

Roman Catholicism

Table of Contents

I. THE PRIESTHOOD	1
II. PETER	4
III. THE PAPACY	8
IV. MARY	10
V. THE MASS	18
VI. THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE	25
VII. BY WHAT MORAL STANDARD?	27
CONCLUSION	29

Study Questions For Roman Catholicism.....33 - 34

Additional Outlines in the back.

REQUIREMENTS FOR THIS BLOCK:

1. **Read all the material** for this block.
2. **Look up and read all the verses** in the material as you read through the material.
3. **Fill in the answers** to your **STUDY QUESTIONS** ahead of time so you will be better prepared for the EXAM during the final hour.
4. **T-H-I-N-K** as you read this material. **It will be a blessing to you.**
It will also change your life.

Roman Catholicism

I. THE PRIESTHOOD

A. The Office of the Priest.

In the Old Testament the work of Christ was prefigured under the three offices of prophet, priest, and king. Each of these was given special prominence in the nation of Israel. Each was designed to set forth a particular phase of the work of the coming Redeemer, and each was filled by those who were divinely called to the work.

The prophet was appointed to be God's spokesman to the people, revealing to them His will and purpose for their salvation. The priest was appointed to represent the people before God, to offer sacrifices for them and to intercede with God on their behalf. And the king was appointed to rule over the people, to defend them and to restrain and conquer all His and their enemies.

The essential idea of a priest is that of a mediator between God and man. In his fallen estate man is a sinner, guilty before God, and alienated from Him. He has no right of approach to God. He is, therefore, helpless until someone undertakes to act as his representative before God.

In ancient Israel the priests performed three primary duties: (1) they ministered at the sanctuary before God, offering sacrifices to Him in behalf of the people, (2) they taught the people the law of God; and (3) they inquired for the people concerning the divine will. Under the old covenant the men who held the offices of prophet, priest, or king were only shadows or types of Christ who was to come. With His coming each of these offices found its fulfilment in Him. And with the accomplishment of His work of redemption each of these offices, as it functioned on the human level, reached its fulfilment and was abolished. As regards the priesthood, Christ alone is now our Priest, our one and only High Priest. He fulfils that office in that He once offered up Himself a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice, thereby making unnecessary and putting an end to all other sacrifices.

All of this is clearly set forth in Hebrews 9: "Christ having come a high priest ..." (Read vs. 11, 12, 14, 24, 26). In Heb. 8:1, 2 it says that "We have such a high priest, who sat down on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens ..."

In accordance with this N.T. change in the priesthood, through which the old order of ritual and sacrifice which prefigured the atoning work of Christ has been fulfilled and Christ alone has become our true High Priest, the human priesthood as a distinct and separate order of men has fulfilled its function and has been abolished. Furthermore, all born again believers, having now been given the right of access to God through Christ their Saviour, and being able to go directly to God in prayer and so to intercede for themselves and others, themselves become priests of God. For these are the functions of a priest. This we term the universal priesthood of believers. And this is the distinctive feature of Protestantism (and Baptists too) as regards the doctrine of the priesthood.

"Ye also," says Peter, "as living stones are built up a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood ... " (read 1 Peter 2:5, 9). In making that statement Peter was not addressing a priestly caste, but all true believers, as is shown by the fact that his epistle was addressed to Jewish Christians of the Dispersion (1:1), even to those are as "new-born babes" in the faith (2:2). In Rev. 1:5, 6 John says" ... made us to be a kingdom, to be priests unto his God and Father."

The sacrifices offered by the Christian are termed "spiritual", and they relate to worship and service:

- (1) **the sacrifice of praise, Heb. 13:15**
- (2) **the sacrifice offered through our gifts, Heb. 13:16**
- (3) **the sacrifice of ourselves, our bodies, our lives, Rom. 12:1, 2.**

Thus the N.T. sets forth a new and different kind of priesthood: first, Christ, the true High Priest, who is in heaven; and second, the universal priesthood of believers, through which

Roman Catholicism

they offer the "spiritual" sacrifices of praise, of gifts, and of themselves in Christian service.

Every believer now has the inexpressibly high privilege of going directly to God in prayer, without the mediation of any earthly priest, and of interceding for himself and for others. (Matt. 7:7; John 16:23; Acts 2:21).

Yet Rome would rob us of this privilege and would interpose her priests and dead saints between the soul and God. Rome's teaching and practice is heresy.

The Bible teaches that, "There is one God and one mediator between God and men, the man Jesus Christ" (1 Tim. 2:5). The church of Rome teaches that there are many mediators, the priests, Mary, a host of saints, and the angels. And that it is right and proper to pray to them. But to any honest priest in the church of Rome it must become more and more apparent that Christ is the only true Priest, the only true Mediator, and that in serving as a priest, in pretending to offer the sacrifice of the mass and to forgive sins, he is merely acting the part of an impostor.

B. No New Testament Authority for a Human Priesthood.

In the N.T. we are taught that the priesthood, along with the other elements of the old dispensation, including the sacrificial system, the ritual, the Levitical law, the temple, etc., has served its purpose and has passed away. It is very inconsistent for the Roman church to retain the priesthood while discarding the other elements of that system.

Paul enumerates the different kinds of ministers and agents in the Christian church, and the office of priest is not among them. (Eph. 4:11; 1 Cor. 12:28). The only mediatorial priesthood recognized in the N.T. is that of Christ, the great High Priest, and to Him alone is the title "priest" (*hiereus*) given. (Heb. 7:17, 24-27; 10:14).

In the epistle to the Hebrews several chapters are devoted to showing that the O.T. priesthood has been abolished (9:12; 10:12; 9:26; 10:10).

The sacrifice of Christ was therefore a "once-for-all" sacrifice which only He could make, and which cannot be repeated. By its very nature it was final and complete. It was a work of Deity, and so cannot be repeated by man any more than can the work of creation. Let all men now look to that one sacrifice on Calvary. Any continuing priesthood and any "unbloody repetition of the mass," which professes to offer the same sacrifice that Christ offered on Calvary, is in reality merely a sham.

The abolition of the priestly caste which through the old dispensation stood between God and man was dramatically illustrated at the very moment that Christ died on the cross. When He cried, "It is finished", a strange sound filled the temple as the veil that separated the sanctuary from the holy of holies was torn from top to bottom. The ministering priests found themselves gazing at the torn veil with wondering eyes, for God's own hand had removed the curtain and had opened the way into the holy of holies, symbolizing by that act that no longer did man have to approach Him through the mediation of a priest, but that the way of access to Him is now open to all.

Hence the continuing priesthood in the church of Rome is absolutely unscriptural and unchristian. It owes its existence solely to a man-made development that can be traced in detail in the history of the church, for it was not until the third or fourth century that priests began to appear in the church. But papal dominance has been built up on that practice and is dependent on its continuance. Without an hierarchical priesthood the papal system would immediately disintegrate.

The apostle Peter, far from making himself a priest or a pope, was content to call himself one of the many elders, a *presbuteros*. And he specifically warned the elders against that most glaring error of the Roman Catholic priests, lording it over the charges given to them. He rather urged that they serve as examples to the flock (1 Pet. 5:1-3).

Roman Catholicism

But the doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers is not merely a negative teaching abolishing an order of clergy. For along with that freedom which makes the believer responsible only to God for his faith and life, there is an added responsibility (1 Pet. 2:9). As Christians, then we are not laymen, nor mere spectators of the Christian enterprise who may or may not engage in it as we choose, but "priests", and therefore responsible to God for the faith and lives of others. We are under obligation to make known this message of salvation. This priesthood applies to all believers, and consists of two things:

(1) Immediate access to God in prayer for one's self; and (2) The right and duty of intercession for others.

