

Truth Versus Tradition

**A Study of the Doctrines of
Roman Catholicism**

by
Reuben S. Emperado

Published by
J.C. Choate Publications
Winona/Singapore/Cebu City/Jakarta/New Delhi/Cape Town

© Copyright 2001 J.C. Choate Publications

Cover Design: Betty Burton Choate
Typesetting: Eulene Ramsey
Layout: Barbara A. Oliver

First Printing, 2001
Second Printing, 2010

Order From:

J.C. Choate Publications
P.O. Box 72
Winona, MS 38967
Phone: 662-283-1192; Fax: 662-283-1191
E-Mail: choate@worldangelism.org

The Publisher's Statement

A number of years ago I was doing literature and radio work in the Philippines and was interested in finding someone who could help expand that effort. Brother Ray Bryan, who worked for many years in Baguio City and Manila, put me in contact with Reuben Emperado in Cebu City. Since he was already involved in radio programming, he was ready to work with me. I provided him with recording equipment and we began to add to the programs that were already on the air.

While increasing the radio work, we also began to print literature to be used as follow-up tools throughout the country. In addition to helping us to circulate **The Voice of Truth International**, a quarterly magazine, Reuben also began to print a local edition of **The Voice of Truth**.

Reuben has a wonderful Christian family and is one of the most evangelistic people I have met anywhere in the world. As mentioned, he is deeply involved in radio and literature work, but he is also out all over the southern islands of the Philippines, doing campaign work, establishing new congregations, and teaching in Preacher Training Schools.

The Philippines has a largely Catholic population. Reuben has dealt with their teachings most of his adult life. Seeing the contradictions between their doctrines and what the Bible says, he has taken the time to make an in-depth study of those contradictions. This book is the result of that study.

I count it an honor to be associated with Reuben in an effort

to spread the gospel throughout the Philippines and the world, and I want to commend his book to you. It has not been written in anger but with love for souls around the globe. I want to encourage you to read what he has to say and go to the Bible itself to see if it is so or not. If you will do that, we have every reason to believe that you will be greatly benefited by such a study.

J. C. Choate
Church of Christ
Winona, MS 38967
Nov. 1, 2001

Introduction

A well known and very high ranking Catholic Cardinal said,

“The true church must be Apostolical. Hence in the Creed framed in the first Ecumenical Council of Nicea, in the year 325, we find these words: ‘I believe in the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.’ This attribute of note of the Church implies that the true Church must always teach the identical doctrines delivered by the Apostles, and her ministers must derive their powers from the Apostles by an uninterrupted succession. Consequently, no church can claim to be the true one whose doctrines differ from those of the Apostles, or those ministers are unable to trace, by an unbroken chain, their authority to an Apostolic source” (**Faith Of Our Fathers**, Cardinal Gibbons, page 32).

In the same book Cardinal Gibbons also said,

“To discover, therefore, the Church of Christ among the various conflicting claimants we have to inquire, first, which church teaches whole and entire those doctrines taught by the Apostles; second, what minister can trace back, in an unbroken line, their missionary powers to the Apostles. The Catholic Church **alone** teaches doctrines which are in all respects identical with those of the first teachers of the gospel” (**Faith Of Our Fathers**, page 33).

The Catholic hierarchy capitalize so much on Apostolic succession. They think that they are impregnable in this point, but their supposed-to-be Apostolic succession is based on nothing

but mere assumption and forgery. In order to advance their claim, they had to fabricate false documents supposed to be written by the early fathers of the church.

Before the Roman Catholic Church can claim that their ministers are the rightful successors of the Apostles they have to prove these things:

1. That Peter was appointed by our Lord Jesus as the chief of the Apostles.
2. That the Lord intended that Peter have successors.
3. That Peter was the first Bishop of Rome and that he stayed in Rome for 25 years as claimed by the Roman Catholic Church.
4. That the popes of Rome are genuine successors of Peter.
5. That the Bishops of Rome have been faithful to the original teachings of the Apostles.
6. That the Roman Catholic Church has never deviated from the true teachings of the Lord as written in the New Testament.

Apostolic succession is of no service to the Roman Catholic Church because Paul said, *“Also from among yourselves men will rise up, speaking perverse things, to draw away the disciples after themselves”* (Acts 20:30). And that *“...some will depart from the faith, giving heed to deceiving spirits and doctrines of demons”* (1 Timothy 4:1).

Since the Roman Catholic Church claims that “The Catholic Church alone teaches the doctrines which are in all respects iden-

tical with those of the first teachers of the gospel,” let us compare these teachings with the word of God to determine if these claims are indeed true. However, if in our investigations we learn that these contradict the Bible, then she could not possibly be the true church because Cardinal Gibbons said, “Consequently, no church can claim to be the true one whose doctrines differ from those of the Apostles” (**Faith Of Our Fathers**, page 32).

Hans Kung, a Roman Catholic theologian, was right when he wrote, “...The living, original and fundamental witness of the Apostles is handed down to us in the New Testament which is valid for the church for all ages” (**The Church**, Hans Kung, pages 458, 459). He was again correct when he further stated, “There is no original ‘Apostolic’ tradition about the origins of the church outside the New Testament” (Ibid, page 459).

In this investigation we will allow the Roman Catholic Church to speak for herself by quoting directly from her authorized books, bearing the permission of her own bishops or cardinals, to avoid misrepresentation. We will compare these official doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church with the Bible, which is the infallible Word of God.

One Catholic writer said: “If it be not identical in belief, in government, etc., with the primitive Church, then it is not the Church of Christ” (**Catholic Facts** by John Francis Knoll, page 27).

According to Hans Kung: “Apostolic succession therefore entails a continuing and living confrontation of the Church with the original, fundamental testimony of Scripture. Apostolic suc-

cession is achieved only if this Biblical witness is faithfully followed in preaching, faith and action, if the Bible does not remain a closed book,...but as a living voice of witness, to be heard and believed here and now as a message of joy, of liberation, of good news. In this sense Apostolic succession means following the faith and confession of the apostles” (**The Church**, Hans Kung, page 459).

We therefore ask: Are the doctrines and practices of the Roman Catholic Church identical with the doctrines and practices taught by the Apostles? Has the Roman Church been faithful to this **original and fundamental testimony of the Scripture**? We would like to challenge this claim of Apostolicity in the light of the Scripture and historical developments of the doctrines taught by the Roman Catholic Church today.

We therefore invite you to study with us this most important subject. *“Come now, and let us reason together”* (Isaiah 1:18).

Table of Contents

Chapter 1	The Authority of the Bible	1
Chapter 2	Can We Understand the Bible?	4
Chapter 3	Is the Bible a Dead Letter?	11
Chapter 4	Who Is the Head of the Church?.....	17
Chapter 5	The Foundation and Center of Unity of the Church	20
Chapter 6	How Many Mediators, One or Many?	28
Chapter 7	Should a Bishop Be Married or Celibate?	30
Chapter 8	Is Enforced Clerical Celibacy from Heaven or from Demons?.....	32
Chapter 9	“Father” as a Religious Title	40
Chapter 10	The Christian Priesthood	42
Chapter 11	Is Scriptural Baptism Immersion or Infusion?	46
Chapter 12	The Fate of Unbaptized Infants.....	54
Chapter 13	Original Sin	56
Chapter 14	Is the Rosary from Heaven or from Men?	66
Chapter 15	Purgatory	68
Chapter 16	Are the Dead Helped by Our Prayers?	74
Chapter 17	Are We to Worship Graven Images?.....	76
Chapter 18	The Traditions of the Catholic Church: From Heaven or From Men?	80
Chapter 19	The Seven Sacraments: Are They From Heaven or From Men?	92
Chapter 20	The False Decretals	107

Chapter 1

The Authority of the Bible

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE: The Roman Catholic Church teaches that the Bible does not contain all the truths of the Christian religion.

According to John O'Brien, a Catholic priest, "The Bible does not contain all the teachings of the Christian religion, nor does it formulate all the duties of its members."

He further states, "The Bible alone is not a safe and competent guide because it is not now and has never been accessible to all, because it does not contain all the truths of the Christian religion" (**The Faith Of Millions**, J. A. O'Brien, pages 138,139).

In another book Bertrand Conway stated, "No, the Bible is not the only source of faith..." (**Question Box**, page 76).

THE BIBLE TEACHES: The Holy Scripture is a sufficient guide for our salvation.

Jesus said, "*He who rejects Me, and does not receive My words, has that which judges him — the word that I have spoken will judge him in the last day*" (John 12:48).

Paul stated in 1 Corinthians 4:6, "*That you may learn in us not to think beyond what is written.*"

"But these are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in His name" (John 20:31).

“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 complete, thoroughly equipped for every good work” (2 Timothy 3:16,17).

“His divine power has given to us all things that pertain to life and godliness, through the knowledge of Him who called us by glory and virtue, by which have been given to us exceeding great and precious promises, that through these you may be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust” (2 Peter 1:3,4).

The Apostle Paul said that he has delivered the whole council of God. *“Therefore I testify to you this day that I am innocent of the blood of all men. For I have not shunned to declare to you the whole counsel of God” (Acts 20:26,27).*

Our Lord Jesus Christ promised His apostles that the Holy Spirit would guide them into all truth. *“However, when He, the Spirit of truth, has come, He will guide you into all truth; for He will not speak on His own authority, but whatever He hears He will speak; and He will tell you things to come” (John 16:13).*

Jude told us, *“Beloved, while I was very diligent to write to you concerning our common salvation, I found it necessary to write to you exhorting you to contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints” (Jude 3).*

We Cannot Add to or Subtract from the Word of God

There are many warnings in the Bible which prohibit us from adding to it or taking from it. Let us notice some of these warnings:

“But even if we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel to you than what we have preached to you, let him be accursed” (Galatians 1:8).

“Whoever transgresses and does not abide in the doctrine of Christ does not have God. He who abides in the doctrine of Christ has both the Father and the Son” (2 John 9).

“You shall not add to the word which I command you, nor take from it, that you may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you” (Deuteronomy 4:2).

“Every word of God is pure; He is a shield to those who put their trust in Him. Do not add to His words, lest He rebuke you, and you be found a liar” (Proverbs 30:5,6).

“For I testify to everyone who hears the words of the prophecy of this book: If anyone adds to these things, God will add to him the plagues that are written in this book; and if anyone takes away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part from the Book of Life, from the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book” (Revelation 22:18,19).

Chapter 2

Can We Understand the Bible?

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE: The Roman Catholic Church teaches that we cannot understand the Bible. Bible reading was forbidden by some popes.

In order to discourage the ordinary person from reading the Bible, the Roman Catholic hierarchy has made some biased statements concerning it. Please notice what a Catholic Cardinal, James Gibbons, said:

“We must therefore conclude that the Scripture alone cannot be a sufficient guide...because they are not of themselves clear and intelligible in matters of highest importance, and because they don’t contain all the truths necessary to salvation” (**Faith Of Our Fathers**, Gibbons, page 73).

“Clement XI condemned the proposition that the reading of the Scripture is for all” (**National Catholic Almanac**, 1949 Edition, pages 211,212).

The same book also said, “It is not necessary for all Christians to read the Bible” (Ibid, page 212).

According to the fourth **Rule of the Congregation of the Index of Prohibited Books**, which was approved by Pope Pius IV, any person who wished to possess or read the Bible must first have the permission of the priest or bishop. Failure to do this was considered to be a grave sin.

“Since it is manifest by experience that if the Holy Bible in the vernacular tongue be suffered to be read everywhere without distinction, more evil than good arises, let the judgment of the bishop or inquisitor be abided by in this respect; so that, after consulting with the parish priest or the confessor, they may grant permission to read translations of the Scriptures made by Catholic writers, to those whom they understand to be able to receive no harm, but an increase of faith and piety, from such reading; which faculty let them have in writing. But whosoever shall presume to read these Bibles, or have them in possession without such faculty, shall not be capable of receiving absolution of their sins, unless they have first given up the Bible to the Ordinary” (Quoted by George Salmon, **Infallibility of the Church**, page 49).

These writers have made some important charges against the Bible:

1. The Scripture alone is not a sufficient guide.
2. The Scripture is not clear and intelligible in matters of highest importance.
3. The Scripture does not contain all the truth necessary to salvation.
4. Bible reading is not good and not necessary for all.
5. Bible reading may cause more evil than good if not assisted by the Catholic Priest or Bishops.
6. Reading the Bible, or the possession of it, is considered to be a grave sin if there is not **written** permission from the Catholic authorities.

Are these allegations true? Let us find out from the Bible itself.

THE BIBLE TEACHES:

1. The Bible is a sufficient guide.
2. The Bible is intelligible in matters that are important.
3. The Scripture contains all the truth that pertains to salvation, life and godliness.
4. Reading the Bible is very important and beneficial to all who are engaged in it.

“For we are not writing any other things to you than what you read or understand. Now I trust you will understand, even to the end” (2 Corinthians 1:13).

“...by which, when you read, you may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ” (Ephesians 3:4).

“...and that from childhood you have known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make you wise for salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus” (2 Timothy 3:15).

Paul advised Timothy to devote himself to the reading of the Scripture. *“Till I come, give attention to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine”* (1 Timothy 4:13).

Paul commanded the Christians of the first century to read his epistles. *“Now when this epistle is read among you, see that it is read also in the church of the Laodiceans, and that you likewise read the epistle from Laodicea”* (Colossians 4:16).

In Ephesians 5:16,17, we are commanded to **understand**

what the will of the Lord is. *“Redeeming the time, because the days are evil. Therefore do not be unwise, but understand what the will of the Lord is.”*

The disciples understood the parables of Jesus. He asked them: *“Have you understood all these things? They said to Him, Yes, Lord”* (Matthew 13:51).

According to John, the reading of the Gospel of John can produce faith. He said, *“...but these are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in His name”* (John 20:31).

The Apostle Paul said that **faith comes from hearing the word of God**. *“But what does it say? The word is near you, in your mouth and in your heart (that is, the word of faith which we preach)...So then faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God”* (Romans 10:8,17).

So, if we read the Bible and do not understand it, how can we have faith in Jesus? These verses prove that the Bible is not difficult to understand for people who are really seeking God's will.

The Bereans examined the scriptures daily to see if what Paul preached was true or not. *“These were more fair-minded than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness and searched the Scriptures daily to find out whether these things were so”* (Acts 17:11).

This verse shows two things: (1) They understood what Paul preached to them. They received the word with all eagerness,

and (2) they understood the scripture without an official interpreter because they personally examined the Scriptures daily to see if what Paul had preached was true. Paul did not tell them that they could not understand the Scriptures by themselves alone!

Paul also said that his aim was to speak so that people could understand him (Ephesians 3:4; 2 Corinthians 1:13). In his first epistle to the Corinthians he said, *“I thank my God I speak with tongues more than you all; yet in the church I would rather speak five words with my understanding, that I may teach others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue”* (1 Corinthians 14:18,19).

Paul also said to rightly divide the word of truth: *“Be diligent to present yourself approved to God, a worker who does not need to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth”* (2 Timothy 2:15). How can we rightly handle the word of truth if we can’t understand it?

The Catholic Church uses 2 Peter 3:16 to prove that the ordinary reader cannot understand the Scripture without the help of the **“teaching church”**: *“...in which are some things hard to understand, which untaught and unstable people twist to their own destruction.”* These words do not teach that we can’t understand the Bible. They only show that some of Paul’s writings were difficult to understand and that the unlearned and the unstable twisted them to their own destruction.

The kings of Israel were required to have a copy of the Law to guide them in their daily lives and in the administration of justice. *“Also it shall be, when he sits on the throne of his kingdom,*

that he shall write for himself a copy of this law in a book, from the one before the priests, the Levites. And it shall be with him, and he shall read it all the days of his life, that he may learn to fear the Lord his God and be careful to observe all the words of this law and these statutes” (Deuteronomy 17:18,19).

The wisdom of the entire nation of Israel was in knowing and keeping the Law.

*“Now, O Israel, listen to the statutes and the judgments which I teach you to observe, that you may live, and go in and possess the land which the Lord God of your fathers is giving you. You shall not add to the word which I command you, nor take from it, that you may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you. Your eyes have seen what the Lord did at Baal Peor; for the Lord your God has destroyed from among you all the men who followed Baal of Peor. But you who held fast to the Lord your God are alive today, every one of you. Surely I have taught you statutes and judgments, just as the Lord my God commanded me, that you should act according to them in the land which you go to possess. **Therefore be careful to observe them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the peoples who will hear all these statutes, and say, surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people.** For what great nation is there that has God so near to it, as the Lord our God is to us, for whatever reason we may call upon Him? And what great nation is there that has such statutes and righteous judgments as are in all this law which I set before you this day? And take heed to yourself, and diligently keep yourself, lest you forget the things your*

eyes have seen, and lest they depart from your heart all the days of your life. And teach them to your children and your grandchildren, especially concerning the day you stood before the Lord your God in Horeb, when the Lord said to me, 'Gather the people to Me, and I will let them hear My words, that they may learn to fear Me all the days they live on the earth, and that they may teach their children.' Then you came near and stood at the foot of the mountain, and the mountain burned with fire to the midst of heaven, with darkness, cloud, and thick darkness. And the Lord spoke to you out of the midst of the fire. You heard the sound of the words, but saw no form; you only heard a voice. So He declared to you His covenant which He commanded you to perform, the Ten Commandments; and He wrote them on two tables of stone. And the Lord commanded me at that time to teach you statutes and judgments, that you might observe them in the land which you cross over to possess. Take careful heed to yourselves, for you saw no form when the Lord spoke to you at Horeb out of the midst of the fire..." (Deuteronomy 4:1-15).

Chapter 3

Is the Bible a Dead Letter?

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE: The Roman Catholic Church teaches that the Bible is a dead letter and that the Roman Catholic Church is the authoritative interpreter of the Bible.

John O'Brien, a Catholic priest and author, made the following statement and claims: "The simple fact is that the Bible, like all dead letters, calls for a living interpreter. Just as the Supreme Court is the authorized living interpreter of the Constitution, so the Catholic Church is the living authoritative interpreter of the Bible. She has been the preserver and custodian of the Bible through the centuries, and she interprets it for us in the name and with authority of Jesus Christ. Christ never wrote a word, never commanded His Apostles or disciples to write. He taught and commissioned His Apostles to teach and assured them His abiding presence with them" (**The Faith of Millions**, page 139).

There are five things John O'Brien has said here:

1. The Bible is a dead letter.
2. The Bible needs a living interpreter.
3. The Roman Catholic Church is the living interpreter of the Bible.
4. The Roman Catholic Church is the custodian and the preserver of the Bible through the centuries.
5. Jesus never wrote anything, and He did not command His Apostles or disciples to write anything.

THE BIBLE TEACHES:

1. That the word of God is *living* and *active*, *powerful* and *abiding*!
2. The Bible does not need a living interpreter in order for its message to be understood by its readers.
3. The Roman Catholic Church is not the authorized interpreter of the Bible. On the contrary, many of her teachings contradict the plain teachings of the Scripture.
4. The Roman Catholic Church, although she has claimed to be the custodian and preserver of the Bible for many centuries, in reality was the arch enemy of the Bible and has kept the ordinary people from reading it, burning hundred of copies of it through the ages.
5. The Roman Catholic Church has finally revealed her true color and sentiment when she says that Jesus has never written a word and He has never commanded His disciples to write. Why has she said these words? Do they not diminish the importance and the authority of the written word of God?

Let us now examine the Scriptures to see if the statements of John O'Brien and the claims of the Roman Catholic Church are really true.

I. The Bible Is *Living, Active, Powerful and Abiding*.

A. *“For the word of God is living and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the division of soul and spirit, and of joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart” (Hebrews 4:12).*

B. *“Is not My word like a fire? says the Lord, and like a hammer that breaks the rock in pieces?” (Jeremiah 23:29).*

C. Jeremiah said that the word of God is like a burning fire in his heart shut up in his bones: *“Then I said, I will not make mention of Him, nor speak anymore in His name. But His word was in my heart like a burning fire shut up in my bones; I was weary of holding it back, and I could not” (Jeremiah 20:9).*

D. *“For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal but mighty in God for pulling down strongholds, casting down arguments and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ” (2 Corinthians 10:4,5).*

E. The Apostle Paul said that the gospel is the power (Greek — *dunamis*) of God unto salvation to everyone who believes. *“For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God to salvation for everyone who believes, for the Jew first and also for the Greek” (Romans 1:16).*

F. Peter said concerning the word of God: *“All flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of the grass. The grass withers, and its flower falls away, but the word of the Lord endures forever” (1 Peter 1:24,25).*

G. Peter described God's word as **regenerating, living and abiding!**

II. The Bible Does Not Need any Official Interpreter.

A. Timothy understood the Scripture. Even when he was still very young he learned the Scripture from his mother and grandmother, not from the Roman Catholic Church, which did not exist at that time. *"...and that from childhood you have known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make you wise for salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus"* (2 Timothy 3:15).

