendable qualities. He has warm personal friends among them and has always admired and respected their zeal and earnestness, though unable to harmonize these with God's will. While recognizing their zeal, earnestness, and sincerity, which are necessary to the Christian character, these do not constitute the whole of it. The apostle Paul thought he was doing God's will when he was persecuting the church; but when he was converted, he recognized that he was chief of sinners. No one ever manifested greater zeal nor more earnestness than did he; but his zeal and earnestness, his honesty and sincerity, were not all that God required. Acceptance with God re-

quires humble submission to his will and service according to his divine instruction.

The author acknowledges the great value of the authorities quoted and the helpful suggestions of friends in preparing the matter for this publication. To what extent he has succeeded in the aims and purposes of this book the reader is to judge.

With the hope of accomplishing good, with malice toward none, and with charity for all, this work is respectfully submitted.

THE AUTHOR.

CONTENTS

PART I

	RELIGIOUS AUTHORITY	PAGE
Introduction		7
	CHAPTER I	
Bible as Authority		9
	CHAPTER II	
Tradition		11
	CHAPTER III	
Evidence of Claims of the Bible		17
Ignorance of Critics		17
	CHAPTER IV	
The Bible Text		20
Greek Bibles		21
Ancient Versions		21
English Versions		23
	CHAPTER V	
Evidence From Language		25
	CHAPTER VI	
New Testament Early Period		27
	CHAPTER VII	
Evidence From Catalogues		32
	CHAPTER VIII	
Evidence From Quotations		33
	CHAPTER IX	
Evidence From Archaeology		35
The Didache		36
Ancient Odes		38
Tatian's Diatessaron		38
	CHAPTER X	
Internal Evidence		40
	CHAPTER XI	
Apocryphal Books		43
	CHAPTER XII	
Jerome's Latin Vulgate		45
	CHAPTER XIII	
Reading the Bible		47
	CHAPTER XIV	
Which Church		58

PART II	
PRIMACY OF PETER PAGE	
Introduction	62
CHAPTER I	
Has Jesus Christ Established the Office of Pope?	63
CHAPTER II	
Who Was First to Fill the Office?	70
CHAPTER III	
Was There a Succession Ordained?	76
CHAPTER IV	
Is There an Unbroken Succession Down to This Time?	78
CHAPTER V	
Powers of the Pope	83
PART III	
ROMANISM FURTHER EXAMINED Introduction	90
CHAPTER I	
Wicked Popes	91
CHAPTER II	
Persecution a Romish Dogma	95
CHAPTER III	
Purgatory, Indulgences and Jubilees	101
CHAPTER IV	
Martin Luther	108
CHAPTER V	
Invocation of Saints	111
CHAPTER VI	
Maryolatry	113
CHAPTER VII	
Veneration of Relics	115
CHAPTER VIII	
Worship of Images	118
CHAPTER IX	
The Pope a Subject of Scripture Prophecy	120
CHAPTER X	
By Their Fruits Ye Shall Know Them	128
NOTE.—Some of the authorities freely quoted are abbreviated as follows:	
Question Box (Roman Catholic)—abbreviated Q.B.	
Faith of the Fathers, by Cardinal Gibbons—abbreviated F.F.	
History of Romanism, by Rev. John Dowling—abbreviated H.R.	

PART I

RELIGIOUS AUTHORITY

INTRODUCTION

A tract before me entitled, "The Bible an Authority Only in Catholic Hands," issued by Our Sunday *Visitor Press*, Huntington, Ind., attempts to prove what the title affirms. The argument is in the form of a dialogue between a Catholic and a Protestant, both sides being dictated by the author. By this means and the free use of baseless assumptions a complete victory for the Catholic over Protestantism is only what might be expected.

In this work we wish to examine some of the leading arguments of this tract and other Roman Catholic teaching, comparing them with the Bible for the purpose of ascertaining the truth pertaining to the questions involved. Our plan will be to examine the *actual* teaching and practice of Roman Catholics and not to demolish a man of straw. Neither will we attempt to give an exhaustive treatise on the evidences of Christianity. That task has been done by others whose works are available and may be used by all.

It is agreed that our authority for religious faith and practice must be regarded as an infallible guide, but just what constitutes this infallible authority is another question. Our Roman Catholic friends tell us that the Bible alone is not sufficient, that without tradition man would not be "thoroughly furnished unto every good work." Their position is that while the Bible is accepted as the divinely inspired written word of God, it is not sufficient alone as a safe guide; that there must be added to the written word certain unwritten words given by inspired teachers and handed down by tradition. They contend also that both the Bible and Tradition are to be interpreted by the Roman Catholic Church, and by this they mean the pope, be-

fore either can be accepted as established infallible authority. They tell us that this infallible authority is vested in an infallible *interpreter*, who is the mouthpiece of the Roman Catholic Church, and that the governing and directing power of God's kingdom on earth is lodged in him; that he is the head of the church; that he is Christ's vice-gerent on earth, and, as such, has full power and authority to reign and rule over Christ's kingdom on earth. Since all power in heaven and earth was given to Christ, his vice-gerent on earth is to succeed to all power in earth. It follows then, as a necessary logical sequence, that all departments of God's rule in the earth—legislative, executive and judicial—are lodged in the pope. History abounds with proof that the pope has undertaken to exercise such powers. From these facts it would be easy to deduce that the pope is the ultimate *Religious Authority* of Romanists. If he is to censor God's word before it is acceptable to men, this places him in a position higher in authority than God himself. Papists frequently compare the pope to the Supreme Court of the United States as being the final tribunal, and this only confirms the view that the pope is regarded as the highest authority in the universe with power to construe or even to nullify the legislative acts of God.

CHAPTER I

BIBLE AS AUTHORITY

In the tract referred to, page 2, demand is made upon Protestants to prove the reliability of the Bible, as undisputed authority, before it can be admitted as proof of anything. It would seem unnecessary to do this since it is agreed by both sides that the Bible is a revelation from God. But why should not the Romanist be required also to make the same proof? For a reply to this question I quote from Roman Catholic authority, another tract entitled, "What is the Bible?" by Rev. W. H. Anderson, a Jesuit, issued by the International Truth Society, Brooklyn, N. Y., page 6, as follows:

"Because it never was a Bible, till the infallible Church pronounced it to be so. The separate treatises, each of them inspired, were lying, as it were dispersedly; easy to confound with others, that were uninspired. The Church gathered them up, selected them, pronounced judgment on them; rejecting some, which she defined and declared not to be canonical, because not inspired; adopting others as being inspired, and therefore canonical."

Cardinal Gibbons, in "Faith of the Fathers," page 249, says: "The canonicity of the Holy Scriptures rests solely on the authority of the Catholic Church." And from the Romanist "Question Box," page 46, we quote: "It is only by the divine authority of the Catholic Church that Christians know that the scripture is the word of God, and what books certainly belong to the Bible." Finally, Cardinal Gibbons gives us the true position of the Romanists in its simplest form in the following words:

"When a dispute arises in the church regarding the sense of scripture the subject is referred to the Pope for final adjudication. The sovereign pontiff, before deciding the case, gathers around him his venerable colleagues, the cardinals of the Church; or he calls a council of his associate judges of faith, the Bishops of Christendom; or he has recourse to other lights which the Holy Ghost may suggest to him. Then, after mature

and prayerful deliberation, he pronounces judgment, and *his sentence is final, irrevocable and infallible.*" ("Faith of the Fathers," p. 150.)

Many similar quotations could be produced, but these are sufficient to indicate the status of the Bible as *"Authority in Catholic Hands."* Roman Catholic doctrine is that the authority of the Bible depends on two things: (1) its canonicity by the Roman Catholic Church, and (2) its interpretation by the Roman Catholic Church, the Pope being the supreme infallible authority to tell mortals what is God's revealed will. Thus it is clear that the Bible as it was written by inspired men is not even *"An Authority in Catholic Hands."* It has to be approved and interpreted to make it so. What a pity God is not able to reveal his will to his intelligent creatures without the assistance of the Pope to tell them what He means!

If Romanists prove the Church by the Bible, and reversing the process, prove the Bible by the Church, they reason in a circle, which amounts to no proof at all. But they reply *that they prove the Church on the "historical authority of the New Testament"; but that "the historical value of the New Testament is not proved by the Church."* ("Question Box," p. 68.) This is still worse logic, if possible, and cannot be classed as even a clever dodge. The New Testament may not be thus dissected. The historical value of the New Testament is proved by the same evidence that proves any other value it may have. All its values stand or fall together on the same evidence. If its historical statements are true, the New Testament is true; if they are false, the New Testament is false.

CHAPTER II

TRADITION

Roman Catholics claim both the Bible and *Tradition* as equal authority, the first as the inspired written word of God, the second as the inspired unwritten word of God—*lex non scripta*; that the latter was spoken by Christ and the inspired apostles and handed down from generation to generation by word of mouth through the church. This dogma was first declared by the council of Trent which began its sessions April 8, 1546, when Tradition was placed on equality with the Scriptures as authority. But since the decree of a council may not alone satisfy every one Romanists offer as support for this doctrine the following scriptures:

1. "Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of his disciples which are not written in this book: but these are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name." (John 20:30.)

2. "There are also many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself would not contain the books that should be written." (John 21:25.)

3. "So then, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye were taught, whether by word or by epistle of ours." (2 These. 2:15.)

Instead of supporting the Roman Catholic doctrine of *Tradition*, the first of these passages predicates faith upon what *was written* and life upon the faith thus produced. The apostle thought this sufficient to produce faith and life. But what is still more unfortunate for the doctrine of *Tradition* is the fact that these passages quoted from John's gospel refer only to things that *Jesus did* and not to what he *taught*. There is not even a remote hint at anything that Jesus taught that was not written. Such gross perversion of a plain passage of scripture is unworthy of an infallible church and an infallible interpreter.

Again, the passage from 2 Thes. 2:15 does not support the Tradition held by Romanists. The Thessalonians were then living and had heard the inspired word of teaching given by word of mouth and the same had been confirmed by Paul's epistles to them. When all the traditions had been committed to writing that form of it had to be depended on alone. The verbal lessons passed away with the hearers and no provision was ever made for handing them down orally.

I suppose Cardinal Gibbons will be considered good Roman Catholic authority, and in order to clearly set forth the second place accorded the Scriptures by Romanists I quote as follows:

"Christians of every denomination admit the orthodoxy of the fathers of the first five centuries of the church. No one has ever called in question the faith of such men as Basil, Chrysostom, Cyprian, Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose, and Leo. They were the acknowledged guardians of pure doctrine, and the living representatives 'of the faith once delivered to the saints.' They were to the church in their generation what Peter and Paul and James were to the church in its infancy. We instinctively consult them about the faith of those times; for, to whom shall we go for the words of eternal life, if not to them?" ("Faith of the Fathers," p. 113.)

It would be difficult to imagine words more emphatic in discrediting the words of Peter and Paul and James and other inspired teachers of the Bible. But the statement of the Cardinal, this apostolic successor (?), not only reflects absolute discredit upon his supposed predecessors, but makes other statements very far from the truth. Why should we turn away from the writings of Peter and Paul and James and other inspired men, and seek instruction, even "the words of eternal life" from Basil, Chrysostom, Cyprian, Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose and Leo—none of whom even claimed to be inspired—all of whom were fallible men, likely to err, and did err at many points?

Romanists freely quote the fathers in support of their doctrine, and I am persuaded that they even pervert their statements as they do the inspired writ-

ings. No intelligent person posted in the Scriptures will deny that the gospel was first taught orally, nor can it be successfully denied that the same gospel was fully committed to writing. The fathers of the second century and later frequently refer to the gospel as "that that comes down from the apostles, which has been kept as a sacred deposit in the churches of the apostles." This language from Tertullian is misapplied to an *oral deposit*, while the author neither said nor meant such a thing. The fathers never arrayed *Tradition* against the Scriptures as seems to appear from some of the arguments of Romanists, though as an argument against heresies Irenaeus does mention *Tradition* along with Scriptures, saying that the heretics accepted neither. It is also true that he lived near enough to the apostles for *Tradition* to have some weight in his day, especially since he had known Polycarp who had been taught by the apostle John and other apostles. It is natural that he might mention *Tradition* in support of the Scriptures in dealing with those who rejected inspired writings as did Marcion and others of his day. But he did not teach by this that "*the truth of Holy Scripture cannot be erected into a norma of interpretation, except through the instrumentality of Tradition. Tradition is the well-spring and head. With it rests the decision. It alone can set the faith and keep it firm. For this task Scripture is incompetent.*" ("Schanz Christian Apology," Vol. III, p. 368.) Irenaeus knew nothing of an official infallible interpreter, and the above quotation from the Romanist writer, Schanz, is a far-fetched construction upon the words of Irenaeus. The same authority makes the following admission (p. 388): "*The very Fathers who, in some passages, mention Scripture alone as God's word, elsewhere speak of Tradition in similar terms. They looked upon the two as inseparable, and as giving expression to the same divine truth that was preached from the beginning.*" The above language practically surrenders the whole proposition, especially when we consider that *Tradition*, as used by Paul in 2 Thess. 2:15 and very often

by the Fathers, is a generic term and includes both oral and written instruction. From Paul's language we can gather no idea of different instructions being given by the two methods. Both kinds were to be accepted because coming from an inspired teacher.

But if Irenaeus regarded the Scriptures as not being perfect without an infallible interpreter through Tradition he certainly did not know what he was saying in the following:

"If, however, we cannot discover explanations of all these things in Scripture which are made the subject of investigation, yet let us not on that account seek after any other God besides Him who really exists. . . . We should leave things of that nature to God who created us, being most perfectly assured that the Scriptures are indeed perfect, since they were spoken by the word of God and His Spirit." ("Against Heresies," Vol. I, p. 220.)

In the above Irenaeus certainly missed a great opportunity to tell us that in those passages of Scripture that we do not understand fully we should appeal to an *infallible interpreter*. Had there been such a thing in his day, no doubt he would have given such advice. But he does not appeal to either *Tradition* or an infallible interpreter, which seems a very great fault on his part if he taught what Dr. Schanz says he did in the foregoing quotation from "Schanz Christian Apology."

Our Romanist friends, like Cardinal Gibbons, often place more stress on the writings of the Fathers than on inspired scripture. They rely largely on a statement found in the reputed writings of Irenaeus to prove that the church at Rome was founded by Peter and Paul, though Irenaeus states this on tradition, and we know that it is not true from the fact that the church was established before Paul ever visited it. Yet hear what this early religious writer, who lived from 135 to 200 A.D., has to say on the subject of *Religious Authority*:

"We have learned from none others the plan of our salvation, than from those through whom the gospel has come down to us, which they did at one time proclaim in public, and at a later period, by the will of God, handed down to us in the Scrip-

tures to be the ground and pillow of our faith. . . . For after our Lord rose from the dead the apostles were invested with power from on high when the Holy Spirit came down, were filled from all his gifts and had perfect knowledge." ("Against Heresies," Vol. III, p. 1.)

This testimony clearly shows how Irenaeus regarded the Scriptures in that early period. Tradition as authority was unknown to the Christians of that day, but developed "according to the working of Satan" at a later period.

Romanism richly merits the scathing rebuke administered by our Savior to the Pharisees and scribes when he said: "But in vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men. Ye leave the commandment of God, and hold fast the tradition of men. . . . Full well do ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your tradition." (Mark 7:7-8.)

It is believed the foregoing citations are Quite sufficient to set forth the Roman Catholic view based on four major propositions as follows:

- (1) Continuous, unbroken succession of the Roman Catholic Church.
- (2) Tradition as Equal Authority with the Bible.
- (3) Necessity of Authorized Official Interpretation.

(4) Infallibility of the Pope as Interpreter and Head of the Church. These propositions themselves being unproved assumptions cannot be admitted as evidence in establishing *Religious Authority*. But more of these will be given later.

Roman Catholic scribes ask protestants: "How do you know the Bible is the inspired word of God? how do you know it has been faithfully transcribed and handed down with its original text uncorrupted? and how do you know it has been correctly translated?" We freely confess that we do not know these things upon the assumptions of the Roman Catholic Church, nor do their pretensions give the Romanists any monopoly of evidence on this subject. In further reply, we may startle our Romanist friends by admitting that we do not know, neither do they know, that the Bible is the inspired word of God, nor that it has come down

to us correctly transcribed, nor yet that it is correctly translated into our mother tongue. Neither do we know that Caesar, or Napoleon, or Washington ever lived. We believe these things and our faith is based on evidence, evidence which reason says is competent and trustworthy. "We walk by faith, not by sight," said Paul. If our faith in the Bible is misplaced, we have lost nothing. Nothing better has been offered us, not even by the Roman Catholic Church.

CHAPTER III

EVIDENCE OF CLAIMS OF THE BIBLE

We have said that our acceptance of the Bible rests on evidence. Lack of space forbids our giving any extensive treatise here on evidences, but a brief statement of some of the vast amount of such evidence will suffice to show why we accept the Bible as *Religious Authority*. In considering this subject, let us lay aside speculation, surmise and sentiment, and approach the subject free from prejudice and in the spirit of an inquirer rather than that of an advocate. God has endowed us with reason and the power to choose between good and evil, right and wrong, truth and error. These are all set before us and the responsibility rests upon us to function as intelligent free agents. That truth and righteousness should be sought and error and evil avoided is axiomatic.

IGNORANCE OF CRITICS

Destructive critics being ignorant of the Bible are guilty of presenting objections to it before they know what it teaches or the evidences in its favor—of arguing the negative before the affirmative is known or heard. Thomas Payne said in reference to Part I of his "Age of Reason": "I had neither Bible nor Testament to refer to, though I was writing against both." In his preface to Part II, he says: "I have now furnished myself with a Bible and a Testament, and I can say also that I have found them to be much worse books than I had conceived." (Quoted by J. W. McGarvey in "Text and Canon.")

The learned Geo. A. Barton, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Biblical Literature, author of many books on religion including "The Religion of Israel," expresses gross ignorance of the Bible which he attacks as a higher critic. On page 97 of this book he makes the following startling statement:

"The religion of Yahweh as conceived by Amos was not only socially ethical, but it was that alone. Ritual formed no part of it. Sacrifices and burnt offerings had no place in it. These, Amos declared, were no part of Yahweh's original covenant. In most emphatic terms he proclaims Yahweh's displeasure and even abhorrence of the sacrificial feasts."

Only a casual reading of Amos should convince even the unlearned that he is not teaching what Doctor Barton attributes to him. Fairness and justice, as well as the established rules of _ interpretation, demand that we take into consideration the circumstances and the prophet's purpose in determining the true meaning of his statement referred to in chapter 5:21-24. The whole book is a message of warning from God and a plea for reformation. Israel had fallen into sin and deep degradation; the people had turned justice into wormwood and had cast down righteousness to the earth; they had afflicted the just, had taken bribes and had turned aside the needy in the gate from their right; they oppressed the poor and crushed the needy. The prophet even chides them with irony for their corrupt and idolatrous worship on the Mount of Samaria and at Bethel, unauthorized places of worship, when he says: "Come to Bethel and transgress; to Gilgal and multiply transgression; and bring your sacrifices every morning," etc. After reminding them that chastisements had been ineffectual as a means of reformation, the prophet pronounces a woe upon Israel and tells them that God spurns all of their hypocritical service, even their feasts, their solemn assemblies, their burnt offerings and their songs. God did not want service from unclean hands, which was hypocritical service, but the prophet exhorted them to "Let justice roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream." The inference is plain that if they would do this God would accept their service offered according to the law of Moses.

I venture to give another example of the ignorance of the Bible manifested by a noted higher critic of the destructive school. Dr. E. Sellin, Professor in the University of Berlin, in his "Introduction to the Old

Testament," page 74, says that the "book of the law" found in the house of Jehovah was not the pentateuch, but the book of Deuteronomy. He offers as proof of this that Shaphan, the scribe, *read it twice in one day*, as recorded in 2 Kings 22:8-10. Since one could not read the pentateuch through in one day, he concludes that it could not have been that as the meaning of the "book of the law." Now a careful reading of this scripture and the connection fails to disclose the time required for the two readings. Not one word is said about how long he was in reading the book, whether one day, one week or month or one year. But this destructive critic must sustain his modernist view against the Mosaic authorship of the pentateuch, and this method will answer that purpose if people accept his negation without knowing what the Bible says. Such inexcusable ignorance or perversion of scripture, is manifested by practically all the enemies of the Bible.

CHAPTER IV

THE BIBLE TEXT

Under this head we wish to name some of the most important Bible manuscripts and translations known to modern scholars. We have no autographs of any of the books of the Bible, neither have we of any Greek or Roman classic writings. But this does not mitigate against their existence when and as claimed by the books themselves.

Scholars classify the Hebrew Old Testament under two heads, viz.: Premassoretic and Massoretic, the former being in the most ancient form of Hebrew writing, and said to be almost identical with the Phoenician and Moabitic writing. Specimens of this ancient form of Hebrew writing are found in the inscriptions of the Moabite Stone and the Siloam inscription, also in the manuscript of the Samaritan Pentateuch.

The Massoretic text represents a later recension or form by Jewish scholars some centuries after the beginning of the Christian era. It was written in Aramaic characters instead of ancient Hebrew writing. The only complete Hebrew Old Testaments now extant are in Hebrew but are written with Aramaic characters or letters. The ancient Hebrew text had no vowels nor accents, and like Semitic writing in general, was essentially consonantal. Ezra and Daniel are said to have been written originally in Aramaic, which is strong evidence of their origin about the time of the return from exile. The separation of the text into words seems to have occurred before the time of Jerome (385-405 A.D.). (See "Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia," Vol. I, p. 94.)

The Hebrew Old Testament never contained any of the so-called apocryphal books, some of which were later attached to the Septuagint.