C. The Claims of the Roman Priesthood.

The Council of Trent, whose decrees must be accepted by all Roman Catholics under pain of mortal sin or excommunication, says:

"The priest is the man of God, the minister of God ... He that despiseth the priest despiseth God; he that hears him hears God. The priest remits sins as God, and that which he calls his body at the altar is adorned as God by himself and by the congregation ... It is clear that their function is such that none greater can be conceived. Wherefore they are justly called not only angels, but also God, holding as they do among us the power and authority of the immortal God".

In a similar vein a Roman Catholic book, carrying the imprimatur of the **Archbishop of Ottawa, Canada**, says:

"Without the priest the death and passion of our Lord would be of no avail to us. See the power of the priest. By one word from his lips he changes a piece of bread into a God. A greater fact than the creation of a world. If I were to meet a priest and an angel, I would salute the priest before saluting the angel. The priest holds the place of God."

To millions of Christians who are outside the Roman Church such words are blasphemy.

The titles of "archbishop," "cardinal" ("prince of the church," as they like to be called), and "pope" are not even in the Bible. The term "bishop" *episcopos* and "elder" *presbyteros* were used interchangeably.

Christ bade His followers practice humility, acknowledge one another as equals, and serve one another (Matt. 20:25-28; 1 Pet. 5:3; 2 Cor. 4:5). But Rome denies this equality and sets up the priest as a dictator belonging to a sacred order, altogether apart from and superior to the people of the parish. **The loyal Roman Catholic** must heed what the priest says.

Romanism puts the priest between the Christian believer and the knowledge of God as revealed in the Scriptures, and makes him the sole interpreter of truth. It puts the priest between the confession of sins and the forgiveness of sins. It carries this interposition through to the last hour, in which the priest, in the sacrament of extreme unction, stands between the soul and eternity, and even after death the release of the soul from purgatory and its entrance into heavenly joy is still dependent on the priest's prayers which must be paid for by relatives or friends.

No matter what the moral character of a priest, his prayers and his ministrations are declared to be valid and efficacious because he is in holy orders. The Council of Trent has declared that, "Even those priests who are living in mortal sin exercise the same function of forgiving sins as ministers of Christ."

In our method of choosing a minister, which we believe is in harmony with the teaching of Scripture and practice of the early church, we choose a man not because he is of a superior order, but because of our belief that he is capable of ministering the things of the Spirit to his fellow men and because we believe he will live an honest, humble, sincere, and upright life. Ordinarily the minister marries and dwells in a family because this is the natural state of man, and hence he is closer to his people than is the celibate priest. He is chosen by the people, not, however, to govern according to the will of the

Roman Catholicism

people, but according to the will of Christ as revealed in the Scriptures. He is among the flock as a spiritual leader, friend, and counsellor, not to be ministered unto, but to minister.

D. The Christian Ministry is Not a Sacrificing Ministry.

All pre-Christian religions, Judaism included, contained two common elements: (1) a human priesthood; and, (2) the teaching that salvation was not complete as provided. Their sacrifices were of limited value and therefore deficient; and so continued endlessly day after day.

However, because Christ was both God and man His sacrifice was of infinite value, and therefore complete, efficacious, and final. This is the clear teaching of Hebrews, (10:10-14). And again: "... (Christ), who needeth not daily ... for this he did once for all, when he offered up himself." (7:27)

The "one sacrifice," offered "once for all," by Christ paid the penalty for the sin of His people and so fulfilled the ritual and made all further sacrifices unnecessary.. There is, therefore, no place for a sacrificing priesthood in the Christian dispensation.

This same truth is taught when we are told that after Christ had completed His work, He "sat down" on the right hand of God, thus symbolizing that His work was finished, that nothing more needed to be added (Heb. 1:3; 10:12, 13).

The greatness and completeness and finality of Christ's sacrificial work is seen in His royal rest. The fact that He has sat down is of special interest since in the tabernacle and the temple there were no seats or benches on which the priests could ever sit down or rest.

It is interesting to notice that when Christ sent out His apostles He commanded them to preach and teach, but said not one word about sacrifice (Matt. 28:19, 20). The mass is the very heart of the service. In the first part of the ordination service for a priest he is addressed as follows: "Receive thou the power to offer sacrifices to God, and to celebrate masses, both

for the living and for the dead. In the name of the Lord. Amen."

In the book of Acts there are no references whatever to a sacrificing priesthood. Paul likewise through his epistles gave many directions concerning the duties of the ministry. But nowhere is there even a hint that the ministers were to offer sacrifices, nowhere even an allusion to the mass.

Our conclusion concerning the priesthood must be that Christ alone is our true High Priest, the only Mediator between God and men, the reality toward which the entire O.T. ritual and sacrifice and priesthood looked forward, and that when He completed His work that entire system fell away. Consequently, we reject all merely human and earthly priests, whether in the Roman Catholic Church or in heathen religions, and look upon their continued practice as simply an attempt to usurp divine authority.

II. PETER

A. The Roman Catholic Position.

The controversial passage in regard to Peter's place in the church is in Matthew 16:13-19. The late **Cardinal Gibbons**, a former archbishop of Baltimore, Maryland and one of the most representative American Roman Catholics, in his widely read book, *Faith of our Fathers*, sets forth the position of his church in these words:

"The Catholic Church teaches that our Lord conferred on St. Peter the first place of honor and jurisdiction in the government of His whole church, and that the same spiritual supremacy has always resided in the popes,, or bishops of Rome, as being the successors of St. Peter. Consequently to be true followers of Christ, all Christians, both among the clergy and laity, must be in communion with the See of Rome, where Peter rules in the person of his successor" (pg. 95).

The whole structure of the Roman church is built on the assumption that in Matt. 16:13-19 Christ appointed Peter the first pope and so established the papacy. Disprove the primacy of Peter, and the foundation of the papacy is

Roman Catholicism

destroyed. Destroy the papacy, and the whole Roman hierarchy topples with it.

Their system of priesthood depends absolutely upon **their claim** that Peter was the first pope at Rome, and that they are his successors. We propose to show that (1) Matthew 16:13-19 does not teach that Christ appointed Peter a pope; (2) that there is no proof that Peter ever was in Rome; and (3) that the N.T. records, particularly Peter's own writings, show that he never claimed authority over the other apostles or over the church, and that that authority was never accorded him.

B. The "Rock"

"And I say to thee, thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." (Matt. 16:18, Confraternity Version)

Romanists quote this verse with relish, and add their own interpretation to establish **their claim** for papal authority. But in the Greek the word "Peter" is *petros*, a person, masculine, while the word "rock", *petra*, is feminine and refers not to a person but to the declaration of Christ's deity that Peter had just uttered - "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."

Using Peter's name and making, as it were, a play upon words, Jesus said to Peter, "You are *petros*, and upon this *petra* I will build my church." The truth that Peter had just confessed was the foundation upon which Christ would build His church. He meant that Peter had seen the basic, essential truth concerning His person, the essential truth upon which the church would be founded, and that nothing would be able to overthrow that truth, not even all the forces of evil that might be arrayed against it. Peter was the first among the disciples to see our Lord as the Christ of God. Christ commended him for that spiritual insight, and said that His church would be founded upon that fact. And that, of course, was a far different thing from founding the church on Peter.

Had Christ intended to say that the Church would be founded on Peter, it would have

been ridiculous for Him to have shifted to the feminine form of the word in the middle of the statement, saying, if we may translate literally and somewhat whimsically, "And I say unto thee, that thou art Mr. Rock, and upon this, the Miss Rock, I will build my church." Clearly it was upon the truth that Peter had expressed, the deity of Christ, and not upon weak, vacillating Peter, that the church would be founded. The Greek "*petros*" is commonly used of a small, movable stone, a mere pebble, as it were. But "*petra*" means an immovable foundation, in this instance, the basic truth that Peter had just confessed, the deity of Christ.

The Bible tells us plainly, not that the church is built upon Peter, but that it is "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner stone" (Eph. 2:20). And again, "For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. 3:11). Without that foundation the true Christian church could not exist.