If the claim of the Roman Catholic Church is correct, then who was the authorized interpreter of the Bible that guided the young Timothy, since the Roman Catholic Church did not exist at that time?

B. The Bereans examined the Scripture daily to see if what Paul preached to them was true. They did this without any guide from an authorized interpreter. *"These were more fair-minded than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness, and searched the Scriptures daily to find out whether these things were so"* (Acts 17:11).

III. The Roman Catholic Church Is Not the Authorized Interpreter of the Bible.

A. The Roman Catholic Church must prove its claims from the Bible, not just state them. Where does the Bible say that the Roman Church is the authorized interpreter? In fact, this statement is nowhere made in the Scriptures.

B. Many of the official teachings of the Roman Catholic Church contradict the plain teachings of the Bible. Therefore, she cannot be the official interpreter of the Bible. The Roman Catholic Church claims infallibility and her final teachings are non-appealable. Many of the popes of the Roman Catholic Church did not even know an iota of the Scripture. Some were not even spiritual minded.

C. Since many of the priests do not know the Bible, how can they be its authorized interpreter?

D. A person becomes well versed in the Scripture by studying it and applying its teachings to one's life, not by some kind of church ordination.

E. If the Roman Catholic Church is truly the guardian and the authoritative interpreter of the Bible, let them follow its precepts and not contradict them.

IV. The Roman Catholic Church Is Not a Faithful Custodian of the Bible and Was, in fact, Its Worse Enemy.

A. The Roman Catholic Church has kept the Bible away from the people for many centuries. In the hands of the Roman Catholic Church, the Bible was a chained book and written in a language that only the clergy could read. In this manner the hierarchy had successfully blinded the minds of the people to the truth. Jesus declared that the word of God is truth (John 17:17), and we can be free only by knowing the truth (John 8:32). For so many centuries the ordinary people were enslaved to the tradi-

tions of men. The Roman Catholic Church, if she were the custodian of the Bible, was not a faithful custodian.

B. Throughout the centuries, hundreds of Bibles were burned by order of the Roman Catholic Church.

Chapter 4

Who Is the Head of the Church?

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE: The Roman Catholic Church teaches that she is governed by the pope as her head and that he is the successor of Peter.

John O'Brien, a Roman Catholic author wrote, "The Church, then, is governed by one head. Who is that head? The Bishop of Rome, as the successor of St. Peter" (**The Faith of Millions**, page 107). He further said that the Pope is "the supreme head" and "ruler of Christ's church on earth."

THE BIBLE TEACHES: Christ is the head of the church, and He is the king in His kingdom.

The Apostle Paul said in Ephesians 1:22,23 that God has "*put all things under His feet, and gave **Him to be head over all things to the church**, which is His body, the fullness of Him who fills all in all.*"

"And He is the head of the body, the church, who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead, that in all things He may have the preeminence" (Colossians 1:18).

*"For the husband is head of the wife, as also **Christ is head of the church**, and He is the Savior of the body"* (Ephesians 5:23).

Christ Is the King of His Kingdom and Head of His Church.

In the Scripture, the Church and the Kingdom are the same. The head of the Church and the King of the Kingdom is Jesus Christ our Lord, not Peter or the Pope of Rome.

“Then to Him was given dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve Him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and His kingdom the one which shall not be destroyed” (Daniel 7:14).

“For unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given; and the government will be upon His shoulder, and His name will be called Wonderful, Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace. Of the increase of His government and peace there will be no end, upon the throne of David and over His kingdom, to order it and establish it with judgment and justice from that time forward, even forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this” (Isaiah 9:6,7).

“He will be great, and will be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God will give Him the throne of His father David. And He will reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of His kingdom there will be no end” (Luke 1:32,33).

“Therefore being exalted to the right hand of God, and having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, He poured out this which you now see and hear. For David did not ascend into the heavens, but he said himself: ‘The

Lord said to my Lord, sit at My right hand, till I make Your enemies Your footstool'” (Acts 2:33-35).

“And Jesus came and spoke to them, saying, ‘All authority has been given to Me in heaven and on earth’” (Matthew 28:18).

The Apostle Peter said that Jesus Christ is the chief shepherd, not Peter. He said that he is Christ’s servant, not His vicar or the prince of the apostles (1 Peter 3,4).

Jesus forbade his disciples to exercise lordship over the church. He said, *“But Jesus called them to Himself and said, ‘You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and those who are great exercise authority over them. Yet it shall not be so among you; but whoever desires to become great among you, let him be your servant. And whoever desires to be first among you, let him be your slave — just as the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give His life a ransom for many” (Matthew 20:23-28).*

If the claim of the Roman Catholic Church is correct that Peter was the head of the church, then Peter was also the king of Christ’s kingdom, but we have seen that Jesus is the only king of His kingdom, and all the apostles were His servants. (2 Corinthians 4:5; 2 Peter 1:1)

Chapter 5

The Foundation and Center of Unity of the Church

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE: The Roman Catholic Church teaches that Peter and the Popes are the foundation of the Church and the center of unity.

“The Vatican Council teaches that Christ appointed the Apostle Peter to be the ‘**visible foundation**’ (Dogma 1821) and the center of the unity of the Church” (**Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma**, page 301).

“The Vatican Council teaches: ‘In order that the whole host of the faithful may remain in unity of faith and communion (in fidei et communionis unitate) He placed St. Peter over the apostles and instituted in him both a perpetual principle of unity and a visible foundation’” (Ibid, page 302).

The same author further said: “In the Encyclical ‘*Satis cognitum*’, which ex-professor treats of unity of the Church, Leo XIII commented: ‘As her Divine Founder willed that the Church should be one in faith, in government and in communion, He appointed Peter and his successors to be the foundation as it were, the centre of its unity’ (Dogma 1960) (**Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma**, Dr. Ludwig Ott, pages 302-303).

Cardinal Gibbons also said: “Therefore, any church that does not recognize Peter as its foundation is not the Church of Christ” (**Faith Of Our Fathers**, Gibbons, page 82).

“...he (Peter) is the centre of the church’s unity...he alone is the rock on which the church is built. Peter was to be its chief foundation stone” (**Catholic Dictionary**, Addis & Arnold, pages 642,643).

THE BIBLE TEACHES: That Jesus Christ is the foundation of the church.

I. Foundation of the Church:

“For no other foundation can anyone lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ” (1 Corinthians 3:11).

“This is the stone which was rejected by you builders, which has become the chief cornerstone” (Acts 4:11).

“Having been built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief cornerstone, in whom the whole building, being fitted together, grows into a holy temple in the Lord, in whom you also are being built together for a dwelling place of God in the Spirit” (Ephesians 2:20-22).

“Behold, I lay in Zion a stone for a foundation, a tried stone, a precious cornerstone, a sure foundation; whoever believes will not act hastily” (Isaiah 28:16).

In 1 Peter 2:4-6 the fulfillment of this prophecy is Jesus Christ, not Peter or the pope. *“Coming to Him as to a living stone, rejected indeed by men, but chosen by God and precious, you also, as living stones, are being built up a spiritual house, a*

holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. Therefore it is also contained in the Scripture, 'Behold, I lay in Zion a chief cornerstone, elect, precious, and he who believes on Him will by no means be put to shame'' (1 Peter 2:4-6).

"And I also say to you that you are Peter, and on this rock I will build My church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it" (Matthew 16:18). The Roman Catholic Church has wrongly taught that the foundation of the church is Peter (Petros). But Jesus did not say that He would build His church on Petros (Peter) but on *petra*, the rock, the ledge of rock. In Greek, the word Petros is the masculine gender and *petra* is the feminine gender. The church of Christ is not built on the person of Peter but on the truth he had just confessed, that Jesus is *"the Christ, the Son of the Living God."* The **rock foundation**, therefore, is the **divinity of Jesus Christ**, not Peter.

Peter de Rosa in his book, **Vicars of Christ: The Dark Side of the Papacy**, said, "For the fathers, it is Peter's faith — or the Lord in whom Peter has faith — which is called the Rock, not Peter. All the Councils of the church from Nicaea in the fourth century to Constance in the fifteenth century agree that Christ is the only foundation of the church; that is, the Rock on which the church rests" (page 32).

The Catholic Dictionary said, "We cannot interpret contrary to the unanimous consent of the fathers without making shipwreck of the faith" (page 77).

Joseph Strossmayer, a Catholic Bishop, in his speech during

the First Vatican Council in 1870, made this important observation on Matthew 16:18: "And I come now to speak of the great argument which you mentioned before to establish the primacy of the Bishop of Rome by the rock (petra). If these were true, the dispute would be at an end; but our forefathers — and they certainly know something — did not think of it as we do."

A. **St. Cyril**, in his fourth book on the Trinity, said, "I believe that by the rock you must understand the unshaken faith of the apostles."

B. **St. Hilary**, Bishop of Poitiers, in his second book on the Trinity, said, "The Rock (petra) is the blessed and only rock of the faith confessed by the mouth of St. Peter." In the sixth book of the Trinity, he wrote, "It is on this rock of the confession of faith that the church is built."

C. **St. Jerome**, in his sixth book on St. Matthew, said: "God has founded His church on this rock, and it is from this rock that the Apostle Peter has been named."

D. **St. Chrysostom**, in his fifty-third homily on St. Matthew said: "On this rock I will build my church — that is, on the faith of the confession." Now what was the confession of the apostles? Here it is — *Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God.*"

E. Other men mentioned by Bishop Strossmayer holding to the same belief were: **Ambrose**, Archbishop of Milan, **St. Basil of Seleucia** and the **Fathers of the Council of Chalcedon.**

F. Finally, he cited **Augustine**, “Of all the doctors of Christian antiquity, St. Augustine occupies one of the first places of knowledge and holiness. Listen then to what he writes in his second treatise on the first epistle of St. John: ‘What do the words mean, I will build my church on this rock? On this faith, on that which you said, Thou art the Christ the Son of the Living God.’ In his treatise on St. John we find this most significant phrase: **‘On this rock which thou hast confessed I will build my church, since Christ was the rock.’** The great bishop believed so little that the church was built on St. Peter that he said to the people in his thirteenth sermon, ‘Thou art Peter, and on this rock (petra) which thou hast confessed, on this rock which thou hast known, saying, Thou art the Christ the Son of the Living God; I will build it on **Me** and not **Me on thee.**’ That which St. Augustine thought upon this celebrated passage was the opinion of all Christendom in his time” (**Infallibility of the Pope**, by Bishop J. Strossmayer).

II. Center of Unity of the Church: The Bible teaches that Christ is the center of unity for the church.

“And I, if I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all peoples to Myself” (John 12:32).

“But now in Christ Jesus you who once were far off have been brought near by the blood of Christ. For He Himself is our peace, who has made both one, and has broken down the middle wall of separation, having abolished in His flesh the enmity, that is, the law of commandments contained in ordinances, so as to create in Himself one new man from the two, thus making peace, and that He might reconcile them

both to God in one body through the cross, thereby putting to death the enmity. And He came and preached peace to you who were afar off and to those who were near. For through Him we both have access by one Spirit to the Father. Now, therefore, you are no longer strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints and members of the household of God, having been built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief cornerstone, in whom the whole building, being fitted together, grows into a holy temple in the Lord” (Ephesians 2:13-21).

“Having made known to us the mystery of His will, according to His good pleasure which He purposed in Himself, that in the dispensation of the fullness of the times He might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth — in Him” (Ephesians 1:9,10).

“I do not pray for these alone, but also for those who will believe in Me through their word: that they all may be one, as You, Father, are in Me, and I in You; that they also may be one in Us, that the world may believe that You sent Me” (John 17:20,21).

In Paul's first epistle to the Christians in Corinth he condemned those who said that they were of Cephas: *“Now I plead with you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you, but that you be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment. For it has been declared to me con-*

cerning you, my brethren, by those of Chloe's household, that there are contentions among you. Now I say this, that each of you says, 'I am of Paul,' or 'I am of Apollos,' or 'I am of Cephas,' or 'I am of Christ.' Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? Or were you baptized in the name of Paul?" (1 Corinthians 1:10-13).

III. The Platform of Unity for the Church

In his epistle to the church in Ephesus Paul outlined the basis of Christian unity and listed seven points, but the pope is not in the list. Here is what Paul said:

"Endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body and one Spirit, just as you were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism: one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all. But to each one of us grace was given according to the measure of Christ's gift. Therefore He says: When He ascended on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts to men. (Now this, 'He ascended' — what does it mean but that He also first descended into the lower parts of the earth? He who descended is also the One who ascended far above all the heavens, that He might fill all things.) And He Himself gave some to be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the equipping of the saints for the work of ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ; that we should no longer be children, tossed to and

from and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the trickery of men, in the cunning craftiness of deceitful plotting, but, speaking the truth in love, may grow up in all things into Him who is the head — Christ — from whom the whole body, joined and knit together by what every joint supplies, according to the effective working by which every part does its share, causes growth of the body for the edifying of itself in love” (Ephesians 4:3-16).

In this epistle Paul also listed the gifts that build the body of Christ up, and again, the pope is not mentioned among these gifts. If indeed the office of the Papacy is so crucial and important for the unity and edification of the body of Christ, why is it not here mentioned by Paul? The silence of Paul on this matter is fatal to the theory of the Papal Supremacy. Would Paul forget the most important part of the edifice — the Papacy — if indeed it then existed as the center of the building?

Chapter 6

How Many Mediators, One or Many?

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE: The Roman Catholic Church teaches that there are many mediators, such as Mary, the saints and priests.

According to Pius XI, "...the priest...is established as a mediator between God and the human race." (**The Social Encyclical of Pius XI**, pages 185,190).

According to a Roman Catholic author, Mary is also a mediatrix of the church (**Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma** by Dr. Ludwig Ott, page 209).

Pope Pius XI, in his **Bull Ineffabilis**, designated Mary as the Mediatrix of all graces in a double sense (**Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma**, page 209).

THE BIBLE TEACHES: That Jesus Christ is the only mediator between God and men.

"For there is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time" (1 Timothy 2:5,6).

"Therefore He is also able to save to the uttermost those who come to God through Him, since He always lives to make intercession for them" (Hebrews 7:25).

“Through whom also we have access by faith into this grace in which we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God” (Romans 5:2).

“Nor is there salvation in any other, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved” (Acts 4:12).

“Who shall bring a charge against God’s elect? It is God who justifies. Who is he who condemns? It is Christ who died, and furthermore is also risen, who is even at the right hand of God, who also makes intercession for us” (Romans 8:33,34).

“My little children, these things I write to you, so that you may not sin. And if anyone sins, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous” (1 John 2:1).

Chapter 7

Should a Bishop Be Married or Celibate?

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE: The Roman Catholic Church teaches that bishops and priests must not be married.

Pope Pius XI said in his book: “The Church does not on any account admit a man living in the wedded state and having children, even though he have only one wife, to the orders of deacon, priest, bishop...only him whose wife be dead or who should abstain from the use of marriage” (**The Social Encyclical of Pius XI**, page 190).

THE BIBLE TEACHES: Bishops must be the husband of one wife.

“A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, temperate, sober-minded, of good behavior, hospitable, able to teach; not given to wine, not violent, not greedy for money, but gentle, not quarrelsome, not covetous; one who rules his own house well, having his children in submission with all reverence (for if a man does not know how to rule his own house, how will he take care of the church of God?); not a novice, lest being puffed up with pride he fall into the same condemnation as the devil. Moreover he must have a good testimony among those who are outside, lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil” (1 Timothy 3:2-7).

“For this reason I left you in Crete, that you should set in order the things that are lacking, and appoint elders in every city as I commanded you — if a man is blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children not accused of dissipation or insubordination. For a bishop must be blameless, as a steward of God, not self-willed, not quick-tempered, not given to wine, not violent, not greedy for money, but hospitable, a lover of what is good, sober-minded, just, holy, self-controlled, holding fast the faithful word as he has been taught, that he may be able, by sound doctrine, both to exhort and convict those who contradict” (Titus 1:5-9).

“One who rules his own house well, having his children in submission with all reverence” (1 Timothy 3:4).

We are informed that Peter had a wife and a mother-in-law: *“Now when Jesus had come into Peter’s house, He saw his wife’s mother lying sick with a fever”* (Matthew 8:14). *“Do we have no right to take along a believing wife, as do also the other apostles, the brothers of the Lord, and Cephas?”* (1 Corinthians 9:5).

Chapter 8

Is Enforced Clerical Celibacy from Heaven or from Demons?

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE: The Roman Catholic Church admits that enforced celibacy is not a divine command but only a church discipline.

Bertrand Conway, a Catholic priest and author, wrote that enforced clerical celibacy is not a divine law. He said, "Clerical celibacy is not a precept of divine or natural law; neither is it a dogma of the Catholic Church" (**Question Box**, page 311). "The earliest law enforcing celibacy was passed by the council of Elvira...in Spain about the year 300" (**Question Box**, page 313).

The Catholic Church admits that the New Testament does not make celibacy compulsory. "...we do not find in the New Testament any indication of celibacy being made compulsory upon the apostles or those whom they ordained..." (**Catholic Encyclopedia**, Vol. III, page 481).

Even Cardinal Gibbons was forced to admit that, "Celibacy is not expressly enforced by our Savior" (**Faith Of Our Fathers**, page 238).

"In the primitive days of the church...married men were admitted to the sacred orders" (**Faith Of Our Fathers**, page 329).

According to the **Catholic Encyclopedia**, a priest can no longer enter marriage after taking the vows. It says: "He is

henceforth unable to contract a valid marriage and any serious transgression in the matter of this vow is not only grievous sin in itself but incurs the additional guilt of sacrilege” (**Catholic Encyclopedia**, Vol. III, page 481).

Another Roman Catholic author said: “Strange to say, it would be legally possible to select even a married man (to be pope) for the law of celibacy of the clergy is not of divine institution, but is a rule of the church which developed gradually and was finally made a part of the legal code for the greater part of the world (**Externals of the Catholic Church**, by Sullivan, page 6).

Peter de Rosa noted in his book, **Vicars of Christ: The Dark Side of the Papacy**, “It should be noted, Paul never made any connection between celibacy and ministry; he was no advocate of celibate priests. In fact, when he deals with the ministry, he assumes the opposite. A bishop, he says, should have only one wife. This was taken probably in error, by celibate theologians, to mean that bishops should only have married once” (page 559).

It was Pope Gregory VII in 1074 who made a decree that anyone who wished to be ordained as a priest must first pledge to be celibate (**SUN STAR DAILY, Judge Officiates Priest’s Marriage**, page 23).

THE BIBLE TEACHES: That enforced celibacy is a sign of apostasy and is a doctrine of demons.

Paul states in 1 Timothy 4:1-4, “*Now the Spirit expressly*

says that in latter times some will depart from the faith, giving heed to deceiving spirits and doctrines of demons, speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their own conscience seared with a hot iron, forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from foods which God created to be received with thanksgiving by those who believe and know the truth. For every creature of God is good, and nothing is to be refused if it is received with thanksgiving; for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer.”

According to James 4:12, there is only “*one law giver,*” that is God. Therefore, the Roman Church has no right or authority to enforce a law which God has not enforced, such as clerical celibacy.

In 1 Corinthians 7:9 Paul said when speaking to the unmarried and the widows, “*But if they cannot exercise self-control, let them marry. For it is better to marry than to burn with passion.*”

In 1 Corinthians 7:11 Paul advised the married not to forsake their partner.

“But if any man thinks he is behaving improperly toward his virgin, if she is past the flower of youth, and thus it must be, let him do what he wishes. He does not sin; let them marry” (1 Corinthians 7:36).

“Marriage is honorable among all, and the bed undefiled; but fornicators and adulterers God will judge” (Hebrews 13:4).

Paul said that being married is one of the apostolic rights:

“Do we have no right to take along a believing wife, as do also the other apostles, the brothers of the Lord, and Cephas?” (1 Corinthians 9:5).

Evil Results of Enforced Clerical Celibacy.

History attests to the evil results in enforced clerical celibacy. Peter de Rosa, a Catholic priest, in his book, **Vicars of Christ: The Dark Side of the Papacy**, pointed out the immoralities committed by celibate priests. He said, “The devil never harmed the church so much as when the church herself adopted the vow of celibacy” (page 375).