GREEK BIBLES

Following are some of the most noted and ancient Greek manuscripts of the Bible known at this time:

1. Septuagint—Old Testament translated into Greek about 135 B.C.
2. Codex Alexandrinus, in British Museum, transcribed in 4th century.
3. Codex Sinaiticus, in library, Leningrad (Russia), transcribed 340 to 367 A.D.
4. Codex Vaticanus, in Vatican at Rome, transcribed 4th century.
5. Codex Ephraem, transcribed 4th century.

While these are the most important manuscripts known, there are many other Greek Bibles of later dates.

ANCIENT VERSIONS

1. Peshito, Syriac, translated about 150 A.D.
2. Old Latin, made in North Africa, translated about 200 A.D.
3. Egyptian, or Coptic, translated in second century.
4. Latin Vulgate, translated by Jerome, 385 to 405 A.D.
5. Ethiopic Version, translated in 4th century.
6. Gothic Version, translated in 4th century by a missionary scholar who originated the Gothic alphabet for that purpose.
7. Armenian Version—A native Armenian invented alphabet and with other scholars translated the Bible into his tongue, in the 4th century.

The foregoing Greek Bibles and translations, some of the latter being older than any Greek manuscript now extant, have constituted the chief sources from which scholars have given us our present Bible.

Transcribing Bibles, like any other copying, was a slow and tedious process, and subject to errors and variations. Notwithstanding the great pains taken by scribes in copying the sacred text many errors crept into the various manuscripts, and, as might be expected, the later manuscripts show the greater number of variations. While the number of the variations found in even the best and most ancient texts is great, nearly all of them are so unimportant as not to change the sense in any way. In the few that may be regarded as changing the sense the correct original is believed to be deter-

mined by a preponderance of evidence so convincing that no room is left for doubt. It is said that these variations that affect the sense amount to not over one-thousandth part of the text, and scholars agree that all the doctrines, duties and privileges of Christianity remain unaffected by any of them. This is indeed remarkable when we consider the great number of times, the text had been copied and re-copied.

The art of printing invented in 1438 effectually checked this tendency, and now when the text is set in type and plates made from it, there is no chance for variations. Scholars have diligently compared the various ancient texts and versions, and, adopting the preponderance of evidence, have eliminated those readings which are obviously incorrect. It is believed that in this way we have a text which is practically the original, free from errors, and which "thoroughly furnishes the man of God unto every good work." Those who repudiate the Bible upon the ground of such variations would do so under any circumstances, though if the record of a will in which they are financially interested shows some trivial variation which does not change the result their attitude is quite different.

Roman Catholics make the proud boast that for fifteen centuries they were the sole possessors of all the Bibles of the world and that they had it in their power to destroy every copy in Christendom. On the other hand they claim that the world owes them a debt of gratitude for preserving the Bible through the persecutions of pagan Rome and through the dark period of the middle ages. They fail to consider the fact that the darkness of the middle ages represents the period when the Roman Catholic Church had reached the zenith of its power and influence. Who, then, can fail to give Romanism credit for conditions existing at a time when the Roman Catholic Church held universal sway in both ecclesiastical and civil rule—a period which has been characterized as the midnight of the world?

But the claim is false. They were not the sole

possessors of the Bible at any time. Some of the most valuable Greek Bibles and versions have been handed down to us from non-Romanist sources. A notable example of this is the Codex Sinaiticus, perhaps the oldest and most perfect Greek Bible now known, whose pages were never soiled by the hands of a Romanist monk. This Bible was found by Dr. Constantine Tischendorff in 1844 in the Greek Catholic Monastery of St. Catherine at the foot of Mt. Sinai. The Codex Alexandrinus represents essentially the text of the King James version, but had it been in Roman Catholic hands, no doubt the jealousy of the pope would have withheld it from protestant scholars as they withheld the Codex Vaticanus.

No protestant scholar of ability was allowed to study the Vatican Greek Bible until about the middle of the nineteenth century. Napoleon took it to Paris in 1809 and kept it for six years. Dr. Tischendorff was allowed to look at it for six hours in 1843; de Muralt was permitted to see it nine hours in 1845, and Tregelles was granted a view of it in 1846, but was not allowed to have any writing material on his person. Tischendorff was again permitted to study it for three hours per day for fourteen days in 1866 under guard. Finally the jealousy, the fanaticism and the intolerance of the pope relented and in 1889 and 1890 this wonderful Greek Bible, one of the oldest and best extant, was allowed to be photographed and thus became the property of the world.

ENGLISH VERSIONS

John Wycliffe translated the New Testament from the Latin Vulgate into English in 1380. This was a grave offense to the Romanists who opposed the giving of the Bible to the people in the vulgar tongue. Wycliffe was shielded from the wrath of his popish enemies by John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, and was permitted to die peaceably in 1384. But his enemies, still seeking vengeance and a means of staying the tide of interest in the Bible reading made possible by Wycliffe's

translation, some 44 years after his death, by order of the council of Constance, dug up his bones and burned them and cast the ashes upon a stream. This fact, symbolizing the widespread influence of Wycliffe's gift to English-speaking peoples, has been memorialized in, these words:

"The Avon to the Severn runs,
The Severn to the sea;
And Wycliffe's dust shall spread abroad
As wide as the waters be."

Wm. Tyndale, in 1525, translated the New Testament into English in the face of great opposition on the part of Romanists, many copies of his translation being publicly burnt by order of the bishop of London. Ten years later he was publicly strangled and then burnt as a dangerous heretic.

Miles Coverdale, in 1535, gave us the first version of the whole Bible in English, and for this offense he was imprisoned for two years, being finally released by the request of the king of Denmark.

In 1539 Cranmer's Bible was published in English, and this reformer paid the penalty with his life, being burnt at the stake by his popish enemies.

At last the word of God gained a footing in the English tongue. So many versions had been published that The Romanists themselves felt compelled to give their people the Bible in English, and accordingly they translated it in the Douay version about 1582, but not without the all-important notes explaining that Peter was pope and that the church was built on Peter, etc.

When the great translation of King James was made in 1611 the power of the pope had been so broken by the elevating influence of the Bible, that Christians were permitted to publish and read the Bible for themselves with but little interference. Since then we have the English Revised published in 1885 and the American Revised in 1901, and millions of Bibles are now being published not only in English, but in all the languages of the earth and are being distributed throughout the world.

CHAPTER V

EVIDENCE FROM LANGUAGE

The Old Testament was written in Hebrew, except Ezra, and Daniel which were written in Aramaic, the latter being the language of the Jewish exiles, and this fact is strong evidence of the date of these books. The New Testament was written in Greek. Scholars tell us that the style of language used in both the Old Testament and the New Testament identifies the different books in the periods with which they deal. It is well known that all languages grow. A glance at the writings of Chaucer will convince the most skeptical that our English has grown. The word *let* in our King James version has a meaning directly opposite its present meaning, likewise the word *cleave*. In 2 Cor. 8:1 Paul said "Moreover, brethren, I do you to wit of the grace of God," which may not be readily understood by some English readers of the present, but when one reads in the American Revised Version, "I make known unto you the grace of God," the meaning is perfectly clear. Many other characteristics of language combine to show that the King James version belongs, not to the twentieth century but to the seventeenth century—1611.

To further illustrate how internal evidence may fix the date of a document, we observe that in old English printed books the letter *s* has the form of *f*, but this form passed away early in the 19th century. Of the Greek Bibles extant, it is said that those copied before the tenth century are all in uncial or capital letters, while beginning with the tenth century all Greek manuscripts are in cursive writing.

Scholars also tell us that the Moabite Stone and the most ancient Hebrew literature prove the archaic style of the Hebrew of the pentateuch, while the later Hebrew of Kings and prophets shows a very different style. Chas. A. Briggs, D.D., a noted modernist, admits

the archaic style of Hebrew throughout Deuteronomy while the language of Kings and Jeremiah shows a later development of Hebrew. But he argues that Deuteronomy was made up of "older documents *recodified* by a later editor who was *influenced to use an archaic style to preserve the flavor of the original.*" ("Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch," pp. 87 and 88.) By such unfounded assumptions we may convert plain statements into irony, truth into error, facts into fiction, and thus discredit any historic statement. Scholars mention many names, customs and manners peculiar to the time and place of the Exodus which were employed in the pentateuch, which had become obsolete at the time of Ezra when critics tell us the pentateuch (excepting Deuteronomy) was written. They tell us that Deuteronomy was not written till about the time of Josiah, but even then these peculiar terms of the pentateuch had become obsolete.

It is now known that the New Testament was written in the prevailing literary language of Palestine of the first century. This was a modified form of Greek peculiar to the first century. It is shown that the formation of letters, the character of abbreviations and the changes in handwriting and orthography make it as easy to distinguish between a first century and a third century Greek manuscript as between a sixteenth and a nineteenth century English manuscript. The Grammar and phraseology show equal changes. Dr. Camden M. Coburn to whom I am largely indebted for these observations, tells us in his book on modern Archaeology, that these facts constitute a new argument inexpressibly strong and compelling skeptical scholars almost irresistibly to date the New Testament in the first century.

CHAPTER VI

NEW TESTAMENT EARLY PERIOD

Dr. Westcott says "the writings of the first fathers are not essays, or histories, or apologies, but letters"; that they wrote as brethren, giving to one another "council and warning," in faith and hope and love, and that they did not write to argue.

While the disciples of the apostles recognized the power, wisdom and authority of the apostles, and their writings were accepted as inspired, "they did not feel that the apostles were providentially charged to express once for all in their writings the essential forms of Christianity" (Westcott, "New Testament Canon," p. 56). They accepted these writings intuitively and without argument. The canon was fixed from the beginning in the most natural and practical way by the common use of Christians, rather than by apologies—by instinct rather than by investigation. The demonstrations by signs and wonders, manifold powers and spiritual gifts, were too fresh on their memories for any to feel a formal statement of canonicity was necessary. It was not a matter of opinion, but when pagan persecutors demanded the surrender of all the books of Christian literature to be destroyed Christians knew full well which to give up and which to conceal from the view of the persecutors who searched for them.

The transition from a traditional form to the written form of the gospel after the death of the last apostle was a gradual and practically unconscious change. The New Testament scriptures were all in existence before the death of the last apostle, John, and were in general use by the churches. No challenge of the canonicity of any of the books ever came from the apostolic church or from any apostle, and Paul said he had the "care of all the churches." On the other hand apostolic recognition was specific when Peter spoke of the epistles of Paul as a whole, saying, "In all his epistles speaking

in them of these things." (2 Pet. 3:16.) Again it is evident that copies were made and distributed among the churches. "When this epistle hath been read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye also read the epistle from Laodicea." (Col. 4:16.) Thus we have apostolic provision for the multiplication and distribution of the Scriptures.

Dr. Westcott says that it cannot be denied that the canon of the New Testament was fixed gradually. Neither can it be shown that the practical settlement of the canon manifested itself from the beginning in formal declaration. So long as the apostolic doctrine and authenticity of the scriptures were generally held undisputed by the church, there was no demand for a formal statement of canonicity. Most of the first heretics impugned the authority of apostles rather than the genuineness of their writings.

"Finally heretics arose who claimed to be possessed of other traditional rules derived in succession from St. Peter or St. Paul, and it was only possible to try their authenticity by documents beyond the reach of change or corruption. Dissentions arose within the church itself, and the appeal to the written word of the apostles became natural and decisive." (Westcott, "Canon of New Testament," p. 6.)

Spurious gospels and epistles, creeds and liturgies attributed to individual apostles, sprang up at an early period of the church after the death of the apostles, and their authenticity is claimed by Romanists upon the traditions of the early fathers. This is strong confirmation of Paul's prediction in addressing the elders of the church at Ephesus, when he said: "For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock." (Acts 20:29.) After the close of the second century proof of the New Testament canon is abundant and clear, all of the books now received being recognized from the time of Irenaeus.

"But," it may be asked, "if the written word is our only authority, how did the New Testament Church carry out the commission to teach God's word to the

world at a time when not all the books were written and perhaps few copies of those that had been written were in circulation?" A complete reply to this question is given by the Apostle Paul in 1 Cor., chapters 12, 13 and 14. The Holy Spirit came in fulfillment of the Savior's promise to the apostles to *"teach" them "all things" and "bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you."* (John 14:26), and to *"guide" them "into all the truth"* (John 16:13). The apostles were thus infallibly qualified and fortified against ignorance or lapse of memory and fully commissioned as the ambassadors of Christ to deliver his message of salvation to the world without error or fault.

Paul says: "Now concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I would not have you ignorant . . . there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit ... to profit withal. For to one is given through the Spirit the word of wisdom; and to another the word of knowledge; ... to another faith; ... to another gifts of healing; ... to another workings of miracles; ... to another prophecy; ... to another discernings of spirits; to another diverse kinds of tongues; and to another the interpretation of tongues." These special gifts of supernatural wisdom, knowledge, faith, and of miraculous power, prophecy, kinds of tongues and interpretations of tongues were conferred by the imposition of the apostles' hands. When the cause was planted in a new field provision was made for the proper edification of the new converts by having spiritually endowed prophets, teachers and helpers installed to feed the flock.

"Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God they sent unto them Peter and John who when they were come down prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Spirit: for as yet he was fallen on none of them: only they had been baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus. Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Spirit." (Acts 8:14-17.)

When Simon, the sorcerer, saw this he sought to purchase the power to impart the Holy Spirit and was rebuked for this wicked thought. Peter and John did

not impart the Holy Spirit to these Samaritans nor to others as a display of power, nor yet merely to "confirm" them, but to provide for their proper teaching and building up in the most holy faith, because the revelation of God's law had not been completed from and by which capable teachers could be supplied. In the fourteenth chapter of *1 Corinthians* directions are more fully given as to how these spiritual gifts were to be used in the assembly of the church. The purpose was specified that "all things be done unto edifying," "that all may learn, and all may be exhorted." Thus we see that God provided the infallible message and messengers qualified and spiritually endowed to deliver it without error or defect. He also provided for confirming the message "both by signs and wonders, and by manifold powers, and by gifts of the Holy Spirit, according to his own will." (Heb. 2:4.) Not only this, but God also provided for the oral translation or interpretation of his word into the diverse kinds of tongues as occasion demanded.

But the time was to come when this method of teaching was to be done away. The thirteenth chapter of the same epistle (*1 Cor. 13:8-13*) makes this clear also.

"But whether there be prophecies, they shall be done away; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall be done away. For we know in part, and we prophesy in part: but when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away."

The plan of teaching through spiritually endowed teachers, by prophecies, tongues, supernatural knowledge and interpretations of tongues was partial and imperfect and was to be done away "when that which is perfect is come"—when the revelation of God is fully completed as the "perfect law of liberty." The apostle classes this stage of the church as its infancy. The truth was dimmed by this partial, imperfect system of obtaining it, but when the entire revelation of God shall

have come the opportunities for learning God's truth will be greatly increased. This is called the "more excellent way" that Paul promised to show at the close of the preceding chapter (1 Cor. 12:31), and I think he kept his promise in showing this more perfect way.

CHAPTER VII

EVIDENCE FROM CATALOGUES

A number of catalogues of the books of the Bible are given by some of the early Christian writers and councils before the birth of the Roman Catholic Church which properly dates from A.D. 606 when Boniface III was made the first Universal Bishop of that church. Among these catalogues we mention some of the early ones as follows:

397. Council of Carthage—which listed all the books of the Bible and some apocryphal books.
326. Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, mentions all of the New Testament books, and adds this warning: "These are the foundations of salvation, that he who thirsts may be satisfied with the oracles contained in them: in these alone the doctrine of religion is taught: let no one add to them or take any thing from them." (J. W. McGarvey, "Text and Canon.")
- 315 to 386. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, gives a list of all New Testament books except Revelation.
270. Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea, called the Father of ecclesiastical history, gives an account of the persecution of Emperor Diocletian whose edict required that all churches be destroyed and the Scriptures burned. He lists all the books of the New Testament. He was commissioned by Constantine to have transcribed fifty copies of the Bible for use of the churches in Constantinople.
- 185 to 254. Origen, born at Alexandria, names all the books of both Old Testament and New Testament.
- 165 to 220. Clement, of Alexandria, names all the books of the New Testament except Philemon, James, II Peter and III John.

In addition we are told by Eusebius who had the works of Clement that he gave explanations and quotations from all the canonical books net omitting the disputed books.

- 160 to 240. Turtullian, contemporary of Orogen and Clement, mentions all the New Testament books except II Peter, James and II John.

CHAPTER VIII

EVIDENCE FROM QUOTATIONS

Orogen, born at Alexandria, A.D. 185 and died A.D. 254, was a voluminous Greek writer. Among his many writings was a "Homily on Joshua," and at Chapter 7, verse 1, after commenting on Joshua's experience at Jericho, says:

"Matthew first sounded the priestly trumpet in his gospel. Mark also, Luke and John, each gave forth a strain on their priestly trumpets. Peter moreover sounds loudly on the twofold trumpet of his epistles; and so also James and Jude. Still the number is incomplete and John gives forth the trumpet-sound in his epistles and apocalypse; and Luke while describing the Acts of the Apostles. Lastly, however, came he who said: *I think that God hath set forth us apostles last of all*, and, thundering on the fourteen trumpets of his epistles threw down even to the ground the walls of Jericho, that is to say all the instruments of idolatry and the doctrines of philosophers." (Westcott, "Canon of New Testament," p. 362.)

Irenaeus (135-200) quoted from all New Testament books except Philemon, Jude, James and III John. Polycarp, who suffered martyrdom in A.D. 155 or 156, is quoted as declaring when the proconsul urged him to recant and reproach Christ, "Eighty and six years have I served him, and he never did me an injury, how then can I blaspheme my King and my Savior?" ("Martyrdom of Polycarp," c. IX. Ante-Nicene Library. Vol. I.)

Irenaeus says he knew Polycarp when he (Irenaeus) was a boy, that Polycarp was instructed by apostles and that he had conversed with many who had seen Christ, that he was overseer of the church at Smyrna, lived to be very old and finally suffered martyrdom.

Polycarp told Irenaeus that the teachings of John and other apostles which he had heard from their lips were "in harmony with the writings"; by which Ire-

naeus, who had substantially our canon, meant the Scriptures which we read today. ("Apostolic Fathers," Rev. Geo. A. Jackson, p. 80.)

Justin Martyr (c. 100-147) mentions the "Memoirs" of the apostles, referring to the Gospels as being four in number and quotes from them and some of the epistles of Paul and Revelation. Barnabas, Clement of Rome and others have handed down in their writings quotations representing nearly all the New Testament books, thus tracing them back to the age of the apostles.

Papias, an overseer of the church at Hierapolis, lived very early in the second century and is quoted by Eusebius as mentioning three of the Gospels and some other New Testament books including Revelation.

Thus it appears that the New Testament books were in existence in their present form at the close of the apostolic age. Had they been gradual developments representing the experiences of uninspired men, as claimed by critics, this would not have been true.

CHAPTER IX

EVIDENCE FROM ARCHAEOLOGY

Archaeologists found while excavating near the Parthenon in Athens a marble figure of a female head, belonging to the frieze of Phidias on the ancient Parthenon, but its place was not fully determined till some one suggested that there was among the marbles in the British Museum a headless figure of Iris, the goddess of the rainbow, which belonged to the Parthenon. When a cast was made of the head it was found to fit exactly the broken part of the figure in the British Museum. No argument was necessary to show where it belonged. So it is with the Bible. All of the historical, geographical, social, political and religious references found in the Pentateuch fit exactly the period of the Exodus and the wilderness wanderings, and those found in the New Testament fit exactly the first century and no other. Too much of historical facts were related; too many technical terms were used; and too many dates, names and places were given for a correct history to have been forged at a later date. And these references have been fully confirmed in all of the many points of contact with modern discovery.

The date of Isaiah's prophecy against Egypt is fixed by reference to an historical fact in Isa. 20:1, where the prophet says the word came to him in the year of Sargon's conquest of Ashdod. Modernists had denied the existence of any such king of Assyria, but about 1844 archaeologists unearthed the palace of Sargon in ancient Nineveh and found among his annals inscribed on the walls of his palace this very identical item of history in almost the words of the prophet. I am not unmindful of the claims of modernists set up at a later date that the book of Isaiah shows evidences of being a composite document, that different parts of it were written at different times by different authors.

This claim, however, does not help their cause, and it needs no refutation until they present some sort of evidence worthy the name. They first divided the book into Isaiah I, and Isaiah II. Now, some have gone further and added Isaiah III and Isaiah IV.

Archaeology has touched Bible history at many points in modern times and has confirmed it in every case where all the connected facts were known. In no case has the Bible been discredited by modern research. Bible names and characters from the time of Abraham down to the close of revelation have been identified and the inspired records sustained in the minutest details. Where a king or ruler gained a victory over Israel his pride and vanity caused him to record the fact in the most permanent form that succeeding generations might know of his achievements and sing his praises. But they are as silent as the grave regarding David and Solomon, though they do mention Solomon's son, Rehoboam, and others who met defeat at the hands of their enemies. The Bible records a continued series of victories for David and a reign of peace for Solomon. No enemy ever gained a victory of note over these kings and consequently they had nothing to glory over and nothing to say. The Bible records both successes and failures of its heroes, which is evidence of its divine origin. Many volumes have been published giving most exact and literal confirmations of the Bible by archaeology, ethnology and philology.