The gates of hell were not to prevail against the church. But the gates of hell did prevail against Peter shortly afterward, as recorded in this same chapter, when he attempted to deny that Christ would be crucified, and almost immediately afterward, in the presence of the other disciples, received the stinging rebuke, "Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art a stumbling block unto me, for thou mindest not the things of God but the things of men" (v. 23) - surely strong words to use against one who had just been appointed pope

Later we read that Peter slept in Gethsemane, during Christ's agony. His rash act in cutting off the servant's ear drew Christ's rebuke. He boasted that he was ready to die for his Master, but shortly afterward shamefully denied with oaths and curses that he even knew Him. And even after Pentecost Peter still was subject to such serious error that his hypocrisy had to be rebuked by Paul, who says: "But when Cephas came to Antioch (at which time he was in full possession of his papal powers according

Roman Catholicism

to Romanist doctrine), I resisted him to the face, because he stood condemned" (Gal. 2:11). And yet, Romanists allege that their pope, as Peter's successor, is infallible in matters of faith and morals.

The Gospel written by Mark, who is described in early Christian literature as Peter's close companion and understudy, does not even record the remark about the "rock" in reporting Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi (Mk. 8:27-30). No, Christ did not build His church upon a weak, sinful man. Rather the essential deity of Christ, which was so forcefully set forth in Peter's confession, was the foundation stone, the starting point, on which the church would be built.

That no superior standing was conferred upon Peter is clear from the later disputes among the disciples concerning who should be greatest among them. Had such rank already been given, Christ would simply have referred to His grant of power to Peter (Mk. 9:33-35; 10:34-44).

In 1 Peter 2:6-8 Christ is called a rock and a chief cornerstone. But **Peter** here **claims** nothing for himself. Indeed he is explicit in calling all believers living stones built up a spiritual house with Christ as the head of the corner.

"Christ is repeatedly called a Rock. The background for this is that around 34 times in the O.T. God is called a Rock or the Rock of Israel. It was a designation of God. In the Messianic passages, Isa. 8:14; 28:16; and Psa. 118:22, Christ is called a Rock or Stone upon which we should believe. These passages are quoted in the N.T. and for that reason Christ is called a Rock several times. It designates Him as divine. For that reason, every Jew, knowing the O.T., would refuse the designation to Peter or to anyone except insofar as we are children of Christ. He is the Rock. We are living stones built upon Him. Eph. 2:20 says this plainly. Paul says of the Rock from which the Israelites drank that it typified Christ (1 Cor. 10:4). In the N.T. there are 12 foundations and on them are the

names of the 12 apostles - none of them are made pre-eminent."

(*The Bible Presbyterian Reporter*, Jan. 1959).

And **Dr. Henry M. Woods** says:

"If Christ had meant that Peter was to be the foundation, the natural form of statement would have been, 'Thou art Peter, and on thee I will build my church'; but He does not say this, because Peter was not to be the rock on which the church was built. Note also that in the expression 'on this rock'; our Lord purposely used a different Greek word, *petra*, from that used for Peter, *petros*. He did this to show that, not Peter, but the great truth which had just been revealed to him, viz., that our Lord was 'the Christ, the Son of the living God,' was to be the church's foundation. Built on the Christ, the everlasting Saviour, the gates of hell would never prevail against the Church. But built on the well-meaning but sinful Peter, the gates of hell would surely prevail; for a little later our Lord had to severely rebuke Peter, calling him 'Satan'" (*Our Priceless Heritage*, pg. 40).

C. The "Keys".

"And I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Matt. 16:19, Confraternity Version).

It is important to notice, that the authority to bind and to loose was not given exclusively to Peter. In the 18th chapter of Matthew the same power is given to all of the disciples. (vs. 1, 18) Even the scribes and Pharisees had this same power (Matt. 23:13; 23:2-4).

Here the expression clearly means that the scribes and Pharisees, in that the Word of God was in their hands, thereby had the power, in declaring that Word to the people, to open the kingdom of heaven to them; and in withholding that Word they shut the kingdom of heaven against people. See also Luke 11:52.

Thus the "keys" symbolize the authority to open, in this instance, to open the kingdom of heaven to men through the proclamation of the Gospel. What the disciples were commissioned

Roman Catholicism

to do, given the privilege of doing, was the opposite of that which the scribes and Pharisees were doing, that is, they were to facilitate (make easier) the entrance of the people into the kingdom of heaven.

Christ alone - is He "that openeth and none shall shut, and that shutteth and none openeth" (Rev. 3:7). It meant that Peter, and later the other apostles, being in possession of the Gospel message, truly did open the door and present the opportunity to enter in as they proclaimed the message before the people. This same privilege of opening the door or of closing the door of salvation to others is given to every Christian, for the command that Christ gave His church was to go and make disciples of all the nations. Thus "the power of the keys" is a declarative power only.

It can almost be said that the **RCC** build their church upon these two verses which speak of the "rock" and the "keys". They say that the power given to Peter was absolute and that it was transferred by him to his successors, although they have to admit that there is not one verse in Scripture which teaches such a transfer. Under this "power of the keys" the **RCC** claims that "In heaven God ratifies the decisions which Peter makes on earth" (Footnote, Confraternity Version, pg. 37).

Rome terribly abuses this "power of the keys" to insure obedience to her commands on the part of her church members and to instill in them a sense of fear and of constant dependence on the church for their salvation. This sense of fear and dependence, with constant references to "Mother Church," goes far to explain the power that the **RCC** has over her members.

D. Papal Authority Not Claimed By Peter.

The **RCC** claims that Peter was the first bishop or pope in Rome and that the later popes are his successors. But the best proof of a man's position and authority is his own testimony. Does Peter claim to be a pope, or to have primacy over the other apostles?

(1 Peter 1:1; 5:1-3):

"Peter, an apostle ... a fellow elder, and a witness ... tend the flock of God ... neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock".

Here Peter refers to himself as an apostle of Jesus Christ, an elder (the word in the Greek is *presbuteros*), which of course had nothing to do with a sacrificing priesthood. He does not claim the highest place in the church as some would expect him to do or as some would claim for him. He assumes no ecclesiastical superiority, but with profound humility puts himself on a level with those whom he exhorts. He makes it clear that the church must be democratic, not authoritarian. He forbids the leaders to lord it over the people, to work for money or to take money unjustly. He says that they are to serve the people willingly, even eagerly, and that by their general lives they are to make themselves examples for the people. The fact is that the **RCC** acts directly contrary to these instructions.

Peter refused to accept homage from men - as when Cornelius the Roman centurion fell down at his feet and would have worshipped him, Peter protested quickly and said, "Stand up; I myself also am a man" (Acts 10:25, 26). Yet the popes not only accept, but demand, such homage, even to the extent that men, including even the highest cardinals, prostrate themselves on the floor before a newly elected pope or when making ordination vows before him and kiss his foot. The popes accept the blasphemous title of "Holy Father".

Surely if Peter had been a pope, "the supreme head of the church," He would have declared that fact in his general epistles. Instead Peter refers to himself as only an apostle (of which there were at least eleven others), and as an elder or presbyter, that is, simply as a minister of Christ.

Roman Catholicism

E. Paul's Attitude Toward Peter.

Paul was called to be an apostle at a later time, after the church had been launched. Yet Peter had nothing to do with that choice, as he surely would have had if he had been pope. Paul was easily the greatest of the apostles, with a deeper insight into the way of salvation and a larger revealed knowledge concerning the mysteries of life and death. He wrote much more of the N.T. than did Peter. His 13 (not counting Hebrews) epistles contain 2,023 verses, while Peter's two epistles contain only 166 verses. Paul worked more recorded miracles than did Peter, he seems to have established more churches than did Peter. His influence in the church at Rome was much greater than was that of Peter.

On one occasion Paul publicly rebuked Peter. When Peter at Antioch sided with the "false brethren" (v. 4) in their Jewish legalism and "drew back and separated himself" from the Gentiles and was even the cause of Barnabas being misled, Paul administered a severe rebuke. (Gal. 2:11-14).