“In the view of some historians, it (celibacy, RSE) has probably done more harm to morals than any other institution in the West, including prostitution. For everyone is on his guard against women of the streets, whereas ministers of the Gospel, even when unfaithful, are given respect and personal confidences. The proof of the harm done by celibacy comes not from bigoted anti-Catholic sources; on the contrary, it includes papal and conciliatory documents and letters of reforming saints. They all point in one direction: far from being a candle in a naughty world, priestly celibacy has been more often than not a stain on the name of Christianity” (page 554).

Peter de Rosa further said:

“The discipline of celibacy now in place actually led to unchastity. Proof of this comes in the writing of one of the great reforming saints, Bernard of Clairvaux. In the year

1135 he was responding to the Albigensian claim that marriage is sordid. Bernard said, "Take from the Church an honorable marriage and an immaculate marriage bed, and do you not fill it with concubinage, incest, homosexuality and every kind of uncleanness?" ...The evidence for this exists on an alarming scale, impeccable Catholic sources, papal documents, letters of reforming saints, all paint the same depressing picture. Monasteries full of women; every friar had his 'Martha', every nun her lover. Bishops, in every sense the fathers of their people, kept harems and the few brave souls who tried to enforce the discipline risked being poisoned or beaten to death. Alexander IV, in a Bull dated 1259, bemoans the fact that the laity were not reformed but corrupted by the clergy. In Avignon, the avaricious John XXII allowed priests to keep their mistresses on payment of a tax. Even the few chaste priests had to pay up just in case they, too, fell into the arms of a woman. It was a cynical acceptance of the fact that even the offenses against God could benefit the system, only disobedience to canon law undermined it. 'The subject,' says the fastidious Lea, 'is too repulsive to be presented in all its loathsome details.' The clergy did not scruple to use the sacrament of penance for beginning and continuing their immoral liaisons. Petrarch, Boccaccio, Chaucer, all give witness to the sheer size of the scandal. They satirized the situation but in no way exaggerated it."

An Italian diarist, the wandering thirteenth century Franciscan friar Salimbene, wrote: "I have seen priests keeping taverns...and their whole house full of bastard children, and spending their nights in sin and celebrating Mass next day. One

day, when a Franciscan friar had to celebrate Mass in a certain priest's church on a feast day, he had no stole but the girdle of the priest's concubine, with the bunch of keys attached; and when the friar, whom I know well, turned round to say, Dominus Vobis cum, the people heard the jangling of the keys" (**Vicars of Christ: The Dark side of the Papacy**, pages 574,575).

The same author, Peter de Rosa, made this observation concerning the evil results of celibacy:

"A large part of the history of celibacy is the story of the degradation of women and an invariable consequence of frequent abortions and infanticide. In the ninth century, many monasteries were the haunts of homosexuals, many convents were brothels in which babies were killed and buried. Since the end of the Roman Empire, historians say that infanticide was probably not practiced in the West on any great scale — except in convents. The Council of Aix-la-Chapelle in the year 836 openly admitted it. As to the sex-starved secular clergy, they were so often accused of incest that they were at length forbidden even to have mothers, aunts or sisters living in their house. Children, the fruits of incest, were killed by the clergy, as many a French prelate put on record" (Ibid, pages 566,567).

Peter de Rosa also pointed out that even popes have violated the vow of celibacy. In his book he included the following facts:

"The long line of popes who were libertines before and sometimes after ascending the throne of Peter suggests that celibacy was not honored by the rank and file of the clergy,

either. As we noted in Part One, a list of popes who misbehaved would include, among others, Benedict V, Sergius III, John X, John XII, Benedict VII, Benedict IX, Clement V, Clement VI, John XXIII, Sixtus IV, Pius II, Innocent VIII, Alexander VI, Julius II, Paul III, Julius III, Gregory XIII, Gregory XV, Urban VIII, Innocent X, Alexander VII. When popes had mistresses of fifteen years of age, were guilty of incest and sexual perversions of every sort, had innumerable children, were murdered in the very act of adultery, there can be no doubt that celibacy among the clergy as a whole was more honored in the breach than in the observance. In the old Catholic phrase, why be holier than the pope?" (Ibid, page 556).

Pope Adrian VI in 1525 said: "The profession of the priest is the surest road to hell" (**Vicars of Christ**, page 588). He further said: "We prelates and clergy have gone astray from the right way, and for long there is none that has done good, no not one" (**Pastors's History of the Pope**, Vol IX, page 135). Again, he said: "The Roman courts had been the fountainhead of all corruption in the church" (**Catholic Encyclopedia**, Vol 1, page 60).

Emperor Ferdinand complained that the priests in his time were very corrupt. "By the year 1560 the Emperor Ferdinand was begging the pope to permit the clergy to marry as the only way to get them to behave. 'For although all flesh was corrupt,' he wrote, 'none the less, the corruption of the priesthood is worst of all'" (**Vicars of Christ**, page 589).

Peter de Rosa noted that even the Council of Constance in 1414 was served by 1,200 prostitutes. He said, "Another requirement was that the meeting place had to be large enough to accom-

modate the vast numbers of prostitutes who found the clergy required their services more urgently than the military and paid keener prices. At the height of the Council there were reckoned to be over twelve hundred whores in Constance working round the clock” (**Vicars of Christ**, page 130).

After reading some of these revolting stories about the evil results of enforced clerical celibacy, we now understand why Paul said that enforced celibacy is one of the doctrines of demons (1 Timothy 4:3). Only the devil could possibly invent such a doctrine with so many evil results.

Again, quoting a Catholic writer, Peter Comestor, in the twelfth century: “The devil never harmed the church so much as when the church herself adopted the vow of celibacy” (Quoted from Peter de Rosa, **Vicars of Christ**, page 375).

Chapter 9

“Father” as a Religious Title

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE: The Roman Catholic Church used the title “Father” for her priests, bishops, and popes.

“Catholics call their priest Father, because the priest is the ordinary minister of baptism, which gives them new birth of supernatural grace” (Question Box, page 310).

THE BIBLE TEACHES: The Bible forbids any man to use religious titles such as “Father,” “Rabbi” or “Teacher,” etc.

Jesus Christ, when talking to the religious leaders of His day, said, *“But you, do not be called Rabbi, for One is your Teacher, the Christ, and you are all brethren. Do not call anyone on earth your father; for One is your Father, He who is in heaven”* (Matthew 23:8,9). In these verses, Jesus was not talking about our relationship with our earthly parents but He was talking about “religious titles.”

In Hebrews 12:9 we are told that there are two kinds of father: **earthly** and **spiritual**. Our only **spiritual Father** is God. *“Furthermore, we have had human fathers who corrected us, and we paid them respect. Shall we not much more readily be in subjection to the Father of spirits and live?”*

Objection Answered:

The Catholics used 1 Corinthians 4:15 to prove their unscrip-

tural practice of using Father as a religious title. In this verse Paul said to the Corinthian Christians, “*For though you might have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet you do not have many fathers; for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel.*”

In this verse, Paul was not using the word **father** as a religious title, but he was describing the unique relationship that a gospel preacher sustained with his converts. A minister of the gospel can be rightly called a “father” in a sense to his converts, like Paul to Timothy and Peter to John Mark. But the term father in describing this type of relationship between the preacher and his converts was never used in the New Testament as a religious title, the way modern preachers are using it today. Such practice of calling a minister “father” directly contradicts the words of Jesus Christ (Matthew 23:9).

Note what Paul said to the Corinthians. He said that although they had *countless guides*, they did not have many fathers. This verse actually refutes the custom of the Roman Catholic church in calling every priest a “**father**” because only those who have been instruments in begetting a person to the gospel has *this right and relationship* to his converts. Besides, the custom of calling a minister of God “**Father**” was unknown for hundreds of years after the death of the apostle. You can never read in the New Testament that the apostles were called by any religious titles such as “**Father**”, “**Reverend Father**”, or even “**Most Holy Father**”, etc.

Chapter 10

The Christian Priesthood

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE: The Roman Catholic Church teaches that not all Christians are priests. They also speak of external and internal priesthood.

Bertrand Conway, in his book, **The Question Box**, had these comments on the subject of the **minister of the sacraments**: “Can anyone administer the Sacraments? Are not all Christians priests? No, this doctrine of Luther was condemned by the Council of Trent” (Session V, VII, Canon 10, **Question Box**, page 236).

The Council of Trent in its seventh session on March 3, 1547, in its Decree Concerning the Sacraments, Canon 10, says: “If anyone says that all Christians have the power to administer the word and all the sacraments, let him be anathema” (**The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent**, translated by Rev. H. J. Schroeder, O.P., Imprimatur Joannes J. Glennon, page 52).

Also, **The Catechism of the Council of Trent**, published by the command by Pope Pius V, pages 220,221, said: “The external Priesthood does not extend indiscriminately to the great body of the faithful; it is appropriated to a certain class of persons, who, being invested with this august character, and consecrated to God by the lawful imposition of hands and the solemn ceremonies of the Church, are devoted to some particular office in the sacred ministry.”

The Catholic Church contradicted itself when it admitted that in a sense all Christians are priests. “All those who are baptized are in a sense priests. For they are called to witness to the Gospel by the word and by work and to unite with Christ” (**What Every Catholic Should Know**, page 9).

The Roman Catholic Church in **The Catechism of the Council of Trent** made a distinction between **external** and **internal priesthood**. This classification of the Christian priesthood has no warrant from the New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is another invention of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in order to rob the members of their God-given rights and to subvert the Scriptural teaching of the priesthood of all believers and their equal standing in the Lord.

According to **The Catechism of the Council of Trent**, “The **internal priesthood** extends to all the faithful, who have been baptized, particularly to the just, who are anointed by the Spirit of God, and by the divine grace are made living members of the High Priest Christ Jesus” (page 220).

The new Catechism published by the Roman Catholic Church has classified the priesthood into two categories: the “**common priesthood**” and the so-called “**ministerial**” or “**hierarchical priesthood**.” These classifications, of course, are not to be found in the New Testament. The idea of two separate priesthoods in the church was unknown in the first century.

“Christ, high priest and unique mediator, has made of the Church a kingdom, priests for his God and Father. The whole community of believers is, as such, priestly. The

faithful exercise their baptismal priesthood through the participation, each according to his own vocation, in Christ's mission as a priest, prophet, and king. Through the sacraments of Baptism and Confirmation the faithful are consecrated to be a holy priesthood.

“The ministerial or hierarchical priesthood of bishops and priests, and the common priesthood of all the faithful participate, ‘each in its own proper way, in the one priesthood of Christ...The ministerial priesthood is a means by which Christ unceasingly builds up and leads his Church. For this reason it is transmitted by its own sacrament, the sacrament of Holy Orders.’” (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, Part Two, Nos. 1546,1547; pages 430,431).

THE BIBLE TEACHES: All Christians are priests and Jesus is our only high priest.

I. All Christians are priests.

In 1 Peter 2:9, the apostle Peter said, “*But you are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, His own special people, that you may proclaim the praises of Him who called you out of darkness into His marvelous light.*” This was spoken to all Christians.

In Revelation 1:6, the apostle John also said that Christ “*Has made us kings and priests to His God and Father, to Him be glory and dominion forever and ever.*”

Also, in Revelation 5:10, John said, “*And have made us*

kings and priests to our God; and we shall reign on the earth.”

Acts 8:4 states, *“Therefore those who were scattered went everywhere preaching the word.”* Here we have seen that every Christian had the authority to preach the word, contrary to the teachings of the Council of Trent.

Jesus commanded his apostles to teach the disciples to do *“all things”* that *He commanded them* (Matthew 28:18-20).

II. Jesus is our only high priest.

Psalm 110:1; Hebrews 2:17;7:11-28;8:1-6;9:11-26;10:19-25

Chapter 11

Is Scriptural Baptism Immersion or Infusion?

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE: The Roman Catholic Church admits that true baptism is by immersion, but they are practicing infusion as the method of baptizing.

James Cardinal Gibbons, in his book, **Faith of our Fathers**, admitted that, “For several centuries after the establishment of Christianity baptism was usually conferred by immersion; but since the twelfth century the practice of baptizing by infusion has prevailed in the Catholic Church, as that manner is attended with less inconvenience than baptism by immersion” (page 223).

Bertrand Conway, a Catholic writer, said that the Catholic Church today has forbidden immersion as a means of baptizing people. “The present law for Catholics makes baptism by pouring obligatory. Immersion and sprinkling, though valid, are forbidden” (**Question Box**, page 153, 1962 Edition).

Please take note how Catholic tradition has made void God’s law on baptism. Through their commandments they have forbidden immersion, which is the scriptural baptism.

In the **Revised Standard Catholic Edition Bible**, in its note on Romans 6:4, has this comment on page 245: “Buried: Immersed in the water of baptism.”

Addis and Arnold, Editors of **Catholic Dictionary**, have this to say on baptism: “In Apostolic times the body of the baptized person was immersed, for St. Paul looks on the immersion as typifying the burial with Christ, and speaks of baptism as a bath. Immersion still prevails among the Copts and Nestorians, and for many ages baptism was given among the Latins also for even Saint Thomas, in the thirteenth century, speaks of baptism by immersion as the common practice of his time” (page 192).

THE BIBLE TEACHES: **Baptism is a burial or immersion in water for repentant believers only.**

The apostle Paul said: *“Therefore we were buried with Him through baptism into death, that just as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life”* (Romans 6:4).

The **Jerusalem Bible**, which is a Catholic translation, has this comment on Romans 6:3 and following verses: “The sinner is immersed in water (the etymological meaning of ‘baptize’ is ‘dip’) and thus ‘buried’ with Christ, Colossians 2:12 with whom also he emerges to resurrection.”

Paul said: *“Buried with Him in baptism, in which you also were raised with Him through faith in the working of God, who raised Him from the dead”* (Colossians 2:12).

Jesus said, *“Go therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit”* (Matthew 28:19).

Jesus said to them, *“Go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He who believes and is baptized will be saved; but he who does not believe will be condemned”* (Mark 16:15,16).

“Then Peter said to them, repent, and let every one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit” (Acts 2:38).

When Philip baptized the Eunuch, *“both Philip and the eunuch went down into the water, and he baptized him”* (Acts 8:38).

The History of Sprinkling as Baptism.

I. Novatian was the first to receive sprinkling as baptism in 251.

According to Arthur Stanley in his book, **Baptism in the Nineteenth Century**, pages 697,698, “Baptism by sprinkling was rejected by the whole ancient church as no baptism at all. Almost the first exception was the heretic Novatian.”

The **Catholic Dictionary**, edited by Addis and Arnold, said, “In the letter already mentioned, **Cornelius states that it was against the law** for one who has received clinical baptism to enter the ranks of clergy. The Council of Neocaesare (Canon 12) in the early part of the fourth century. This canon was received into the ‘Corpus Juris,’ but is now obsolete” (page 191).

Please note how the Roman Church has changed the law concerning sprinkling as baptism. Before, “It was not lawful for any person to enter the rank of clergy who has received ‘clinical baptism’.” Clinical baptism was the term they used for sprinkling. But now, since they have made pouring as an official way of “baptizing” people, the earlier law has now become obsolete!

Yet Cardinal Gibbons boasted that Roman Catholicism never changes! He said, “If only one instance be given in which the Church ceased to teach a doctrine which had been previously held, that single instance would be a death blow to her claim of infallibility” (**Faith of Our Fathers**, page 61).

II. Sprinkling was invented in Africa in the Third Century.

“The administration of baptism by sprinkling was first invented in Africa in the third century in favor of clinics, or bedridden people; but even African Catholics, the least enlightened and most depraved of all Catholics, derided it, and refuted it as no baptism” (**Rees’ Encyclopedia**, article on baptism, quoted by Shepherds, **Handbook on Baptism**, pages 205,206).

III. First law on pouring was approved by Pope Stephen III in 754.

“A canon of Pope Stephen III, who during his residence in France in 754,...is said to have given occasion to the first authentic law for administering baptism by pouring, which in time was interpreted to signify sprinkling. This, says the

learned James Basnage, is accounted the first law for sprinkling, but it does not forbid dipping, allowing sprinkling only in case of imminent danger. It has been alleged that this answer of Stephen is the true origin of private baptism and of sprinkling” (**Rees’ Encyclopedia**, Article on Baptism, Volume III).

The Origin of Infant Baptism

Infant baptism is not an apostolic practice. The New Testament is silent about this practice. The earliest time infant baptism was mentioned was in the second century.

“The earliest period of infant baptism is from Irenaeus, in the second Century” (**Standard Bible Dictionary**, page 85).

Even the Catholic officials admit that infant baptism is not found in the New Testament. According to Bertrand Conway, in his Book, **The Question Box**, “There is no conclusive proof in the New Testament of the practice of infant baptism. In this matter many Protestants inconsistently violate their principle of the Bible only as the rule of faith, and follow the divine tradition of the Catholic Church” (pages 368,369).

Tertullian (about A.D. 200) was opposed to the practice of baptizing infants. He said, “According to the circumstances and nature, and also age, of each person, the delay of baptism is more suitable, especially in the case of small children. Let them ‘come’ then while they are growing up, while they are learning, while they are instructed [about] why they are coming. Let them become Christians when they are able to know Christ. In what

respect does the innocent period of life hasten to the remission of sin?" (**On Baptism**, page 18, quoted by Richard Ady, **The New Birth**, page 29).

Early Advocates for Infant Baptism

Origen (about A.D. 250) argued in favor of infant baptism: "Infants are baptized for the remission of sins. Of what kinds? Or when did they sin? But since 'no one is exempt from stain,' one removes the stain by the mystery of baptism. For this reason, infants also are baptized. For 'Unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven' (Homily on Leviticus 8:3, quoted by Richard Ady, **The New Birth**, page 30).

Cyprian developed a theological basis for infant baptism. "If forgiveness of sins is granted even to the worst transgressors (hardened sinners), how much less ought an infant to be held back. Having been born recently, an infant has not sinned, except that in being born physically according to Adam, he has contracted the contagion of the ancient death by his first birth. He approaches that much more easily to the reception of the forgiveness of sins because the sins remitted to him are not his own, but those of another" (Epistle 58 [64], quoted by Richard Ady, **The New Birth**, page 30).

Cardinal Newman, in his book, **Conscience, Consensus, and the Development of Doctrine**, said: "One of the passages of St. Chrysostom to which I might refer is this, 'We baptize infants, though they are not defiled with sin, that they may receive sanctity, righteousness, adoption, heirship, brotherhood with Christ, and may become His members' (Aug. contr. Jul.

1,21). This at least shows that he had a clear view of the importance and duty of infant baptism, but such was the case even with saints in the generation immediately before him. As is well known, it was not unusual in that age of the Church for those who might be considered catechumens to delay their baptism, as Protestants now delay reception of the Holy Eucharist. But so it was in matter of fact, that baptism which is a fundamental rule of Christian duty with us, was less earnestly insisted on in early times.

“Even in the fourth century St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Basil, and St. Augustine, having Christian mothers, still were not baptized till they were adults. St. Gregory’s mother dedicated him to God immediately on his birth; and again when he had come to years of discretion, with the rite of taking the gospel into his hands by way of consecration. He was religiously minded from his youth, and had devoted himself to a single life. Yet his baptism did not take place till after he had attended the schools of Caesarea, Palestine, and Alexandria and was on his voyage to Athens. St. Basil was the son of Christian confessors on both father’s and mother’s side. His grandmother Macrina, who brought him up, had for seven years lived with her husband in the woods of Pontus during the Decian persecution, yet the child of such parents was not baptized till he had come to man’s estate — till, according to the Benedictine Editor, his twenty-first and perhaps his twenty-ninth year.

“Now how are the modern sects, which protest against infant baptism, to be answered by Anglicans with this array of great names in their favor? By the later rule of the Church

surely; by the dicta of some later Saints, as by St. Crysostom; by one or two inferences from Scripture; by an argument founded on the absolute necessity of baptism for salvation — sufficient reasons certainly, but impotent to reverse the fact that neither in Dalmatia nor in Cappadocia, neither in Rome nor in Africa, was it then imperative on Christian parents, as it is now, to give baptism to their young children” (Cardinal Newman, **Conscience, Consensus, and the Development of Doctrine**, pages 140,141).

Chapter 12

The Fate of Unbaptized Infants

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE: The Roman Catholic Church teaches that unbaptized children can not enter heaven and are deprived of seeing God.

According to Cardinal Gibbons, "It is proper here to state briefly what the Church actually teaches regarding the future state of unbaptized infants. Though the Church, in obedience to God's Word, declares that unbaptized infants are excluded from the kingdom of heaven, it should not hence be concluded that they are consigned to the place of the reprobate. None are condemned to the torments of the damned but such as merit Divine vengeance by their personal sins. All that the Church holds on this point is that unregenerate children are deprived of the beatific vision, or the possession of God, which constitutes the essential happiness of the blessed" (**Faith Of Our Fathers**, Gibbons, page 224).