THE DIDACHE

In 1873 a Greek manuscript was found in a monastery at Constantinople known as the *Didache* or *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* which scholars date about 100 or 120 A.D. This discovery created much interest and many wondered what this most ancient of all church disciplines (aside from the Bible) would teach on controverted subjects. When translated and published in 1883, it was found to vary but little from the plain teaching of the New Testament, thus proving the ex-

istence of and accepted authority of the same at that early period. It recognizes only one church, the church of God, and the word of God as the only accepted authority. On church organization it speaks of only "bishops" and "deacons" "as the honored ones among you with the prophets and teachers." No mention is made of presbyters, for at that period bishops and presbyters were one and the same. Christians were to "confess" their "sins in the congregation," and they were to *assemble on the "Lord's day of the Lord"* to "break bread," and the cup was to be included in the service for all baptized believers. It does not mention the Sabbath, nor direct the observance of any holy day except the Lord's day. It demands baptism by immersion in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, if sufficient water can be had. But if sufficient water cannot be had a three-fold pouring on the head is allowed.¹ This latter provision seems to be superfluous, for no one would live long in a place so destitute of water. The cattle and sheep would die of thirst, and people would die of filth and disease if they did not get an occasional bath.

While for the most part the *Didache* reflects New Testament teaching, we should not be surprised at a departure in some measure when men become dissatisfied with the inspired Scriptures and undertake to write a *creed* or *discipline* for the government of Christians.

The *Didache* refers to Paul and his teaching, but does not mention Peter nor a pope nor the Virgin Mary. While it gives the Lord's prayer and other simple forms of prayer they are all addressed to God. Indeed this early Christian discipline knows nothing of

¹ This exception is believed by some to be spurious and to have been added later. There is no evidence that pouring was substituted for baptism at the early date ascribed to the *Didache*.

Dr. Camden M. Coburn, a noted archaeologist and a Methodist, says: "The very oldest baptismal picture found among the catacombs of Home represents the new convert as coming up after immersion from the river which reaches over his knees, and joining hands with the baptiser who is dressed in a tunic; while in the air hovers a dove with a twig in its mouth."

The Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. 2, p. 262, says: "In the Latin Church immersion seems to have prevailed until the twelfth century."

the unscriptural practices of the Roman Catholic Church because it had no existence in that period.

ANCIENT ODES

In 1909 Dr. J. Rendel Harris discovered and published a Syrac manuscript of 64 leaves which was a collection of Christian hymns and spiritual songs which scholars think belong to the end of the first century. Dr. Coburn says: "No one doubts that we have here a collection of hymns and spiritual songs coming from the apostolic age and breathing the deepest thoughts of the New Testament." They reflect the thought and style of the Gospel of John to such a degree as to bear strong evidence of the existence of John's Gospel. It is said to contain the doctrine of the trinity, the virgin birth, descent into hades, Christ's preexistence and preeminence, spiritual union with believers, his deity as Son of the Most High, word and Messiah. Ode No. 16 shows that the author did not keep the Sabbath." (See "New Archaeological Discoveries," Coburn, 308.)

TATIAN'S DIATESSARON

Tatian, a Syrian scholar, was born about A.D. 110, became a Christian under Justin Martyr about 150 to 170, and wrote his *Diatessaron* on harmony of the Gospels some time later. The *Diatessaron* (by means of four) was an attempt to weave into one continuous narrative everything found in the four Gospels. Hostile critics admitted its early date and the significance of the title, but they affirmed that it would not be a compilation of the four canonical gospels. They thought it was taken from some of the apocryphal gospels written at a much later date than that in which the canonical gospels were claimed to have been written. They argued that time was necessary to develop the miraculous stories and supernaturalisms found in the four canonical gospels and that they could not have been written in the first century in their present form with the miraculous accounts fully developed and accepted by the people. For this reason they claimed

that the four canonical gospels originated not earlier than the last half of the second century when the monstrous stories as they called them had sufficient time to develop.

The *Diatessaron* was lost in the early centuries and a commentary on it had also been lost, and nothing was known of either but the name and a few quotations found in other works. In 1836 the commentary was found in a convent in Venice and later the *Diatessaron* itself in Syrian manuscript was found in the Vatican at Rome, and a second copy was found in the possession of an Egyptian scholar which is now translated and published in English. Hostile critics who were confidently affirming that it could not be the compilation of our gospels were completely routed and surprised when it was found that the *Diatessaron* was compiled from the canonical gospels—these four and no more, containing most of the first three gospels and nearly all of John— just what critics said it could not be! It has not one sentence from a spurious gospel of Thomas, or any other than our canonical gospels. The proof is, therefore, conclusive that the four gospels were not only in existence at this early date, but that they alone were recognized and accepted as the only inspired and authoritative histories of the life of Christ. This places the gospels in the first century where they belong— miracles and all—and since false stories of miracles and supernaturalisms could not have developed and become fixed and accepted in so short a time, the gospel story as told by Matthew, Mark, Luke and John must be true.

Jesus himself endorsed the Old Testament when he said: "These are my words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms, concerning me." (Luke 24:44.) The entire Old Testament was well known in his day as consisting of these three divisions.

CHAPTER X

INTERNAL EVIDENCE

While external evidence supports the claims of the Bible at every point of contact, internal evidence carries greater weight, is more convincing and more conclusive, so that when the inspired message is read with a view of learning the truth about life and salvation the inevitable result is a compelling conviction of the truth of its claims.

The Bible having been written by some forty men during a period of about 1,500 years, in different languages, in different countries, mostly unacquainted with each other, often not knowing much or any thing of what predecessors among them had written, having no intention of working their writings into the system of those predecessors, and not knowing that their writings would form a part of a collation, is a marvel of harmony and unity which cannot be accounted for by human reason apart from Divine influence. The many undesigned coincidences and consistent historical facts found in the Bible cannot be the result of chance, and such a consistent record cannot be the work of men unaided by Divine Providence.

The exact and literal fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies concerning Jesus and the character and nature of his kingdom, many of which were couched in language so obscure and mystical that even the prophet who uttered them did not grasp their meaning, has ever been the strong argument of Christian prophets and teachers in support of the Christian religion. No one can read the prophecy concerning the birth of Jesus in the Old Testament and the fulfillment of it in the New Testament without wonder and amazement. Nor can one read the prophecy concerning his death and contemplate the scenes of Calvary pictured

in the New Testament without realizing the wonderful fitness in every detail of a most incomprehensible prediction.

The nature of the contents of the Bible could alone come from God. Only by revelation from God could we know any thing of creation, of the nature and person of God, heaven or hell; only Divine power could exercise the foreknowledge manifested in predictive teaching; and true wisdom can come only through the precepts of an all-wise God.

The central thought of the Bible is the person and mission of the Redeemer, and this thought runs like a colored strand in the cable of time. It begins with the bruising of the tempter's head; becomes the scepter that shall not depart from Judah till Shilo come when as yet there was no scepter in any tribe; and takes the form of the "Star out of Jacob and scepter out of Israel," and the "Lion of the tribe of Judah." It is seen in the prediction "a virgin shall conceive and bear a son"; it is proclaimed in Isaiah's vision of his forerunner, his beneficent works and his miracles; in his rejection by the Jews and acceptance by the Gentiles, so often predicted in the prophets of old. He is to be a prophet like Moses and a priest like Melchizedek; his dominion universal and everlasting; his reign one of peace and good will.

The unity of the Bible is seen in all its parts. Its historical records not exhaustive, but showing God's dealings with man, portray the coming and work of Christ, the Messiah-King of the Old Testament, the incarnate God of the New, relating to the necessity of his coming entailed by the fall of man and his restoration and salvation.

The moral character of the Bible is a unit in representing God as holy, hating sin, as being a just judge, rewarding the good and punishing the evil, and representing man in a fallen state but capable of recovering his original moral condition through obedience, while showing the moral failings of Noah, Lot and Abraham; of Moses, David and Peter; Christ alone being perfect.

The spiritual unity of the Bible is shown by representing man as needing a savior; by sacrificial system looking forward to Christ in the Old Testament and back to the cross in the New; by ever recurring references to the mercy of God as required by men and granted by him; and by the idea of God as supreme spiritual Head of all mankind. This spiritual unity of the Bible is manifested in its adequacy and adaptability to the needs of man, and when applied to his life satisfies the longing, the yearning and the craving of the human heart for something higher and nobler and better than this life can supply. It is the only balm for the sin-sick soul hungering and thirsting for righteousness.

The Bible itself is the greatest miracle of the world. Its harmony and unity, each book being independent, yet all of them simultaneous, having always one supreme purpose—the good of mankind—combine to make its Divine origin axiomatic rather than logical. The arrangement of the books in the Bible is most natural and shows them to synchronize with one another, each being the complement of others, thus forming a unit with one author, God; one character, truth; and one purpose, man's temporal good and eternal salvation. It has a beginning, a middle and an end with all the elements necessary to consummate the Divine purpose. No other collection of books could be made to harmonize and synchronize in all departments regarding their history, purpose, character and authority in any department of human endeavor. It is the only book in the world wholly devoted to man's highest good, the science of human happiness, giving his origin, his relations and obligations, and his destiny. The Bible is its own interpreter. To read it and imbibe its teaching is to accept it with the fullest assurance of faith that we have the right book, without the testimony or interpretation of fallible men claiming infallibility—an attribute belonging alone to God.

CHAPTER XI APOCRYPHAL BOOKS

Those books of doubtful authenticity called Apocryphal, which are included by Romanists in their canon of inspired Scriptures are:

I	Esdras,	Wisdom,
II	Esdras,	Ecclesiasticus,
	Tobias,	Baruch.
	Judith.	

These were listed as canonical by the council of Trent in the sixteenth century and a curse was pronounced upon any who shall not receive them. It is also true that some early Christians received these books as part of the sacred literature. They were included in the catalogue of Carthage A.D. 397, and were appended to the Septuagint Greek translation of the Old Testament by the Alexandrian Jews, but they were not listed in any of the catalogues of inspired books till the fourth century, neither do they appear in any of the Hebrew texts of the Old Testament. Melito, the bishop of Sardis, in the second century, referring to the Hebrew canon, separated them from the authoritative and Divine records. Jerome called them apocryphal and said that while the church read them, yet it did not apply them to establish any doctrine. (See "Helps in Oxford Teachers Bible.")

The apocryphal books differ from the canonical books of the Old Testament in the marked absence of prophetic teaching, of Divine revelation and of religious poetry, while the Old Testament was referred to as the "Law of Moses, and the prophets and the psalms" (Luke 24:44), none of the apocryphal books laying any claim to inspiration.

The internal evidences are strong against the Divine inspiration of the apocrypha. The book of Judith is

believed to be a book of fiction on account of irreconcilable references in its historical and geographic references. There are many inconsistencies in the books and they vary at many points from the inspired records. Second Mace. 12:43, 44, shows the writer believed in praying for the dead, a thing totally unknown in the canonical books. In II Mace. 15:12 is related a dream or vision, in which Jeremiah, long dead, is represented as praying for the people of the holy city and helping them. This is cited by Romanists as authority for invoking the dead to intercede for them. No such doctrine is to be found in the canonical books, but the contrary teaching that the night of death cometh when no man can work.

The Bible forbids and condemns magical incantations (Lev. 19:26; Deut. 18:10-14), but Tobias 6:1-8, represents an angel of God as directing him in the practice of incantations and augury. Besides other inconsistencies, the very language of the apocrypha betrays human authorship, as uncertain, vacillating, extravagant or silly.

From the Romanist Question Box, p. 54, we read:

"Is it not strange that if the Septuagint version enumerated books not belonging to the canon Christ and his apostles should have continually cited it? For some 300 out of the 350 quotations from the Old Testament found in the New are taken from the Greek of this version, which contained all the books of the Catholic Bible of today?"

In reply to the above I would ask, is it not strange also that not one of these 350 quotations is taken from any of the list of apocryphal books, and that not one of these apocryphal books is found in the Hebrew Old Testament?

CHAPTER XII

JEROME'S LATIN VULGATE

Notwithstanding the claims of Romish writers that the decrees of councils and the bulls of popes are "*final, irrevocable and infallible*" (F. F., 150), and that the Latin Vulgate is the only true and authentic Bible, history records complete refutation of all such claims. The council of Trent, held in the sixteenth century, being the last one called by the Roman Catholic Church, *ordained and declared* the original printed by Robert Stephens in 1540 (with perhaps the changes made in a new edition of 1547) "shall be held as authentic in all public lectures, disputations, sermons and expositions; and that no one shall dare or presume to reject it, under any pretense whatever." However, a number of various readings were added in the edition of 1547, and again new editions in 1580 and in 1585 contained many more variations in the text. Since the Vulgate was thus exalted by the council of Trent to a place above the inspired original, it was deemed necessary to replace an authorized edition of this Latin version on account of the innumerable variations in the different editions of the Vulgate issued previous to that time. To effect uniformity Pope Sixtus V authorized and directed a new revision of the text to be made which was published in 1590. This new edition was proclaimed by his infallible papal authority to be the authentic and unalterable standard of Scripture. It was soon discovered that this edition also abounded with errors, though it had been accompanied by a papal bull, enjoining its universal acceptance. This proved to be an embarrassing situation to the church dignitaries of the Romish faith. Something must be done. Either this edition with a great number of glaring errors in it must be maintained, or it must be infallibly shown to be fallible by the correction of the errors. Of the two horns of this dilemma they decided to recall the edition as far

as possible and a more correct edition was issued by order of Pope Clement VIII in 1592 accompanied by another infallible bull. But not all of the edition was destroyed, a few copies being found in libraries to tell the story. It is said that these Latin Vulgates, claimed to be infallibly correct, contain more than 2,000 variations. Dr. Jahn, a noted Romanist, says as quoted by Dr. Dowling: "The more learned Catholics have never denied the existence of errors in the Vulgate." (H. R., 487.)

It would be interesting to hear an explanation of these contradictions and conflicts of infallible (?) authority. It will be remembered also, that the Douay Bible, the only English version that Romanists are permitted to read, is a translation, not from the original Hebrew and Greek, but, from this infallible (?) Latin Vulgate.

The "Romish Question Box" says: "The Catholic Church alone guarantees infallibly the authenticity of the Latin Vulgate" (p. 47). What about those conflicting editions, each being guaranteed infallible by papal bulls? They pertain to "faith and morals," and it is presumed, of course that they were given "*ex cathedra*," in the pope's official capacity, which Romish writers tell us must be the case in order for the pope's decrees to be infallible.

CHAPTER XIII

READING THE BIBLE

The Synod of Toulouse in 1229 forbade the laity to have in their possession any copy of the books of the Old and New Testament except the Psalter and such other portions as are contained in the *Breviary* or the *Hours of the Blessed Mary*. These works were most strictly forbidden in the vulgar tone. The Synod of Tarragona (1234) ordered all vernacular versions to be brought to the bishop to be burned.

There were German Bibles before Luther was born and English Bibles or portions of the Bible in English before the time of Wycliffe, but they were all translated from the Latin Vulgate, itself a very imperfect translation, instead of being translated from the original Hebrew and Greek Scriptures. But these were not generally distributed among the people and no special effort was made to this end. It is evident that if the Bible in the vernacular tongue had been generally distributed among the people there would not have been such a storm of protest by the Roman Catholics when it was translated and given to the people by Wycliffe and Luther. The Roman Catholic Church claims to have been the sole possessor of the Bible for a long time and that "had she hated it she could easily have dragged into the light of day every copy then in existence, and were she so disposed, could have destroyed and reduced all to ashes."

In the first place the Roman Catholic Church was not the sole possessor of the Bible at any time, and besides God is able to protect his word even in the hands of his enemies, as he protected Daniel in the den of lions and the Hebrew children in the fiery furnace. "Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee." (Ps. 76:10.) We also have God's guarantee that his word shall not

return unto him void, "But it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereunto I sent it." (Isa. 55:11.)

A Roman Catholic writer makes the following proud boast: "She [the Roman Catholic Church] has been the parent, the author and maker under God of the Bible; she has always been the only effective and consistent preserver of the Bible; she guarded it through the ages from error and destruction; she has ever held it in highest veneration and esteem, and has ever grounded her doctrines upon it; she alone has the right to call it her book and she alone possesses the Bible in all its fullness and integrity." ("Facts About Luther," 184.)

The same author says further that the "Sacred Scriptures were always a favorite subject of study among the clergy . . . The Scriptures besides were read regularly to the people and explained frequently both in church and school, through sermons, instructions and addresses, so that the faithful were steeped in, and permeated through and through with the inspired Word of God. Paintings and statuary and frescoes and stained glass windows were used in the churches to depict Biblical subjects and fix on the people's memories and understandings the doctrines of faith and the great events in God's dealings with His creatures since the beginning of the world." (*Ibid.*, 192.)

The foregoing will appear absurd and ridiculous enough to a Bible reader without comment. But I wish to call attention to the fact that it betrays what was already known, that the clergy, the priests and the monks had copies of the whole Bible, but the people were to rely on such sermons, instructions, and addresses as the clergy saw fit to give. The Roman Catholic position has ever been that the Bible is of little or no value to the people except as it is dished out to them and interpreted by the clergy. With a Romanist "paintings and statuary and frescoes and

stained glass windows" "used in the churches" were most effective agencies of instruction to "fix on the people's memories and *understandings* the doctrines of faith and the great events in God's dealings with His creatures since the beginning of the world." The marvel is that any people in this enlightened age could be persuaded to believe such stuff as the foregoing. Suppose you try such methods in school, studying history, science, law, medicine by means of "paintings," "statuary," "frescoes," "stained glass windows." It will work just as well there as in trying to fix on the *understandings* the *doctrines of faith*. But it serves to keep the people in ignorance of the real teaching of the Scriptures. The Bible can no more be taught in its true meaning by such means than can the science of law or medicine. If more time were devoted to the reading of the Bible itself by the people they would soon learn not to rely upon auricular confessions, indulgences, prayers to the saints, veneration of relics and images, and many other rites and ceremonies of the Roman Catholic Church which are unknown to the Bible.

Roman Catholic writers are most inconsistent in these modern times in claiming that they do not object and never have objected to the reading of the Bible in the vernacular tongue. They teach that the decrees of their councils and popes are "*final, irrevocable and infallible*" but their former attitude on this subject has certainly been revoked or reversed as will be shown by the evidences of the past which cannot be disputed. Many writers of that faith now claim they have never objected to the reading of the Bible in the vernacular tongue, but only to faulty translations. History does not so teach and we shall examine some of their own doctrines of the past to see just what their position has been.

The following is a copy from Dr. Bowling's History of Romanism, p. 492, where the original Latin is found with the translation giving Rules on prohibited 4

books enacted by the council of Trent, and approved by Pope Pius IV in a bull issued on the 24th of March, 1564:

Rule 4. "Inasmuch as it is manifest from experience, that if the Holy Bible, translated into the vernacular tongue, be indiscriminately allowed to every one, the temerity of men will cause more evil than good to arise from it, it is, on this point, referred to the judgement of the bishops, or inquisitors, who may, by the advice of the priest or confessor, permit the reading of the Bible translated into the vulgar tongue by Catholic authors, to those persons whose faith and piety, they apprehend, will be augmented, and not injured by it; and this permission they must have in writing. But if any one shall have the presumption to read or possess it without such written permission, he shall not receive absolution until he have first delivered up such Bible to the ordinary. Booksellers, however, who shall sell, or otherwise dispose of Bibles in the vernacular tongue, to any person not having such permission, shall forfeit the value of the books, to be applied by the bishop to some pious use; and be subjected by the bishop to such other penalties as the bishop shall judge proper, according to the quality of the offence. But regulars shall neither read nor purchase such Bibles without a special license from their superiors."

Gregory XVI issued a bull May 8, 1844, reciting the efforts of his predecessors in suppressing the reading of the Bible in the vernacular tongue adds the following:

"Whence it is generally laid down in the regulations dictated by the Fathers, adopted by the council of Trent, and approved by our predecessor, Pius VIII, of happy memory, and which [regulations] are prefixed to the list of prohibited books, that the reading of the Holy Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue, should not be permitted except to those to whom it might be deemed necessary to confirm in the faith and piety. Subsequently when heretics still persisted in their frauds it became necessary for Benedict XIV to superadd the injunction that no version whatever should be suffered to be read but those which should be approved of by the Holy See, accompanied by notes derived from the writings of the Holy Fathers, or other learned and Catholic authors." (H. R., 622.)

The foregoing authorities clearly show that the Roman Catholic Church opposes not so-called faulty translations, but the promiscuous reading of the Bible in the common, vernacular or vulgar tongue—one's own mother tongue. That is, German and English

people might read the Latin Vulgate, but not the Bible in their native language, except as may be granted by the Holy See. And in no case is a Bible in the vulgar tongue to be read unless it is "accompanied by notes derived from the writings of the Holy Fathers, or other learned and Catholic authors." In English this means the Douay translation only, which has the text accompanied by the required notes by Catholic authors. It is evident from these and other Roman Catholic testimonies that might be furnished that the reading of the Bible by the laity is not only not encouraged, but it is absolutely forbidden except when accompanied by notes teaching the Roman Catholic doctrine. From the simple word of God without notes of interpretation one would never learn that there was such a thing as the Roman Catholic Church, or that Peter was ever pope, or that the church was built on Peter.

But if the Roman doctrine be true that people cannot read and understand the Bible for themselves why should they read it? The only objection to their policy in this case would be that God has not said any thing about such prohibition nor did he authorize the pope or any one else to limit or prevent the reading of his word. There seems to be a showing of consistency here when we hear the Romanist saying that we should "hear the church," "Jesus himself never wrote one line of scripture," "never once commanded his apostles to write a word (except when he directed John to write the Apocalypse)," or "even to circulate the Scriptures already written." (F. F., 101.) Gibbons further refers to the Bible as the "Dead letter of the law" and insists that the gospel of Christ was to be given to the world by oral teaching. He thinks "Go teach all nations" is limited to oral instruction.¹ These views are absurd and utterly unworthy of the scholarly Gibbons. He simply *assumes* that teaching excludes written instruction. The Savior prayed not

¹ "Christ gave his disciples no command to write, but only to teach." ("Catholic Encyclopedia," Vol. V, 767.)

only for his apostles but for all who might believe on him through their word. We have their word in the Scriptures and they were written that we might "believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing [we] might have life through his name." (John 20:30.) Did the Holy Spirit make a mistake in influencing them to do such an unnecessary thing?