In other words, Paul gave the "Holy Father" a "dressing down" before them all, accusing him of not walking uprightly in the truth of the Gospel.

The other apostles as well as Paul seem totally unaware of any appointment that made Peter the head of the church. Nowhere do they acknowledge his authority. And nowhere does he attempt to exercise authority over them.

The doctrine of the primacy of Peter is just one more of the many errors that the **RCC** had added to the Christian religion. With the exposure of that fallacy the foundation of the **RCC** is swept away. The whole papal system stands or falls depending on whether or not Peter was a pope in Rome, and neither the N.T. nor reliable historical records give any reason to believe that he ever held that position or that he was ever in Rome.

III. THE PAPACY

A. The Rise of the Papacy.

The word "pope" and the word "papacy," are not found in the Bible. The word "pope" comes from the Latin *papa*, meaning "father." But Jesus forbade his followers to call any man "father" in a spiritual sense (Matt. 23:9).

The name was first given to Gregory I by the wicked emperor Phocas, in 604. This he did to spite the bishop of Constantinople, who had justly excommunicated him for having caused the assassination of his (Phocas') predecessor, emperor Mauritius. Gregory, however, refused the title, but his second successor, Boniface III (607) assumed the title, and it has been the designation of the bishops of Rome ever since.

The title "pontiff" literally means "bridge builder" (*pons*, bridge, and *facio*, make). It comes, not from the Bible but from pagan Rome, where the emperor, as the high priest of the heathen religion, and in that sense professing to be the bridge or connecting link between this life and the next, was called "Pontifex Maximus." The title was therefore, lifted from paganism and applied to the head of the **RCC**. **The pope also claims** to be the mediator between God and man, with power over the souls in purgatory so that he can release them from further suffering and admit them to heaven, or prolong their suffering indefinitely. But Christ alone is the mediator between God and men (1 Tim. 2:5; Col. 2:9; Eph. 1:22, 23; and Col. 1:18).

Romanists claim an unbroken line of succession from the alleged first pope, Peter, to the present pope. The list has been revised several times, with a considerable number who formerly were listed as popes now listed as anti-popes. It simply is not true that they can name with certainty all the bishops of Rome from Peter to the present one. A glance at the notices of each of the early popes in the Catholic Encyclopedia will show that they really know little or nothing about the first 10 popes.

For a period of six centuries after the time of Christ none of the regional churches attempted

Roman Catholicism

to exercise authority over all of the other regional churches. The papacy really began in the year 590 with Gregory I, as Gregory the Great. He consolidated the power of the bishopric in Rome and started that church on a new course. **Says Professor A. M. Renwick**, of the Free Church College, Edinburgh, Scotland:

"His brilliant rule set a standard for those who came after him and he is really the first 'pope' who can, with perfect accuracy, be given the title. Along with Leo I (440-461), Gregory VII (1073-1085), and Innocent III (1198-1216) he stands out as one of the chief architects of the papal system"

(*The Story of the Church*, pg. 64).

And the Roman Catholic, **Philip Hughes**, says that Gregory I, "... is generally regarded as the greatest of all his line ... It was to him that Rome turned at every crisis where the Lombards (the invaders from the north) were concerned.. He begged his people off and he bought them off. He ransomed the captives and organized the great relief services for widows and orphans. Finally, in 598, he secured a thirty year's truce. It was St. Gregory who, in these years, was the real ruler of Rome and in a very real sense he is the founder of the papal monarchy" (*A Popular History of the Catholic Church*, pg. 75; 1947. Used by permission of the Macmillan Company).

B. The Claims of the Papacy.

When the triple crown is placed on the head of a new pope at his "coronation" ceremony the ritual prescribes the following declaration by the officiating cardinal:

"Receive the tiara adorned with three crowns, and know that thou are the Father of Princes and Kings, Ruler of the World, the Vicar of our Saviour Jesus Christ ..." (*National Catholic Almanac*).

The **New York Catechism** says:

"The pope takes the place of Jesus Christ on earth ... By divine right the pope has supreme and full power in faith and morals over each and every pastor and his flock. He is the true Vicar of Christ, and head of the entire church, the

father and teacher of all Christians. He is the infallible ruler, the founder of dogmas, the author of and the judge of councils; the universal ruler of truth, the arbiter of the world, and supreme judge of heaven and earth, the judge of all, being judged by no one. God himself on earth."

And pope Leo XIII, in his encyclical, *The Reunion of Christendom* (1885), declared that the pope holds "upon this earth the place of God Almighty."

Thus the **RCC** holds that the pope, as the vicar of Christ on earth is the ruler of the world, supreme not only over the **RCC** itself but over all kings, presidents, and civil rulers, indeed over all peoples and nations.

The **RCC** has been prevented from exercising such authority in the U. S. because they do not have control there and because the Constitution serves as a shield against such outside interference.

The pope thus demands a submission from his people, and indeed from all peoples in so far as he is able to make it effective, which is due only to God. Even the cardinals, the next highest ranking officials in the **RCC**, prostrate themselves before him and kiss his feet. The popes have gone so far in assuming the place of God that they even insist on being called by His names, e. g. "the Holy Father", "His Holiness", etc. We cannot but wonder what goes through the mind of a pope when people thus reverence him, carrying him on their shoulders, kissing his hands and feet, hailing him as the "Holy Father," and performing acts of worship before him. By such means this so-called "vicar of Christ" accepts the position of ruler of the world which the Devil offered to Christ, but which Christ spurned with the command, "Get thee hence, Satan."

The triple crown the pope wears symbolizes his authority in heaven, on earth, and in the underworld - as king of heaven, king of earth, and king of hell - in that through his absolutions souls are admitted to heaven. On the earth he attempts to exercise political as well as spiritual

Roman Catholicism

power, and through his special jurisdiction over the souls in purgatory and his exercise of the "power of the keys" he can release whatever souls he pleases from further suffering and those whom he refuses to release are continued in their suffering, the decisions he makes on earth being ratified in heaven.

The Bible teaches clearly that Christ's Vicar on earth is the Holy Spirit - "the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things" (John 14:26).

Indeed, the **claims of the pope** to universal and total authority over the souls of men and over the church and nations are such that either he is all that **he claims** to be - the vicar of Christ and the vice regent of God - or he is the biggest impostor and fraud that the world has ever seen.

C. Worldly Character of the Papacy.

The fallacy of the **claim** that the **pope** is the vice regent of Christ is apparent in the glaring contrast between him and Christ. The pope wears, as a fitting symbol of the authority claimed by him, a jewel-laden, extremely expensive crown, while Christ had no earthly crown at all - except a crown of thorns which He wore in our behalf. In solemn ceremonies the pope is carried in a portable chair on the shoulders of 12 men, while Christ walked wherever He needed to go. We cannot imagine Christ, who came not to be ministered unto but to minister, being carried in luxury on the shoulders of men. The pope is adored with genuflections (a bowing of the knee in reverence), he is preceded by the papal cross and by two large fans of peacock feathers, and his garments are very elaborate and costly, all of which is out of harmony with the person and manner of Christ.

The pope lives in luxury with many servants in a huge palace in Vatican City, while Christ when on earth "had not where to lay His head". Many of the popes, particularly during the Middle Ages, were grossly immoral, while Christ was perfect in holiness. Christ said that His kingdom was not of this world, and He

refused to exercise temporal authority. But the pope is a temporal ruler, just like a little king, with his own country, his own system of court, vassals, coinage, postal service, and a Swiss military guard (100 men in sixteenth century uniforms) which serves as a papal bodyguard.

The popes claim political power, and for many years ruled the Papal States, which stretched all the way across Italy and contained 16,000 square miles and a population of approximately 3,000,000. Those states were confiscated by Italy, under the leadership of patriot Garibaldi in 1870, and since that time the popes have been limited to Vatican City, located within the city of Rome, which has an area of about 1/6 of a square mile, and a permanent population of about 1,000, with some 22,000 more employed there. In maintaining **his claim** to political power the pope sends ambassadors and ministers to foreign governments, and in turn receives ambassadors and ministers from those governments. As of Oct. 12, 1960, 31 nations maintained ambassadors at the Vatican and received ambassadors from the Vatican, and 11 nations maintained ministers there.