The **Catechism of the Council of Trent**, published by the command of Pope Pius V, page 124, says: "Infants, unless baptized, cannot enter heaven."

THE BIBLE TEACHES: The kingdom of heaven is for children, and infant baptism is not mentioned in the New Testament.

Jesus said in Matthew 18:3, "*Assuredly, I say to you, unless you are converted and become as little children, you will by no means enter the kingdom of heaven.*"

Jesus said, *“Let the little children come to Me, and do not forbid them; for of such is the kingdom of heaven”* (Matthew 19:14).

“But when Jesus saw it, He was greatly displeased and said to them, Let the little children come to Me, and do not forbid them; for of such is the kingdom of God” (Mark 10:14).

Catholics are divided as to the destiny of unbaptized infants. “The second General Council of Lyons (1274), the Council of Florence (1438-45), declared: ‘The souls of those who die in original sin as well as those who die in actual mortal sin go immediately into hell, but their punishment is very different’” (**Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma**, page 113).

“While St. Augustine and many Latin Fathers are of the opinion that children dying in original sin must suffer ‘poena sensus’ (pain of the sense) also, even if only a very mild one” (Ibid. 114).

Chapter 13

ORIGINAL SIN

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE: The Roman Catholic Church teaches that infants are tainted with the sin of Adam.

Original sin is defined by authoritative works of two Catholic scholars in the following manner: “**Original Sin** is the sin which we inherit by natural descent from Adam, our first father. The **Council of Trent** (session V, Decree on Original Sin) defines, as of faith, that Adam lost original justice not only for himself but also for us; that he ‘poured sin, which is the death of the soul, into the whole human race,’ that this sin comes not by imitation of Adam’s transgression, but by propagation from him. Further, the council teaches that original sin does not consist in those desires and temptations which are common to fallen nature because they remain even after baptism, which takes away original sin” (**Catholic Dictionary**, by Addis and Arnold, page 608).

Cardinal Gibbons, a high ranking Catholic defender, said, “Adam’s transgression was not confined to himself, but was transmitted, with its long train of dire consequences, to all his posterity. It is called ‘original sin’ because it is derived from our original progenitor” (**Faith Of Our Fathers**, page 219).

“...We have all inherited the transgression of our first parents, and that we are born enemies of God” (**Faith Of Our Fathers**, pages 219,220).

Does the Roman Catholic Church understand how original

sin is being transmitted? The newest **Catholic Catechism** said the following words:

“The transmission of original sin is a mystery that we cannot fully understand. But we do know by revelation that Adam had received original holiness and justice not for himself alone, but for all human nature. By yielding to the tempter, Adam and Eve committed a personal sin, but this sin affected the human nature that they would then transmit in a fallen state. It is a sin which will be transmitted by propagation to all mankind, that is, by the transmission of human nature deprived of original holiness and justice. And that is why original sin is called ‘sin’ only in an analogical sense; it is a sin ‘contracted’ and not ‘committed’ — a state and not an act” (**Catechism of the Catholic Church**, page 114).

The admission of these difficulties is a reaffirmation of the old Catholic dilemma, as stated by two Catholic editors:

“The doctrine, then, of original sin is mysterious, but by no means cruel or unreasonable. We cannot fully understand the manner in which it is transmitted, for the soul comes directly from God, not from parents. But here, the Catholic doctrine of a mere privation, not a positive quality, comes to help. God cannot be the author of sin, nor can He stain the soul which comes from Him. But he can and does infuse souls deprived of original justice; and since the infusion follows by a natural law on the generation of the body, in that sense natural propagation may be rightly called the cause of original sin. Theologians differ widely on the consequences of original sin” (**Catholic Dictionary**, Addis & Arnold, page 609).

Admittedly, this doctrine is confusing even to the most learned Catholic theologians. Let us summarize what we have gathered so far. According to the Catholic Church, original sin is:

1. Inherited from Adam by natural descent.
2. A loss of original justice.
3. Transmitted not by imitation but by propagation. It is “contracted”, not “committed.”
4. A mere privation, not a positive quality. It is a “state,” not an “act”.
5. Mysterious in its transmission. It is not fully understood even by the most learned Catholic theologians and scholars do not know how original sin is propagated and transmitted.
6. Babies are born into this world as enemies of God because of original sin.
7. The soul comes directly from God, not from the parents, but the soul as infused by God in man is deprived of original justice.
8. Original sin does not consist in desire and temptation.
9. Original sin is removed only by baptism.

Catholics Are Divided as to the Fate of the Unbaptized Infants.

The positions held by different Catholics on this subject are very confusing. Please take note of some of these major differences:

1. Augustine believed that unbaptized infants go straight to hell.

2. The Council of Trent pronounced that unbaptized infants will suffer positive pain.
3. Other Catholic theologians believe, to the contrary, that unbaptized infants will enjoy a certain degree of happiness; only they will be deprived of the vision of God, which they call “beatific vision.”

According to the **New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge:**

“The doctrines of infant damnation and non-elect were unknown to the early church. That the baptism of infants was often postponed to Easter week (see Baptisms III, 5) proves that it was not considered a loss to the child to die unbaptized. But as sacerdotal and ecclesiastical ideas spread in the Church, baptism was more and more emphasized, until in the fourth century Gregory Nazianzen and Ambrose could say that unbaptized children could not be saved. It was Augustine who first taught the damnation of infants; but their sufferings, though eternal, are of the mildest character; indeed, it seemed to him doubtful whether they were punished at all. The Roman Church, accepting Augustine’s conceptions of the necessity of baptism to salvation and of the mildness of the punishment of those infants who died unbaptized, agreed with him that they were sent to hell and assigned to them a distinct place in it, the *limbus infantium* or *puerorum*” (page 490).

THE BIBLE TEACHES: Sin is not inherited.

“The soul who sins shall die. The son shall not bear the guilt

of the father, nor the father bear the guilt of the son. The righteousness of the righteous shall be upon himself, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon himself" (Ezekiel 18:20). This verse refutes the idea of inherited sin.

"So then each of us shall give account of himself to God" (Romans 14:12). In the judgment bar of God, each man will be accountable only for his own deeds, not for the deeds of his ancestors. No one will be deprived of justice just because of Adam's transgression. Surely Adam will be judged for his own misdeeds, but the whole world will not be charged accountable for Adam's sin.

"Whoever commits sin also commits lawlessness, and sin is lawlessness" (1 John 3:4). Sin is something a person does, not something he inherits.

"For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he has done, whether good or bad" (2 Corinthians 5:10).

"For the children not yet being born, nor having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works but of Him who calls" (Romans 9:11).

Our Lord Jesus Christ said that the kingdom of God belongs to the children and to people of similar disposition. *"But Jesus said, 'Let the little children come to Me, and do not forbid them; for of such is the kingdom of heaven'"* (Matthew 19:14).

The Bible teaches that children are innocent.

1. Children have no knowledge of good or evil (Deuteronomy 1:39).
2. Children do not know their right hand from their left (Jonah 4:11).
3. Children do not know how to refuse evil and choose good (Isaiah 7:15,16).
4. Children are innocent, not enemies of God (Psalm 106:38).
5. God made man upright, but they have sought out many devices (Ecclesiastes 7:29).
6. Man is God's offspring (Acts 17:28).
7. Children are God's gift (Psalm 127:3).

According to James 1:17, God's gift is perfect and good. Therefore, God cannot be the author of original sin. But according to the Catholic theory, God has infused the soul into man already deprived of his original justice, and man is born into this world an enemy of God.

This false doctrine was first thought of by Tertullian (**The Eternal Kingdom**, page 117). But Augustine was the one who popularized the doctrine in the fourth century (Raymond Brown, **Biblical Exegesis & Church Doctrine**, page 43, *Imprimatur*, Joseph O'Keefe).

Question:

1. How is original sin transmitted? Catholic authorities admit that they don't understand how sin is transmitted.

“We cannot fully understand the manner in which it (original sin) is transmitted, for the soul comes directly from God, not from the parents” (**Catholic Dictionary**, page 609).

“The transmission of original sin is a mystery that we cannot fully understand” (**Catechism of the Catholic Church**, page 114).

2. If two baptized people marry, why is it that their children still bear the original sin, when supposedly it has already been removed from the parents by baptism? (1 Corinthians 7:14).

According to Peter de Rosa, a Catholic priest, “For example, parents were cleansed from original sin in baptism. How could they hand on original sin to their babies?” (**Vicars of Christ: The Dark Side of Papacy**, page 458).

Note: These questions must be answered by Roman Catholic Church defenders:

1. How is original sin transmitted?

2. Why is it that after a person is baptized, they still transmit the original sin? Is it not true that, according to the Roman Catholic doctrine, infant baptism removes original sin? Then how is it that two baptized persons who marry and have a child still transmit the original sin to their offspring?

3. What about the death of Jesus? Is it not possible that through His death He has destroyed the consequences of Adam’s sin? “*Therefore, as through one man’s offense judgment came to*

all men, resulting in condemnation, even so through one Man's righteous act the free gift came to all men, resulting in justification of life" (Romans 5:18).

Verses Used by the Roman Catholics to Prove the Doctrine of Original Sin

1. Psalm 51:5, "*Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity, and in sin my mother conceived me.*"

ANSWER: This text is simply an Oriental hyperbole, a way of saying that he had begun to sin at the earliest practicable period. This language is no more to be understood literally than is Job's declaration found in Job 31:17,18 where Job said that he has **guided** the orphans even from his "**mother's womb.**" "*Or eaten my morsel by myself, so that the fatherless could not eat of it. (But from my youth I reared him as a father, and from my mother's womb I guided the widow)*" (Job 31:17,18).

That is, as Delitzsch says, "From earliest youth, so far back as he can remember, he was wont to behave like a father to the orphans and like a child to the widow. To take the language, in either case, in a rigidly literal sense, is a gross absurdity" (John Halley, **Alleged Discrepancies of the Bible**, page 161).

2. Psalm 58:3, "*The wicked are estranged from the womb; they go astray as soon as they are born, speaking lies.*"

ANSWER: This verse, also, is another poetical Oriental hyperbole. The absurdity of a literal interpretation is obvious from the fact that the wicked are represented as "speaking lies,"

as soon as they are born. Literalistic exegesis would make them rather precocious. The meaning plainly is, that they begin very early to speak lies and go astray (**Alleged Discrepancies of the Bible**, Halleys, page 162).

Besides, this verse only speaks of the wicked, not the entire human race.

In addition to these explanations, this verse is contrary to the official teaching of the Roman Catholic Church concerning original sin because it says that original sin is not something you do but something you inherit. It is not an action but mere deprivation of the original justice of God, transmitted not by imitation but by propagation. It is “contracted,” not “committed.” It is a state, not an act, which would mean that even though these verses speak of sin, the description doesn’t match the Catholic definition of “original sin.”

Therefore it is very plain that the dogma of original sin taught by the Roman Catholic Church has no support from the Scripture.

3. Job 14:4, *“Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? No one!”*

ANSWER: Man can’t, but God can. Children are God’s gift of life and His gifts are perfect (Psalm 127:3; James 1:17). According to the Catholic teachings, “The soul comes directly from God, not from the parent” (**Catholic Dictionary**, Addis & Arnold, page 609).

Therefore, how can a human soul from the beginning be

tainted with sin when God who is the giver of that soul is pure and clean? For man to be born unclean, the Roman Catholic Church must either prove that the human soul comes from the parents or that God is the author of original sin. Both possibilities are, of course, false.

4. Isaiah 48:8, *“Surely you did not hear. Surely you did not know; surely from long ago your ear was not opened. For I knew that you would deal very treacherously, and were called a transgressor from the womb.”*

ANSWER: This statement is specifically addressed to the rebellious nation of Israel, not to the entire human race in general. This verse can be understood in two ways. This could either refer to Jacob, personally, who represented the race of Israel or to the nation of Israel as a whole. If to Jacob, then the statement is true because Jacob means a supplanter. But if to the nation of Israel, then this also is true because the nation of Israel has always been a rebellious nation since its birth from the land of Egypt. In fact, many of the Israelites perished in the wilderness because of rebellion.

But this verse, again, does not teach “original sin” as it is defined by the Catholic Church. Therefore it cannot be used as a proof text to support the doctrine.

We have seen in this study that the verses used by the Catholics in the Old Testament do not prove the doctrine of Original Sin. The sin committed by Adam was his own; it could not be transmitted to his descendants.

Chapter 14

Is the Rosary from Heaven or from Men?

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE: The Roman Catholic Church admits that the Rosary is the result of an evolution, not from divine revelation.

“What is the Rosary? The standard devotion to the blessed Virgin, instituted by St. Dominic” (**A Full Course of Instruction in Explanation of the Catechism**, by Perry, page 95).

“This is a form of prayer consisting of 150 Hail Marys said on beads, each decade preceded by an Our Father and followed by a Gloria” (**New Vatican Dictionary**, page 836).

“There is no record of Rosary of 150 Aves before St. Dominic” (**The Catholic Dictionary**, page 206).

According to **Catholic Encyclopedia**, the tradition which is believed by many Catholics that St. Dominic received the Rosary from Virgin Mary is now admitted to be a forgery. Instead, Allan de Rupe, a devout man but full of delusions, was actually the person who started the Rosary (Volume XIII, page 186).

According to one Catholic author, St. Louis Mary de Monfort, in his book, **The Secret of the Rosary**, says “It was only in the year 1214, however, that the Holy Mother Church received the Rosary in its present form according to the method we use today. It was given to the Church by St. Dominic who had

received it from the Blessed Virgin as a powerful means of converting the Albigensians and other sinners” (page 18).

In an article, “How We Got The Rosary”, written by George Martin, from the **Catholic Digest**, May 1988, he said, “What of St. Dominic? The story of Mary giving him the Rosary can not be traced back earlier than the end of the fifteenth century, over 200 years after Dominic died” (**How We Got The Rosary**, **Catholic Digest**, by George Martin, page 51).

THE BIBLE TEACHES: The Bible is silent about the practice of praying the rosary. It is admitted by the Catholics as being only a human tradition. The Bible condemns following human traditions in religion.

Jesus said, “*These people draw near to Me with their mouth, and honor Me with their lips, but their heart is far from Me. And in vain they worship Me, teaching as doctrines the commandments of men*” (Matthew 15:8,9).

Jesus said, “*And when you pray, do not use vain repetitions as the heathens do. For they think that they will be heard for their many words*” (Matthew 6:7).

God alone should be the object of our worship. “*Then Jesus said to him, Away with you, Satan! For it is written, You shall worship the Lord your God, and Him only you shall serve*” (Matthew 4:10).

Source of Rosary forgery: “It is now admitted by the Dominican authorities to be a forgery” (**Catholic Encyclopedia**, Volume 13, pages 184-186).

Chapter 15

Purgatory

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE: The Roman Catholic Church teaches that purgatory is an intermediate state where souls are detained and are helped by the prayers of the living.

According to Cardinal Gibbons, “The doctrine of an intermediate state is succinctly asserted by the Council of Trent. There is a Purgatory, and the souls there detained are helped by the prayers of the faithful and especially by the acceptable Sacrifice of the Altar” (**Faith Of Our Fathers**, page 173).

“The Councils of Florence and Trent declare ‘There is a Purgatory, and that the souls detained there are helped by the prayers of the faithful and above all, by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar’” (**Catholic Dictionary**, Addis and Arnold, page 676).

THE BIBLE TEACHES: The Bible mentions only heaven and hell. It is silent about purgatory. The doctrine of purgatory is another invention of the Roman Catholic Church.

Origin of the Doctrine: According to the **History of the Christian Church**, by Philip Schaff, “Gregory the Great was chiefly responsible for the doctrine of purgatorial fire, and masses for the benefit of the souls of purgatory” (Vol. 4, page 226).

According to the **Grollier Multi-Media Encyclopedia** 1995 Edition:

“In Roman Catholicism, purgatory (from the Latin *purgare*, ‘to cleanse’) is the place or state after death where those who have died in a state of grace but not free from imperfection expiate their remaining sins before entering the visible presence of God and the saints; the damned, on the other hand, go directly to hell.

“The living are encouraged to offer Masses, prayers, alms, and other acts of piety and devotion on behalf of those in purgatory. The suffering of purgatory is less a concept of physical pain than one of postponement of the ‘beatific vision.’ Purgatory will end with the last judgment at the close of the world.

“The official Roman Catholic teaching on purgatory was defined at the councils of Lyon (1274) and Ferrara-Florence (1438-45) and reaffirmed at Trent (1545-63). This doctrine was rejected by leaders of the Reformation who taught that persons are freed from sin through faith in Jesus Christ and go straight to heaven. The Orthodox church also rejects the theology of purgatory, although it encourages prayers for the dead in some undefined intermediate state” (Harold W. Rast, *Bibliography: Arendzen, John Peter, Purgatory and Heaven* (1960); Le Goff, J., *The Birth of Purgatory*, trans. by A. Goldhammer (1984; repr. 1986).

What does the Bible say about Purgatory?

Jesus spoke of only two places for the soul after death. He said that after a man is dead, the place of his destination is fixed. In the account Jesus gave, Abraham said to the rich man who had

died and gone to torment, *“And besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, so that those who want to pass from here to you cannot, nor can those from there pass to us”* (Luke 16:26).

In Matthew 25:34-41, Jesus speaks only of heaven and hell as the final place for the dead, and there is no purgatory mentioned in the Scriptures.

Paul said, *“For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he has done, whether good or bad”* (2 Corinthians 5:10), and not by the works of others after our death.

The apostle John said, *“And I saw the dead, small and great, standing before God, and books were opened. And another book was opened, which is the Book of Life. And the dead were judged according to their works, by the things which were written in the books. The sea gave up the dead who were in it, and Death and Hades delivered up the dead who were in them. And they were judged, each one according to his works”* (Revelation 20:12,13).

“And as it is appointed for men to die once, but after this the judgment” (Hebrews 9:27).

“Who does not need daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifices, first for His own sins and then for the people’s, for this He did once for all when He offered up Himself” (Hebrews 7:27).

Avarice is the basis for the doctrine of Purgatory.

According to Peter de Rosa, a Catholic priest, said, “Purgatory had no justification, whether in Scripture or logic. Its real basis was papal avarice” (**Vicars of Christ: The Dark Side**, page 140).

Proof Texts Used by the Roman Catholic Church

There are a few verses in the Bible that the Roman Catholic Church uses in its attempt to advance the doctrine of purgatory:

- A. 1 Maccabees 12:39-45
- B. Matthew 5:25,26
- C. Matthew 12:32
- D. 1 Corinthians 3:15
- E. 1 Peter 3:18-20

ANSWER: The Roman Catholic apologists have wrongly used verses in the Bible in order to justify their unscriptural doctrine of purgatory. We will consider these verses in this section.

A. One of their favorite verses is 1 Maccabees 12:39-45. It says, “It is holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins.”

ANSWER: This book is not a part of the inspired writings in the Bible, but was added by the Roman Catholic Church during the Council of Trent. This apocryphal book was never accepted by the Jews as a part of the Old Testament Scripture. Even Jerome, a Catholic authority, did not consider this book to

be inspired. In addition, the sin of these fallen soldiers was idolatry, which was the reason they died in battle. According to Deuteronomy 7:25, the sin of idolatry is an abomination to the Lord.

B. Matthew 5:25,26 — *“Agree with your adversary quickly, while you are on the way with him, lest your adversary deliver you to the judge, the judge hand you over to the officer, and you be thrown into prison. Assuredly, I say to you, you will by no means get out of there till you have paid the last penny.”*

ANSWER: The context of this verse deals with things that pertain to the present life, not to things after death. It speaks of a person offering a gift at an altar. Will there be an altar in purgatory? Who is the officer here? And who is the judge? Is the Judge Jesus Christ? Therefore, who will pray for you in purgatory, since after the judgment all of us will be already in his final abode? These verses do not support purgatory!

C. Matthew 12:32 — *“But whosoever speaks a word against the Son of Man, it will be forgiven him; but whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit, it will not be forgiven him, either in this age or in the age to come.”*

ANSWER: The parallel passages in Mark 3:29 and Luke 12:10 show that the expression *“neither in this age nor in the age to come”* is a strong mode of stating the truth, that transgressors have no hope or chance of being forgiven. The words “world” or “age” do not refer to the next world after this life but past, present or future. When Jesus said “in this age” He was referring to

the Jewish age, and the age to come is the Christian age, or the age after the Jewish period, not the world after death.