To more fully set forth the attitude of Roman Catholics toward the Bible we quote from page 12 of a tract entitled "The Open Bible in Pre-Reformation Times," by Rev. J. M. Lenhart, a Romanist, as follows:

"Nothing is more subversive of faith than shallow enlightenment and a smattering of knowledge. Shallow draughts of knowledge intoxicate the brain. Hence indiscriminate reading of the Bible by half-educated people has been quite often not for their best interests. The Church had witnessed in her long career many lay people perverting the sacred text to defend their errors. She had to safeguard the truth against men who wantonly misinterpreted the Bible in order to support a variety of heretical doctrines. Quite naturally she warned her children against erroneous interpretations and abuses of the Scriptures. There were prelates and theologians who did not favor the movement to place the vernacular Bible in the hands of half-educated people, too ignorant to read the Scriptures in Latin. In 1530, the majority of Catholic bishops and priests in England declared that it was not necessary to have the Scriptures in the English tongue, and in the hands of the common people, and that, considering the unsettled state of things at home, the circulation of an English Bible among the people would rather tend to confusion than to deification. And those English prelates and priests could have found the best justification for their attitude in the development of the Reformation in Germany."

We quote from the Roman Catholic "Question Box," 144: "A logical protestant is ever a seeker after truth; a Catholic has found it, and therefore is under no necessity of further search." We believe the first part of the above is true and will apply to all intelligent people who are not so obsessed with conceit or so blinded by ignorance and prejudice that they cannot appreciate the truth when it is presented. The Catholic thinks he has found the truth and shuts his eyes to facts and refuses to investigate for himself in the light of the Scriptures. He has been taught to do so, and thus he is

not open to the reception of the truth, being so thoroughly fossilized in the false teaching of Romanism that he is satisfied with the ignorance and superstition of that system. The Bible teaches that we should feed upon the "sincere milk of the word" that we may grow thereby. Solomon advised all to seek after truth and wisdom, but the Romanist says "You must excuse me, I have it already. I do not need to do any seeking or thinking." This also accounts for the attitude of many Roman Catholics toward most any question that may come up in religion or regarding the Bible, for when asked regarding these matters they very often answer, "I don't know; ask Father N. N."

David said: "Thy word have I hid in my heart, that I might not sin against thee." "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path." Cardinal Gibbons says: "Do not tell me that the Bible is all-sufficient." Yet he admits that the Bible is inspired and it says: "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." (2 Tim. 3:16, 17.) The controversy here is between Gibbons and the inspired apostle Paul.

"Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." (John 20:30.) Again the controversy is between Cardinal Gibbons and other Romanists on the one side and the inspired apostle John on the other. If not to be read why were these things written? And why did the apostle say that he had written these things to produce faith and salvation through that faith? And if not to be read without being interpreted by the Roman Catholic pope or infallible interpreter why did not the apostle say so, or at least tell us why?

The apostle John says also "My little children, these things write I unto you that ye may not sin." When

the lawyer asked Jesus what to do to inherit eternal life the Savior said: "What is written in the law? How readest thou?" With all these facts and scriptures before us how can we minimize the importance, yea, the necessity of reading the Bible?

Objection to reading the Bible now offered by Romanists is very different from what it once was. Formerly they protested loudly against giving the Bible in the vernacular tongue to the people, as we have abundantly shown. But now the objection is against reading what they class as faulty translations. I have before me an argument of this kind where objection is made to Luther's translation of Rom. 3:28 where the reading is "justified by faith alone." In the King James version the reading is "justified without the deeds of the law," and in the American Revised the expression is "justified apart from the works of the law." Again the same writer gives as a corrupt translation 2 Pet. 1:10, which in the Douay (Roman Catholic English Bible) reads, "Wherefore, brethren, labor the more that by good works you may make sure your vocation and election." In the King James version it reads, "Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure." The American Revised gives it, "Wherefore, brethren, give the more diligence to make your calling and election sure." This objector says Luther's translation omits the words *by your good works* which are found in the Douay. But in the so-called faulty translations the expression is followed by the words "for if ye do these things ye shall never stumble (fall)." So the idea of doing the things named is there and the objection is not sustained to one who really wants to do the things specified.

But granting that Luther was wrong at this point, more serious errors are found in the Douay (Roman Catholic Bible) which was translated from the Latin Vulgate, itself a faulty translation, the later version of the Vulgate having over 2,000 variations from the first edition of the same. But the omission is fully supplied in the King James and American Revised versions to

which our Romanist friends object as much as to Luther's or Wycliffe's translations. They are also bitterly opposed to the American Bible Society and other agencies for the distribution of the Bible, and the above excuses are the best they have offered for their opposition. For my part I cannot understand how honest and sincere objection could be made to these translations on the grounds mentioned. Do they really believe that the differences pointed out are sufficient to justify objection to reading protestant translations of the Bible and that one's salvation is jeopardized by reading them? It is unthinkable that such can be true. May we not suggest that the real reason is, whether they realize it or not, that they do not wish to violate the edicts of the power at Rome?

The Romish doctrine of indulgences is responsible for the perversion of the meaning of repentance, making it to mean a series of satisfactions and confessions. Hence their Douay Bible gives *do penance* in many places where repent is the proper word to express the command to turn away from sin and reverse one's course. In Mark 1:4; Luke 3:8 *metanoias*, Luke 24:47 *metanoian* is translated *penance* while in Acts 11:18 the same word is translated *repentance*. Why the difference?

Repentance is produced by Godly sorrow and is a change or reformation of the purpose and conduct. Where an injury has been done to others scriptural repentance includes restitution to the extent of one's ability. *Doing penance* includes the undergoing of some punishment either self-imposed or imposed by a superior, both in this life and in purgatory, in expiation of sin. This idea is not found in the Bible teaching. *Doing penance* consists of confessing to the priest and satisfying the penalties imposed by the church through him. The priest claims to be able to remit these penalties upon certain conditions, or the performance of certain good works, *i. e.*, the penalty may be satisfied by assuming some burden or affliction imposed by the priest, such as prayers, almsgiving to churches,

monasteries, hospitals, jubilees, or pilgrimages, etc. The doing of these things thus imposed is *doing penance*—the Roman Catholic idea of repentance—an idea not even hinted at in the scriptures. Martin Luther's break with Rome was precipitated by this gross perversion of repentance, the substitution of *doing penance* for the turning away from sin in Godly sorrow. When his parishioners came to Luther to make confession, his demand, that they promise to cease the particular sins they were confessing, was refused whereupon Luther refused absolution. This led to his ninety-five theses and finally to his break with the papal system.

It is true that we often see the results or penalties of sin in this life even after God has granted pardon, but no man is authorized to impose these penalties, neither is there any scripture warrant for one assuming penalties or afflictions upon himself. For mortal man to presume to impose penalties or to pretend to remit them either in this life or in purgatory is nothing less than blasphemy and is high treason against the God of heaven.

Roman Catholics have attempted to make a distinction between scriptural elders and bishops and to establish an order of priests under the Christian dispensation. Consequently their Douay Bible is seriously at fault in translating *presbuteros*¹ priest in 1 Tim. 5:17, 19; Titus 1:5; James 5:14; Acts 14:23, while the same Greek word is translated *ancients* in 1 Tim. 5:1; 1 Pet. 5:1; Acts 11:30 and in many other places. Why the difference? The real priest of the Old Testament is represented by the Greek word *hiereus* which is correctly translated *priest*, but this has nothing whatever to do with the translation of *presbuteros* as priest when it simply means elder.

The Greek word *episkopon*¹ is correctly translated *bishop* in the Douay Bible, but there is no distinction between elder (ancient) and bishop in the New Testament. This is clearly shown in Acts 20:17 where *elder* (*presbuteros*¹) and in the 28th verse *bishop* (*epis-*

kopon¹) refer to the same persons. The same is true of Titus 1:5 where *elder* (presbuteros¹) and in the 7th verse *bishop* (episkopon¹) refer to the same person. There is no authority in the New Testament for a priest nor for any distinction between elders and bishops and it is a serious fault to make a translation indicate such. In view of these plain facts Roman Catholics will have to abandon their objection to faulty translations or abandon their Douay Bible. When they object to the King James or Revised version on account of faulty translation and accept the Douay version they strain at gnats and swallow camels.

¹ For convenience the nominative singular is given.

CHAPTER XIV

WHICH CHURCH?

The New Testament recognizes but one church, the church of God, called also in the Bible, the church. Christ also spoke of it as "my church," and it is therefore the church of Christ. This church is Christ's body—"And gave him to be head over all things to the church which is his body" (Eph. 1:22, 23). It is also called kingdom of heaven (Matt. 16:19); and Christ's kingdom (Col. 1:13); and the kingdom of God (1 Cor. 6:9). In declaring this church to be Christ's body Paul, addressing the "Church of God which is at Corinth, even them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ in every place," tells them "Now ye are the body of Christ, and severally members thereof" (1 Cor. 12:27).

The idea of sectarianism or denominationalism is foreign to the New Testament. The figure of the vine and the branches (John 15:5) does not teach it, but teaches that "ye (individual disciples or Christians) are branches." No thought of denominations is even remotely hinted at here. The Savior prayed earnestly that his apostles and all who should believe on him through their word might be one; and Paul (in 1 Cor. 1:10-13) condemns division and the giving of unauthorized names to different groups of the followers of Christ.

The only recognized and approved religious organization known in the New Testament is the church of Christ which includes all Christians, and the local congregations or churches served by elders and deacons. That elders did not differ at all from bishops or overseers is evident from the fact that the two words are used indiscriminately in Acts 20:17, 28 and in Titus 1:5, 7 (See Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, p. 536, Edition of 1889). These

were not to lord it over God's heritage, but were to teach and be "ensamples to the flock," using moral suasion and not force (1 Pet. 5:1-3). Peter here calls himself a "fellow elder" and places upon himself these restrictions along with other elders. If Peter was a pope he certainly did not know it.

We do not join the church, but when we believe in Christ as the Son of God, repent of our sins (turn away from them, making restitution where possible for injuries done), and obey the Lord in the ordinance of baptism, God adds us to his church, not some sect or denomination (Acts 2:38-41). Jesus said just before his ascension, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:16, 17).

"But," says one, "where was the church of the New Testament when Luther was born?" or "Where was it when Alexander Campbell was born?" When Luther was born the Roman Catholic church held almost if not quite universal sway. With that church persecution was the strong argument for orthodoxy, and by this means the heathen and even Jews were persuaded to accept the Romish faith. As a result of the reformation by Luther and others the universal power of the Roman Catholic Church was broken and most of the denominations of our time came into being soon after. These denominations which sprang from the reformation of Luther claimed nearly or quite all professed Christians outside the Roman Catholic Church and the Greek Catholic Church at the time of Alexander Campbell's birth. The question then is, "where was the true church when Luther was born if the Roman Catholic Church was not that church"? Or "when Alexander Campbell was born where was the true church if it was not the Roman Catholic Church or one of the denominations then in existence or among them?" The assumption is that the "gates of hell shall not prevail against" the church and it must, therefore, have a Continuous existence on earth, unbroken from the time of the apostles. At this point I shall neither affirm nor

deny that there were true Christians all along constituting the true church of Christ not under the control or domination of these sectarian groups, and I mean to include Roman Catholics as a sect. The prophet Elijah thought himself the only one who had remained loyal to the true God, but God told him there were 7,000 souls who had not bowed the knee to Baal. Likewise there may have been some who did not claim allegiance to the pope nor bow the knee to the crucifix.

The history of Romanism from its inception to the present records no period when there were no "heretics" as the objects of its wrath. At all times then there were persons claiming to be Christians who repudiated the Roman Catholic faith. Who can deny that there were individuals among them who were true Christians?

But granting that the falling away, the mystery of lawlessness which had already begun its work in Paul's day, grew to such proportions that all professed Christians on earth were embraced in its destructive development, this would not necessarily imply that the gates of hell had prevailed against Christ's church, for God's family is not limited to those on earth, but includes those gone on before. A temporary falling away cannot be classed as permanent destruction or annihilation. In this sense (which *I* think is the true sense) the gates of hell have not prevailed against the church and can never do so. Another view held by eminent Bible scholars is that the prevailing spoken of was not against the church, but against the building of it as determined by the Savior. The gates of hell was the grave where Jesus remained three days, then came forth a mighty conqueror over the powers of the hadean world and established his church as he had affirmed he would do. Thus from either viewpoint the promise of the Christ has not failed.

Again, there is no reason nor scripture to support the claim that a continuous, unbroken succession of Christians on earth is necessary to acceptable obedience to the gospel at any time even after a complete

falling away. The gospel "is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth" (Rom. 1:16), and its efficacy is nowhere limited to an unbroken succession of God's faithful ones on earth. "The seed" [of the kingdom] "is the word of God" (Luke 8:11). "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever" (1 Pet. 1:23). The life-giving germ remains in the gospel and when believed and obeyed it will produce Christians. When God places no limitations or restrictions on this law let not man corrupt it by theories of his own. We dare not legislate where God has not. So far as the Scriptures speak, even after lapse of a thousand years of any length of time since a true Christian lived on earth, the gospel would still be the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes it. The association of any number of such believers would constitute a local church or congregation and the whole number of such persons would constitute the church of God, or the Church of Christ, or simply the church as frequently called in the New Testament.

PART II

PRIMACY OF PETER

INTRODUCTION

The Primacy of Peter constitutes the very foundation of the whole Roman Catholic system of religion, though not the foundation of the church of the New Testament, for there is no evidence that Peter was the foundation of any church, nor is there any primacy accorded him in the Scriptures. Peter was impulsive, affectionate, thoroughly human, and his haste sometimes led him into difficulty. His natural disposition accounts for his quick replies, often speaking before others, and thus naturally acting as spokesman for the apostles on many occasions without official appointment or election to such duties. There is no evidence that either Peter or any of the rest of the apostles recognized in him anything official or authoritative over other apostles. In order to make a systematic examination of the claims of Romanists that Peter was Prince of the apostles, the *sine qua non* of the whole system of Roman Catholicism, we classify the inquiry as follows:

- (1) Has Jesus Christ established the office of pope?
- (2) Who was first to fill the office?
- (3) Was there a succession ordained?
- (4) Is there an unbroken succession down to this time?
- (5) Powers of the pope.

CHAPTER I

(1) HAS JESUS CHRIST ESTABLISHED THE OFFICE OF POPE?

Our first inquiry is as to whether the office of pope has been established. If it has been established we should be able to show this from the Scriptures, for we have learned that there is no other standard of authority in matters of religion. In all the New Testament no mention is made of such an office. Paul gives in detail a list of the servants of the church in 1 Cor. 12:28 and in Eph. 4:11, but fails to mention either by name or character of service such an office or duty as that of pope or vicar of Christ. Aside from the silence of the Scriptures on this subject, the fact that equal authority to bind and loose, and to forgive sins and retain sins was given to all the apostles, precludes the *Primacy* of one of them.

Jesus said, "Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority over them, but it shall not be so among you." (Matt. 20:25, 26.) This settles forever the question of supremacy or *Primacy among* the apostles. They were all "ambassadors for Christ as though God did Beseech you by us" (2 Cor. 5:20). Had there been a Primacy it seems that Paul would have known it and would have indicated it rather than placing all the apostles on the same basis as all being ambassadors for Christ.

But in addition to the scriptural proofs of the equality of the apostles so far as authority or official rule or power is concerned, we have evidence that may appeal to Romanists where the inspired writings fail to impress. I refer to the fact that while the church at Rome had in New Testament times a plurality of bishops or elders according to Divine appointment, later on a single bishop assumed authority over this church, just as was the case with the church at Alex-

andria, at Antioch, at Jerusalem, at Constantinople, these being appointed first by Constantine and clothed by him with civil authority as well as ecclesiastical rule. These offices developed under the lofty title of *Patriarch*, each being independent of all others in his own district. The idea of Universal Bishop, Pope, or Vicar of Christ does not appear in the New Testament, nor have our Romanist friends produced any historical evidence from the primitive Fathers, the councils both provincial and general, down to the close of the sixth century, that such office existed in the church.

The Roman Catholic hierarchy did not originate in New Testament times nor by inspired apostles. Neither did it spring into existence suddenly at any subsequent time. It is a gradual development covering several centuries, an evolution, if you please, which began in Paul's day, "For the mystery of iniquity doth already work" (2 These. 2:7), and has continued to develop even to the present day. Dr. Coburn, a noted archaeologist, says: "In the catacomb inscriptions we observe simplicity and brevity beginning with the first century. Later they became more elaborate and extensive and showed a gradual development of a corrupted gospel. The cross first appears in the end of the third or beginning of the fourth century, while the halo about the head of the Savior originated in the third century and later about the head of *any saint*. The *crucifix* does not appear till the seventh century." New forms, ceremonies and superstitions were gradually adopted till we have the gigantic combination of Judaism, paganism and Christianity proudly parading today under the pretense of the latter as the "Holy Roman Catholic Church." Under the system as now constituted, governed by an absolute monarch, with all departments,—legislative, judicial and executive—vested in the pope, Christ's viceregent on earth, why should it not continue to grow and develop as it has done in the past? And having cut loose from the Bible as a standard of authority, who can predict the limits to which this great apostasy may go?

One of the first steps toward papal supremacy, after the act of Constantine already referred to, was a decree of the council of Sardis in A.D. 347 authorizing appeals to the bishop of Rome for assistance in settling disputes. (See Hammond on Six Councils 1843, p. 40, quoted by Dr. Dowling.)

A second step toward papal supremacy was a law enacted in the year 372, by the emperor Valentinian empowering the bishops of Rome to judge other bishops. (See Dr. Maclaine's note in Mosheim I, p. 344, quoted by Dr. Dowling.)

Gieseler, Vol. I, p. 260 (quoted by Dr. Dowling), says:

"From this time forth [4th century], there was no controversy in the East in which each party did not seek to win the bishop of Rome, and through him the Western church to its cause, vying with each other in flattery and servility. At the councils, his legates were always treated with the greatest deference, and at the council of Chalcedon, 451, they, for the first time, presided."

The bishop of Constantinople had assumed spiritual government over Asia Minor, Thrace, Pontus and a portion of Illiricum very much to the dissatisfaction of Leo the Great, bishop of Rome, whose ambition for the supremacy was denied by the passage of the 28th canon of the council of Chalcedon (451) granting the same rights and honors to the bishop of Constantinople which were claimed by the bishop of Rome on account of the equal dignity and lustre of the two cities in which these prelates exercised their authority. This same council also, by solemn act, confirmed the bishop of Constantinople in his ambitious usurpation of authority over the provinces named above. These decrees were passed over the most vehement opposition and protest of Leo. (H. R., 41.)

While the bishop of Rome had been ambitious for power and authority, and for several centuries the See of Rome had been gradually increasing in influence so' that ecclesiastic problems were frequently referred to it for decision, and although Emperor Valentinian enacted a law in 372 empowering the bishop of Rome

to judge other bishops, still no Roman bishop ever claimed the title of Universal Bishop till after the close of the sixth century, though the seeds had been sown and the ground cultivated for the germination of the ambitious power. Bitter contests between rivals for the Roman See had been the cause of much disgrace and strife, but the rivalry between the See of Rome and that of Constantinople was more intense and raged with greater acrimony near the end of the sixth century than at any previous time, and in the year 588, John the *faster*, bishop of Constantinople, assumed the title of Universal Bishop. This act was a great offence to Gregory the Great, bishop of Rome, whose jealousy was aroused and expressed with great zeal and vigor. The letters which Gregory wrote and which have been preserved are to the point and shed much light on the pretended succession of the popes of Rome. In his letters to his own ambassador at Constantinople, to the patriarch John, and to the emperor Mauritius, Gregory denounced the vain pretensions of bishop John, as "*vain*," "*execrable*," "*anti-Christian*," "*blasphemous*" "*infernal*," and "*diabolical*"

To bishop John Gregory wrote in part:

"You know it, my brother; hath not the venerable council of Chalcedon conferred the honorary title of universal upon the bishops of this Apostolic See, whereof I am, by God's will, the servant? And yet none of us hath permitted this title to be given to him; none has assumed this bold title, lest by assuming a special episcopate, we should seem to refuse it to all the brethren. . . . The Lord wishing to recall to a proper humility the yet feeble hearts of his disciples, said to them, 'If any man desire to be first, the same shall be last of all'; whereby we are clearly taught that he who is truly high is he who is most humble in mind. Let us, therefore, beware of being of the number of those who love the chief seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the markets, and to be called of men, 'Rabi, Rabi'. In fact, the Lord said to his disciples, 'Be ye not called Rabi, for one is your master . . . and all

ye are brethren. Neither be ye called Fathers, for ye have but one Father'.

"What then could you answer, beloved brother, in terrible judgment to come, who desire not only to be called Father, but *Universal Father* of the world? Beware then of evil suggestions; fly from the council of offense. 'It is impossible' indeed, 'but that offenses will come; but for all that woe unto him through whom they come!' In consequence of your wicked and vainglorious title, the church is divided and the hearts of the brethren are offended" (H. R. 50.)

Gregory also wrote to the emperor Mauritius, who bestowed this title of Universal Bishop upon John, protesting against this proud assumption and beseeching the emperor to interfere with his imperial authority. We quote from Gregory's letter to the emperor as follows:

"If then, every one of that church assumes the name by which he makes himself the head of all good men; the Catholic Church, which God forbid should ever be the case, must needs be overthrown when he falls who is called *Universal*. But far from Christians be this *blasphemous name*, by which all honor is taken from all other priests, while it is foolishly arrogated by one".