IV. MARY

A. Mary's Place in Scripture.

The N.T. has surprisingly little to say about Mary. Her last recorded words were spoken at the marriage in Cana, at the very beginning of Jesus' ministry: "Whatsoever he saith unto you, do it" (John 2:5) - then silence. But the **RCC** breaks that silence, and from sources entirely outside of Scripture builds up a most elaborate system of Mary works and Mary devotions.

Following Mary's appearance at the marriage in Cana, we meet her only once more during Jesus' public ministry, when she and His brothers came where He was speaking to the multitudes, seeking Him, only to draw the rebuke: "Who is my mother? and who are my brethren? ... Whosoever shall do the will of my Father who is in heaven, he is my brother, and sister, and mother" (Matt. 12:46-50). She was present at the cross, where she was committed

Roman Catholicism

to the care of the disciple John for the remainder of her natural life (John 19:25-27). Finally, in Acts 1:14, she is mentioned as having been with the disciples and the other women and the Lord's brethren engaged steadfastly in prayer immediately after the ascension, but she has no prominent place.

The apostles never prayed to Mary, nor, so far as the record shows, did they show her any special honor. Peter, John, Paul and James do not mention her name even once in the epistles which they wrote to the churches. John took care of her until she died, but he does not mention her in any of his three epistles or in the book of Revelation. We recall that the Prime Minister Churchill used to make it a special point of honor to mention the Queen in his public addresses. Imagine the Prime Minister of England never mentioning the Queen in any of his addresses to Parliament or in any of his state papers.

When the church was instituted at Pentecost there was only one name given among men whereby we must be saved, that of Jesus (Acts 4:12). Wherever the eyes of the church are directed to the abundance of grace, there is no mention of Mary. Surely this silence is a rebuke to those who would build a system of salvation around her. God has given us all the record we need concerning Mary, and that record does not indicate that worship or veneration in any form is to be given to her. How complete, then, is the falsehood of Romanism that gives primary worship and devotion to her.

B. "Mother of God"

The full-fledged system of Mariolatry is a comparatively recent development in **RCC** dogma. In fact the last 100 years have quite appropriately been called the "Century of Mariolatry."

The phrase "Mother of God" originated in the Council of Ephesus, in the year 431. It occurs in the Creed of Chalcedon, which was adopted by the council which met in that city in 451, and in regard to the person of Christ it

declared that He was, "Born of the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God according to the manhood."

The purpose of the expression as used by the council was not to glorify Mary, but to emphasize the deity of Christ over against those who denied His equality with the Father and the Holy Spirit. It emphasized the fact that the "person" born to Mary was truly divine. In that sense only was she called "the Mother of God."

The term today has come to have a far different meaning and is used to exalt Mary to a supernatural status as Queen of Heaven, Queen of the Angels, etc., so that, because of her assumed position of prominence in heaven, she is able to approach her Son effectively and to secure for her followers whatever favors they ask through her. When we say that a woman is the mother of a person we mean that she gave birth to that person. But Mary certainly did not give birth to God, nor Jesus Christ as the eternal Son of God. She was not the mother of our Lord's divinity, but only of His humanity. The **RCC** teaches Mary's perpetual virginity, her exemption from original sin and from any sin of commission, and (since 1950) her bodily assumption to heaven.

The Bible calls Mary the "Mother of Jesus" but gives her no other title. Roman Catholics come to look upon Mary as stronger, more mature, and more powerful than Christ. To them she becomes the source of His being and overshadows Him. So they go to her, not to Him. "He came to us through Mary," says **Rome**, "and we must go to Him through her." Romanism magnifies the person that the Holy Spirit wants minimized, and minimizes the person that the Holy Spirit wants magnified.

Says S. E. Anderson:

"Roman priests call Mary the 'mother of God', a name impossible, illogical, and unscriptural. It is impossible for God can have no mother; He is eternal and without beginning while Mary was born and died within a few short years ..."

Roman Catholicism

And **Marcus Meyer** says:

"God has no mother. God has always existed. God Himself is the Creator of all things. Since a mother must exist before her child, if you speak of a 'mother of God' you are thereby putting someone before God. And you are therefore making that person God ... Can you imagine Mary introducing Jesus to others with the words: 'This is God, my Son?'"
(Pamphlet, *No Mother*)

C. Contrast Between Roman and Bible Teaching.

The following quotations are taken from the book, *The Glories of Mary*, which was written by Bishop Alphonse de Liguori, one of the greatest devotional writers of the **RCC**, and the Word of God taken from the Douay Version which is approved by James Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore.

Mary is given the place belonging to Christ.

RCC says:

"And she is truly a mediatrix of peace between sinners and God. Sinners receive pardon by ... Mary alone" (pp. 82,83).

"Mary is our life ... Mary in obtaining this grace for sinners by her intercession, thus restores them to life" (p. 80). "He fails and is LOST who has not recourse to Mary" (p. 94).

Bible says:

"For there is one God, and ONE Mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus" (1 Tim 2:5). "Jesus saith to him: I am the way, and the truth, and the life. No man cometh to the Father, but by me: (John 14:6). "Christ ... is our life" (Col. 3:4).

Mary is glorified more than Christ.

RCC says:

"The Holy Church commands a WORSHIP peculiar to MARY: (p. 130). "Many things ... are asked from God, and are not granted they are asked from MARY, and are obtained," for "She ... is even Queen of Hell, and Sovereign Mistress of the Devils" (pp. 127, 141, 143).

Bible says:

"In the Name of Jesus Christ ... For there is no other name under heaven given to men,

whereby we must be saved" (Acts 3:6; 4:12). His Name is "above every name ... not only in this world, but also in that which is to come" (Eph. 1:21).

Mary is the gate to heaven instead of Christ.

RCC says:

"Mary is called ... the gate of heaven because no one can enter that blessed kingdom without passing through HER" (p. 160). "The Way of Salvation is open to none otherwise than through MARY," and since "Our salvation is in the hands of Mary ... He who is protected by MARY will be saved, he who is not will be lost" (pp. 169, 170).

Bible says:

"I am the door. By me, if any man enter in, he shall be saved," says **Christ** (John 10:1, 7, 9). "Jesus saith to him, I am the way ... no man cometh to the Father but by me" (John 14:6). "Neither is there Salvation in any other" (Acts 4:12).

Mary is given the power of Christ.

RCC says:

"All power is given to thee in heaven and on earth," so that "at the command of Mary all obey - even God ... and thus ... God has placed the whole church ... under the domination of MARY" (pp. 180, 181). Mary "is also the Advocate of the whole human race ... for she can do what she wills with God" (p. 193).

Bible says:

"All power is given to me in Heaven and in earth" so that "in the Name of JESUS every knee should bow," "that in all things He may hold the primacy" (Matt. 28:18; Phil 2:9-11; Col. 1:18). "But if any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, JESUS CHRIST the Just: and he is the propitiation for our sins" (1 John 2:1,2).

Mary is the peace maker instead of Jesus Christ our peace.

RCC says:

"Mary is the Peacemaker between sinners and God" (p. 197). "We often more quickly obtain what we ask by calling on the name of MARY than by invoking that of Jesus." "She ...

Roman Catholicism

is our Salvation, our Life, our Hope, our Counsel, our Refuge, our Help" (pp. 254, 257).

Bible says:

"But now in CHRIST JESUS, you, who sometimes were far off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For He is our peace" (Eph. 2:13,14). "Hitherto you have not asked anything in my name. Ask, and you shall receive," for "Whatsoever we shall ask according to His will, He heareth us" (John 16:23,24).

Mary is given the glory that belongs to Christ alone.

RCC says:

"The whole Trinity, O MARY, gave thee a name ... above every other name, that at thy name, every knee should bow, of things in heaven, on earth and under the earth" (p. 260).