D. 1 Corinthians 3:15 — *“If anyone’s work is burned, he will suffer loss; but he himself will be saved, yet so as through fire.”*

ANSWER: This verse is not talking about the fire in purgatory for it is not the person that will be tested by fire, but his work. Paul said, *“The fire will test what sort of work each one has done.”*

NOTE: Roman Catholic authors admit that the verses they used to prove the doctrine of purgatory do not really mention that doctrine in particular. See **Catholic Dictionary**, pages 677-678.

Chapter 16

Are the Dead Helped by Our Prayers?

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE: The Roman Catholic Church teaches that prayer for the dead is a correlative dogma to the doctrine of purgatory.

Cardinal Gibbons said, “The existence of purgatory naturally implies the correlative dogma — the utility of praying for the dead, for the souls consigned to this middle state have not reached the termination of their journey” (**Faith Of Our Fathers**, page 173).

THE BIBLE TEACHES: The Bible is silent about the living praying for the dead.

According to Paul, “*For to me, to live is Christ, and to die is gain. But if I live on in the flesh, this will mean fruit from my labor; yet what I shall choose I cannot tell. For I am hard-pressed between the two, having a desire to depart and be with Christ, which is far better*” (Philippians 1:21-23).

“For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he has done, whether good or bad” (2 Corinthians 5:10).

In Philippians 2:12, Paul told the Philippians to “*Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling.*”

Paul said, *“Take heed to yourself and to the doctrine. Continue in them, for in doing this you will save both yourself and those who hear you”* (1 Timothy 4:16).

There are only two places mentioned in the Bible, and between these two places there is a fixed chasm which no one can cross. Read Luke 16:19-33.

Chapter 17

Are We to Worship Graven Images?

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE: The Roman Catholic Church teaches that veneration of images is a cherished devotion of the church.

According to Cardinal Gibbons, “The veneration of images of Christ and His saints is a cherished devotion in the Catholic Church” (**Faith Of Our Fathers**, page 162).

THE BIBLE TEACHES: Images as objects of worship are an abomination to the Lord and are strictly prohibited by God.

“You shall not make for yourself a carved image — any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; you shall not bow down to them nor serve them” (Exodus 20:4,5).

“Lest you act corruptly and make for yourselves a carved image in the form of any figure: the likeness of male or female, the likeness of any animal that is on the earth or the likeness of any winged bird that flies in the air, the likeness of anything that creeps on the ground or the likeness of any fish that is in the water beneath the earth. And take heed, lest you lift your eyes to heaven, and when you see the sun, the moon, and the stars, all the host of heaven, you feel driven to worship them and serve them, which the Lord your

God has given to all the peoples under the whole heaven as a heritage” (Deuteronomy 4:16-19).

“You shall not make idols for yourselves; neither a carved image nor a sacred pillar shall you rear up for yourselves; nor shall you set up an engraved stone in your land, to bow down to it” (Leviticus 26:1).

“Little children, keep yourselves from idols” (1 John 5:21).

“Therefore, my beloved, flee from idolatry” (1 Corinthians 10:14).

For additional verses, please read Jeremiah 2:11-13; 3:1-5; Romans 1:18-25; Acts 17:29; John 4:24; 2 Corinthians 5:7.

The Origin of Religious Images in the Catholic Church

Tertullian, an early church father (about A.D. 200), was opposed to religious images. He said, “We must not cling to the sensuous, but we must rise to the spiritual. The familiarity of daily sight lowers the dignity of the divine, and to pretend to worship a spiritual essence through earthly matter is to degrade that essence to the world of sense” (**General History of the Christian Religion and Church**, by Dr. Augustus Neander, page 292).

Dr. Neander commented:

“It is evident from these remarks how foreign, on the whole,

to the notions of Christians in this age must have been images of Christ. Pagans, like Alexander Severus, who recognized something of a divine nature in Christ, and sects which confounded paganism with Christianity, were the first to introduce images of Christ.

“It was not in the church, but in the family, that religious images first came into use among the Christians. In their daily intercourse with men, the Christians saw themselves everywhere surrounded by the objects of the pagan mythology, or at least by objects offensive to their moral and Christian sentiments. It was natural that in place of these objects, so offensive to their religious and moral sentiments, the Christians should wish to make substitutes more agreeable to them. Thus, they preferred to have on their goblets the figure of a shepherd carrying a lamb on his shoulder, which was the symbol of our Savior rescuing the repentant sinner, according to the gospel parable.

“Yet, religious emblems passed from domestic use to use in the churches, perhaps as early as the end of the third century the Council of Elvira, in the year 303, opposed this invocation as an abuse, and forbade ‘the objects of worship and adoration to be painted on the walls’” (Dr. Augustus Neanders, **General History of the Christian Religion**, pages 292,293).

“It was not the primitive believers who introduced images and pictures into churches. The Council of Elvira (306) decided against the use of pictures in churches” (**Encyclopedia Americana**, Volume 14, page 705).

God destroyed the brazen serpent when Israel worshiped it. *“He removed the high places and broke the sacred pillars, cut down the wooden image and broke in pieces the bronze serpent that Moses had made”* (2 Kings 18:4).

Chapter 18

The Traditions of the Catholic Church: From Heaven or From Men?

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE: The Roman Catholic Church uses tradition in addition to the sacred Scripture as authority in religion. The Church exalts tradition over the Scripture.

“The Catholic Church affirms that all Scripture is the word of God, but at the same time it maintains that there is an unwritten word of God over and above the Scripture” (**Catholic Dictionary**, Addis and Arnold, page 77).

According to Bertrand Conway, “The Council of Trent, seeing clearly that this truth and discipline are contained in the written books and the unwritten traditions which, received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ” (**Question Box**, page 78).

He also said that “the Bible is not the only source of faith.” He wrote that “a number of revealed truths have been handed down by divine tradition only” (**Question Box**, page 76).

“Tradition would have been sufficient guide, even if the Church had been left without any Scripture at all. Christ left His church with no written books, and nothing but tradition to guide it” (**Catholic Dictionary**, Addis & Arnold, pages 782-783).

Are Catholic Traditions from God or from Man?

1. **EMBER DAYS** — “A Christianized pagan custom.” The Ember days are Wednesdays, Fridays, and Saturdays the beginning of the four seasons, which the church appointed as special days of fasting and abstinence. “While their origin is uncertain, it is generally believed they were instituted to offset the pagan customs of the fifth century in Rome.” **The Roman Catholic Church Christianized the pagan custom.** “They are first mentioned by Pope Leo the Great (440-461), who declared they are of Apostolic origin although there is no proof of such assertion” (**Question Box**, page 442).

2. **APOSTLES’ CREED** — According to **Catholic Dictionary**, “There is no evidence to support the legend that each Apostle contributed one of the twelve articles of the creed. The creed in its present form seems to have been established in the West in the third century” (**Catholic Dictionary**, Imprimatur; Samuel Cardinal Stritch, page 17).

3. **USE OF HOLY WATER, 120 A.D.** — The use of “aqua lustrales” by the Roman priest existed among the heathen and has been adopted by the Roman Church (**Catholic Dictionary**, Addis and Arnold, page 403; see also **The History of Apostasies**, John F. Row, pages 1-7).

4. **LENTEN FAST, 140 A.D.** — Instituted by Telesphorus, Bishop of Rome in 140 A.D., based on a pretended apostolic tradition (**The History of the Apostasies**, John F. Row, page 8).

5. **RISE OF MONARCHICAL BISHOP, 150 A.D.** —

The New Testament church was originally independent but later Ignatius of Antioch introduced the idea of centralized church government, patterned after civil government (**An Encyclopedia of World History**, page 155; **The Eternal Kingdom**, pages 59-62).

6. DISTINCTION BETWEEN BISHOP AND PRESBYTERS, Second Century — “What we find existing in the second century enables us to infer, respecting the preceding times, that soon after the Apostolic Age the standing office of the president of the presbytery must have been formed; which president of the oversight over all, was designated by the special name ‘Episkopos, Bishop,’ and thus distinguished from the other presbyters. Thus the name came at length to be applied exclusively to this presbyter, while the name presbyter continued at first to be common to all” (**General History of the Christian Religion**, Dr. Augustus Neander, page 9, Vol. 1).

7. DISTINCTION BETWEEN CLERGY AND LAITY, Fourth Century — The distinction of clerus and laicus was established before the time of Tertullian (**The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire**, Edward Gibbons, Vol 1, page 220; **Ecclesiastical History**, J. L. Mosheim, Vol. 1, page 160).

8. ORIGINAL SIN — Tertullian (160-220 A.D.) was the first to formulate the doctrine of original sin (**The Eternal Kingdom**, Mattox, page 117; **Catholic Encyclopedia**, Volume XI, pages 312-315; **The History of Apostasies**, pages 297-300).

9. INFANT BAPTISM, 2ND CENTURY — The earliest period of infant baptism is from Irenaeus, in the second Century

(**Funk and Wagnalls Standard Encyclopedia**, III, page 174). According to John Laux, "Infant baptism was rare until the beginning of the fifth century" (**Church History**, page 84).

10. BAPTISMAL REGENERATION — Baptism itself without faith and repentance removes sins (**The Eternal Kingdom**, Mattox, pages 118,119).

11. SPRINKLING INSTEAD OF IMMERSION, THIRD CENTURY —

- a) Novatian was the first person to be sprinkled in bed, in 251 A.D.
- b) Sprinkling was invented in Africa in the third century but was not accepted even by Christians in Africa.
- c) First law authorizing sprinkling as baptism was approved by Pope Stephen III in 753 (**Rees' Encyclopedia, Article on Baptism, Vol. III**).

12. POURING — Legalized by Council of Ravenna, Spain in 1311 (**Edinburgh Encyclopedia, Volume II, page 245**).

13. SIGN OF THE CROSS — Second century (**History of the Christian Church**, by Philip Schaff, Volume II, page 269).

14. IMAGES OF CHRIST — Sixth century. Pagans, like Alexander Severus, and sects which confounded paganism with Christianity, were the first to introduce images of Christ. The Council of Elvira (303).

15. CRUCIFIX, Sixth century — "The first mention of

crucifixes are in the sixth century” (**Catholic Encyclopedia**, Volume VII, page 667).

16. LENT, Fourth century — First mention was in Fifth Canon of the Council of Nicea (325), and in the Festal Letters of Athanasius (Letter to Bishop Serapion of Thmuis, written from Rome in 341, **Question Box**, page 442).

17. PONTIFEX MAXIMUS (High Priest) — A pagan title, “Originally the title of the pagan Roman high priests. Used by Roman emperors from the time of Augustus and abandoned by Gratian (378). From the time of Leo I it has been a title of the popes” (**The Church**, Hans Kung, page 596). **In the New Testament Christ is the only High Priest.** Read Hebrews 4:14-16; 5:5-10; 6:19-20; 7:11-28; 8:1-13; 9:14; 10:1-18.

18. PENANCE, 157 A.D. — “We know very little about an official and ordered discipline of penance in the first and early second centuries” (**The Church**, Hans Kung, page 428).

19. MASS VESTMENTS — It was only in the fifth century that the Mass vestments began to be different from ordinary dress. Christ and His apostles did not have any special vestments when they celebrated the Lord’s Supper. In the early days of the church there were no special clothes for men who served the Lord’s table (**Come to Me**, page 121; **The Church**, page 557).

20. EXTREME UNCTION AS A SACRAMENT — “Only about the twelfth or thirteenth centuries did the people commence in the Western church to look upon Extreme Unction as the sacrament of the dying” (**Legislation on the Sacraments**

in the New Code, page 300). The name is now changed into Sacrament for the Sick.

21. THEOTOKOS, THE MOTHER OF GOD — Council of Ephesus 431. Pope Celestine I (422-432) was the first to call Mary “Mother of God,” later in the Council of Ephesus, Cyril of Alexandria presented the matter and it was approved (**Lives and Times of the Roman Pontiffs**, Volume 1, page 98; **The Mystery of the Woman**, pages 5,6).

22. YEARLY CONFESSION — “In 1215 the Fourth Lateran Council prescribed confession once a year” (**The Church**, Hans Kung, page 429).

23. REAL PRESENCE — Anastasius of Mt. Sinai, A.D. 680, began teaching real substantial presence in bread and wine (but not yet transubstantiation of elements). John of Dasmascus, A.D. 740, denied the bread and wine were types of Christ’s body and blood (**The History of Apostasies**, John F. Row, page 75).

24. TRANSUBSTANTIATION — Radbertus in the ninth century was the first one who thought about this doctrine. Later in 1215 the Fourth Lateran Council made a formal definition of transubstantiation (**Roman Catholicism**, page 187; **The Church**, page 94).

25. COMMUNION OF ONE KIND — It was the common custom for the first twelve centuries to give both the bread and the fruit of the vine in communion. The present law giving Communion to the laity through the form of bread only dates from the council of Constance in 1414 (**The Faith of Millions**,

John O'Brien, page 212; **The History of Apostacies**, John F. Row, page 127).

26. SACRIFICE OF THE MASS — Second century. "The Lord's Supper is never referred to as a sacrifice in the New Testament. It is only in the writings outside the New Testament, first of all in the Didache 14:1-3 and then in Justin and Irenaeus, that the Lord's Supper is called a sacrifice" (**The Church**, page 488). Later it was defined by the Council of Trent in September 17, 1582 as a doctrine (**Catholic Dictionary**, Rev. Ed. 789).

27. CANONIZATION — "The first person to be canonized was St. Ulric, Bishop of Augsburg. It was decreed by John XV during a synod at the Lateran Basilica in Rome in 993" (**Catholic Encyclopedia for School and Homes**, page 246, Volume II).

28. FIRST BEATIFICATION — The first formal beatification is that of St. Francis de Sales in 1661 (**Encyclopedia Britannica**; quoted by Roland L. Espina, **The Freeman**, page 12, Wednesday, January 21, 1981).

29. UNIVERSAL BISHOP — As a title, Boniface III, 606-607. This title was condemned by Gregory the Great as the title of the forerunner of the anti-christ. However; Boniface III was able to secure it from Emperor Phocas who was a vile person, guilty of murder (**The Ante-Nicene Fathers**, Volume VIII, page 602; **History of the Christian Church**, Philip Schaff, Volume III, page 220).

30. PSEUDO-ISIDOREAN DECRETALS — These false decretals were published about the ninth century by an unknown

author signing himself as Isidore Mercator. These decretals granted the pope and his successors honor, supremacy over other patriarchs, and sovereignty over Rome. These colossal forgeries were used and cited by many popes, numerous councils and by canonist (**The New Funk and Wagnalls Encyclopedia**, Volume II, page 3824; C, 3545, **Ante-Nicene**, Volume VIII, pages 603-607).

31. TRADITION EQUAL TO THE BIBLE — The Council of Trent in 1546 later taught that these traditions are as authoritative as the Bible (**The History of Apostasies**, John F. Row, page 84). “Other than the Scriptures, tradition must be accepted as a true fount of faith” (**Denz**, page 783, quoted by Gerald Paden, page 11).

32. TITLE “POPE” EXCLUSIVE TO ROMAN BISHOP — From the fourth century the title “pope” which was a common title for all priests and bishops became a distinctive title for the Bishop of Rome, to whom Gregory VII (1085) exclusively restricted its use” (**Colliers Encyclopedia**, Volume 19, page 244).

- a) Nicholas I (858-867) the first to unite princely crown with the miter.
- b) Boniface VII (1294-1303) added the second crown in keeping with his idea of the twofold authority of the pope.
- c) Benedict 12, third crown added (**Catholic Dictionary**, page 779).

33. VICAR OF CHRIST — Innocent III (1277-1280) was the first to claim to be the “Vicar of Christ,” and Nicholas III was

the first who styled himself “Vicar of God.” (**Catholic Encyclopedia**, Volume IV, page 403).

34. SALE OF INDULGENCES — In 1390 Boniface IX was the first pope who introduced the sales of indulgences, according to historians Platina and Polydore Vergil (**The History of Apostasies**, by John F. Row, pages 126,127).

35. INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE — On July 18, 1870 the doctrine of Papal Infallibility was explicitly proclaimed as a dogma in the Roman Church by Pope Pius IX, at the Council of Catican. During the council 136 bishops and cardinals opposed the definition of the dogma of Papal Infallibility (**Catholic Digest**, page 10, November 1962; **Catholic Dictionary**, Addis and Arnold, page 814). According to **TIME** magazine, the council was rigged by the pope himself (**Time**, November 14, 1977, page 50).

36. USE OF INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC IN WORSHIP — The music in the New Testament Church was purely vocal. The use of organs in churches is ascribed to Pope Vitalian (657-672) (**History of the Christian Church**, Philip Schaff, Volume IV, page 439).

37. APOCRYPHA — The Council of Trent added the apocryphal books to the canon of Scriptures in 1546 (**Introduction to the Revised Standard Version Catholic Edition**, page 7).

38. IMMACULATE CONCEPTION — December 8, 1854, Pope Pius IX in his Bull *Ineffabilis Deus*. This doctrine

was rejected by many Catholic theologians such as Thomas Aquinas, St. Bernard, Petrus Lombardus, Cardinal Torquemada, Cardinal Cajetan, St. Catherine of Seina, Augustine, and by some Popes, Gregory the Great and Innocent. It was John Dunn Scotus who first formulated the philosophical approach to this doctrine, but his explanation was rejected by Thomas Aquinas (**Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma**, pages 199,200).

Note: These doctrines and many Catholic practices were unknown during the days of the apostles. These are not apostolic traditions but human innovations introduced by uninspired men many years after the death of the apostles. Many of these doctrines are directly opposed to the inspired teachings of the Scriptures.

THE BIBLE TEACHES: Jesus forbids human traditions as the source of religious authority, and the Bible predicted that there would be a departure from the faith.

Colossians 2:8, *“Beware lest anyone cheat you through philosophy and empty deceit, according to the tradition of men, according to the basic principles of the world, and not according to Christ”* (**Revised Standard Version Catholic Edition**, Imprimatur John Cardinal Heenan, Archbishop of Westminster, December 1965).

Matthew 15:3,6,8,9,13,14, *“Why do you also transgress the commandment of God because of your tradition?...then he need not honor his father or mother. Thus you have made the commandment of God of no effect by your tradition...These people*

draw near to Me with their mouth, and honor Me with their lips, but their heart is far from Me. And in vain they worship Me, teaching as doctrines the commandments of men...Every plant which My heavenly Father has not planted will be uprooted. Let them alone. They are blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind leads the blind, both will fall into a ditch.”

Mark 7:8,9,13, *“For laying aside the commandment of God, you hold the tradition of men — the washing of pitchers and cups, and many other such things you do. All too well you reject the commandment of God, that you may keep your tradition...making the word of God of no effect through your tradition which you have handed down. And many such things you do.”*

The Bible warned that there would be a departure from the faith (Acts 20:28,29; 1 Timothy 4:1-3; 2 Peter 2:1-22).

The Roman Catholic Church is wrong when it says that Christ left His church nothing to guide it. Jesus promised His apostles that the Holy Spirit would guide them into all truth. The apostles, in turn, were the guides of the early church (John 14:26; 16:13; Acts 2:42). It was not tradition that directed the church of the first century but the inspired teachings of the apostles.

We have noticed that these Roman Catholic traditions are exalted at the expense of the Scriptures. They have undermined the authority of the Bible and for this reason they should be rejected by all God-fearing, God-loving and Bible-believing people.

Tertullian said, “It is not lawful for us either to introduce any-

thing of our own will, or to attach ourselves to anything which anyone else has thus introduced. We claim as our originals the apostles of the Lord Jesus Christ, who never presumed to introduce anything themselves, but who faithfully transmitted to the nations what they themselves had received of Him” (**De Proescriptione Hareret**, C. VI, quoted by Laborde, **The Impossibility of the Immaculate Conception**, page 35).

Chapter 19

The Seven Sacraments: Are They From Heaven or From Men?

Roman Catholicism has invented seven rites which they admit were unknown for twelve centuries and which are, therefore, unscriptural. These seven rites are called by the Church of Rome "Seven Sacraments." They say that these sacraments are the channels of God's grace. They further claim that these rites are endowed with magical powers. Priests who administer these must have the proper intention to perform what the Church intends them to do. Without the Catholic priest and the proper intention of the ministers, the church declares that no sacraments are valid.

Through these seven sacraments and the rules regarding them, the Roman priesthood has been able to control the laity for many centuries. Are the Roman Catholic claims and allegations scriptural and valid? Let us study them in the light of the Bible and true historical developments.

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE: The Roman Catholic Church teaches that there are only seven sacraments instituted by Christ.