In another letter to Emperor Mauritius Gregory uses even stronger language, if possible, as follows:

"I am bold to say, *that whoever adopts or affects the title of Universal Bishop has the pride and character of anti-Christ, and is in some manner his forerunner in this haughty quality of elevating himself above the rest of his order. And indeed both the one and the other seem to split upon the same rock; for as pride makes anti-Christ strain his pretensions up to Godhead, so whoever is ambitious to be called the only or universal prelate, arrogates to himself a distinguished superiority, and rises, as it were upon the ruins of the rest*". (H. R. 54.)

Vain efforts have been made by Romanists to break the force of these statements of Gregory by trying to make it appear that he was simply protesting against the wearing of the title by one who had no right to it. But the language cannot be made to bear out such an idea, as it is applied to "*whoever,*" "*by it all honor is taken from the other priests,*" "*rises upon the ruins of the rest,*" etc. Furthermore Gregory says the title was offered to the See of Rome by the council of Chalcedon, but that *no one assumed it or accepted it*. His plain language is that no one had ever thus exalted himself among all the bishops. Let it be remembered too that Gregory the Great was of the regular line of popes according to Roman Catholic authority and was canonized as a *saint*. It would be difficult to conceive of more convincing evidence than the letters of Gregory proving that to his time no one had claimed the title or office of pope or Universal Bishop, except John, bishop of Constantinople, and his claim is repudiated by the Roman Catholic Church.

Two years after the death of Gregory the Great pope Boniface III applied to the emperor, Phocas, a most cruel and bloodthirsty tyrant, who made his way to the throne by usurpation and murder, and secured the title with the privilege of handing it down to his successors. Thus *Boniface III became the first recognized Universal Bishop of Rome* and the "man of sin" predicted by Paul and the "anti-Christ" suggested by Gregory, was fully developed and revealed in the *year A. D. 606*.

Nothing is more firmly fixed in the Roman Catholic mind than the idea that the pope is the viceregent of Christ on earth, and that since "all power is given unto" Christ "in heaven and in earth" this all power in earth is exercised by the pope as viceregent, and since the "Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins" the viceregent also has this power. This reasoning would be quite logical if we should assume that the pope is Christ's viceregent on earth. So would the charge of blasphemy made by the scribes and Pharisees

against Jesus when he claimed the power to forgive the sins of the paralytic (Luke 5:21) if he were not Divine. They were correct in believing that only God could forgive sins, but Christ was the Divine Son of God. A viceregent is one clothed with full power, to act instead of the principal ruler during his absence. But Jesus is not absent. He assures us that "Lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world" (Matt. 28:20). He is not here in person, but his representative is here, his last will and testament, given through the Holy Spirit, the comforter whom Jesus sent as his representative to be with us forever. So Christ is with us as he promised and reigns and rules in earth, not through a pope but, through his inspired will, the New Testament. We are taught in the Scriptures that a testament is of force after men are dead (Heb. 9:17). By that will we are to be governed and directed in this life; by it we are to be judged in the last day, and by it we are to receive the inheritance of eternal life or eternal condemnation according as we shall have met the requirements and conditions of that will on earth.

CHAPTER II

(2) WHO WAS FIRST TO FILL THE OFFICE?

The second inquiry under this heading is *Who was first to fill the office?* As evidence that Peter was pope Romanists claim that he was the first apostle called, but it is plainly stated (Jno. 1:41) that Andrew was first called and that he brought his "brother Simon and saith unto him, We have found the Messias." Again they sometimes say that Peter's name is first in all lists of apostles, but this is not the case in 1 Cor. 9:5, 6, and in Gal. 2:9, where he is listed second. Yet if it were true that he was first called and that his name appeared always first in the list of apostles, we do not see that this fact would lend any color whatever to the claim of his primacy in matters of rule or authority.

Romanists are fully persuaded that Matt. 16:18, 19 gives full support to all their claims for Peter, where it is said:

"And I say also unto 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 unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven."

They appeal to the Peshito Syriac translation where it is claimed that the masculine petros and feminine petra of the Greek original have only one form, kepha, for both masculine and feminine in the Syriac language. They assert that since the common language of Palestine was Syriac or Aramaic the Savior spoke this language and therefore used the word kepha which makes no distinction as to gender such as the Greek words of Matthew make. This argument implies that Matthew did not quote the Savior correctly, for he represents the Savior as using the Greek words petros

(masculine) and *petra* (feminine), in the form of direct quotation.

When the inspired writers represented or made use of a direct quotation in another language, the exact words of the speaker are given, followed by the explanation "which is, being interpreted," and then the meaning of the foreign language is given in Greek. When Jesus said to the daughter of Jairus "Talitha cumi" (Aramaic) the inspired record adds "which is, being interpreted," "Damsel, I say unto thee arise," this interpretation being in Greek (Mark 5:41). See also Matt. 1:23; Mark 15:22; John 1:38; John 1:41; Acts 4:36.

Scholars tell us that Greek was perhaps as much used by the common people of Palestine in New Testament times as was the Aramaic. Greek had been imposed by Alexander the Great upon the countries he conquered, and at this time it was to be heard not only in Greece, but in Italy, in Egypt, in Asia Minor and in Palestine. Not only were all the books of the New Testament written in Greek, but all the writings of the early Fathers, even of Rome, including her liturgies, were in Greek. Why is it considered unreasonable that Matthew quoted the Savior correctly as using Greek words in this scripture? The obvious purpose is to save a fundamental , dogma of the Romish faith. Furthermore the Latin Vulgate, which Romanists accept as the only authorized and infallible version of the Bible makes the same distinction as to gender, "Thou art *petrus* (masculine) and upon this *petram*" (feminine). The gender being different precludes their being the same things. The first referred to Peter (masculine) while the second referred to the truth (feminine) that Peter had confessed. Thus the main foundation of this fundamental doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, this *sine qua non* of their whole fabric vanishes into thin air, and no evidence remains to show that Christ built his church on Peter, but that it was built upon the solid foundation of the truth that Jesus is the Christ is most conclusive.

Again there is no evidence that the gift of the keys of the kingdom of heaven and the power of binding and loosing were given exclusively to Peter. In Matt. 18:18 the power of binding and loosing is given to all of the apostles. Upon what grounds, then, can Romanists claim that this gift was to Peter exclusive of all the other apostles? The plain facts are that the apostles were commissioned as the ambassadors of Christ and charged with the duty of delivering the message of salvation to the world. They had no prerogatives of their own, but they were to deliver the message of the Great King and "spake as the Spirit gave them utterance." If there is any special significance to the keys being given to Peter it lies in the fact that he had the privilege of preaching the gospel for the first time on the day of Pentecost when the Holy Spirit came upon the apostles—all of them and they all "spake with tongues." The fact that only one could have this particular privilege of preaching the first gospel sermon under the new covenant does not carry special authority or superiority over other apostles nor special privileges in other respects. This scripture is the main proof-text of Romanists for the *Primacy of Peter*, but the only support found in it is that of pure and unadulterated assumption.

"And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat: but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not; and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." (Luke 22:31, 32.)

Romanists use this scripture in support of their claims of a primacy for Peter above the other apostles, because he is here exhorted to confirm or strengthen his brethren. There is absolutely nothing peculiar to Peter in this scripture except that Satan had desired to have him that he might sift him, and the Lord seeing the danger Peter was facing interceded by prayer for him. Had other apostles been in such imminent danger, no doubt the Savior would have prayed for them just the same. As for strengthening or confirming his

brethren all of the apostles were expected to do that and did do it in their oral and written instructions.

"So when they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Peed my lambs. He saith to him again the second time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Peed my sheep. He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me? And he said unto him, Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed my sheep." (John 21:15-17.)

Romanists paraphrase the words "Lovest thou me more than these" which were addressed to Peter in the above scripture thus: "Peter, do you love me more than these (other disciples) love me?" This would ruin the grammar of the passage, for the word *these* would have to be nominative as the subject of the verb love understood, which is not the case. It is obvious that the pronoun *these* has as its antecedent "bread" and "fish" in verse 13. If the Romanist view is correct, it appears that Jesus asked a very unreasonable and impossible thing of Peter. For how could Peter know how much the other apostles loved him? On the other hand Peter could know his own heart and answer that he loved the Lord more than he loved the loaves and fishes or the fleeting things of life. Again it is claimed by Romanists that "feed my lambs" means *feed my flock* and "Feed my sheep" means *feed my clergy*. This is pure assumption that sheep means pastors or clergy while lambs means the laity. No examples of such distinction are cited and none can be found in the New Testament. It is indeed a sign of great weakness when a fundamental dogma has to rest on such assumptions. In the words of A. Campbell, "On what precarious, inferential and illogical grounds rest the proud assumptions of the pope on Rome! . . . who claims dominion over angels and saints in heaven—over all the spirits in the wide domains of purgatory; who styles himself, or permits

others to address him as a God on earth—as 'His Holiness! Lord God the Pope,' as holding the keys of heaven and hell, and the two swords of ecclesiastical and political justice; and all this mighty empire resting upon the words "petra," "strengthen thy brethren," "lovest thou me more than these," "feed my sheep and lambs"!

While Paul had the "care of all the churches" (2 Cor. 11:28) he did not have this exclusively. Peter, James, John and other apostles had the same responsibility. There was no conflict, no rivalry, no dioceses. All alike had the "care of all the churches"; all alike were to "feed my lambs" and "feed my sheep"; all alike were to "strengthen thy brethren." It is strange indeed that Romanists did not select Paul as pope rather than Peter. Had it been said anywhere in all the New Testament that Peter had the care of all the churches, this would have been used, no doubt, with great energy in support of his Primacy.

Bishop Purcell in his debate with A. Campbell, p. 183, defied him to prove that Peter retained his wife after he became a bishop. It would seem that the burden of proof should be on Bishop Purcell to prove that Peter put his wife away, since it is admitted that he had a wife. But Paul settles this question forever when he says: "Have we no right to lead about a wife that is a believer, even as the rest of the apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas (Peter)?" (1 Cor. 9:5.)

Again hear Paul: "The bishop therefore must be without reproach, the husband of one wife . . . one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; (but if a man knoweth not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?)" (1 Tim. 3:2-5). Peter confesses that he is a fellow-elder or bishop (1 Pet. 5:1). If Bishop Purcell means that Peter put away his wife after he became pope he has two propositions to prove instead of one—that he was pope and that he put away his wife at any time.

Again it seems that Peter was woefully neglecting his papal chair at Rome while he was at Joppa, when he went to the house of Cornelius, when he and John were sent as legates of the apostles to Samaria when they learned of the conversion of the Samaritans, and when he attended the council at Jerusalem; also when Paul visited him for fifteen days at Jerusalem, when he was at Antioch and when he agreed to preach to the Jews while Paul was to preach to the Gentiles.

At the first and only council of the church members mentioned in the New Testament Peter was present, but James presided (Acts 15 ch.). When Paul rebuked Peter he certainly did not regard him as his superior (Gal. 2:11-14). In his first epistle (5:1) Peter exhorts the elders and calls himself an elder. How, then, could he be pope? According to Roman Catholic doctrine the fact that Peter had a wife disqualified him as pope.

That there was no general recognition of Peter as prince of apostles or the head of the church in apostolic times is conclusive from Paul's statement in 1 Cor. 1:12 where one faction claimed to be of Paul, one of Apollos, one of Cephas (Peter) and one of Christ,

'Paul told the Ephesians (2:19, 20) that they were fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God *"and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone."* Again Paul told the church at Corinth: "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. 3:11). Neither Jesus nor any inspired writer ever said that the church was built on Peter; Peter himself, though not perfect in the flesh, was never guilty of the charge of usurping this honor, which the Holy Spirit ascribes to Jesus Christ alone. It is nothing less than a base slander against Peter to charge that he usurped or assumed or claimed the position and honor which the Scriptures confer upon Christ alone.

CHAPTER III

(3) WAS THERE A SUCCESSION ORDAINED?

The third item under this head is *Was a Succession of Popes Ordained?* Since no such office as pope was ever ordained by Divine authority, and since, according to the Scriptures, there was never such an official in the church, it necessarily follows that there could be no succession. There is not even any authority whatever in the Scriptures for any successors of the apostles. Jesus told the twelve apostles that they were to sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel, and if they have ever been dethroned or if they have abdicated their thrones we certainly have no evidence of it. The great commission was given to them to "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark 16:15, 16). They carried out this commission by preaching and then committed the same to writing which, by the grace and mercy of God has been handed down to us, and is for all the world for all time. There is, therefore, no need of other apostles. The plan of salvation provided through them is perfect and complete and needs no amending or alteration. These twelve apostles are still occupying the same thrones which they began to occupy on pentecost, and they are to continue to judge the whole people of God, spiritual Israel, till the end of time. It is through their word that we are to become Christians and by it we are to live this life and by it we are to be judged in the last day. (Matt. 19:28.)

The apostles were to be the special witnesses of Christ and his resurrection, all of them having seen him after he arose from the dead. We have their testimony in the New Testament, given by the Holy Spirit, through inspired apostles and prophets. If this qualification was necessary for apostles, as we

are told it was (Acts 1:22) when the twelve became authorized apostles by the Holy Spirit, how could it be possible for them to have successors unless such successors were thus made eligible as witnesses of the resurrection of Christ?

CHAPTER IV

(4) IS THERE AN UNBROKEN SUCCESSION DOWN TO THIS TIME?

The fourth item of the discussion of the *Primacy of Peter* is the question "*Is there an unbroken succession down to this time?*" Since the Bible recognizes no such office as that of pope, and consequently no such official appointed in the first place and therefore no successors ordained, it necessarily follows that there could be no unbroken succession down to this time. We could, with propriety, dismiss this topic here with the conclusion fully established that the negative is true. But in order to bring out some features which have been brought into this subject by the affirmative, we wish to give attention to some of the claims and evidences offered in its support.

In presenting the negative of this proposition we may say in the outset that Romanists have not shown an unbroken chain of succession of popes reaching back to Peter. No evidence from either inspired or profane history has been adduced to show that Peter was ever pope or was even in Rome at any time. I grant that tradition abounds with the claim, but tradition also abounds with many things that are not true. Tradition abounds with the story that Simon the sorcerer followed Peter to Rome, and, there was a tradition in John's day recorded in his gospel to the effect that John should never die, which might have gained currency and been handed down to this day had not John corrected the false report in his record.

The earliest tradition offered on this point is a statement in the reputed writings of Irenaeus who lived and wrote in the second half of the second century to the effect that Peter and Paul founded the church in Rome. But Irenaeus gives this as tradition and we know from the Scriptures that it is not true. The cause was well established at Rome when Paul

wrote his epistle to that church and he had never been there at that time (Rom. 1:8-13).

The only scripture cited to support the claim that Peter was in Rome is to be found in 1 Pet. 5:13. Our Romanist friends think the name Babylon means Rome in this passage, but it reads as follows: "The church that is in Babylon saluteth you and so doth Mark, my son." I quote from a learned scholar on this point as follows:

"There is no tradition whatever of Peter's movements after the council of Jerusalem (Acts 15); and, if, as is stated in Galatians, Peter and Paul agreed to go the one to the Gentiles, and the other to the Jews, then Peter may well have gone eastward while Paul journeyed to the West. There was a large Jewish population in Mesopotamia, and it was a splendid field for missionary enterprise. Mark, it is true, is recorded to have gone with Barnabas to Cypress, but he might easily have crossed later to Syria, joined Peter, and accompanied him to Babylon. That once famous city had indeed fallen from its high estate; but in the first century it was still inhabited; and Josephus relates that there was a considerable colony of Jews in the half desolate capital of Nebuchadnezzar." ("Peter: Prince of Apostles," F. J. Foakes-Jackson, 117.)

The same authority says:

"Peter's employment of Aramaic, which he spoke with a marked provincial accent, is a reason for supposing that his chief labors were in the East." (*Ibid.*, 136.)

"There is, however, a third possible solution, which few accept. In Egypt in the first century there was a very important military station near the modern Cairo called Babylon. Is it possible that this was Peter's place? It would explain the early tradition that Mark was appointed bishop of Alexandria." (*Ibid.*, p. 118.)

It is not certain that the "Mark my son" of 1 Pet. 5:13 is the John Mark of Acts and Paul's letters.

There is no uniformity and no certainty even among Romanist authority regarding the supposed successor of Peter to the papal throne. The Clementine literature contains a supposed letter from Peter to James when Peter is about to suffer martyrdom at Rome which represents Peter as ordaining Clement as bishop of Rome by the imposition of his hands, etc., and enjoining him to send an account of it to James. In most

of the early lists in the succession of Roman bishops Linus and Cletus, who seems to be duplicated by Anicletus, stand first. But in the Clementine literature Clement appears as the immediate successor of Peter (*Ibid*, 170, 171). F. J. Foakes-Jackson further says, referring to certain statements in the Clementine *Homilies* of Peter and the *Recognitions*, "they prove, whatever their date, that there was a time when some Christians looked back to a primacy, not of Peter, but of James, and regarded the Brother or Brethren of the Lord as superior to the apostles and their great leader" (*Ibid.*, 170).

Among the steps leading away from primitive Christianity toward the development of the "man of sin" was the substitution of a single bishop over each church instead of a plurality of bishops or elders to have the oversight of each church or local congregation. This line of bishops for Rome is said by some to have begun with Linus next after Peter, but others give a different name, for the second place. There seems to be much confusion and uncertainty even among Roman Catholic authorities in regard to the bishops for this early period. It is likely that there was a line of succession of these bishops, not only of Rome, but of the church at Alexandria, at Antioch, at Jerusalem and at Constantinople, but none of them were popes. The bishops of these other churches were just as much popes in the beginning as was the bishop of Rome. Each had authority over his district. Later on, however, as we have already shown, the church at Rome gradually gained power and influence until the pope was fully developed in the person of Boniface III in A.D. 606, he being the first in the line of Roman bishops to claim the title of *Universal Bishop* with authority over all the churches of the world. But Romanist writers constantly refer to this uncertain list of bishops, sometimes giving it in one form and sometimes in another, as evidence of succession of their popes and of the Roman Catholic Church. There was likewise a succession of kings of Judah from David to Zedekiah when

the kingdom became so corrupt that God no longer recognized it and Judah was sent into captivity as an apostate nation. David was a man after God's own heart, but his successors cannot claim the favor of God on the ground of succession.

It appears that the argument of succession fails in the beginning! so far as the Western or Roman Catholic church is concerned. The first seven general councils were called, not by Romans but, by Greeks, and were composed almost entirely of Greek bishops and were held in Greek cities. Of the first general council, called, not by the bishop of Rome but, by Constantine in 325 A.D., 315 bishops were Greeks and 3 were Romans; of the second general council held in Constantinople 381 A.D., 149 bishops were Greek and only one was Roman; of the third general council held in Ephesus 431 A.D., 67 bishops were Greeks and only one was Roman; and of the fourth general council held at Chalcedon, 451 A.D., 350 bishops were Greek while only three were Roman. No general council for the first six hundred years of the existence of the church ever even mentioned a universal bishop or any one having universal rule over the churches. The legates of the Roman bishop never presided at any of these councils till that of Chalcedon in 451 A.D. (See Campbell-Purcell Debate.) These facts show conclusively that there was no pope during these centuries, and that the Greek church has a better title to the supremacy than does the Latin or Western Church.

Again, the chain of succession was badly broken at many points during the history of the Roman Catholic church. For seventy years the pope resided at Avignon, France, and left the chair of St. Peter at Rome empty. For nearly half a century there were two popes, and two lines of popes existing at one time, one in Italy and one in France. Finally there were three popes—Benedict XIII, the Spanish pope, Gregory XII, the French pope, and John XIII, the Italian pope. Then the council of Constance met, A.D. 1414, and made a

fourth pope, and deposed the three anti-popes. (See "Campbell-Purcell Debate," 171, also H.R.)

Thus it appears that there is no evidence for the boasted *Primacy of Peter*; that Jesus never established the office of pope or viceregent; that no one was appointed to fill such an office; that no succession was ordained nor did one exist in the New Testament church which has come down unbroken to the present time.

CHAPTER V

(5) POWERS OF THE POPE

Our fifth inquiry under the general heading of the *Primacy of Peter* is regarding the *Powers of the Pope*, or rather the powers claimed by the pope. In the absence of any evidence in support of the claims of Romanists that the office of pope was established by divine authority or the existence of any such servant in the church having been ordained by Christ, we might consistently dismiss the subject with the fixed and established conclusion that the pope has no powers and no authority granted by divine authority. We shall, however, discuss the subject giving attention to the claims of those favoring this proposition.

In order to set these claims clearly before us in a form that cannot be denied or doubted, we quote from "Goffine's Devout Instructions," p. 409, as follows:

"Powers of the pope: 'to receive persons into the Church, and to excommunicate them from it; to forgive sins, or to retain them; to impose or to remit punishments for them; to establish laws and prohibitions, to abolish them, to change them, and, in general, to govern and direct in every thing, as shall be necessary for the preservation of unity and order in the Church, and for the good of the faithful.'"

We may add that the exclusive right or power of interpretation is also claimed by the pope and this may be included with the power to "govern and direct" in the above. To one familiar with the Bible teaching and who accepts its teaching the above statement will appear as most blasphemous and as usurpation of powers and prerogatives of God.