Bible says:

"God also hath highly exalted HIM, and given HIM a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth ..." (Phil 2:9, 10).

Liguori, more than any other one person, has been responsible for promoting Mariolatry in the **RCC**, dethroning Christ and enthroning Mary in the hearts of the people. Yet instead of excommunicating him for his heresies, the **RCC** has canonized him as a saint and has published his book in many editions, more recently under the imprimatur of Cardinal Patrick Joseph Hays, of New York.

In a widely used prayer book, *The Raccolta*, we read such as the following:

"Hail, Queen, Mother of Mercy, our Life, Sweetness, and Hope, all Hail. To thee we cry, banished sons of Eve; to thee we sigh, groaning and weeping in this vale of tears."

"We fly beneath thy shelter, O holy Mother of God, despise not our petitions in our necessity, and deliver us always from all perils, O glorious and Blessed Virgin."

"Heart of Mary, Mother of God ... Worthy of all the veneration of angels and men ... In thee

let the Holy Church find safe shelter; protect it, and be its asylum, its tower, its strength."

"Sweet heart of Mary, be my salvation."

"Leave me not, My Mother, in my own hands, or I am lost; let me but cling to thee. Save me, my Hope; save me from hell."

The rosary, which is by far the most popular RC ritual prayer, contains 50 "Hail Marys". The Hail Mary is also called Ave Maria.

D. Mary as an Object of Worship.

The devotions to Mary are undoubtedly the most spontaneous of any in the **RCC** worship. Attendance at Sunday mass is obligatory, under penalty of mortal sin if one is absent without a good reason, and much of the regular service is formalistic and routine. But the people by the thousands voluntarily attend novenas for the "Sorrowful Mother." Almost every religious order dedicates itself to the Virgin Mary. National shrines, such as those at Lourdes in France, Fatima in Portugal, and Our Lady of Guadalupe in Mexico, are dedicated to her and attract millions. The shrine of Sta. Anne do Beaupre, in Quebec, the most popular shrine in Canada, is dedicated to Saint Anne, who according to apocryphal literature was the mother of Mary. Thousands of churches, schools, hospitals, convents, and shrines are dedicated to her glory.

Margaret Shepherd, and ex nun says:

"No words can define to my readers the feeling of reverential love that I had for the Virgin Mary. As the humble suppliant kneels before her statue he thinks of her as the tender, compassionate mother of Jesus, the friend and mediatrix of sinners. The thought of praying to Christ for any special grace without seeking the intercession of Mary never occurred to me." (*My Life in the Covent*, p. 31)

The titles given Mary are in themselves a revelation of **RCC** sentiment toward her. She is called: Mother of God, Queen of the Apostles, Queen of Heaven, Queen of the Angels, The Door of Paradise, The Gate of Heaven, Our Life, Mother of Grace, Mother of Mercy, and

Roman Catholicism

many others which ascribe to her supernatural powers.

All of those titles are false. When did the apostles elect Mary their queen? Heaven has no queen. The only references in Scriptures to prayers to the "queen of heaven" are found in Jeremiah 7:18; 44:17-19, 25, where it is severely condemned as a heathen custom practised by some apostate Jews. This so-called "queen of heaven" was a Canaanitish goddess of fertility, Astarte (plural, Ashtaroth) (Judges 2:13).

Nowhere in the Bible is there the slightest suggestion that prayer should be offered to Mary. Worship is accorded to the infant Jesus; but never his mother (Matt. 2:11 - "... fell down and worshipped HIM"). And to whom did they give their gifts of gold, frankincense and myrrh? To Mary? or to Joseph? No. They presented their gifts to Jesus. They recognized Him, not Mary or Joseph, as worthy of adoration.

The **RCC** commits grievous sin in promoting the worship of Mary. It dishonors God, first, by its use of images; and secondly, by giving to a creature the worship that belongs only to the Creator.

Charles Chiniquy, a former priest from Montreal, Canada, who became a Presbyterian minister, tells of the following conversation between himself and his bishop when doubts began to assail him regarding the place given to Mary:

"My lord, who has saved you and me upon the cross?"

He answered, "Jesus Christ."

"And who paid your debt and mine by shedding His blood; was it Mary or Jesus?"

He said, "Jesus Christ."

"Now, my lord, when Jesus and Mary were on earth, who loved the sinner more; was it Mary or Jesus?"

Again he answered that it was Jesus.

"Did any sinner come to Mary on earth to be saved?"

"No."

"Do you remember that any sinner has gone to Jesus to be saved?"

"Yes, many."

"Have they been rebuked?"

"Never."

"Do you remember that Jesus ever said to sinners, 'Come to Mary and she will save you?'"

"No," he said.

"Do you remember that Jesus has said to poor sinners, 'Come to me?'"

"Yes, He has said it."

"Has He ever retracted those words?"

"No."

"And who was, then, the more powerful to save sinners?" I asked.

"O, it was Jesus".

"Now, my lord, since Jesus and Mary are in heaven, can you show me in the Scriptures that Jesus has lost anything of His desire and power to save sinners, or that He has delegated this power to Mary?"

And the bishop answered, "No."

"Then, my lord," I asked, "why do we not go to Him, and to Him alone? Why do we invite poor sinners to come to Mary, when, by your own confession she is nothing compared with Jesus in power, in mercy, in love, and in compassion for the sinner?"

To that the bishop could give no answer. (*Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, p. 262).

We have no need for the intercession of Mary, or departed saints, or angels, for we ourselves have direct access to God through Christ. Furthermore, not only do we have no single instance in the Bible of a living saint worshipping a departed saint, but all attempts on the part of the living to make any kind of contact with the dead are severely condemned (Deut. 18:9-12; Ex. 22:18; Lev. 20:6; Isa. 8:19, 20).

We have specific examples of Peter, and Paul, and even of an angel rejecting such worship. Peter, in Acts 10:25, Paul in Acts 14:14, 15, an angel in Rev. 22:8, 9.

E. In Romanism Mary Usurps the Place of Christ.

Christ is usually represented as a helpless babe in a manger or in his mother's arms, or as a

Roman Catholicism

dead Christ upon the cross. The babe in a manger or in his mother's arms gives little promise of being able to help anyone. And the dead Christ upon a cross, with a horribly ugly and tortured face, is the very incarnation of misery and helplessness, wholly irrelevant to the needs and problems of the people. The **RCC** cannot get its people to love a dead Christ, no matter how many masses are said before him, or how many images are dedicated to Him. There can be no real love for Christ unless the worshipper sees Him as his living Saviour, who died for him, but who arose, and who now lives gloriously and triumphantly - as indeed He is presented in the Bible. In the **RCC** the people prefer a living Mary to a dead Christ. And the result is that the center of worship has shifted from Christ to Mary.

The most popular prayer ritual of Roman Catholics, the rosary, has 10 prayers to Mary for each one directed to God. The prayer book contains more prayers which are to be offered to Mary and the saints than to Christ. Mary is unquestionably the chief object of prayer.

F. Mary Represented as More Sympathetic than Jesus.

In "*The Glories of Mary*," Liguori pictures Christ as a stern, cruel Judge, while Mary is pictured as a kind and loveable intercessor. Among other things **Liguori** says: "If God is angry with a sinner, and Mary takes him under her protection, she withholds the avenging arm of her Son, and saves him" (p. 124). "O Immaculate Virgin, prevent thy beloved Son, who is irritated by our sins, from abandoning us to the power of the devil" (p. 248); and again: "We often obtain more promptly what we ask by calling on the name of Mary, than by invoking that of Jesus" (p. 248).

How dishonoring it is to Christ to teach that He is lacking in pity and compassion for His people, and that He must be persuaded to that end by His mother.

G. One Mediator

The Bible teaches that there is but one mediator between God and men. Read

1 Tim. 2:5. When this verse is understood the whole system of the **RCC** falls to the ground, for it invalidates the papacy, priesthood and Mariolatry.