"The Catholic Church teaches that there are but seven sacraments, instituted by Jesus Christ Himself. They are the ordinary channels or means of grace for those properly disposed to receive them. To confer a sacrament validly, that is, to produce the effects intended by Christ, the one administering it, besides having the necessary power, must intend to do

what the church wishes; the state of grace in the minister is not a condition for validity” (**The National Catholic Almanac**, 1949 Edition, page 203).

What is a Sacrament?

According to the Roman Catholic Church, sacraments are: “Visible signs instituted by Christ to signify and confer grace. They are seven in number: Baptism, Confirmation, Holy Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, and Matrimony” (**National Catholic Almanac**, page 245).

“The sacraments do more than signify grace; they produce it by their own virtue. They are not, as the Protestants pretend, pure exterior ceremonies which testify of grace. They are the signs to which God has attached the power to produce grace of themselves” (**Catholic Doctrine**, Volume III, page 36).

The Council of Trent emphatically stated: “If any one says that the sacraments have not been instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, or that there are more or less than seven, to wit: baptism, confirmation, the eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders and marriage, let him be anathema” (Boulenger, **Catholic Doctrine**, Volume III, page 38).

According to the Roman Catholic teaching:

1. The sacraments are channels of God’s grace.
2. The sacraments themselves have the power to produce grace by their own virtue.

3. A sacrament to be valid and to produce the effects intended by the Catholic church must be administered by a person authorized by the church. In this case it is the priest.
4. The minister must have the intention to do what the church wishes.
5. The state of grace of the minister is not a condition for the validity of the sacrament. In other words an immoral priest could still perform a valid sacrament if he has the right intention. A sinful priest can still offer Jesus Christ on the altar as a sacrifice for sin validly!
6. Finally, there are only seven sacraments that Jesus instituted. An anathema was pronounced on those who would disagree.

A Closer Look at the Seven Sacraments

I. This doctrine is not based on the Bible but on tradition!

According to one Catholic writer, the doctrine of the sacrament is **not** based on the Bible but on tradition! Listen to what he said: “The Bible is silent, or at least is not clear, on a number of matters such as baptism of infants and the exact number of sacraments, concerning which the church follows tradition” (**National Catholic Almanac**, 1943 Edition, page 128).

Another Catholic author wrote: “The enumeration of sacra-

ments was unknown for nearly twelve centuries of church history” (**Catholic Dictionary**, page 714).

11. Early Christians did not know about the Seven Sacraments.

“No formal enumeration of the seven sacraments is found in the Fathers. The formal numerical seven presupposes a well-developed concept of a sacrament. This emerged only around the middle of the twelfth century” (**Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma**, page 338).

These admissions are very damaging to the teaching of the Roman Catholic church, especially to their claim that Jesus instituted these seven sacraments.

III. Theologians disagree on the exact number of sacraments.

A. In the past there were 30 sacraments recognized by the church (**International Standard Bible Encyclopedia**, Volume IV, page 2636).

B. Peter Damian said that there were twelve sacraments in the church.

C. St. Victor stated that there were two necessary sacraments (Baptism and Eucharist).

D. St. Bernard said that there were three sacraments (Baptism, Eucharist and feet washing).

E. Peter Lombard was the first to mention seven sacraments (**Catholic Dictionary**, Addis and Arnold, page 716).

It was only in the *Council of Trent* in 1546 that the number of the sacraments was pegged to seven only. This council defined and pronounced that there were only seven sacraments that Jesus instituted, the same council pronounced an anathema on those who would disagree with its definition. If the Council of Trent was correct on its pronouncement then what happened to those Catholic “saints” and theologians in the past that believed otherwise?

The varying opinions among the past Roman Catholic theologians concerning the number of the sacraments prove that the doctrine now imposed by the Roman Catholic Church has no basis in the Bible or in history. These facts completely destroy the claims of the Catholic Church that Jesus Christ instituted the seven sacraments. It has been shown Biblically and historically that the innumeration of the sacraments into seven are just inventions introduced by uninspired men many centuries after the death of the apostles. These things were never mentioned by the inspired writers, and they were not known in church history for twelve hundred years. These human innovations have no biblical basis. The apostle Paul said, “*even if we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel to you than what we have preached to you, let him be accursed*” (Galatians 1:8).

1. BAPTISM — Baptism is never referred to in the New Testament as a sacrament. The term sacrament is not a Biblical word, neither is its concept. Biblical Baptism and Roman Catholic baptism differs in many important aspect.

A. Biblical baptism is for those who have heard and believed the Gospel. Hearing and believing the word of God is a necessary requisite to baptism. Jesus made this plain in His Great Commission (Matthew 28:18-20; Mark 16:15-16). In the book of Acts all those who were baptized first heard and believed the word (See Acts 2:36-42; 8:35-38; 1 Corinthians 15:1-4). In the Roman Catholic Church, infants are baptized, even though they still do not understand the word of God and do not have the capacity to believe.

B. Biblical baptism is immersion in water. Even Catholic scholars and theologians admit that baptism is immersion, yet their mode of baptism is by pouring. Baptism by pouring or infusion is a departure from the biblical pattern. (Please see Chapter 11 on Baptism for a more detailed discussion). Romans 6:4 and Colossians 2:12 tells us that baptism is a burial. When the Eunuch was baptized by Philip both of them went down to the water (Acts 8:38,39).

C. Biblical baptism is for the remission of sins (Mark 16:16; Acts 2:38).

2. CONFIRMATION — Confirmation as a sacrament was never heard in the apostolic times. In fact according to the author of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, the Sacrament of Confirmation was one of those doctrines that are based on forgeries (**The Ante-Nicene Fathers**, Volume VIII, page 604). In the New Testament we read of Paul and Barnabas going around the churches they have established “confirming the souls of the disciples” (Acts 14:22). The word *confirm* in this verse simply means to **strengthen**.

3. HOLY EUCHARIST — The Lord's Supper in the New Testament and the Mass of the Roman Catholic Church are two different things.

A. The Mass as a sacrifice: To the Roman Catholic Church, the Mass is a sacrifice, but the Lord's Supper is a memorial. (1 Corinthians 11:23-26). According to the book of Hebrews, the sacrifice of Jesus was made once and for all time, never to be repeated again (Hebrews 9:11-28; 10:11-18, 26).

One Roman Catholic writer has pointed out that the Lord's supper was never called in the New Testament as a sacrifice. "The Lord's Supper is never referred to as a sacrifice in the New Testament. It is only in the writings outside the New Testament, first of all in the Didache 14:1-3 and then in Justin and Irenaeus, that the Lord's Supper is called a sacrifice" (**The Church**, page 488).

It was the Council of Trent in September 17, 1582 that defined the Lord's Supper as a sacrifice (**Catholic Dictionary**, Rev. Ed. 789).

B. The doctrine of Transubstantiation: The Roman Catholic Church further claims that the priest has the power to change the bread and wine into the literal body and blood of Jesus Christ. This doctrine is called *transubstantiation* — meaning "to change across". This doctrine was never taught by any apostle. This was only made a dogma of the Roman Catholic Church in 1215, at the Fourth Lateran Council (**The Church**, Hans Kung, page 94).

C. Communion of One Kind: The Roman Catholic Church has also taught an unscriptural practice of withholding the cup from its members, they called this doctrine "*Communion of One Kind*". This dogma was only made official during the Council of Constance in 1414. It directly contradicts Jesus' command when He said to the apostles "drink ye all of it." (Matthew 26:27). Popes in the past had condemned the practice of withholding the cup from the members. The doctrine of only giving the bread to the members as now taught in the Roman Catholic Church, does not only contradict the Bible but also contradicts their own teachings in the past.

John O'Brien, a Catholic priest, in his book said that "it was the common custom for the first twelve centuries to give both the bread and the fruit of the vine in communion. The present law of giving Communion to the laity through the form of bread only dates from the council of Constance in 1414." (**The Faith of Millions**, John O'Brien, page 212; also see **The History of Apostasies**, John F. Row, 127).

The Apostle Paul, in writing to the Christians in Corinth, handed down what the Lord had taught the apostles in the beginning. "*In the same manner He also took the cup after supper, saying, 'This cup is the new covenant in My blood. This do, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me. For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death till He comes.'*" (1 Corinthians 11:25,26).

4. PENANCE — The Roman Catholic Church teaches that the priest has the power to forgive sins and that Catholics must confess their sins to their priest at least once a year. They call this

dogma “*auricular confession*,” because the confession is whispered to the ears of the priest. This doctrine was only made an official dogma by the Catholic Church in 1215 during the fourth Lateran Council (**The Church**, Hans Kung, page 429). The Bible tells us that only God can forgive sins, and that confession is to be made to God (Mark 2:7; 1 John 1:5-9). David said in the book of Psalms, “*I acknowledge my sin to You, and my iniquity I have not hidden.*’ *I said: ‘I will confess my transgression to the LORD,’ and You forgave the iniquity of my sin.*” (Psalm 32:5).

In the book of James we are told to confess *to one another* (James 5:16). He did not say to confess your sins to the Catholic priest. In the Roman Catholic Church, the members confess their sins to the priests but the priests will not confess their sins to their members.

According to Peter de Rosa, a Jesuit priest and author, the **Sacrament of Penance** was abused by the priests in the past. (**Vicars of Christ**, pages 574,575).

A Roman Catholic booklet published by the Knights of Columbus said that the Sacrament of Penance was opposed by St. Hippolytus and Tertullian (**Short Story of the Popes**, page 6). This tells us that this doctrine was not apostolic in origin, for even people whom the Roman Catholics had later on canonized as “saints” opposed them.

5. EXTREME UNCTION — The Roman Catholic sacrament called extreme unction is intended for those who are sick or dying. This was made only as an official dogma in the Roman Catholic church in the 12th and 13th century (**Legislation on the Sacraments in the New Code**, page 300).

During the second Vatican Council in the 1960's the doctrine was renamed and it became known as the *Sacrament for the Sick*.

In the book of James, he tells us, *“Is anyone among you sick? Let him call for the **elders** of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith will save the sick, and the Lord will raise him up. And if he has committed sins, he will be forgiven.”* (James 5:14,15). The Roman Catholic Church said that this verse supports the sacrament of Extreme Unction. However, a closer look on this verse will destroy their theory. In the first place, James said that we are to call the **elders** of the church; he did not say call for the priest. Of course the church of Rome would argue that the elders are priests. But their reasoning is faulty, because New Testament elders and Roman Catholic priests are two different things. The Roman Catholic priesthood is an office which the Roman Catholic church invented. This kind of priesthood is unknown in the New Testament. In the New Testament, elders are bishops of the church, and according to Paul these men had certain qualifications, which the Roman Catholic priests don't have nor qualify (1 Timothy 3:1-7; Titus 1:5-9). In the second place, the elders are called not because of an imminent danger of death but in order to heal the sick.

6. HOLY ORDERS — The Roman Catholic Church has a special kind of priesthood which they call **ministerial or external priesthood**. These priests are endowed with tremendous power which they exercised in the Sacraments of the Church. This priesthood is unknown in the New Testament and was never established by Jesus Christ (Please see Chapter 10.).

7. MATRIMONY — It is true that marriage is a divine institution, but nowhere in the Scripture can we read that it is a sacrament. In the book of Ephesians the *Rheims Douay* Version of the Roman Catholic Church had erroneously translated the word “*mystery*” as a *sacrament*. Because of this erroneous translation, the Roman Catholic church has made the wrong notion that marriage is a sacrament (see Ephesians 5:32). Roman Catholic authorities have now freely admitted that the Rheims Douay Bible has wrongly translated the Greek word **musterion** as a sacrament.

The authors of the **Catholic Dictionary**, said: “One text indeed, so translated in our Douay Bible would certainly seem to settle the question - viz, Ephesians 5:31,32. “This is a great sacrament” is not the true sense of the Vulgate. Indeed the word ‘sacramentum’ occurs in any one of them. We translate, accordingly, “This is a mystery...” We have the authority of Estius for this interpretation, which is adopted by modern scholars, and denies that ancients appealed to this text to prove marriage a sacrament” (page 545,546).

According to the authoritative volume of the Roman Catholic Church, **marriage** was not considered a sacrament in the church in earlier times (**Catholic Encyclopedia**, Volume IX, page 707).

THE BIBLE TEACHES: The Bible is silent about the doctrine of Sacrament. The historical development of the sacraments proved that this doctrine of the Catholics is not from Jesus Christ.

A. We must listen to Christ’s words only. God has spoken

through His son, Jesus Christ, and we must listen to Christ's authority and obey His commands.

1. Hebrews 1:1,2 — God speaks through His Son today.
2. Matthew 17:3-5 — We must listen to Christ today.
3. Acts 3:22,23 — We must listen to Christ as God's prophet today.
4. Matthew 28:18-20 — Christ commanded His apostles to teach what He had commanded them.

B. The Apostles never taught the doctrine of the seven sacraments. The apostles were guided by the Holy Spirit into all truth, and they delivered the whole counsel of God during their time, but they never taught the doctrine of seven sacraments.

1. John 14:26 — The Holy Spirit was to teach the apostles all truth.
2. John 16:13 — The Holy Spirit was to guide them into all truth.
3. Acts 20:27 — Apostle Paul said he had delivered the whole counsel of God.
4. 2 Thessalonians 2:13 — What the apostles taught was the word of God.
5. 1 Corinthians 11:37 — What the apostles wrote are commandments from the Lord.

C. The faith was once and for all delivered to the saints.

1. Jude 3 — Christians are told to contend for **the faith** which was **once and for all delivered** to the saints.
2. Acts 6:7 — Some of the priests were obedient to **the faith**.

3. 2 Timothy 4:1 — There was the warning that some shall depart from **the faith**.

NOTE: Are the seven sacraments part of **the faith** delivered by the apostles in the first century and accepted by the early Christians? No, they never taught anything about the seven sacraments. They were unknown for twelve centuries, as admitted by the Roman Church. These seven sacraments are additions to the doctrine of Christ, and they were not part of the original teachings of the apostles who were guided and inspired by the Holy Spirit of God.

D. Certain Bible Warnings:

1. Deuteronomy 4:12 — Do not add to the word of God nor take away from it.
2. Proverbs 30:5,6 — Do not add to the word of God or you will be found a liar.
3. Revelation 22:18,19 — Do not add or take away from it.
4. 1 Peter 2:1 — There will be false teachers and false prophets.
5. Acts 20:28,29 — There will be a departure from the faith.
6. 2 Timothy 4:1-3 — Some shall depart from the faith.
7. Galatians 1:7-9 — Some will pervert the gospel of Christ.

E. The definition of the seven sacraments is presumptuous and without divine authority.

The Church of Rome has spoken presumptuously when she declared that there were seven sacraments instituted by Christ and pronounced an anathema on those who disagree with them.

In the Old Testament God warned His people of **prophets who spoke presumptuously in the name of the Lord**. The Roman Catholic Church has committed the sin of presumption when she claimed that our Lord Jesus Christ instituted the seven sacraments. This claim is false and unscriptural because the apostles who were guided by the Holy Spirit into all truth did not know such doctrine (Deuteronomy 18:20-22).

God said through His prophet Jeremiah that *“An astonishing and horrible thing has been committed in the land: the prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests rule by their own power; and My people love to have it so”* (Jeremiah 5:30,31).

The priests were accused by God of doing violence to His law. *“Her prophets are insolent, treacherous people; her priests have polluted the sanctuary. They have done violence to the law”* (Zephaniah 3:4).

During the time of Christ the priests were the ones who caused Jesus to be crucified. *“But the chief priests and elders persuaded the multitudes that they should ask for Barabbas and destroy Jesus”* (Matthew 27:20).

NOTE: The Roman Catholic priests have also done violence to the laws of God by adding new commandments and undermining the authority of the Scriptures. By their traditions they have made the word of God void and of no effect.

Jerome said, “Thou that bringest new doctrines, whoever thou art, I beseech you, spare the ears of men, spare the faith they have received from the lips of the apostles! Why after four hun-

dred years (rather 1200 years) do you presume to teach that which we have never heard before? Why publish, and ask us to accept that which was never published by St. Peter and Paul? **The world has been Christian, heretofore, without any such doctrine.** I will have no faith now that I am old and gray-haired into which I was not baptized when I was a child” (Quoted by Laborde, **The Impossibility of the Immaculate Conception**, pages 100-101).

We will say Amen to these wise words of Jerome!

Chapter 20

The False Decretals

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE: The Roman Catholic Church employs forgeries in order to bolster her claims.

In her bid for power and supremacy, the Roman Catholic Church did not hesitate to manufacture and employ forgeries. These forgeries were used to their fullest to enhance the power, prestige and interests of the Roman Catholic Church. Popes used them in their official communications and councils, and theologians used them in their formulation of decrees. Eventually these forgeries found their way into the official Catechism and Canon Laws of the Roman Catholic Church. This chapter will center on forgeries the Church of Rome has manufactured and used in the past centuries.

ROME A HOME OF FORGERIES: “For seven centuries the Greeks had called Rome the home of forgeries. Whenever they tried talking with Rome the popes brought out forged documents, even papal additions to Council documents, which the Greeks, naturally, had never seen” (*Vicars of Christ The Dark Side of the Papacy*, Peter de Rosa, page 80).

THE BIBLE TEACHES: The time would come when men would turn away from the truth and turn to fables. The apostles of Christ did not use fables.

A. Paul said to Timothy, “*For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine, but according to their own*

desires, because they have itching ears, they will heap up for themselves teachers; and they will turn their ears away from the truth, and be turned aside to fables” (2 Timothy 4:3,4).

B. Peter said, *“For we did not follow cunningly devised fables when we made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnesses of His majesty” (2 Peter 1:16).*

C. *“Now the Spirit expressly says that in latter times some will depart from the faith, giving heed to deceiving spirits and doctrines of demons, speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their own conscience seared with a hot iron, forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from foods which God created to be received with thanksgiving by those who believe and know the truth” (1 Timothy 4:1-3).*

D. *“But evil men and impostors will grow worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived” (2 Timothy 3:13).*

E. Some church leaders will speak perverse things. *“For I know this, that after my departure savage wolves will come in among you, not sparing the flock” (Acts 20:29).*

F. No lie is of the truth. *“I have not written to you because you do not know the truth, but because you know it, and that no lie is of the truth” (1 John 2:21).*

G. There is no other gospel. *“Which is not another; but there are some who trouble you and want to pervert the gospel of Christ. But even if we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other*

gospel to you than what we have preached to you, let him be accursed. As we have said before, so now I say again, if anyone preaches any other gospel to you than what you have received, let him be accursed” (Galatians 1:7-9).

H. We are to speak the truth. *“But, speaking the truth in love, may grow up in all things into Him who is the head — Christ” (Ephesians 4:15).*

I. We are to gird ourselves with the truth. *“Stand therefore, having girded your waist with truth, having put on the breastplate of righteousness” (Ephesians 6:14).*

J. We are of the truth. *“And by this we know that we are of the truth, and shall assure our hearts before Him” (1 John 3:19).*

K. The Spirit is the spirit of truth. *“This is He who came by water and blood — Jesus Christ; not only by water, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit who bears witness, because the Spirit is truth” (1 John 5:6).*

L. God is the God of truth. *“He is the Rock, His work is perfect; for all His ways are justice, a God of truth and without injustice; righteous and upright is He” (Deuteronomy 32:4).*

M. Christ is the truth. *“If indeed you have heard Him and have been taught by Him, as the truth is in Jesus” (Ephesians 4:21).*

N. Satan is the father of all lies. *“You are of your father the devil, and the desires of your father you want to do. He was a*

murderer from the beginning, and does not stand in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaks a lie, he speaks from his own resources, for he is a liar and the father of it” (John 8:44).

O. The children of the devil are full of all fraud and deceit. *“O full of all deceit and all fraud, you son of the devil, you enemy of all righteousness, will you not cease perverting the straight ways of the Lord?” (Acts 13:10).*

P. False prophets cause the way of the truth to be blasphemed. *“And many will follow their destructive ways, because of whom the way of truth will be blasphemed” (2 Peter 2:2).*

Q. We must receive the teachings of Jesus Christ. *“He who rejects Me, and does not receive My words, has that which judges him — the word that I have spoken will judge him in the last day. For I have not spoken on My own authority; but the Father who sent Me gave Me a command, what I should say and what I should speak. And I know that His command is everlasting life. Therefore, whatever I speak, just as the Father has told Me, so I speak” (John 12:48-50).*

R. The working of Satan will be accompanied by all deceptions, and God will send a strong delusion so that those who refuse to believe the truth will believe a lie. *“The coming of the lawless one is according to the working of Satan, with all power, signs, and lying wonders, and with all unrighteous deception among those who perish, because they did not receive the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this reason God will send them strong delusion, that they should believe the lie, that*

they all may be condemned who did not believe the truth but had pleasure in unrighteousness” (2 Thessalonians 2:9-12).