A tract by Rev. Arnold Daman S. J. is entitled "*Church or Bible—Which Was Appointed by Christ to Teach Mankind the True Religion?*" The author proceeds to set forth the Roman Catholic view in the following words:

"If God commands me under pain of eternal damnation, to believe all He has taught, He is bound to give me the means to

know what He has taught, and the means that God gives me to know what He has taught must have been at all times within the reach of all people—must be adapted to the capacities of all intellects, must be an infallible means to us, so that if a man makes use of it he will be brought to a knowledge of all the truth God has taught."

He then proceeds to tell us that God has provided this means, an infallible means—the Roman Catholic Church as the teacher and infallible interpreter of God's word, and this infallible interpreter is none other than the pope of Rome. We agree with the above statement that God has provided a means to know what he has taught, that that means is infallible, is within reach of all who desire salvation and is adapted to the understanding of all intellects, so that "if a man makes use of it he will be brought to a knowledge of all the truth God has taught" on the subject of man's duty to him. We believe, however, that this means is the revealed will of God, the Bible, and not the pope of Rome. It appears to us that the word of God might be as available at all times as the pope or the clergy. It also appears to us that God should be able to reveal his will to man so as to be understood by him. If God could not do this we do not believe the pope can. It seems too that if God's word needs interpretation or explanation, the interpretation of the pope would need it more.

Rev. Daman further informs us that the "Catholic religion existed sixty-five years before the Bible was completed, before it was written," and asks if those Christians who became such before the Bible was written were really Christians, good Christians, enlightened Christians. He then proceeds to argue that because they became Christians without the Bible that therefore the Bible is not now this necessary means of learning God's will. Rev. Daman is a Jesuit, and Jesuits are claimed to be well educated and wise above their fellows, but I am frank to say that he manifests the very quintessence of ignorance in the foregoing argument. Evidently he has spent his time in reading other books instead of reading the Bible to learn what it

teaches. If he has read the Bible to any purpose he should know that the Bible does not array itself against the church nor the church against the Bible in teaching true religion. It is not a question of the "Church or Bible." The church is the pillow and ground of the truth; and by Christians the gospel, God's power to save, was to be taught to the world. At first this gospel was taught orally by inspired apostles and prophets who were infallibly guided into all truth. These supernatural endowments were never transmitted to successors by tradition as God's means of handing down to us this gospel message, but inspired men wrote the gospel and we have it in the form of the New Testament where it is declared that "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works" (2 Tim. 3:16, 17).

The "Roman Catholic Question Box," p. 45, has the following: "Catholics . . . hold with St. Paul, that faith cometh not by reading, but by hearing (Rom. 10:17); that the gospel of Christ is to be learned from a divine infallible voice—the Catholic Church, which guarantees to every one not merely the written word, but also the unwritten teaching of divine tradition."

If by *hearing*, in the above, is meant that faith comes only by auditory reception of vocal teaching to the exclusion of reading as the above indicates, the apostle Paul contradicts the apostle John who positively declares that "these are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name" (John 20:30). On this point Romanists have their quarrel with the apostle John rather than with protestants.

But answering the question propounded in Rev. Arnold Daman's tract "Church or Bible" I would say that neither was appointed to the exclusion of the other to teach mankind the true religion. The church would be helpless without a written code authorized by God from which to teach his message of salvation.

The very fact that we have this message claiming to be the inspired word of God belies the claim that it was not authorized for that purpose and the claim that God meant to rely on tradition as the infallible means of teaching man his will. We are told that it is "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." If the above claim made by Holy Writ be allowed, then what use have we for more in the matter of authorized means of instruction? Such a claim as that made by the Rev. Daman is directly opposed to the plain teaching of God's word and repudiates his authority. Of course there were real Christians, good Christians intelligent Christians made under oral teaching as well as under written instruction, and oral teaching was indeed used at first, but Christians eagerly sought the written word as soon as it was given in that form in the gospels and epistles. During the period before the written revelation was completed, God provided teachers supernaturally endowed with such spiritual gifts as were necessary for teaching his word, and, as on the day of pentecost, they "spake as the spirit gave them utterance." Some were endowed with the spirit of prophecy, others with the gift of healing, miracles, discerning of spirits, speaking in different kinds of tongues, interpreting tongues etc., and all was for the purpose of edifying. A careful reading of the 12th, 13th and 14th chapters of 1 Corinthians will make this clear. In 1 Cor. 13:8, 9 we are told "whether there be prophecies, they shall be done away; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge [supernatural knowledge], it shall be done away "For we know in part and we prophesy in part. The method was partial, not perfect. Then in the 10th verse referring evidently to the completed and perfected revelation which was yet future, the record says "but when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away." The apostle compares the partial method of teaching by supernaturally en-

dowed teachers with infancy—the infancy of the church. "When I was a child I spake as a child . . . now that I am become a man I have put away childish things." "Now we see in a mirror darkly . . . but then shall I know fully," etc., that is, "when that which is perfect is come"—the completed revelation of God, the Bible. We now have this perfect and completed revelation and we need no longer the miracles and the supernatural endowments of teachers, etc., which have been done away.

The Roman Catholic Question Box, p. 97, admits the late date (1870) of the definition of the dogma of infallibility given by a council, but argues that if this means an addition to the faith, it necessarily follows that the divinity of Christ (defined in 325) and the divinity of the Holy Ghost (defined in, 381) are likewise additions to the faith. It should be remembered, however, that the infallibility of the pope is not even hinted at in the New Testament, while the divinity of Christ and the Holy Ghost constitute fundamental doctrine of the New Testament. Scriptural doctrines need no definitions; unscriptural doctrines must have them.

Our Romanist friends refer to the case of Philip and the Ethiopian nobleman when Philip asked if he understood what he was reading, and the reply was, "How can I except some one shall guide me?" and make the application that every one must depend on an interpretation. But the nobleman only had the prophecy of Isaiah couched in figures and terms utterly incomprehensible to mortal man, which could not be understood without a knowledge of what had happened at Calvary. Of course, in this formative period when the gospel message had not been fully revealed and the story of the cross had not been told, one would have to be guided to the fulfillment of this dark prophecy to know who it was that "was led as a sheep to the slaughter, and as a lamb before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth." But now that we have the inspired record of the exact and literal fulfillment of this prophecy we do not need interpretation

to tell us what this means and to explain what the gospel requires of us.

Again Romanists refer to 2 Pet. 3:15, 16 where Peter mentions some things written by Paul which were hard to be understood and were wrested as were other scriptures by the unlearned and unstable. But Peter did not point out these things nor undertake to act as infallible interpreter of what Paul wrote. If he had been pope he certainly neglected his duty as interpreter here.

The church is indeed the pillar and ground of the truth. It is God's appointed agency for carrying the message of salvation to the uttermost part of the earth. This message is found now only in the Bible and is described in that book as "the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth" (Rom. 1:16), no matter whether one receives the message through hearing it preached or from reading what was "written that ye might believe." God and his word are infallible. The Bible is its own interpreter and needs only to be heard or read in order to learn the way of life and salvation.

But perhaps the scripture most quoted and relied upon to support the doctrine of interpretation by an infallible church by which they mean an infallible pope, is 2 Pet. 1:20, which reads: "No prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation." Again their "infallible" interpretation perverts the word of God, and Romanists reverse the plain statement of this passage when they declare that all the scriptures are of private interpretation only by the pope, that the general public have no part nor lot in this matter. No mortal on earth or angel in heaven has any monopoly or patent on the meaning of God's word, and no pope or archangel has jurisdiction over Holy Writ. It did not come by the will of man, but holy men spake from God as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. For any man to assume the role of sole interpreter of God's word is to presume that God failed in his purpose of

revelation. Not having come by the will of man no man can justly claim that its meaning is his private property, to be dished out as he may see fit. It is indeed not of any private interpretation but public, and by *private* I mean its most common meaning and use.

PART III

ROMANISM FURTHER EXAMINED

INTRODUCTION

While no attempt can be made within the limits of this volume to give a complete history of Romanism we feel that the work would fall short of its purpose if other leading features of the system were omitted. In Part I we have seen that Romanism has no divine authority for its faith and practice, and in Part II we have seen the utter fallacy of their claims as to origin and organization. It is now desired to examine some of their leading doctrines and practices, comparing them with the Bible, to ascertain what may be the ground of their support.

It is an unpleasant task to engage in exposing the errors, shortcomings and wickedness of others, and we are not opposing individuals, but a system. But we are confronted daily with the doctrines and practices of Romanism which bear these marks and which have so greatly influenced the world, and under these circumstances it becomes our duty to give the facts that this powerful agency for evil may be counteracted and that truth may prevail. The wickedness, persecution, errors and superstitions of Romanism combined with the gross idolatry of the system—parading under the name of Christianity—have done more to retard the progress of Christianity in the world than perhaps any other agency. The effect has been to discredit pure and undefiled religion and to lower the standard of civilization wherever it has gone.

The author claims no originality in stating the history of the doctrines and practices of Romanism. They may be found on the pages of history, in encyclopedias, and even fully verified and confirmed by Roman Catholic standard authorities.

CHAPTER I

WICKED POPES

In order to show what "infallibility" may attach to the popes, the boasted "successors of the apostle Peter," and the value of their lofty claims, we give a brief sketch of a few of these "*holy*" *links* in this chain of "custodians of the keys of the kingdom of heaven," vested with the "infallible power of interpreting God's word," and of "forgiving sins," and as "Christ's viceregents on earth."

The matter under this head is derived largely from that splendid work, "*History of Romanism*," by Rev. John Dowling, where the facts will be found in more detail and covering a much larger scale, many of his quotations from Romish authorities being given in the original Latin.

Pope John VIII of the ninth century was a monster of blood and cruelty. "He commended the unnatural barbarity of Athanasius, bishop of Naples, who put out the eyes of his own brother, Sergius, duke of the same city, and sent him in that state to the pope, to answer to a charge of rebellion against the Holy See." This is a sample of the cruelty of this "Holy" and "Infallible" *link* in the unbroken chain of apostolic succession.

Pope Sergius III, made pope in 904, cohabited with Marozia, a notorious prostitute, the mother of an illegitimate son, and by his "Holiness" she had another son (John) who later became pope through the influence of his licentious mother. Dr. Dowling says of this pope:

"Among other horrid acts, Platina relates the pope rescinded the acts of Pope Formosus, compelled those whom he has ordained to be reordained, dragged his *dead body* from the sepulcher, *beheaded him as though he were alive*, and then threw him into the Tiber." (H. R., p. 217.)

John X, paramour of the harlot Theodora, was raised to the papacy by her influence, in 914. Dr. Dowling relates that "Fleury, a Romish historian, admits these disgraceful facts."

John XI, bastard son of his "Holiness," Pope Sergius III, was raised to the papal throne by the power and influence of his adulterous mother, Marozia, whose licentiousness with his "Holiness," Pope Sergius III, gave the Romish church another "infallible" guide and "vicar of Christ."

Pope John XII, nephew of Pope John XI, the bastard, was such a monster of wickedness, tyranny and debauchery, that upon the complaint of the people of Rome, the emperor Otho caused him to be tried and deposed. His reply to the charges against him was: "We hear that you want to make another pope. If that is your design, I excommunicate you all in the name of the Almighty, that you may not have it in your power to ordain any other, or even to celebrate mass!!!" Regardless of this threat the emperor and council deposed this monster of wickedness and proceeded to elect another, John XIII. Thus this "Vicar of Christ" is reckoned as one of the unbroken line of popes, and his bull of excommunication must not have been infallible, for it failed of its purpose. Did he forget to place the *ex cathedra* tag on this bull?

Pope Benedict IX (1033) was more than once expelled from Rome by the people on account of his debaucheries, and finally, it is said, sold his popedom to his successor, Gregory VI.

Pope Alexander VI, in 1492, was elected through bribery, and history records no example of papal or human depravity which exceeds that of this "head of the church." It is said that not one among the analysts of the Romish church has breathed a whisper in his praise. Among his debaucheries he is said to have given a splendid entertainment, in the Vatican, to no less than fifty public prostitutes. While popes never marry, this link in the "apostolic chain" is said to

have acknowledged five children by Vanozia, a Roman matron.

Of Stephen VII, Baronius says:

"Thus perished this villainous man who entered the sheep-fold as a thief and a robber; and who in the retribution of God, ended his days by the infamous death of the halter." (Baronius, Vol. X, 742. From Campbell-Purcell Debate, 171.)

In regard to these wicked popes, Baronius, a noted Romanist authority, a cardinal and librarian of the "apostolic See," is quoted by Dr. Dowling as follows:

"O! what was then the face of the holy Roman church! how filthy, when the vilest and *most powerful prostitutes* ruled in the court of Rome! by whose arbitrary sway dioceses were made and unmade, bishops were consecrated, and—which is inexpressibly horrible to be mentioned! FALSE POPES, THEIR PARAMOURS, were thrust into the chair of St. Peter, who, in being numbered as popes, serve no purpose except to fill up the catalogues of the popes of Rome. For who can say that persons thrust into the popedom without any law by *harlots of this sort*, were legitimate popes of Rome? In this manner lust supported by secular power, excited to frenzy, in the rage for domination, ruled in all things." (H. R., 219.)

Bishop Purcell, in his debate with A. Campbell, says:

"I should not be surprised if these bad popes were at this moment expiating their crimes in the penal fires of hell." (Campbell-Purcell Debate, 180.)

Volumes have been written filled with the wickedness and crimes of popes and priests, but these few out of the many such records will suffice to show the inconsistency and absurdity of the claim of papal infallibility. The "*ex cathedra*" plea will not excuse the unpardonable acts of Stephen VI, Sergius II, the Johns and others. Yet faith in the pope is a fundamental dogma necessary to salvation according to Roman Catholics. Blind credulity would be more appropriate than faith, for faith is supposed to rest on credible testimony.

Bishop Purcell admits that out of about 260 popes the first forty were saints while of the last fifty only one saint is claimed, and that not over twenty can be called bad men. Romanists freely console themselves on this point with the claim that the proportion of the bad is less than that of the apostles—one Judas

among twelve men. It should be remembered, however, that our Lord never committed the keys of faith and morality to Judas—his mission does not accord in any sense with that of "vicar of Christ" or Christ's viceregent on earth, and a claim of infallibility for Judas would shock the sensibilities of even a Roman Catholic.

CHAPTER II

PERSECUTION A ROMISH DOGMA

With Romanists persecution has been the strong argument for orthodoxy. Every priest takes an oath of allegiance to the pope of Rome. He swears that "heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said lord [the pope] or his foresaid successors, I will to my utmost power persecute and oppose (*persequar et impugnabo*)."

That this has been the policy of the Romanist church through the ages, is clearly shown by the decrees of the councils of Lateran, the second council in 1139, the third in 1179, the fourth in 1215, the fifth in 1517 and the council of Constance in 1414. This fundamental doctrine of the "infallible" Roman Catholic Church is also promulgated by decrees and bulls of popes Lucius, Innocent III, Innocent VIII, and others.

At the close of the council of Trent 1563, the last general council of the Roman Catholic Church, the final responsive dialogue ends thus:

Cardinal.—Accursed be all heretics!

Answer.—Accursed, Accursed!

The burning at the stake of Jerome of Prague, Cranmer of England, John Huss of Bohemia, also of Latimer and Ridley of England and many others on a charge of heresy, the first two even after they had recanted through fear, and John Huss even after a safe conduct had been granted him—these all and many other cases of Romish persecutions are too well established in history to admit of any pretext of excuse or denial.

The violation of the safe-conduct granted to John Huss was issued by the emperor Sigismund and this has been offered as an explanation or excuse for the treacherous murder of Huss by burning at the stake, some Romanists saying that the document issued by the emperor only assured him protection to the council, but not for his return (See Question Box, 113). This is indeed a poor excuse, and is made doubly so, when

we consider the decree of the council of Constance afterwards when it states "The sacred synod declares by these presents, that the said emperor did with regard to John Huss, what he might and ought to have done, notwithstanding his safe-conduct." The same decree also states "According to the natural divine and human laws, no promise of faith ought to have been kept with him, to the prejudice of the Catholic faith." (L'Enfant II, 491, quoted in H. R., 414.)

Cardinal Bellamine, a noted writer and defender of the Romish faith in the early part of the seventeenth century, replied in part to Luther's doctrines as follows:

"The church,' says Luther, 'from the beginning, even to this time, has never burned a heretic. Therefore it does not seem, to be the mind of the Holy Spirit, that they should be burned!' [Luther.]

"I reply that this argument proves not the sentiment, but the ignorance, or impudence of Luther; for as almost an infinite number were either burned or otherwise put to death, Luther either did not know it, and was therefore ignorant; or if he knew it, he is convicted of impudence and falsehood—for that heretics were often burned by the Church may be proved by adducing a few from many examples.

" 'Experience shows that terror is not useful.' [Luther.] I reply, experience proves the contrary—for the Donatists, Manicheans, and Albigenses were routed, and annihilated by arms." (H. R., 545.)

If Luther ever made the statement quoted here in regard to the Church, he referred to the true church. He knew too well the history of the Roman Catholic Church and was evidently contrasting that gigantic system of cruelty and murder with the church established by the Prince of Peace.

Some have thought that the character of the Roman Catholic Church has had a change of heart; that she no longer holds the doctrines of persecution and extirpation of heretics (protestants), and that her ambition for temporal world power and universal sway has gone forever. That she has experienced a change in her policies and that her intolerance and cruelty have ceased in civilized and cultured lands where the dark-

ness of Romanism has been dispelled by the light of the gospel, is admitted. But this change is one of necessity, not of choice. The decrees of councils and popes constituting their standard of authority have never been repealed nor modified. It is the proud boast of Romanists that their doctrines are unchangeable; "that it is a tenet of their creed, that what their faith ever has been, such it was from the beginning, such it is now and such it ever will be." (Southey—quoted in H. R., 548.)

Cardinal Gibbons says the decisions of the pope are "final, irrevocable and infallible." Before they could change their policy, they would have to abolish their infallibility doctrine which is the very cornerstone of the foundation of their faith. That this unchangeable policy of Romanism applies to civil rule and authority as well as to religion is clear from the statement of one who stands high as authority among Romanists. I quote from Question Box, 362, as follows:

"Do you recognize as valid the marriage of a Catholic performed by a Protestant minister or a justice of the peace? No; for such marriages were declared null and void by the decree *Ne Temere* of Pius X, April 19, 1908. The law says: 'Only such marriages are valid, which are contracted before the parish priest or the ordinary of the place, or a priest delegated by either of these, and at least two witnesses.'"

The writer knows of at least one such violation of the Romish regulation on this point where the guilty member was withdrawn from, and lived in mortal fear of her final damnation until she finally secured, through her priest and the cardinal who wrote to the pope at Rome, a special dispensation reinstating her into the fellowship of the church. These facts have been denied, but such denial amounts to nothing in face of the high authority quoted.

Cardinal Gibbons stands high as authority among Romanists, and it would seem that his statements may be accepted as conclusive regarding the real hope and ambitions of the Romish church. Hear this Cardinal, this apostolic successor, on the subject of temporal power:

"For our part, we have every confidence that ere long the clouds which overshadow the civil throne of the pope will be removed by the breath of a righteous God, and that his temporal power will be reestablished on a more permanent basis than ever." (F. F., 180.)

Since, then, the Romish system cannot be reformed, which was fully demonstrated by the failure of Luther's powerful efforts, the only remedy lies in giving the people the Bible instead of the doctrines and commandments of men.

During the bloody crusade of Pope Innocent III against the protestant Albigenses and the Waldenses, many thousands were slaughtered, including 60,000 people at one time at Beziers, France, in the thirteenth century. The massacre of St. Bartholomew at Paris, August 24, 1572, is perhaps one of the most treacherous among the butcheries of hundreds and thousands of heretics executed by the papal authority. History records that the Huguenots with their celebrated leader, Admiral Coligny, had been attracted to Paris through a pretended royal marriage to be celebrated there. When these French protestants had gathered in Paris for this celebration a general massacre had been planned and was executed, not less than 5,000 protestants being slain in Paris alone and many more thousands at the same time throughout France. Many sought refuge in churches and at the king's palace, but no quarter and no mercy were shown; all alike were slain. When the news of the slaughter reached Rome the pope and cardinals were so overjoyed they marched in procession to the church of St. Louis to return solemn thanks to God for the extirpation of the heretics. *Te Deum* was sung and the firing of cannon announced the glad news. As a more fitting expression of joy the pope had triumphal medals struck bearing on one face an angel, with sword in one hand and a crucifix in the other, slaughtering a group of heretics, with the words *Hughnotorum stages*, 1572; while on the other side was the name and title of the reigning pope. (H. R., 590.)

But I shall not dwell at length on this function of the Romish church which has been so faithfully executed in the past in accord with its "infallible" authority from councils and popes. It is true that protestants have in some cases, especially during the Reformation, resorted to persecution of Romanists, which is to be regretted and deplored. They are not justified by the claim that they had been tutored and trained in intolerance, cruelty and persecution so long that it was difficult to throw *off* suddenly all the errors of Rome. But protestants have no such rule of faith while Romanists have heretofore believed they were serving God by exterminating heretics, and by heretics they include all protestants. By comparison protestants have committed few such crimes, while some historians estimate the number of people put to death by Romanists on the charge of heresy at millions—even as high as fifty millions of souls or more.

Romanists meet the charges of wickedness, cruelty and crimes of popes, the sale of indulgences, extirpation of heretics, the operations of the inquisition, etc., by saying these were abuses or excesses. The contradictory decrees of conflicting popes, condemning a predecessor or some of his decrees or re-establishing what a predecessor had suppressed—all these and many acts of bad faith and violence are excused upon the plea that the decree in question was not given "*ex cathedra*," *i. e.*, in the pope's official infallible capacity. This rule gives them a most convenient and ever-ready excuse for inconsistencies, errors and crimes of their "infallible" popes. For who can say which of their decrees and bulls are given *ex cathedra* and which are not? This is like the story of the bad Sunday school boy who gave the definition of a lie as "an abomination in the sight of God and a very great help in time of need." As further explanation of the arbitrary power exercised by popes in deposing sovereigns and absolving people from their allegiance, we are told that "we must be careful not to view the middle ages with the eyes of the twentieth century" (Q. B., 226).