Other verses which teach the same truth are, John 14:6; Acts 4:12; Heb. 9:15; 1 John 2:1; Rom. 8:34; Heb. 7:25.

Thus Christ, because He is both God and man, is the only Saviour, the only Mediator, the only way to God. Not one word is said about Mary, or a pope, or the priests, or the saints, as mediators. Yet Romanism teaches that there are many mediators, and the great majority of Roman Catholics, if asked, would say that our primary approach to God is through the Virgin Mary, and that only as she begs for us can we enter into the presence of God. Humanly speaking, that must grieve her who would want all honor to go to Christ.

H. Adoration or Idolatry?

The RCC officially denies worshipping Mary. Officially she says that Mary is only a creature, highly exalted, but still a creature, in no way equal to God. We must insist that it is worship, and that therefore it is idolatry as practised by millions of people who kneel before Mary's statues and pray and sing to her. That the prayers are addressed to Mary and the saints are idolatrous is clear from the fact that: (1) They are precisely the same kind, and are expressed in the same terms, as those addressed to God. (2) They are presented in the ordinary course of worshipping God. (3) They are offered kneeling. (4) They form the bulk of the prayers offered.

Mary would have to have the attributes of deity to hear and answer such a mass of prayer. Surely Catholics themselves can see the impossibility of all those prayers being heard and answered by one who by the admission of their own church is not God, but only human.

Mary is given divine honors, a large number of miracles are ascribed to her, miracles fully supernatural and similar in all respects to those performed by Christ. Numerous appearances are claimed for her. On some occasions statues of

Roman Catholicism

Mary are said to have blinked or wept. Samples of her clothing, hair, teeth, and milk have been exhibited in numerous places. **Matt. 4:10** says: "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve."

I. Latria - Dulia - Hyperdulia.

The Church of Rome, without any warrant whatever from Scriptures, technically divides worship into three kinds: (1) *latria*, the supreme worship, given to God alone; (2) *dulia*, a secondary kind of veneration given to saints and angels; and (3) *hyperdulia*, a higher kind of veneration given to Mary.

The theory, however, is useless in practice, for the average worshipper is not able to make the distinctions, nor does he even know such distinctions exist. This is particularly true in Roman Catholic countries such as Italy, Spain, and Latin America where so many of the people are illiterate and given to all kinds of superstitions.

J. Jesus' Attitude Toward Mary.

Read Luke 2:48,49; John 2:1-5; and Matt. 12:46-50, for real insight into the attitude Jesus had towards Mary. In the latter scripture, instead of granting Mary's request, He replied in such a way that it was in effect a public rebuke. If Mary had had the influence and authority over Him that is claimed by the **RCC**, He would not have answered her as He did but would have honored her request promptly.

Again, read Luke 11:27, 28. This passage records the most subtle attack of all, appealing, as it does to the sentiments and emotions. But here again Jesus gave a plain and decisive answer which should settle forever the question regarding the superiority of Mary or the promotion of any Mary cult.

We notice further that throughout our Lord's public life He was ever careful to call Mary "woman" never "mother". Even when He was dying on the cross He addressed her thus. The Greek, Hebrew, and Latin each had a word for "mother" as well as for "woman". But the Scripture says "woman" and not "mother". And

of course He never used the term "Lady", which is so much used in the **RCC**.

K. The Protestant Attitude Toward Mary.

Protestants and Baptists honor Mary, the mother of our Lord, with the honor the Scriptures give her as "blessed among woman." No other member of the human race has received such high honor as was conferred upon Mary in that she was chosen to be the mother of the Saviour of the world. She was truly a woman of virtue, and of extraordinary faith. She fulfilled admirably the office assigned to her. She was the chosen vessel to bring the Bread of Life to a sin-cursed world. But she was only the vessel, not the Bread of Life. We cannot eat the vessel; rather it is the Bread of Life we need. It is not Mary the Jewish maiden, but Jesus the Son of God whom we need as Saviour. We worship with her the Son of God, but we do not worship her, nor worship through her, as if she were a mediator.

Peter, the alleged first pope, did not even mention her in any of his sermons or in his two letters. He said much about Christ as the only Saviour from sin, but he did not present Mary as a mediator.

This, then is the Mary we honor - not a weeping statue of stone, not a half-goddess, nor a "Queen of Heaven," but the humble servant of God, who found favor with Him and became the mother of Jesus.

L. Were There Other Children in the Family of Joseph and Mary?

Read Matt. 13:54-56 where 4 brothers and "sisters" are named, also Mark 6:3. In John 7:5 we read: "For neither did his brethren believe in him." It is evident that the people at large did not believe, but here John says that even his own brothers, the members of His own family, did not believe on Him. The prophecy about Christ in Psalm 69 finds its fulfilment in the attitude of Christ's brothers towards Him. See especially verse 8. That the psalm applies to Jesus is clear as we compare vs. 4, 8, 21, 25 with John 15:25; 2:17; Rom. 15:3; Matt. 27:34

Roman Catholicism

and Acts 1:20. **Luke 2:7** says of Mary: "And she brought forth her firstborn son...", implying that there were other sons born after Jesus. Acts 1:14 mentions "Mary the mother of Jesus", and "his brethren," in addition to the disciples.

The **RCC** attempts to explain away these as cousins, and therefore not children of Joseph and Mary at all. But the Greek has another word which means cousin, *anepsios*, as in Col. 4:10: "Mark, sister's son (cousin) to Barnabas..."

Matthew 1:24,25 says that Joseph knew her not until after the birth of Jesus. The inference is that after the birth of Jesus Mary became wholly and completely the wife of Joseph, that they then lived as normal husband and wife, and taken in connection with the other references that were cited, that other children were born into their family.

The Scriptures affirm that Mary was a virgin until after Jesus was born. In going beyond that and teaching "perpetual virginity" of Mary, the **RCC** goes beyond Scriptures and sets up man-made doctrine which has no authority.

Back of Rome's insistence on the perpetual virginity of Mary, of course, is the desire to justify the celibate state of the priests and nuns. Rome teaches that the single state is holier than the married state, that there is something inherently unclean and defiling about marriage.

M. The Immaculate Conception

The doctrine of the "Immaculate Conception" teaches that Mary herself was born without sin, that from the very first moment of her existence she was free from the taint of original sin. The original decree setting forth this doctrine was issued by pope Pius IX, on Dec. 8, 1854, and reads as follows:

"We declare, pronounce and define that the Most Blessed Virgin Mary, at the first instant of her conception was preserved immaculate from all stain of original sin, by the singular grace and privilege of the Omnipotent God, in virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of all mankind, and that this doctrine was revealed by God, and therefore must be believed firmly and constantly by all the faithful" (From the papal

bull, *Ineffabilis Deus*, quoted in *The Tablet*, Dec. 12, 1953).

Many Protestants misunderstand this doctrine and assume that it relates to the virgin birth of Christ. It relates, however, to Mary's own birth, and has nothing to do with the virgin birth of Christ. Along with this doctrine, there developed the doctrine that she did not commit sin at any time during her life, that SHE COULD NOT SIN. All of this was a natural outgrowth of their worship of Mary, a further step in her deification. Their Mariolatry demanded it. They sensed that if they were to give her the worship that is due our Lord, she must be sinless. This doctrine, as so many others of the **RCC** completely lacks any Scriptural support. Mary herself acknowledged her need of a Saviour, for she said:

"My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour."
(Luke 1:46,47).

Note particularly Mary's own words, "my Saviour". No one other than a sinner needs a Saviour. In those words she confessed that she was a sinner in need of a Saviour. It was, therefore, necessary for her to be born again of the Spirit and to participate in the redemption provided by her Son. Note the "all"s in Rom. 3:23; 5:12; and 1 Cor. 15:22. That includes Mary. See also 1 John 1:8, 10 and Rom. 3:10

Scripture tells us that after the birth of Jesus Mary brought the two offerings prescribed in the law, one, a burnt offering (symbolizing the complete surrender of the will to God); and the other a sin offering (a sacrifice acknowledging sin) (Luke 2:22-24; Lev. 12:6-8). The last time Mary is mentioned in the N.T. she is praying on the same plane as other needy Christians, not being prayed to by them (Acts 1:13,14). It did not become an official doctrine until 1854, more than 18 centuries after Christ was born of the virgin Mary.