NOTE: The essence of real Christianity is **truth**. When a religion that professes to follow Christ employs lies and forgeries instead of truth, it cannot be Christ’s religion.

What Are the Forgeries Used by the Roman Catholic Church?

These forgeries are the following:

1. The Apostolic Canons
2. The Apostolic Constitutions
3. The Donation of Constantine
4. The Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals

These writings are now universally accepted as spurious, even by the highest authorities of the Roman Church. But the admission was made only after the Roman Church had benefited by the use of them and after the forgeries had been incorporated into the official teachings of the Roman Church.

According to the Catholic Dictionary, these forgeries are a collection of many spurious writings from different periods of time and different localities: “Moreover as has been shown by Philips and Hefele, it is certain that the greater number of the spurious documents incorporated by the Pseudo-Isidore in his collection were not manufactured by him, but had been in existence some for a longer, others for a shorter period of time. Such are the Apostolic Canons, the Donation of Constantine, Letter of

Pope Sylvester, etc., etc.” (**The Catholic Dictionary**, Addis and Arnold, page 335).

A. The Apostolic Canons:

“A tradition long prevailed that these Canons were dictated by the Apostles themselves to St. Clement of Rome, who committed them to writing. Accurate research has dispelled this notion. Their real value and antiquity that should be assigned to them still are much disputed” (**Catholic Dictionary**, Addis and Arnold, page 41).

“The Apostolic Canons are usually found in manuscripts appended to the last of eight books of the Apostolic Constitutions” (**Catholic Dictionary**, page 42).

1. This forgery was classified among the “holy canons” of Rome. “In deciding any case that might be brought before him (bishop), he had three things to guide him: Scripture, tradition and the “holy canons” — that is the disciplinary rules which Church synods, beginning with the Council of Jerusalem, had established. Many of these primitive canons are still preserved for us in the collection known as the Apostolic Canons” (**Catholic Dictionary**, Addis and Arnold, page 101).

2. It became a part of the canons compiled by Dionysius Exiguus in the fifth and sixth centuries as directed by Popes Anastasius and Symmachus. “An important step towards codification and uniformity of procedure was taken in the fifth and early in the sixth century, when Dionysius Exiguus, under the direction of Popes Anastasius and Symmachus, made a larger

compilation of canons for the use of the Latin Church. In this he included fifty of the Apostolic Canons.”

3. The fifty Apostolic Canons were always regarded as authoritative by Rome. Under the article, “The Apostolic Canons,” the **Catholic Dictionary** said: “These fifty were always regarded in the West as authoritative” (Addis and Arnold, page 42). But these are forgeries, not genuine apostolic traditions! (Authors Note: The West refers to Rome.)

4. Emperors, councils and saints considered them all authoritative but consensus against them was very strong. “With regard to the authority that should be assigned to them, while on one hand the Emperor Constantine, Theodosius, and Justinian, the Council of Ephesus, and especially St. John Damascene (who ranks them with the Canon of the New Testament), are all in their favor, the consensus of opinion against them, since the sixteenth century when they were first critically examined is very strong. It is urged that Eusebius and St. Jerome are silent, though if such a collection of Canons had come down from the apostles, they must have known of them; also that in the controversy (third century) between Pope Stephen and St. Cyprian, neither party appealed to them though, had they been generally known and believed to be genuine, they would at once have decided the point in dispute. Again, it is plain that many things mentioned in them, e.g., metropolitans, divisions of Dioceses, distinction of Church and episcopal property, etc, are of post-apostolic age” (**Catholic Dictionary**, page 42).

5. Some important observations concerning the Apostolic Canons:

- a) The Apostolic Canons were thought to be actual dictations of the apostles to Clement of Rome, but this was found to be false.
- b) These false writings were once a part of the so-called “holy canons” of the early Roman Church to guide bishops in their decisions of cases brought to them.
- c) Accurate research has proven that these writings were forgeries.
- d) Dionysius Exiguus and two Popes, Anastasius and Symmachus, thought that these were genuine. Two “infallible” popes were deceived!
- e) These forgeries were accepted by Rome for hundreds of years as authoritative. Even emperors, a “saint” and the Council of Ephesus considered them authoritative.

B. The Apostolic Constitution:

“Apostolic Constitution: Eight books, devoted to the discussion of the ecclesiastical affairs. They profess to contain the words of the apostles written down by St. Clement of Rome. The spurious character of the book was soon evident to Catholic scholars, such as Baronius, Bellarmine, and Petavius, who were at once, at least on the main point, with Protestants like Daille and Blondel” (**Catholic Dictionary**, page 42).

C. The Donation of Constantine:

1. All historians have agreed that the Donation of Constantine was a fable that greatly enhanced the power of the

Roman Pontiff. Bryce, in his book, **The Holy Roman Empire**, said:

“The cause of the Roman pontiffs, from about the eighth or ninth century forward, was greatly furthered by two remarkable forged documents, known as the **Donation of Constantine** and the **False Decretals**. The probable object of the former (Donation of Constantine) was to justify the donation of Pippin by providing evidence of a similar and earlier donation by the first imperial patron of the Church. It tells how Constantine the Great, cured of his leprosy by the prayers of Sylvester, resolved to forsake the ancient seat for a new capital on the Bosphorus, lest the continuance of the secular government should cramp the freedom of the spiritual, and how he bestowed therewith upon the Pope and his successors the sovereignty over Italy and the continuance of the West” (Bryce, **The Holy Roman Empire**, page 100, quoted by Philip Van Ness Myers, **General History**, pages 351,352).

The Donation of Constantine “granted to the pope and his successors insignia of honor, supremacy over other patriarchs and temporal sovereignty over Rome. This document was regarded as genuine for the greater part of the Middle Ages and from the tenth century on was invoked to support papal claims against temporal powers. Its authenticity was first seriously attacked by the Italian Humanist Laurentius Valla in 1440, but was not completely disproved until the end of the eighteenth century; since that time the document has been universally admitted to be a forgery” (**The New Funk and Wagnalls Encyclopedia**, Volume II, page 3824).

“In that uncritical age the documents were received by everybody as authentic. The papal party quoted them in part proof of their claims for the Roman see. They are now acknowledged by all scholars, Catholic as well as Protestant, to have been forged. Laurentius Valla (1406-1457), one of the greatest of the humanists, was the first to demonstrate the real character of the Donation of Constantine” (**General History**, Philip Van Ness Myers, pages 351,352).

“Constantine’s gift formed the historical nucleus, which the Sylvester Legend later surrounded with that network of myth, that gave rise to the forged document known as the “Donation of Constantine” (**Catholic Encyclopedia**, Volume XIV, page 357).

“In the Middle Ages it was long believed that the first Christian Emperor made a solemn ‘Edict of Donation’ conferring on Pope Sylvester I, the city of Rome, the imperial palaces there, and the provinces, places, cities of all Italy, and the western regions. This donation was long ago recognized as a forgery; Muratori assigns its invention to the eighth century” (**Catholic Dictionary**, Addis and Arnold, page 772).

“The story about Constantine’s donation of sovereign rights to the pope is a fable (**Short History of the Catholic Church**, H. Wedewer and J. McSorley, page 82). Please remember what Paul said in 2 Timothy 4:3,4: *“Men will turn away their ears from the truth, and be turned aside to fables.”* **The Donation of Constantine was a fable, a false story.**

2. The Donation of Constantine was incorporated in another spurious document, the Pseudo-Isidorean.

“Moreover, as was shown by Phillips and Hefele, it is certain that the greater number of the spurious documents incorporated by the Pseudo-Isidore were not manufactured by him, but had been in existence, some for a longer, others for a shorter period of time. Such are the Apostolic Canons, the Donation of Constantine, the letter of Sylvester, etc.” (**Catholic Dictionary**, page 335).

3. The spurious documents were exposed by Laurentius Valla and Nicholas Cusa.

“Here we see the first dawn of historical criticism. Laurentius Valla and Nicholas Cusa had already pointed out the spurious character of the so-called ‘Donation of Constantine,’ and other documents accepted in the Middle Ages, and the new epoch of historical literature was soon to begin” (**Catholic Dictionary**, page 165).

4. A Fresco in Lateran Rome depicted it as if it were true.

“In the Lateran there is a fresco depicting this as if it were true” (**Catholic Encyclopedia**, Volume IX, page 14).

5. Even after the forgery was exposed, Cardinal Gibbons and other Roman Catholic writers still cite the fable of the Donations of Constantine to support the Roman claims.

Cardinal Gibbons in his book, **The Faith Of Our Fathers**,

said: "Constantine gave to the Roman Church munificent donations of money and real estate, which were augmented by additional grants contributed by subsequent emperors. Hence, the Patrimony of the Roman Pontiffs soon became very considerable" (page 112).

Another Catholic author, Rev. Clement H. Crock, alluded to the Donation of Constantine as if it were true (**Apostles Creed**, page 222).

6. Dupin said: "Truthfulness is not the strongest character of the teaching of Rome."

"Absolutely, my Lord, with such evidence before me, I am unable to resist the inference that truthfulness is not one of the strongest characteristics of the teaching of even the modern Church of Rome; for is not this a case, palpably where its highest living authorities are both indifferent to having possible untruths preached from the pulpit, and something more than indifferent to having forgeries, after their detection as such, adduced from the pulpit to authenticate facts?" (**The Ante-Nicene Fathers**, Volume VIII, page 604).

In other words, the Church of Rome is not honest in dealing with historical facts.

D. The Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals

"False Decretals" or "Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals" is the name given to certain forged letters contained in a collection of canon laws composed about the middle of the ninth century by an

author who used the pseudonym of Isidore Mercator. The name "False Decretals" is sometimes extended to cover not only the papal letters forged by Isidore and contained in his compilation, but the whole collection, although it contains other documents, authentic or apocryphal, written before Isidore's time. The Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals is the most notorious of forgeries because it has totally distorted the facts of church history and has contributed much in elevating the power of the Church of Rome.

"The so called Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals, which appeared about the middle of the ninth century, tended to a similar end as did the Donation of Constantine, although they were originally put out in the interest of the bishops, and not of the pope. They formed part of the collection of church documents, and included many alleged letters and edicts of the early popes. Granting their genuineness, they went to prove that the bishops of Rome in the second and third centuries exercised all that authority and extensive jurisdiction which were now being claimed by the popes of the ninth century.

According to Peter de Rosa in his book, **Vicars of Christ**, "Gregory VII was not above a deception of his own. The most influential of all forgeries was the ninth century Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, of French origin, which Rome seized on avidly and which Gregory, who 'could not err,' took to be authentic. It consisted of 115 documents, purportedly written by early bishops of Rome, beginning with Clement (88-97). A further 125 documents had been forged additions which increased the power and prestige of the papacy. According to the forger, the early popes forbade all commerce with an excommunicated person" (**Vicars of Christ**, pages 8,81).

These forged decretals collected and combined all the other forgeries in the past and became the most handy tool in the hands of the ambitious men of Rome.

1. According to Catholic authorities, the purpose of the compiler was to secure the authority of the Roman pontiff and exalt him as the power of unity. (See: **Commentary of the New Code of Canon Law**, Volume 1, page 25.)

The editors of the well-quoted **Catholic Dictionary** admitted that the compiler of these forgeries was strongly urged by many ecclesiastics of rank to make such a collection (see page 333).

2. The compiler of these forgeries was exalted by Catholic authorities as “an intelligent, wise and a great man.”

“Of the unknown author, Mohler writes: ‘Pseudo-Isidore seized exactly that of his own age which corresponded to the wishes of all the higher and better order of men. Thence it was that the legislation was so joyfully received. No one suspected anything false, because it contained so much weight and truth. If we examine carefully these invented decretals, and try to characterize their composer in accordance with their general effort and spirit, we must confess that he was a very learned man, perhaps the most learned man of his time, and at the same time an extremely intelligent and wise man who knew his age and its wants as few did. Rightly he perceived that he must exalt the power of the centre — that is, of the pope — because in that way only was deliverance possible. Nay, if we would pass an unconstrained judgment, we may venture even to call him a great man’” (**Catholic Dictionary**, Addis and Arnold, page 334).

Rome praised a forger as a great man? This is very irregular, suspicious and anomalous.

3. These forgeries were accepted in those times because of great ignorance and criticism, was neither provided nor encouraged.

“In an age of great ignorance, when criticism was neither in favor nor provided with means, it is not wonderful that this collection, which invested with the spurious authority of recorded decisions a system of things existing traditionally, indeed, but liable to constant opposition, passed speedily into general recognition and acceptance. Six centuries passed before it was discovered that these Pseudo-Isidorean or False Decretals, as they are now called, were to great extent a forgery” (**Catholic Dictionary**, Addis and Arnold, pages 101,102).

Rome was able to deceive men for so long because people were ignorant.

The Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals Classified and Exposed

In the **Catholic Encyclopedia**, these forgeries are classified under three headings:

A. List of 60 apocryphal letters attributed to the popes from St. Clement (88-97) to Melchiades (311-314) inclusive.

B. A treatise on the Primitive Church and on the Council of Nicea, written by Isidore and followed by the authentic canons of 54 councils. It should be remarked, however, that among the canons of the second Council of Seville (page 438), Canon VII is an interpolation aimed against the chorepiscopi.

C. The letters mainly of 33 popes, from Silvester (314-335) to Gregory II (715-731). Of those, 30 letters are forgeries while all others are authentic (**Catholic Encyclopedia**, Volume V, page 773).

Dupin, a Catholic theologian, examined these forgeries and proved every single one of them to be lies and impostures. He examined the whole series with learning and candor, showing every single one of them carries unequivocal signs of lying and imposture. To these pages let the student refer, therefore I follow him in the following enumeration of the frauds he calmly exposes with searching logic.

1. St. Clement to St. James the Lord's brother — plain spurious.
2. The Second Epistle of Clement to the same — equally spurious.
3. St. Clement to all suffregan bishops, priests, deacons, and others of the clergy: To all princes great and small and to all the faithful.

Dupin remarks: "This very title suffices to prove the forgery, as in the days of St. Clement there were no 'princesses great or small' in the Church. He adds that it speaks of 'subdeacons,' an order not then existing, and that it is patched up from scraps of the apocryphal recognitions."

4. A Fourth Letter of the same. It is self-refuted for the same reasons. Equally a forgery.
5. The Fifth Letter to St. James to St. Clement, Bishop of Rome and successor of St. Peter. "But," says Dupin, "as St. James died before St. Peter, it necessarily follows that this epistle cannot have been by St. Clement." Further, "We have one genuine epistle of St. Clement, the style of which is different from that of these decretals."
6. The Epistle of Anacletus — Barbarous, full of solecisms and falsehoods.
7. A Second Epistle of Anacletus — Filled with passages out of the authors who lived long after times of Anacletus.
8. A Third Letter of Anacletus — Spurious for the same reason.
9. An Epistle of Evaristus — Patched up out of writings of Innocent in the fifth century, dated under consuls not contemporaries of the alleged writer.
10. A Second Epistle of the Same — Stuffed with patchwork of centuries.
11. An Epistle of Alexander — Contains passages from at least one author of the eighth century.
12. A Second Epistle of Alexander — Refers to the Council of Laodicea which was held (A.D. 365) after Alexander was dead.
13. A Third Epistle of Alexander — Quotes an author of the fifth century.
14. An Epistle of Xystus — Dated under consul that lived in another age and quotes authors of centuries later than his own day.

15. A Second Epistle of Xystus — Subject to the same objections, anachronisms, etc.
16. An Epistle of Telesphorus — False dates, patched from subsequent authors, etc.
17. An Epistle of Hyginus — Anachronisms, etc.
18. A Second Epistle of Hyginus — Stuffed with anachronisms, falsely dated by consuls not of his age.
19. An Epistle of Pius I — Full of absurdities and quotes “the Theodosian Code”!
20. A Second Epistle of Pius I — It is addressed to Justus, Bishop of Vienna. Bad Latin, and wholly unknown to antiquity, though Baronius has tried to sustain it.
21. A Third Epistle of Pius I — Addressed to Justus, Bishop of Vienna. False for the same reason.
22. An Epistle of Soter — Dated under consuls who lived before Soter was Bishop of Rome. Names, titles, and the like, unheard of till later ages.
23. A Second Letter of Soter — Speaks of ‘monks,’ ‘palls,’ and other things of later times; is patched out writings of subsequent ages and dated under consuls not of his contemporaries.
24. An Epistle of Eleutherus — Subject to like objections.
25. A Second Epistle of Eleutherus — Anachronisms.
26. A Third Letter of Eleutherus — Addressed to Disederius, Bishop of Vienna. There was no bishop till the sixth century.
27. A Fourth Letter, etc. — Quotes later authors and is

disproved by its style.

28. An Epistle of Zephyrinus — Little importance to be attached to anything from such a source; but Dupin (who lived before his bad character came to light in the writings of Hippolytus) convicts it of ignorance and shows that it is a patchwork of later ideas and writers.
29. A Second Letter — “Yet more plainly an imposture,” says Dupin.
30. An Epistle of St. Callistus — What sort of a “saint” he was, our readers are already informed. This epistle is like the preceding one of Zephyrinus.
31. A Second Epistle of Callistus — Quotes from writings of the eighth century.
32. An Epistle of Urban — Quotes from the vulgate, the Theodosian Code and Gregory the Fourth.
33. An Epistle of Pontianus — Anachronism.
34. A Second Epistle, etc. — Barbarous and impossible.
35. An Epistle of Anterus — Equally impossible; stuffed with anachronism.
36. An Epistle of Fabianus — Contradicts the facts of history touching Cyprian, Cornelius and Novatus.
37. A Second Epistle, etc. — Self-refuted by its monstrous details of mistake and the like.
38. A Third Epistle, etc. — Quotes author of the sixth century.
39. An Epistle of Cornelius — Contradicts historical facts, etc.
40. A Second Epistle, etc. — Equally full of blunders. “But nothing,” says Dupin, “shows the imposture of these letters more papably than the difference of 67

styles from those truly ascribed to Cornelius in Cyprian's works."

41. A Third Letter of Cornelius — Equally false on its face. Dupin, with his usual candor, remarks: "We find it in the word 'Mass,' which was unknown to the contemporaries of Cornelius."
42. An Epistle of Lucius — It is dated six months before he became Bishop of Rome, and quotes authors who lived after he was dead.
43. An Epistle of Stephen — Filled with citations out of subsequent authors.
44. A Second Epistle of Stephen — Open to the like objection; it does not harmonize with the times to which it is referred.

Dupin winds up his view as follows:

"For like reasons, we must pass judgment in like manner, on two Epistles of Sixtus II, the two Epistles of Dionysius, the three of St. Felix, the two of Eutychianus; one of Cainus, two of Marcellus, the three of Eusebius, those of Miltiades, and the rest of Isidore's collection. They are full of passages out of fathers, popes, and councils, more modern than the very popes by whom they are pretended to be written. In them are many things that clash with the known history of those times, and were purposely framed to favor the court of Rome, and to sustain her pretensions against the rights of bishops and the liberties of churches. But it would take up too much time to show the gross falsehood of these monuments. They are rejected by common consent, and even by those authors who are most favorable to the court of Rome,

who are obliged to abandon the patronage of these epistles, though they have done a great deal of service in developing the greatness of the court of Rome, and ruining the ancient discipline of the Church, especially with the reference to the rights of bishops and ecclesiastical decisions” (**The Ante-Nicene Fathers**, Volume VIII, pages 605-607, Editors: Alexander Roberts, D.D. and Donalds, LL.D.).

The Origin of These False Decretals

A. The Date — Ninth Century: “These False Decretals, or Pseudo-Isidore Decretals, were published about the ninth century by an unknown author signing himself Isidore Mercator, purported to be a collection of decretals and decisions by the church councils” (**The New Funk and Wagnalls**, Volume X, page 3545).

“Most scholars maintain that the forgery dates back from the pontificates of Zachary (741-752), Stephen II (752-757), and Paul I (756-767)” (**Catholic Encyclopedia For Schools And Homes**, Volume III, pages 557,558).

B. The Place of Origin — Region of Rheims: “The Isidorean Decretals is supposed to originate from the region of Rheims, and was compiled between 829-845. The compiler of these forgeries chose to call himself Isidore Mercator” (**Catholic Dictionary**, by Addis and Arnold, page 333).