"We regret," says the Question Box, "that Catholic rulers, Catholic ecclesiastics, and Catholic people have often as a matter of fact persecuted. We denounce as strongly as protestants do the dragonnades of Louis XIV, the enforced conversion of the Moors and Jews in Spain, the cruelty and excesses that often attended the punishment by the state of heresy, which used to be regarded as a political crime. These were times of severity and cruelty. Thank God they have passed away forever" (Q. B., 154).

The great apostasy predicted by Paul and other inspired writers is clearly seen in the Roman hierarchy, which, in its gradual development, forgot God and despised his word, reversing the teaching of the Master who said "Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you," and the teaching of the Spirit that we should "do good to all men," even returning good for evil. A superficial acquaintance with the fundamental doctrine of Christ would preclude the idea of the use of force in attempting to extend the kingdom of heaven. The Christian is indeed a soldier of the cross, but his armor consists of a "shield of faith," "helmet of salvation," "breastplate of righteousness," "girdle of truth," feet shod "with the preparation of the gospel of peace," and the "sword of the Spirit which is the word of God." (Eph. 6:13-17.) "For though we walk in the flesh we do not war according to the flesh (for the weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh, but mighty before God to the casting down of strongholds") (2 Cor. 10:4).

A religion that undertakes to propagate its faith by the sword is not from God any more than is Mohammedanism which holds this doctrine. Those "who take the sword shall perish by the sword" said Jesus. When a church resorts to the sword it is in rebellion against the Prince of Peace and against his rule and authority. Let us pray for the influence of an open Bible which will inspire love, joy and peace and good will to men for all time to come.

CHAPTER III

PURGATORY, INDULGENCES AND JUBILEES

This combination of errors has served well to hold benighted souls in ignorance and superstition and to filch from them funds to fill the coffers of popes and priests. Though unknown to the New Testament these institutions have been for a long time cardinal doctrines of the Romish faith and practice. The idea of Purgatory necessarily preceded that of Indulgences, for if no punishments in Purgatory are imposed, then no indulgences would be asked or desired. But authorities are not agreed as to the exact date of the origin of either of these institutions. The idea of Purgatory is said to have originated not earlier than the time of Augustine who died in 430, and probably not before Gregory or the close of the sixth century. Augustine entertained much doubt and uncertainty regarding the existence of Purgatory, though he grants it without proof and as "unsupported by any canonical authority." He would not, however, "contradict the presumption, because it might perhaps be the truth." (H. R., 359.) He would never have made a fixed dogma of faith a subject of doubt and inquiry. It was, therefore, not a fixed item of faith in the time of Augustine. But upon this flimsy foundation the innovation was recommended by Gregory who was later represented as the discoverer of Purgatory. (H. R., 360.)

After the superstition and dread of Purgatory had been fixed in the minds of the ignorant multitudes the way was open and the time opportune for imposing upon them the remedy offered in Indulgences. But this doctrine had no general recognition for centuries after the death of Gregory, and a council (Aix la Chapelle) in 836 decided in opposition to the doctrine.

Pope Urban II, who instituted the Crusades, appears the first to make any extensive use of Indulgences, when, in the eleventh century, he offered Indulgences

as a reward for those who engaged in the effort to wrest the Holy land from the Turks.

An Indulgence is defined to be the remission of the temporal punishments of our sins which remission is granted by the pope for "all punishments due to sin, not only the eternal, but also the temporal." Amends are made "to the divine justice for us out of the exhaustless treasure of the merits of Christ and of his saints." (See Catechism by Rev. Joseph Deharbe S. J., 105.)

History records that in the twelfth century the popes limited the power of the bishops, who had been enjoying a lucrative trade in the sale of Indulgences, and assumed to themselves most of this profitable traffic. The court of Rome thus became the general warehouse of Indulgences which were used by them to replenish the papal treasury and for such purposes as his "Holiness" might desire. They extended the scope of the papal clemency to include a plenary remission of all temporal pains and penalties which the church imposed for certain offenses, also to include those punishments reserved by the Scriptures for the future state after death. In order to mitigate the absurdity of such assumption and make it more acceptable to human reason, St. Thomas, in the thirteenth century, popularized a new doctrine known as *Works of Supererogation* whereby those good works of the virgin "Mother of God" and all departed saints, over and above what was necessary for their salvation, have been reserved as a fund to be applied by popes and priests to those unfortunate souls whose store of good works was insufficient to pull them through the fires of Purgatory. The doctrine includes the notion that without this means of grace being applied to their credit these derelicts, though free from hell, would have to spend years, perhaps ages, in purifying their souls in the fires of Purgatory before they would be admitted through the gates of pearl into the heavenly Jerusalem by Peter the gate-keeper.

This gainful traffic in Indulgences was greatly augmented by Pope Boniface VIII, who, in the year 1300, invented the Jubilee whereby a "universal plenary (full) indulgence, or remission of all temporal punishments, is granted to those who, 'truly penitent and having confessed and communicated, shall piously visit the Basilicas of the Blessed Peter and Paul, St. John Lateran, and St. Mary Major'" (See H. R., 364). It is said that in the year of its invention by Pope Boniface VIII, in 1300, the income from this source to the papal treasury was enormous, being estimated by some to equal, perhaps, the total previous gains of a century.

To a thoughtful person we believe a clear statement of this doctrine will show its absurdity and that it perverts and contradicts! the plain teaching of the Scriptures. We therefore quote from the Jubilee Bull of Pope Leo issued from the Vatican at Rome in 1824:

"We have resolved by virtue of the authority given to us from heaven, fully to unlock that sacred treasure composed of the merits, sufferings and virtues of Christ, our Lord, and of his *virgin mother* and of *all the saints* which the author of human salvation *has entrusted to our dispensation*. To you, therefore, venerable brethren, patriarchs, primates, archbishops, bishops, it belongs to explain with perspicuity the power of indulgences: what is their efficacy in the remission, not only of the canonical penances, but also of the temporal punishment due to the divine justice for past sin; and what succor is afforded out of this heavenly treasure, from the merits of Christ and *his saints*, to such as have departed real penitents in God's love, yet before they had duly satisfied by fruits worthy of penance for sins of commission and omission, *and are now purifying in the fire of purgatory*." (H. R., 363, note.)

The Jubilee was first reduced from once to twice in a century and finally to twenty-five years, so favorable was the occasion for enriching the treasury of the Roman Pontiff. A special Jubilee has also been provided for those who could not make the pilgrimage to Rome to "piously visit" the church of St. Peter and Paul, etc. It is said that on the occasion of a Jubilee Rome was so crowded with these devout visitors that the streets were almost impassable, and that many of them suffered death from the hardships of the journey.

Martin Luther was a monk and a priest. In 1517,

while acting as confessor (it should be confessee, for to the priest the confession is made), Luther required of all that came to him for confession that they turn away from their sins and resolve to cease the practice of the same. But his parishioners refused to do this, because they were not in the habit of doing so, whereupon Luther refused absolution. This led Luther to meditate and as a result his ninety-five theses followed which finally precipitated his break with the Roman See. About this time Pope Leo X needed funds for rebuilding St. Peters at Rome, and had determined to raise the necessary money for that purpose by the sale of Indulgences. The privilege of the sale of Indulgences in Germany was *farmed out* to one Albert, elector of Mentz, who later became a cardinal. This contract for the "sins of Germany" having been thus made to Albert, he began at once on his task, borrowed money at bank, as an advance payment on his contract, and employed one John Tetzel, a most profligate and licentious Dominican monk, who had many years experience in peddling Indulgences. Tetzel was what might be called in modern times a high-powered salesman and pushed this business with much zeal and energy. Among the many similar appeals given by Tetzel, Dr. Dowling quotes the following:

"Even repentance is not indispensable. But more than all this: indulgences save not the living alone—they also save the dead. Ye priests, ye nobles, ye tradesmen, ye wives, ye maidens, and ye young men, hearken to your departed parents and friends, who cry to you from the bottomless abyss: 'We are enduring horrible torments! a small alms would deliver us; you can give it, and you will not!' *"The very moment the money clinks against the bottom, of the chest, the soul escapes from purgatory, and flies free to heaven."* (H. R., 443.)

He often based his appeal on the use to be made of the money in rebuilding St. Peters Cathedral at Rome. Tetzel gave a form of absolution guaranteeing not only full pardon, of all sins, but that "at death the gate of the place of torment shall be shut against thee." Thus we see that this includes future sins, and is therefore, a license to sin. Tetzel fixed prices according to the

rank of his customer, kings, queens, princes, archbishops, bishops, at a fixed price, while those of a lower rank paid a different price. For particular sins Tetzel had a private scale. Polygamy cost six ducats; sacrilege and perjury, nine ducats; murder, eight; witchcraft, two.

Archbishop Albert, who had the contract for the "Sins of Germany," failed to realize the full measure of profits desired from Tetzel's efforts and being in pecuniary straits advertised a sale of Indulgences at Halle offering 39,540,120 years' and 220 days' respite from purgatory. Luther, upon hearing of this, wrote direct to the archbishop and received a very humble reply wherein Albert acknowledged his sin and promised that in future he would conduct himself as a Christian should.

While Leo succeeded in constructing the most magnificent Cathedral in the world with money obtained by this infamous traffic in Indulgences, yet it was done at a fearful cost to the papal power. For it was the immediate cause of Luther's reformation movement which liberated the world from the domination and power of Roman Catholicism, gave the Bible to the German people and the rest of the world and shook the very foundations of Romanism from center to circumference, from which shock she has never been able to recover. It was the beginning of the decline of the pope's temporal power which came to an end in 1870. It has been said that the darkest hour of the night is just before the dawn of day. So it seems with Romanism. On July 18, of that year papal infallibility had been proclaimed by the pope and on September 20, of the same year, the people of Rome, by a vote of 1,000 to one against the pope rejected him as sovereign and chose Victor Immanuel. Since then the pope has been limited in power to a small reservation called the Vatican, in the city of Rome, and his temporal power seems to be gone forever.

Roman Catholics rely chiefly on 1 Cor. 3:13-15 as scripture authority for the doctrine of Purgatory. In

order to get the subject fully before us with the connection we quote verses 10 to 15:

"According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise masterbuilder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man's work shall be made manifest; for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire."

A careful reading of this passage fails to discover any such thing as a Romish Purgatory. It does not even refer to the dead or the state of the dead. The apostle introduces the subject of preaching the gospel, that the foundation is Jesus Christ and no other can be laid; that he built on this foundation; that others who build upon the foundation which he had laid should take heed how they build by being careful to indoctrinate and prepare their converts as material for the kingdom of God, as lively stones in his temple (1 Pet. 2:5). Some of this material may be weak and combustible—wood, hay, stubble—and will be lost through the fiery trials of persecutions and temptations of life, but that does not mean that the minister or preacher himself is lost; if he shall have done his duty he shall be saved, though some of his labors may be lost. I know this passage is considered by some as one of the items of Paul's writings which Peter said were hard to be understood, but whatever its meaning, it is utterly devoid of any reference to Purgatory.

Another scripture used as evidence by Romanists is 1 Pet. 3:18-20, which reads:

"For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit; by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which some time were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water."

It should be noted that the word Purgatory is not in this scripture nor elsewhere in the Bible. Not only so, but nothing like it is to be found here or elsewhere. It does not declare nor intimate that Christ went, during his stay in the tomb, and preached to the antedeluvians who had been disobedient. The passage declares that Christ was resurrected to life by the Spirit, that it was the same Spirit by which Christ preached to the antedeluvians through Noah who was a preacher of righteousness. Christ was in the beginning with God; it was through him that the worlds were created; he was in Noah by means of the Spirit preaching to the antedeluvians, the spirits in prison, and he was that rock that followed the Israelites in the wilderness wanderings.

Finally the only support to be found for Purgatory, for Indulgences and for the Jubilee is to be found in the apocryphal books which have no standing in the canon of scripture and in the decrees of councils and popes which have no divine authority. It seems a pity that the power of superstition permits the embrace of a doctrine so absurd in its nature and so blighting in its effects as that of Purgatory and Indulgences.

CHAPTER IV

MARTIN LUTHER

Many books and tracts have been written by Romanists attacking Luther's character, charging him with immoral conduct, bitter persecutions, wilful and malicious errors, etc. But it seems that the facts have been greatly exaggerated. I quote from, one Rev. Lucian Johnson, a Romanist, as follows:

"As a young monk at Erfurt monastery he was as exemplary as any other ... It was only afterwards when his manifold official duties and excessive labors took up so much of his time that he began to neglect spiritual duties incumbent upon him as a monk and priest. The neglect also was influenced by his intellectual development more and more in the direction of his pet theory of justification by faith and contempt for 'works.' From then on after his break with Rome, his piety seems to have been about as fervent as that of any other protestant preacher . . . Here again honesty compels us to discard many of the fables about him. He did not, as was alleged, have any children outside of marriage by any other woman than Catherine Bora. It is not proven that he indulged in any orgies of misconduct at his Wittenburg home—the so-called Black Monastery—with the many escaped nuns. Nor is it proven that he was the author of the famous saying attributed to him:

'Who loves not woman, wine and song,
Remains a fool his whole life long.'"

(Luther's Claim to a Divine Mission, 45.)

Again:

"Luther himself wrote to his friend, Spalatin, that 'I have shut the mouth of those who slandered me and Catherine Bora.' There is no proof of actual immorality. The only thing certain is that there was much talk going on about his intimacy with Bora, that he thought it advisable to marry her rather sooner than he expected." (*Ibid.*, 46.)

Jacobs says of Luther, that his "nature was fiery and impetuous; his speech was frank, open, straightforward. If he were angry he uttered all his wrath; if convinced that he had erred, he cared nothing about reputation for consistency, but frankly acknowledged the error."

Granting that Luther did use coarse and bitter language at times; that he countenanced immorality in others at times; that he also, at times, approved a policy of persecution against Romanists; that his theology was not always consistent, and that his translation of the New Testament was not perfect in every detail, we must remember that his long training under Roman Catholicism may have played a large part in shaping his character and fixing his habits which might not be easily thrown off at once. Considering the training he had and the immense change necessary for him to come to a full appreciation of the truth, we can afford to throw the mantle of charity over him and make some allowance for hesitancy, vacillation and other imperfections. Even the charge that he was superstitious, that he endorsed the doctrine of auricular confessions for a while or other Roman Catholic errors, if true, may find mitigation in these facts named.

Let it be understood, however, that we do not endorse all that Luther taught and did. We think he made a serious mistake in predicating salvation upon faith alone, though we believe he was driven to this by the gross error of the Romish Church which stressed works to the exclusion of saving faith and taught the doctrine of supererogation.

Luther favored the retention of every thing in the Romish services not forbidden and contrary to the Scriptures. Zwingli, a co-reformer, demanded an express scriptural command or approved example for every item of the worship. Under Zwingli the service became extremely simple; pictures, statues, etc., were regarded as forbidden by the Ten Commandments. Even instrumental music was banished from the service as interfering with spirituality.

One of the items of heresy charged in the bull of excommunication issued by Pope Leo X against Luther

was his statement that "To burn heretics is against the will of the Spirit."

"Luther said men should be called Christians, not Lutherans. 'What am I, miserable mass of corruption, that the children of Christ should be called by my name?'" (Martin Luther by Jacobs, 206.)

CHAPTER V

INVOCATION OF SAINTS

In support of this doctrine Romanists refer to the patriarch Jacob praying for his two grandchildren, "May the angel that delivereth me from all evils, bless these boys." (Gen. 48:16.) Cardinal Gibbons concludes from this language that we "cannot suppose that he would be so ignorant as to *pray to one* that could not hear him." But there is nothing said in this scripture or its connection about *praying to the angel*. There is no objection to asking God to grant a blessing *through his messengers* appointed "to minister for them which shall be heirs of salvation." (Heb. 1:14.)

Again the parable of Dives and Lazarus is made to do service in giving scripture support for their doctrine of praying to saints, but the unfortunate part of it is that the main point and lesson in this parable is to show that death closes the period of probation for us and that our efforts to appeal to the departed saints in "Limbo" or in heaven will not avail. The petition was not granted, but the positive instruction was to "hear Moses and the prophets."

The Bible abounds with examples of saints on earth praying to God for special blessings for the living, but no approved example is to be found in all Holy Writ where any saint on earth ever prayed to either angel or departed saint. Neither is there any example of any Christian or servant of God praying for the dead in Purgatory or elsewhere. Let us work while it is day for the night of death cometh when no man can work is the teaching of the Scriptures. And there is no evidence that Mary, the mother of Jesus, was any exception to this rule. In every case where any fell down before men in worship they were told

to "stand up; I myself also am a man." (Acts 10:26.) The same applies to falling down at the feet of angels, as well as of Peter. In Rev. 19:10, John said of the angel: "And I fell at his feet to worship him. And he said unto me, See thou do it not. I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus: worship God."

CHAPTER VI

MARYOLATRY

It is true that Mary was highly honored as the mother of Jesus and all generations shall call her blessed. But this does not imply nor do the Scriptures teach that Mary is to be worshiped or adored as the object of our prayers and devotions. Romanists insist that they only honor her and vehemently deny that they worship or adore her. Yet in their Hail Mary they use the most extravagant expressions of adoration, "devotion, consecration" and submission to her, imploring her to "defend," and "protect" the suppliant who says he belongs to her. If this is not worship and adoration it is difficult to understand what is. If she could see one prostrating himself before her image or elsewhere bowing or kneeling in prayer to her, no doubt she would say, as did men and angels under similar circumstances, "stand up," "worship God." Romanists are loud in their claims that Mary is the "*Mother of God.*" Neither tradition nor the decrees of councils can be accepted as competent evidence on this point. Nowhere in the Bible is Mary ever called the "Mother of God." If she be such this would make her divine and all her predecessors divine. If Jesus is divine because he is the Son of God, certainly Mary is divine because she is the "Mother of God!" Then why deny that she is worshiped by them? In the rosary ten prayers are said to Mary the "Mother of God" for one prayer to God.

Jesus is referred to as the word which was with God in the beginning and is of the trinity. But the word became flesh, was born of a woman, and dwelt among us and thus became Jesus (for "he shall save his people from their sins"), and in this process of incarnation Mary became the mother of Jesus—not the mother of his divinity, not the "Mother of God." God is her creator; she his creature.

Again Romanists greatly err in claiming that Mary was immaculate, that is, absolutely sinless. Neither is there any evidence that she was always a virgin. The Bible does not say so nor is such necessary to harmonize with the Scriptures. She is never referred to as such after the birth of Jesus. The fact that Joseph knew her not till after she brought forth her first-born strongly points to a changed condition afterwards. Besides we find reference to "his mother and his brethren" who "stood without." (Matt. 12:46.) See also Mark 3:31; Luke 8:19. In Matt. 13:55, 56 Jesus' family is specifically named, including his father (reputed father), his mother, his brethren and his sisters. There is no reason to suppose as Romanists do, that these were uncles or cousins, aunts or remote relatives.

CHAPTER VII

VENERATION OF RELICS

Among the first errors of the great apostasy was the undue reverence paid to martyrs. This reverence and veneration gradually developed the opinion of the efficacy of the intercession of martyrs and finally the notion that it was possible to communicate with them directly, which led to the invocation of saints. This belief soon adopted the heathen notion that departed souls lingered about the bodies they had once inhabited. It is said that in the fourth and fifth centuries in Egypt Christians began to embalm the bodies of reputed saints and kept them in their houses. The superstition rapidly developed a reverence for the relics of these saints, and to this day no Roman Catholic Church is dedicated without consecrating the altar with a relic of some saint declared by the "infallible" pope to be genuine. The relic may be a bone, a tooth, a toe-nail, a hair, or even a drop of blood or tear. With great pomp and elaborate ceremony the relic is deposited in the altar and the stone cover placed over it.

Jerome in his *Contra Vigilantium* thinks it heresy and blasphemy in Vigilantius to teach as he did "that the honors paid to the rotten bones of the saints and martyrs by adoring, kissing, wrapping them up in silk and vessels of gold, lodging them in their churches, and lighting up wax candles before them after the manner of the heathen, were the ensigns of idolatry— that the celibacy of the clergy was a heresy, and their vows of chastity the seminary of lewdness . . . that to pray to the dead, or to desire the prayers of the dead was superstitious . . . that the sepulchers of the martyrs ought not to be worshiped nor their fasts and vigils to be observed—and finally that the signs and wonders said to be wrought by their relics, and at their sepulchers, serve to no good end or purpose of religion." (H. R., p. 78, note.) Jerome, who was born

in 345, says the foregoing were the sacrilegious tenets of Vigilantius whom he charges with heresy and blasphemy, calling him an organ of the devil because Vigilantius taught that these things were the ensigns of idolatry. While these idolatrous practices originated in the fourth century, we find that they were also vigorously opposed by such protestants as Vigilantius.

By the tenth century this feature of the Romish faith, taken from paganism and modified to suit their purpose, had grown to full maturity. A relic—fragment, bone, or anything belonging to the departed saint—became efficacious for preventing all sorts of calamities, curing of diseases of body and mind, warding off evil spirits and assaults and devices of Satan. No wonder then, that the poor deluded souls who felt the need of such wonderful benefits would pay the limit of their means for such relics. This demand was met by a ready supply. The clergy sought the bodies of dead saints by prayer and fasting which never failed to accomplish the end desired. Travelers brought from those places which Christ and his apostles had honored with their presence many articles to comfort dejected minds, calm guilty consciences, and defend against all sorts of evils and calamities. Thus it was that the Latin church came to possess the celebrated relics of St. Mark, St. James and other saints so highly prized by Romanists.