C. The Authorship — Unknown: In regard to the authorship of the False Decretals, Dean Milman says:

“The author or authors of this most audacious and elaborate of pious frauds are unknown; the date and place of its compilation are driven into such narrow limits that they may be determined within a few years, and within a very circumscribed region. The False Decretals came not from Rome. The time of their arrival at Rome, after they were known beyond the Alps, appears almost certain. In one year Nicholas I is apparently ignorant of their existence; the next he speaks of them with full knowledge. They contain words manifestly used at the council of Paris, A.D. 829, consequently of later date. They were known to the Levite Benedict of Mentz, who composed a supplement to the collection of capitularies by Ansegise, between A.D. 840-847. The City of Mentz is designated with nearly equal certainty as the place in which, if not actually composed, they were first promulgated as the canon law of Christendom” (**History of Latin Christianity**, Volume III, page 193; quoted from **Ante-Nicene Fathers**, Volume VIII, page 607).

The forgery was exposed by Laurentius Valla in 1440 but was not completely disproved until the end of the 18th century.

“Its authenticity was first seriously attacked by the Italian Humanist Laurentius Valla in 1440, but was not completely disproved until the end of the 18th century. Since that time the document has been universally admitted to be a forgery” (**The New Funk and Wagnalls Encyclopedia**, page 13824).

This means that for a thousand years the False Decretals were used by popes, theologians and councils as if they were genuine letters in support of the pretensions of the Roman Church. For a thousand years the Church of Rome, which claimed to be holy and apostolic, used forgeries to bolster its claims, and for a thousand years a church which claimed to be infallible was deceived and deceived millions. Is this the kind of holiness and infallibility the Church of Rome is boasting? This is not according to the Scriptures.

These Forgeries Were Invoked by Popes, Councils and Theologians.

Dupin (a Catholic historian and theologian) in his letter to his co-religionist, Cardinal Manning, wrote as follows:

“Is it credible that the papacy should have so often appealed to these forgeries for its extended claims, had it any better authorities — distinctive authorities — to fall back upon? Every disputant on Latin side finds in these forgeries a convincing argument against the Greeks. ‘To prove this the universal jurisdiction of the pope,’ said Abbot Barlaam, himself converted by them from the Greek Church, to convert his countrymen, ‘one only need look through the decretal epistle of the Roman pontiffs from St. Clement to Sylvester.’ In the twenty-fifth session of the Council of Florence the provincial of the Dominicans is ordered to address the Greeks on the rights of the pope, the pope being present. Twice he argues from the Pseudo-decretal of St. Anacletus, at another time from a synodical letter of St. Athanasius to Felix, at another time from a letter of Julius to the Easter, all

forgeries....” He said that, ‘these decretals epistles of the popes, being synodical epistles in each case, are entitled to the same authority as the Canon themselves.’ Can we need further evidence of the weight attached to them on the Latin side?” (**The Ante-Nicene Fathers**, Volume VIII, pages 603,604).

“Popes appealed to them in their official capacity” (**The Ante-Nicene Fathers**, Volume VIII, page 604).

1. Pope Nicholas was the first pope to utilize the False Decretals to his advantage. “He found the Decretals made to his hand by some impostor and saw a benighted age ready to accept his assumptions. He therefore used them and passed them into the organic canon law of the West” (**The Ante-Nicene Fathers**, Volume VIII, page 603).

“Then finally in the ninth century Nicholas I imposed the ban of anathema on anyone who failed to observe a doctrinal or disciplinary decision of the Pope, set himself up as the Lord of the whole earth, and did not even shrink from declaring that the most scandalous forgeries on church history, the Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals, a very recent work of Frankish forgery which had been handed over to him, had been preserved from earliest times in the Roman archives and were binding and fundamental part of ecclesiastical law” (Hans Kung, **The Church**, pages 593,594).

“What wonder, then, that he deceived the popes also when his work was carried to Rome by Rothade of Soissons about the summer of 864. It is true that Nicholas I erred against

truthfulness; that he pretended that the Isidorean texts were contained in the archives of the Roman Church, an assertion not only inexact but untruthful” (**Catholic Encyclopedia**, Volume V, page 778).

“Hence we see that if Nicholas I made use of the apocrypha to justify his teaching on appeals to Rome, we must necessarily admit that he relied on a forged document” (page 778).

“It was to his interest to quote the authority of the false decretals, and he did not fail to do so. This is proved by a letter written by Nicholas I on 22 January, 865, dealing with Rothade’s appeal” (page 778).

The **Catholic Encyclopedia** also admitted that the popes were benefited by these forgeries. “It must be admitted that the popes were benefited by these forgeries, their good faith is beyond question” (Volume V, page 778). Did Pope Nicholas I use these False Decretals in good faith when he lied about their history? Is the author of the **Catholic Encyclopedia** trying to tell us that the “good faith” of the popes has sanctified the “falsehood of these decretals?” How could infallible popes be deceived? Is good faith enough reason to excuse the popes for utilizing these shameless forgeries in order to advance their unscriptural claims?

2. Pope Leo IX (1049-1054) appealed to the Pseudo-Donation in the prolix epistle by him, or in his name to Michael Cerularius, patriarch of Constantinople, on the eve of the schism” (**The Ante-Nicene Fathers**, Volume VIII, page 604).

3. Pope Engenius IV (1431-1447) appeals to the Pseudo-Decretals of St. Alexander and Julius during the negotiations for healing the schism in his instruction to the Armenians” (Ibid, page 604).

4. Pope Adrian II (867-872), according to the **Catholic Encyclopedia**, also used the forgeries (Volume V, page 778). He was a married pope (Volume I, page 56).

5. Pope Damascus II (1048) was pope for only 23 days, yet in so short a time he also used the false decretals (**Catholic Encyclopedia**, Volume V, page 778).

6. Pope Gregory VII (1073-1085), according to many Catholic authorities Gregory VII used the false decretals and even invented his own documents to bolster his own power. The **Catholic Encyclopedia** said that he used the false decretals freely to support his presumptuous claims (Volume V, page 779), which Williston Walker said were “impracticable and unchristian” claims (**A History of the Christian Church**, page 208).

Hans Kung, a Catholic author and theologian, said: “Gregory VII relied on these and similar statements for monarchical conception of the Church, which in fact represented a new Church constitution; then in the first half of the thirteenth century Gratian, founder of the science of canon law, produced his law book which was basic for later times, including the 1918 Code of Canon. In 324 passages from popes of the first four centuries cited, 313 of them proved forgeries” (**Infallible? An Inquiry**, pages 103,104).

Peter de Rosa, a Jesuit priest, said concerning Gregory VII: "It is hard to know whether he was aware that most of his theses were based on forged documents. The least that can be said is that his credulity was alarming, especially in view of what the New Testament reports about St. Peter's mistakes. These forgeries made it seem that his absolutist claims were based on ancient records zealously kept in the Rome archives" (**Vicars of Christ The Dark Side of the Papacy** , page 80).

GREGORY VII HAD A SCHOOL OF FORGERS:

"Gregory went beyond the Donation of Constantine. He had a whole school of forgers under his very nose, turning out document after document, with the papal seal of approval, to cater for his every need."

The leaders of the school were Anselm of Lucca, nephew of the previous pontiff, Cardinal Deusdedit and, after them, Cardinal Gregory of Pavia. Pope Gregory (and later, Urban II) might require justification for some action against a prince or a bishop. Very well, these prelates literally produced the appropriate document. No need for research; it was all done on the premises.

Many earlier documents were touched up to make them say the opposite of what they said originally. Some of these earlier documents were themselves forgeries. Hildebrand's school treated all papers, forged or genuine, with a completely impartial dishonesty.

This instant method of inventing history was marvelously successful, especially as the forgeries were at once inserted into

canon law. By innumerable subtle changes they made Catholicism seem changeless. They turned “today” into “always was and always will be,” which even now, contrary to findings of history, is the peculiar stamp of Catholicism. Thus was accomplished the quietest and longest-lasting of all revolutions: it was all done on paper. It would not have worked in the era of universal literacy, printing, photocopying and carbon dating; it worked without a hitch in an age of rare manuscripts, inept scholarship and when even some emperors could not read and write.

Looking ahead for a moment, the documents forged in Rome at this time were systematized in the mid-1100s at Bologna by Gratian, a Benedictine monk. His **Decretum**, or Code of Canon Law, was easily the most influential book ever written by a Catholic. It was peppered with three centuries of forgeries and conclusions drawn from them, with his own fictional additions. Of the 324 passages he quotes from popes of the first four centuries, only eleven are genuine.

Among his personal additions was a series of canons treating all excommunicated persons as heretics. This was alarming in view of the way heretics were treated. Urban II had decreed at the end of the eleventh century that they were to be tortured and killed.

Gratian remarkably invented a way to extend papal power. The pope, he declared to Rome’s approval, is superior to and the source of all laws **without qualification**. He must, therefore, stand on an equality with the Son of God. This apotheosis became the inspiration of the Curia which acted in the pope’s name. Every pen-pusher was, in some sense, a god.

Looking further ahead to the thirteenth century, the decretum was Thomas Aquinas' source book for quotes from the fathers and the popes when he came to write his masterly **Summa Theologica**, the second most renowned work by a Catholic." (**Vicars of Christ The Dark Side of the Papacy**, pages 80-83)

7. Urban II (1088-1099) bolstered his pretended claims with an immense forgery, "The Donation of Constantine" (**Catholic Encyclopedia**, Volume V, page 121).

8. Alexander III (1159-1181) approved as authentic the great forgery, "The False Decretals" (Ayinhac, **General Legislation in the New Testament Code**, Imprimatur: Arthur Scanlan, page 34; quoted by O. C. Lambert's **Catholicism Against Itself**, Volume II, page 151).

9. Innocent II (1198-1216) also used the great forgery, "The Donation of Constantine" (**Catholic Encyclopedia**, Volume V, page 121).

10. Gregory IX (1227-1241) also used the forgery, "The Donation of Constantine" (**Catholic Encyclopedia**, Volume V, page 121).

11. Boniface VIII (1294-1303) used a bull, known as **Bull Unam Sanctam**, which states that to be subject to the Roman Pontiff is necessary for salvation. "All these chapters culminate in the statement apparently given a dogmatic formulation for the first time by Thomas and then bluntly defined by Boniface VIII in the Bull Unam Sanctam" On this article too, which is fundamental for the papal teaching authority, Aquinas relied on forged

quotations from Cyril's *Liber Thesaurorum*. It is explicable that Thomas quoted from Libellus just those sentences which were suitable for the substantiation of his statements on the primacy; from what has been said, however, it is clear that they are mostly sentences which had either been forged or interpolated through forgeries.

“These theses resting on forgeries Thomas then takes over in the *Summa Theologiae*, where they really do begin to make history. His minor premise is documented only from a text in the *Decretals*, which again is based on the *Pseudo-Isidore* forgeries already mentioned and in no way corresponds to the historical truth” (***Infallible? An Inquiry***, page 105).

12. Symmachus (498-514). During the dispute with Laurentius, anti-pope, the adherents of Symmachus drew up four apocryphal writings called *Symmachus Forgeries*. The object of these was to produce alleged instances from earlier times to support the whole procedure of the adherents of Symmachus and in particular, the position that the Roman bishop could not be judged by any court composed of other bishops. Still these forgeries are not the first documents to maintain this later tenet (***Catholic Encyclopedia***, Volume XIV, page 378).

13. Adrian I (772-795). “The Second Nicene Council, the Seventh General, met under Tarasius. Besides defining the veneration due to holy images, the Council published the twenty-two canons in which the so-called **Apostolic Canons** and the ecumenical character of the Council of Trullo were recognized” (***Catholic Dictionary***, page 609).

14. Innocent III (1198-1216) also used the great forgery, Donation of Constantine (**Catholic Encyclopedia**, Volume V, page 121).

15. **The Catechism of the Council of Trent** quoted these forgeries.

Dupin, in his letter to Cardinal Manning, continued his remarks concerning these decretals: “But why, my Lord, need I travel any further for proofs, when in the Catechism of the Council of Trent, that has been for three centuries the accredited instructor of the clergy themselves recommended authoritatively by so many Popes, notwithstanding the real value of these miserable impostures had been for three hundred years before the world, I find these words: ‘On the primacy of the Supreme Pontiff, see the third epistle (that is, pseudo-decretal) of Anacletus’” (**The Ante-Cicene Fathers**, Volume VIII, page 604; see **Vicars of Christ**, page 83).

16. The Sacrament of the Confirmation was based on the authority of the forged decretals attributed to the Roman Pontiff authority Fabian (**The Ante-Nicene Fathers**, Volume VIII, page 604).

We have already pointed out that even Cardinal Gibbons still used the alleged Donation of Constantine to support the claims of the Catholic Church.

Dupin, in his letter to Cardinal Manning made similar complaints. He wrote, “Strange phenomenon, indeed, that the observations of such authorities should still be ordered to be taught as

gospel from our pulpits in these days, when everybody that is acquainted with the merest rudiments of ecclesiastical history knows how absolutely, how unauthenticated, they are in point of fact, and how unquestionable the authorities cited to prove them forgeries.

“Absolutely, my Lord, with such evidence before me, I am unable to resist the inference that truthfulness is not one of the strongest characteristics of the teaching of even the modern Church of Rome; for is not this case a palpably where its highest living authorities are both indifferent to having forgeries, after their defection as such, adduced from the pulpit to authenticate facts?” (**The Ante-Nicene Fathers**, Volume VIII, page 604).

17. The First Council of Vatican (1870) based its decree on Papal Infallibility on the forgeries. It is interesting to note that the Dogma of Papal Infallibility was based from these shameless forgeries.

“In the second place, it speaks ill for the Vatican decrees that the possibility of their promulgation grew out of the most shameless forgeries. A majority of the bishops in the Ultramontane (those who favored the doctrine of Papal Infallibility) school were intellectually victims of these forgeries. Manifold inferences from the spurious and falsified documents had been filtered into subsequent literature. Not only this: portions of these venerable lies had kept their place in books which were the daily food of the bishops, especially in the Latin nations. Out of twenty passages quoted by Melchior Cano from earlier popes, on the privileges of

the Holy See, eighteen were taken from the false decretals, and two spurious letters attributed to Athanasius were also cited. Then came Bellarmin, who drew from the same sources, and then the uncritical Liguori, who was content to build on these predecessors, and actually appropriated to his use the whole list of false passages adduced by Cano. As Liguori, a canonized saint, was a writer held in extraordinary repute where the high papal theories prevailed, it is easy to see that the daily fare of the bishops in a large section of the church was plentifully seasoned with falsehoods” (**History of the Christian Church**, Henry Sheldon, Volume V, pages 94, 95).

Hans Kung also proved in his book, **Infallible? An Inquiry**, that Thomas Aquinas relied much on forgeries in his *Summa Theologiae*, in his dogmatic teaching concerning the authority, primacy and infallibility of the popes.

The theses of Aquinas became the basis of the doctrine of the Papal Infallibility today. And in addition to these, these forgeries are still a part of the present Canon Laws of the Catholic Church. Hans Kung said that the entire Canon Laws of the Roman Church must be overhauled if ever a meaningful change within the church is desired. “Much can be achieved by the bold initiatives of individuals. Decisive changes can, however, only be brought about by a radical reform of canon law, and this in turn will require a complete overhaul of the individual articles which have found their way from forgeries into official canon law” (**The Church**, page 608; Imprimatur: Patrick Casey Vicar General).

The Roman Church Has No Better Authorities to Support their Claims.

If the Roman Church is indeed the true Church that Jesus built, why did she use forgeries to support her claims? Were there no better authorities that she could cite? Is the truth not enough? Did not Christ promise His apostles all truth?

Dupin asked: “Is it credible that the papacy should have so often appealed to these forgeries for its extended claims, had it any better authorities — distinctive authorities — to fall back on? Every disputant on the Latin side finds in these forgeries a convincing argument against the Greek” (**The Ante-Nicene Fathers**, Vol. VIII, page 603).

The answer to Dupin’s question is clear. There were none! There were absolutely no reliable and authentic scriptural authorities to back up the claims of the Roman bishops. None at all!

Some Concluding Observations:

1. The **Catholic Encyclopedia** said, “These forgeries blurred the whole historical perspective” (Volume V, page 779). Hans Kung also made the same observation: “These forgeries destroyed all sense of the historical development of institutions and created the impression that the Church in the earliest times had already been ruled in detail by papal decrees: an image of the church and law of the church that appears to be concentrated wholly on the Roman authority” (**Infallibility? An Inquiry**, page 103).

2. As we have already demonstrated, these forgeries became useful tools in the hands of the Roman popes to bolster their unscriptural claims to power and supremacy.

3. These forgeries clearly show that the so-called “apostolic traditions” of the Roman Catholic Church are nothing but man-made laws based on lies.

4. The use of the forgeries proves that the popes are not infallible, because the **Catholic Encyclopedia** said the popes were deceived by the forgeries: “What wonder, then, that he deceived the popes also, when his work was carried to Rome by Rothade of Soissons about the summer of 864? Is it true that Nicholas erred against truthfulness; that he pretended that the Isidorean texts were contained in the archives of the Roman Church, an assertion not only inexact but untruthful?” (Volume V, page 778).

Apostle Paul speaks of “deceivers being deceived.” Paul said, “*But evil men and impostors will grow worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived*” (2 Timothy 3:13).

According to Hans Kung, the meaning of “infallible” means, “can neither deceive nor be deceived. Free from what is deceptive, from lying and fraud” (**Infallible? An Inquiry**, page 125). But here we have seen that the popes were deceived by the forger and they, in turn, deceived their members and their rivals.

5. We have also seen that these forgeries are still being used even after they were discovered and proved to be forgeries. And the fact is, they are still very much a part of the present Canon Laws of the Roman Church.

6. Truth is the very essence of Christianity. God is the God of truth. Christ is the way, the truth and the life. He is, in fact, the embodiment of truth. The Spirit is the Spirit of truth. The word of God is the word of truth. Any religion, therefore, that uses falsehood and lies to promote its cause cannot possibly be the true church of Christ. We have seen that the Roman Catholic Church has admitted using forgeries and lies to promote and enhance the power of the bishop of Rome. These forgeries are still part of the Canon Laws of the present system of the Roman Catholic Church. Therefore, the Roman Catholic Church is not the true church founded by Christ.

Conclusion

Our study and investigation of the doctrines and practices of the Roman Catholic Church have demonstrated that Roman Catholicism has fallen far below her vaunted claims and from the teachings of the Holy Scripture which is the infallible and inspired divine standard.

We have compared her teachings with the Bible and allowed her to speak for herself, by directly quoting from her authorized books. Point-by-point, we have shown with clarity and fairness that Romanism speaks a different language from that of the inspired apostles and holy prophets. We have seen that the doctrines and practices of Roman Catholicism plainly and directly contradict the teachings of God, introduced many new teachings based on human opinions and has manufactured false apostolic traditions which have made the word of God void and of no effect for Catholics (Matthew 15:3-13).

It is therefore plain and clear that the Roman Catholic Church is not the true church founded by Christ because her teachings are not identical with the original teachings of the apostles. We have seen that her teachings are directly opposed to the teachings of our Lord Jesus Christ in many aspects.

Far from being the true apostolic church, she is in fact an apostate church, the enemy of the truth, because all the marks of apostasy are so deeply engraved on her forehead (1 Timothy 4:1-13; Acts 20:28,29).

Our Lord Jesus Christ said, *“Every plant which My heavenly Father has not planted will be uprooted”* (Matthew 15:13). In the context, our Lord Jesus Christ is talking about doctrines and traditions taught by men, declaring that they will be destroyed.

No wonder, then, that the Roman Catholic church has tried to undermine the authority of the Scriptures and to keep its members from reading the Bible. It is through the knowledge of the Bible that men will discover the errors of Romanism, and eventually be freed from its clutches. The best weapon against any human error is a thorough knowledge of the Bible. Jesus said, *“And you shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free”* (John 8:32).

Fearing this exposure by truth in the past centuries, the Roman Catholic Church has tried to keep the Bible from its ordinary members, depriving them of the freedom to read it. Pope Clement XI in his Papal Bull Unigenitus, condemned the proposition that “the reading of the Scripture is for all” (**Catholic**

Dictionary, Addis and Arnold, and **History of the Christian Church**, Henry Sheldon, Volume V, page 418).

“The Councils of Toulouse (1229) and Tarragona (1234) forbade the laity to read the vernacular translations of the Bible. Pius IV required the bishops to refuse lay persons leave to read even Catholic versions of the Scripture, unless their confessors or parish priests judged that such reading was likely to prove beneficial” (**Catholic Dictionary**, page 78).

For many centuries the Bible was a chained book in the church of Rome, written in a language which only the priests could understand. However, men with bolder spirits translated the Bible into the language common of the time. By doing this, the minds of the people were opened and enlightened and were finally liberated from the errors of Roman Catholicism.

King David said, *“The unfolding of thy words gives light; it imparts understanding to the simple”* (Psalm 119:130).