The Crusaders returning from Palestine brought with them a vast number of pretended relics which they bought from the Greeks and Syrians, regarded by them as the noblest spoils of their expedition. These were preserved in their churches and monasteries and honored with many supernatural virtues. These conditions opened the way for many impositions and it is admitted that the clergy did not lose the opportunity of substituting spurious relics or even selling the bones of some animal as those of a saint.

Goffine's *Devout Instructions* (p. 350) approves the veneration of dead saints and their relics—bones and

articles belonging to them, and, as support for the practice, reference is made to the case of a corpse being brought to life by touching the bones of Elisha (2 Kings 13:21); to the woman with an issue of blood being cured by touching the hem of the Savior's garment (Matt. 9:22); to the effect of the shadow of Peter (Acts 5:15), and to the handkerchiefs and aprons of Paul (Acts 19:12) by which various diseases were cured. Romanists make no distinction between the days of miracles and the present time when miracles have been done away. (1 Cor. 13:8.) In fact, they claim that most wonderful miracles and miraculous cures have been performed by the presence of the bones or other relics of a supposed dead saint. Of course, a Mormon or a Christian Scientist can show the same kind of cures—all psychological effects—not real cures of organic diseases or bodily lesions.

The appeal to the Scriptures in support of this idolatrous superstition is in open defiance of what the Scriptures teach regarding miracles. John 20:30 says the signs or miracles performed by Jesus were recorded to produce faith. Again (Heb. 2:4), we are told that God bore witness to the teaching of the apostles "both with signs and wonders and with diverse miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will." And in Acts (16:20) it is said that the apostles "went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following." No such demonstrations are needed now, for we have the word fully revealed in the Bible and amply attested and confirmed by these signs and wonders recorded for the purpose of establishing the word and thus producing faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God; and that believing we "might have life through his name."

CHAPTER VIII

WORSHIP OF IMAGES

Cardinal Gibbons says, "Religious paintings are the catechism of the ignorant." "How many thousands would have died ignorant of the Christian faith if they had not been enlightened by paintings!"

"By means of religious emblems, St. Francis Xavier effected many conversions in India; and by the same means Father De Schmet made known the gospel to the savages of the Rocky Mountains." (F. F., 243.) We make these quotations to show what Roman Catholics believe, so that we may have their real position before us for consideration. To one familiar with God's word, argument would not be necessary, but a statement of such absurd teaching, contrary not only to the Scriptures, but also against all reason and common sense seems sufficient. It is difficult to understand how even devout Romanists can believe such stuff as the above.

Image worship was the subject of much contention and strife from the time of its gradual introduction in the fourth century to its condemnation by the council of Constantinople in 754 and its establishment by the seventh general council of Nice 787. Romanists tell us that they do not really worship images, statues, relics, etc., but use them to honor the saints they represent, to invoke them and to stimulate to an imitation of their virtues. The same excuse has been offered by idolaters in all ages. They all assert that there is no power, wisdom or virtue in the wood, stone or metal image. And the Lord knew that when he gave the law forbidding and condemning idolatry in any form. Celsus in his attacks on Christianity as quoted by Orogen in his argument ridicules time and again the notion that pagans actually worshiped figures of metal, stone and wood. Idolaters claim, as do the Romanists, that they honor the characters whose like-

nesses the images bear when they kiss them, or bow or prostrate themselves before them.

The early Fathers opposed images in the churches. Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria and Orogen were opposed to all sorts of images. (H. R., 154.)

"But Christians and Jews have regard to his command, 'Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him alone'; and this other, 'Thou shalt have no other gods before me: Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them'; and again, 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.' It is in consideration of these and many other such commands, that they not only avoid temples, altars and images, but are ready to suffer death when it is necessary, rather than debase by any such impiety the conception which they have of the Most High God." (Orogen against Celsus, Book VII, 485.)

Again Orogen makes this stronger when he refers to the "conduct of Christians in refusing homage to any object except the Most High God and the Firstborn of all creation." (*Ibid.*, 490.)

"We Christians have nothing to do with images on account of the second commandment; the first thing we teach those who come to us is, to despise idols and images; it being the peculiar character of the Christian religion to raise our minds above images, agreeably to the law which God himself has given to mankind." (Orogen against Celsus, quoted by H. R., 154.)

Our Romanist friends stress the Fathers to such an extent that it is thought proper to give these references from them.

Image worship today in the church is just as idolatrous as it was when God gave the law to Moses; just the same kind of idolatry as that practised by the worshipers of Baal, Ashtaroth and Molech, or as that used by the devotees of Jupiter, Bacchus and Venus. Idolatry only tends to degrade, debase and pollute the religion of Christ, and instead of enlightening its devotees it holds them in the destructive embrace of ignorance and superstition.

CHAPTER IX

THE POPE A SUBJECT OF SCRIPTURE PROPHECY

Romanists tell us that it is by the Roman Catholic Church and the infallible pope that we know the Bible to be true. We agree that if these had never existed, the Bible would have failed in its prophecy concerning them. In the sense that these have fulfilled prophecy they have proved the Scriptures to be true. The following passages are clearly fulfilled in the pope:

"Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord will consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: even him whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs of lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." (2 These. 1:3-10.)

"Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats," etc. (1 Tim. 4:1-3.)

A passage in Tertullian's Apology, written 120 years before pagan Rome came to its end, shows that Christians looked forward to that period as pregnant with calamity to the cause of Christ. The passage reads:

"Christians are under a particular necessity of praying for emperors, for the continued state of the empire; because we know that dreadful power which hangs over the world, and the conclusion of the age, which threatens the most horrible evils, is restrained by the continuance of the time appointed for the

Roman empire, This is not what we would experience; and while we pray that it may be deferred, we hereby show our good-will to the perpetuity of the Roman state.

"This hindrance—'he who now letteth'—was not effectually removed, until Constantine, the emperor, on professing himself a Christian, undertook to convert the kingdom of Christ into a kingdom of this world, by exalting the teachers of Christianity to the same state of affluence, grandeur, and influence in the empire, as had been enjoyed by pagan priests and secular officers in the state . . . What followed was the kingdom of the clergy, supplanting the kingdom of Jesus Christ." (H. R., 29.)

It is not an external foe that Paul describes in 2 Thessalonians as the man of sin, that should come after him "who now letteth" and was to be "taken out of the way," but he is seated in the temple of God and is restrained by an external hindrance which can be none other than pagan Rome whose persecutions prevented the development of the man of sin. When paganism finally gave way under Constantine the exaltation, affluence and grandeur conferred by him upon the church opened the way for Christianity to develop a far worse enemy from her own bosom. We know what that development was and how rapidly it came after the hindrance was removed. We know that it developed from the bosom of the church and manifested the very marks specified in these prophecies. Mohammedanism cannot be the man of sin as suggested by some Romanists. It developed from within and was seated in the temple of God while Mohammedanism was always external and had no connection whatever with the church.

About 555 B.C. the prophet Daniel, in a vision, saw that "four great beasts came up from the sea, diverse one from another." Scholars are agreed that the first of these sea monsters, resembling a lion, represented the Assyrian government; the second, like a bear, with three ribs in its mouth (Babylon, Lydia and Egypt) symbolized the Medo-Persian empire; the third, like a leopard, with four wings of a bird on its back and four heads, represented the rapid conquests of Alexander the Great who established the universal Greek empire upon the ruins of the Medo-Persian empire,

the four heads of this beast fitly representing the partition of Alexander's dominions among his four leading generals; and the fourth beast, terrible and! powerful, devouring and breaking in pieces with its great iron teeth and stamping the residue with its feet, presents a perfect picture of the cruel and tyrannical Roman empire.

This fourth beast had ten horns (ten kings or kingdoms, Rev. 17:12 X which fits the historical fact that after the invasion of the barbarians from the north the Roman empire was partitioned among ten kings or states. Among these horns there came up another horn, a little horn, before which three of the first horns were plucked up by the roots. This little horn had eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things.

Daniel asked one of them that stood by about the vision and especially about the fourth beast and the ten horns and the little horn. The reply was that "out of this kingdom shall ten kings arise: and another shall arise after them; and he shall be diverse from the former, and he shall put down three kings. And he shall speak words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High: and he shall think to change the times and the law; and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and half a time. But the judgment shall be set, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and destroy it unto the end." (Dan. 7:24-26.)

In order to see just how these items of Daniel's prophecy fit the facts of history we arrange them in parallel columns as follows:

PROPHECY	HISTORY
1. The little horn came up among the ten "after" them.	1. The Roman hierarchy developed quietly among the ten kingdoms "after" the partition of the Roman empire into ten kingdoms.
2. Three of the first horns were plucked up by the roots before this little horn.	2. In the eighth century, Pepin, king of France, gave to the pope one horn, the exarchate of Ravenna; Charlamagne confirmed

to him the kingdom of the Lombards, and later Lewis the Pious confirmed to him the *State of Rome*. The papal Tiara is described in the Catholic Encyclopedia as "equipped with three royal diadems. On account of the three diadems it is sometimes called triregnum."

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>3. It was diverse from the other powers, having eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things.</p> | <p>3. The papal power was new and different, boastful, arrogant, claiming both spiritual and civil authority. It was shrewd, cunning and politic.</p> |
| <p>4. He shall speak words against the Most High.</p> | <p>4. The papal power by its assumptions, pretensions and blasphemies has spoken against the Most High whose authority and power the pope has usurped to himself.</p> |
| <p>5. I beheld and the same horn made war with the saints. "And shall wear out the saints of the Most High."</p> | <p>5. The history of Romanism deals very largely with the cruel wars and persecutions of Roman Catholics against all who opposed their idolatry and superstitious errors, and for a long time they prevailed against the saints. Their chief concern was to extirpate heretics.</p> |
| <p>6. And he shall think to change times and the law.</p> | <p>6. Roman Catholic authorities most brazenly and shamelessly make the claim of legislative, executive and judicial authority and power for the pope.</p> |
| <p>7. And they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and half a time. But judgment shall be</p> | <p>7. Boniface III in 606 became the first Universal Bishop or Pope of Rome and in the eighth century the</p> |

set, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and destroy it unto the end.

pope became a temporal ruler which power he exercised till 1870 when his dominion was taken away. According to Daniel his dominion is taken away "unto the end" of time.

8. And the kingdom and the dominion and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High: his kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him.

8. The deposing of the little horn, the Roman Catholic hierarchy, and the loss of its tyrannical power over men gave place to the saints of the Most High. The blessings of civil and religious liberty were enjoyed by the people of all nations. They were permitted to serve the Most High in his everlasting kingdom from all the dominions of earth.

There were to be only four universal world powers, all of which have been identified by the vision of Daniel, the last one being the Roman Empire. The identity of the little horn, among the ten horns of the fourth beast and coming "after" the ten horns had been established, with the papal power of Rome is certain. These items have never met in any king, kingdom, state or empire except in papal Rome. The fourth beast or Roman empire has been utterly destroyed and no little horn could now arise *among the ten* horns of a government which has ceased to exist. Therefore the fulfillment of this prophecy cannot be future, but all its features and characteristics are fully met in papal Rome and in no other.

Again the vision of John in the 13th and 17th chapters of Revelation fully accords with the prophetic dream of Daniel and with the plain statements of Paul regarding the "man of sin." John describes the sea monster of his vision as having "ten horns and seven heads, and on his horns ten diadems, and upon his heads names of blasphemy."

In the 17th chapter verse 1, mention is made of the "great harlot that sitteth upon many waters." In verse 15 we are told that the "Many waters where the harlot sitteth" are "peoples, and multitudes and nations." In verse 9 we are told that the "seven heads are seven mountains on which the woman sitteth; and they are seven kings." The ten horns are also declared to be ten kings (verse 12). The facts of history agree with these marks in that the Roman empire was partitioned or divided into ten kingdoms and when papal Rome was fully developed with temporal power she is described as a harlot or woman sitting upon seven heads, i. e., supported and sustained by seven powers. Bible scholars usually identify the Babylon of this scripture with papal Rome which was blasphemously designated as the "*Holy Roman Empire*," after Pepin, in the eighth century, gave to the pope of Rome worldly dominion and power. This "*Holy Roman Empire*" was, from this time on till the reformation of Luther, sustained and supported in all its papal assumptions by the seven grand electors of Germany. Who can doubt that these are the seven heads of this prophecy?

In this vision of John we find the same characteristics of the beast that Daniel gave in his description of the little horn. He blasphemed against God, against his name and his tabernacle, even them that dwell in heaven, speaking great things and blasphemies; he made war with the saints and overcame them; "and there was given him authority over every tribe and people and tongue and nation." It was to be *catholic, universal*. "And all that dwell on the earth shall worship him, every one whose name hath not been written from the foundation of the world in the book of life, of the Lamb that hath been slain." Whatever this monster, he is described by the Holy Spirit as a fierce and vicious wild beast, a fit symbol of tyranny, cruelty and oppression. *He is called the man of sin, anti-Christ, Babylon the Great, a city, a beast, a harlot, a woman, a mystery. He is a persecuting power,*

drunken with the blood of the saints, with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus. What more could have been said by inspiration to more fully and completely identify this monster of sin and iniquity with the power of papal Rome?

But this beast is still more definitely identified as to his name, besides the identity of characteristics already noticed.

"Here is wisdom. Let him who has understanding compute the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man, and his number is six hundred and sixty and six." (Rev. 13:18.)

It is well established history, not called in question, that the ancient Greeks, before the invention of the Arabic notation and numeration, used the letters of their alphabet to indicate numbers. On this see Clark's Commentary where other authorities are cited.

Irenaeus (b. 135—d. 202) relying on inspired prophecy looked for the Latin kingdom to be divided into ten, and he thought anti-Christ would develop from this kingdom. It is rather remarkable that Irenaeus had such a clear conception of the application of this prophecy before its fulfilment. After advising caution in making a specific application of the number of the beast, he says:

"Let them wait, in the first place, the division of the kingdom into ten. ... It is therefore more certain and less hazardous, to await the fulfillment of the prophecy, than to be making surmises, and casting about for any names that may present themselves, inasmuch as many names can be found possessing the number mentioned; . . . Then also Lateinos (Dateious) has the number six hundred sixty-six; and it is a very probable [solution], this being the name of the last kingdom [of the four seen by Daniel]. For the Latins are they who at present bear rule: I will not, however, make any boast over this [coincidence]. (Against Heresies, Vol. 2, 137.)

The numerical values given to the letters of the name used by Irenaeus are

D 30

A 1

T 300

E 5

I 10

N 50

O 70

S 200

666

Objection has been made to the spelling used by Irenaeus, some claiming that the fourth letter E was not employed in writing this name in Irenaeus' day. While this may be true it seems that Irenaeus should have known it. The fact that the Roman hierarchy did not exist and anti-Christ had not yet developed seems to indicate that Irenaeus would not have been moved by prejudice to thus forge a form of spelling to sustain such a charge. There seems to be no motive for such a fraud.

But scholars tell us that the Latin Kingdom was usually represented in Greek as **H Dative Basileia**, The Latin Kingdom, and the values of the letters of this title amount to exactly 666 as shown below:

$$8+30+1+300+10+50+8 \quad 2+1+200+10+30+5+10+1=666.$$

H D a t i v e B a z i l e i a

Since the name of no other kingdom on earth is 666, and since the beast, the symbol of this kingdom, is proven to be the Latin empire whose Greek name is **H Dative Basileia** which equals 666, its identity with the beast of Revelation 13th chapter is apparent. That this identity is with Papal Rome and not Pagan Rome is indicated by the second beast of Rev. 13:12 being called in Rev. 18:20 the false prophet. Pagan Rome was never called a prophet of any kind.

CHAPTER X

BY THEIR FRUITS YE SHALL KNOW THEM

Our Romanist friends boast of their having preserved the Bible through the dark ages and claim great credit for the development of art and centralization of ecclesiastical power. It is true they did not burn all the Bibles, and it is true that they kept it from the people. It is likewise true that under Roman Catholic sway the people did not revert to cannibalism clad in loin cloths like savages, but in the period of the greatest power of Papal Rome those under her influence were the most intolerant, the most tyrannical, the most cruel and the most ignorant and superstitious people known to the history of civilized peoples.

Roman Catholics claim great credit for the establishment of religious liberty in America and that the Roman Catholic colony of Maryland was the first to make such legal provision. These claims, however, are disputed, and it is shown that Rhode Island through the efforts of Roger Williams made such provision two years before the constitution of Maryland was adopted through the efforts of Lord Baltimore. It is further shown that while Maryland gave some measure of religious liberty, blasphemy against God, denying the Savior Jesus Christ as the Son of God or denying the holy trinity was punished with death under her constitution. And under her laws reproachful words concerning the virgin Mary, or the holy apostles or evangelists, were crimes. The fact that the colonists had just come from under conditions of intolerance against Romanism in England led the founder of the Maryland colony to a more liberal view than had obtained among Romanists—a view not supported by their authorities. Besides, if the thirteen colonies had been composed of twelve Roman Catholics and one protestant, we may be assured that there would have been no religious liberty for the American people.

It is granted that some great geniuses, scholars and artisans have been Roman Catholic—this in spite of their errors, their cruelty and their superstition. But the general effect of their system has been a serious handicap to the progress and welfare of the masses under Roman Catholic domination. An example of this is seen in the trial and imprisonment by the inquisition of Galileo who was condemned to abjure by oath on his knees the sublime truths of his scientific creed.

A comparison of those countries where Roman Catholicism prevails with those countries where the open Bible has gained a firm hold on the people will readily show the greater progress of the latter in all branches of worthy human endeavor. It is seen also by such comparison that this progress is decreased in proportion to the extent of Roman Catholic influence in any given country. Who can deny the superiority of England, Scotland and Wales over Roman Catholic Ireland, in learning, science, wealth and moral influence? Or who does not recognize the superiority of protestant America over Roman Catholic Latin America in all laudable qualities?

Latin America is an example of what Romanism accomplishes where it has unlimited sway. Mr. James Bryce says the "intellectual life and ethical standards of conduct of these countries seem to be entirely divorced from religion." Yet the women and the peasantry are almost universally "practicing" Catholics. But for the men of the educated classes religion has no interest. The form of religion—Catholicism—of most of Latin America is said to be but little above fetishism. The priests fail to supply a pattern for conduct, and the Romish church as a whole lost its hold on the educated classes. As a result of the conquest and the manner in which Catholic Spain administered her colonies, though the peasants are devoutly religious according to Roman Catholic standards, yet they are profoundly ignorant and superstitious. Mr. Bryce says that "of the eight or nine millions of people in Equador, Peru, Bolivia, and Paraguay, probably

one-half are not only illiterate, but cannot speak even Spanish." The same authority says further:

"In all Spanish countries, the church had trodden down the laity and taken freedom and responsibility from them more than befall anywhere else in Christendom, making devotion consist in absolute submission. Thus when at last her sway vanished, her moral influence vanished with it. This absence of religious foundation for thought and conduct is a grave misfortune for Latin America." (South America, 582, 583.)

It is said that 60% of the peasant children born in many of the Latin American countries are illegitimate, due to the exorbitant prices charged by the priests for marriages. Mr. Bryce makes the following remark on this point: "The fees charged for marriages are so high that the rite is commonly neglected." (South America, 461.) Religion does nothing to stir their minds, and they have little incentive to desire instruction or to rise in life. In many instances these Latin American Catholics worship evil spirits and reverence the images of the gods of their fathers. According to a secret report by a commission made to the king of Spain the wretched state of the Indians was to be attributed to the vices of the priests, the extortions practiced on them and the general bad treatment from all Spaniards.

Such is the fruit of Romanism where it has had practically undisputed sway for four hundred years, where the priest-ridden people are kept in ignorance and without the influence of the open Bible. And these benighted souls are included among the lambs of the Roman Catholic fold which claims 50% of all Christendom.

One of the boasted virtues of the Romish church is that this church harbors all kinds of people regardless of their calling, occupation or moral character. The Bible teaches us to withdraw from those that walk disorderly, but Romanists will retain in full fellowship all kinds of unregenerates and even criminals—provided they confess to the priest at least once each year and do such penances as may be imposed. A saloonist, a professional gambler or dive keeper need not sur-

render his profession in order to retain his membership in the Roman Catholic Church. The one sin which calls forth the excommunications and anathemas of this church is that which they designate as heresy— denial of the Romish faith in any of its essentials.

Another item of the corrupted fruit of Romanism is seen in the observance of the eucharist, the Lord's supper, which they pervert in several ways:

1. In the withdrawal of the cup from the laity. (See Luke 22:19, 20.) (The priest takes both bread and wine, but gives only bread to the laity.)

2. In the doctrine of transubstantiation, or that the loaf becomes the real flesh and the wine the real blood of Christ when consecrated by the priest.

3. In the teaching that it is a sacrifice or offering again of Christ's body and blood, while the Bible teaches that Christ offered himself a sacrifice for sin once for all. (Heb. 9:24-28.)

4. In its observance on other days than the first day of the week, the resurrection day of Christ from the tomb. (Acts 20:7.)

Thus it will be seen that the eucharist or Lord's supper has been so perverted and corrupted as to be entirely different from that which was instituted by our Lord.

It would be an endless task to examine in detail all the errors of the Roman Catholic hierarchy with its pope, cardinals, patriarchs, primates, metropolitans, archbishops, archdeacons, monks, friars, nuns, etc., and its multitude of rituals and ceremonies and its numerous feasts and holy days and seasons. But enough has been given to show that the Roman Catholic Church is not from God, but from men. We are taught in Holy Writ that to teach the doctrines and commandments of men is vain worship. Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: "Fear God and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man."