Roman Catholicism

N. The Assumption of Mary.

On Nov. 1, 1950, pope Pius XII pronounced that Mary's body was raised from the grave shortly after she died, that her body and soul were reunited, and that she was taken up and enthroned as Queen of Heaven. And to this pronouncement was added the usual warning that "anyone who may henceforth doubt or deny this doctrine is utterly fallen away from the divine and Catholic faith."

According to tradition Mary's assumption was on this wise:

"On the third day after Mary's death, when the apostles gathered around her tomb, they found it empty. The sacred body had been carried up to the celestial paradise. Jesus Himself came to conduct her hither; the whole court of heaven came to welcome with songs of triumph, the mother of the divine Lord. What a chorus of exultation. Hark now they cry, 'Lift up your gates, O ye princes, and be ye lifted up, O eternal gates, and the Queen of Glory shall enter in.'" (sounds like Psa. 24)

Here we are told that Mary was not only received into heaven, but that she was raised to a pre-eminence far above that which it is possible for any of the saints to attain. Because of her alleged cooperation in the passion of her Son, she is assigned a dignity beyond even the highest of the archangels. She was crowned Queen of Heaven by the Eternal Father, and received a throne at her Son's right hand.

Thus Mary's body was miraculously preserved from corruption, and her resurrection and ascension are made to parallel Christ's resurrection and ascension. And she, like Him, is said to be enthroned in heaven where she makes intercession for the millions of people throughout the world who seek her assistance. This was a natural consequence of the of the 1854 pronouncement of the immaculate conception of Mary - a supernatural entrance into life calls for a supernatural exit from life. A mysterious halo of holiness falls over her entire being. Whereas the glorification of the saints

will take place at the end of the world, her glorification has already taken place.

The most amazing thing about the doctrine of the assumption of Mary is that it has no Scripture proof whatever. Not one shred of evidence can Roman Catholics find in the Bible about Mary's death, burial, location of her grave, or when or how she ascended to

heaven. And yet this troubles the **RCC** not in the least. Pope Pius XII made the pronouncement with the utmost confidence, relying on an alleged original "deposit of faith" given to the apostles by Jesus Christ - but which, we note, did not come clearly to light until some nineteen centuries later.

Millions of people are required to believe in the bodily assumption of Mary without the church furnishing any Scriptural or historical proof, and they do so even without a protest.

Since Mary was sinless it is illogical, we are told, to assume that her body remained in the grave. But the answer is: if Mary was sinless, why did she have to die at all? Death is the penalty for sin. And where there is no sin there can be no penalty. God would be unjust if He punished the innocent. Either Mary was sinless and did not die, or she did have sin, she died, and her body remains in the grave.

V. THE MASS.

A. Definitions.

"The Holy Eucharist" - read Matt. 26:26-28

"Institution of the Eucharist" - read 1 Cor. 11:23-26.

In the New York Catechism we read: "Jesus Christ gave us the sacrifice of the Mass to leave to His church a visible sacrifice which continues His sacrifice on the cross until the end of time. The Mass is the same sacrifice as the sacrifice of the cross. Holy Communion is the receiving of the body and blood of Jesus Christ under the appearance of bread and wine."

The creed of pope Pius IV, which is one of the official creeds of the RCC, says: "I profess that in the Mass is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice (that is, a

Roman Catholicism

sacrifice which satisfies the justice of God and so offsets the penalty for sin) for the living and the dead; and that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is a conversion of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, which the **RCC** calls Transubstantiation."

The Council of Trent declared: "The sacrifice (in the Mass) is identical with the sacrifice of the Cross, inasmuch as Jesus Christ is a priest and victim both. The only difference lies in the manner of offering, which is bloody upon the cross, and bloodless upon our altars".

A Roman Catholic, **John A. O'Brian**, whose books are widely read, says: "The Mass with its colorful vestments and vivid ceremonies is a dramatic re-enactment in an unbloody manner of the sacrifice of Christ on Calvary."
(*The Faith of Millions*, p. 382)

B. The Nature of the Mass.

For Bible believers, the Lord's supper is a means of spiritual blessing and a memorial service, recalling to mind the glorious person of Christ and the great service that He rendered for us on Calvary. But for Roman Catholics it is something quite different. For them it is also a sacrifice, performed by a priest. And its sacrificial element is by far the most important. In fact the sacrifice of the mass is the central point of their worship, while even the preaching of the Gospel is assigned a subordinate role and is not even held to be an essential of the priestly office.

In the **RCC** this further distinction should be noted between the two parts of the mass, the mass proper, and holy communion. In the mass the so-called sacrifice is offered only by the priest and only he partakes of both the bread and the wine. In holy communion the people partake of the bread but not of the wine and have no other active part in the service.

According to Roman teaching, in the sacrifice of the mass the bread and wine are changed by the power of the priest at the time

of consecration into the actual body and blood of Christ. The bread, in the form of thin, round wafers, hundreds of which may be consecrated at once, is contained in a golden dish. The wine is in a golden cup. The supposed body and blood of Christ are then raised before the altar by the hands of the priest and offered up to God for the sins both of the living and the dead. During this part of the ceremony the people are little more than spectators to a religious drama.

In the observance of holy communion the priest partakes of a large wafer, then he drinks the wine in behalf of the congregation. Roman Catholic theology holds that the complete body and blood of Christ are in both the bread and the wine. At this point one is tempted to ask, If the priest can partake of the wine for the congregation, why may he not also partake of the bread for them?

One has to abstain from solid food for only one hour before receiving communion, and he does not have to abstain from water at all. Yet the N.T. tells us that Christ instituted the Lord's supper immediately after He and the disciples had eaten the Passover feast. If Christ had no objection to the bread being mixed with other food, why should the **RCC** object?

The elaborate ritual of the mass is really an extended pageant, designed to re-enact the experiences of Christ from the supper in the upper room, through the agony of the garden, the betrayal, trial, crucifixion, death, burial, resurrection and ascension. It is a drama crowding the detailed events of many days into the space of one hour or less. For its proper performance the priest in seminary goes through long periods of training and needs a marvellous memory. Witness the following: He makes the sign of the cross 16 times; turns toward the congregation 6 times; lifts his eyes to heaven 11 times; kisses the altar 8 times; folds his hands 4 times; strikes his breast 10 times, bows his head 21 times; genuflects 8 times; bows his shoulders 7 times; blesses the altar with the sign of the cross 30 times; lays his hands flat on the altar 29 times; prays secretly 11 times; prays

Roman Catholicism

aloud 13 times; takes the bread and wine and turns it into the body and blood of Christ; covers and uncovers the chalice 10 times; goes to and fro 20 times; and in addition performs numerous other acts. His bowings and genuflections are imitations of Christ in His agony and suffering. The various articles of clothing worn by the priest at different stages of the drama represent those worn by Christ. If the priest forgets even one element of the drama he commits a great sin and technically may invalidate the mass.

But what a miserable form of play-acting is all of that. What a poor substitute for the Gospel do the people depend on for eternal life? In contrast, how simple was the scene in the upper room as Christ instituted the Lord's supper. In 1 Cor. 11:23-26, in just 4 verses, Paul outlines the whole simple service: The Lord Jesus in the night in which He was betrayed **TOOK** bread; He **GAVE** thanks; He **BROKE** the bread; and He **GAVE** it to them as a memorial of His body which was to be broken for them. Just 4 simple actions concerning the bread. Then 2 actions are recorded concerning the wine: The **TOOK** the cup; and He **GAVE** it to them as symbolical of His blood which was to be shed for them. All that we are asked to remember is that He died to save sinners and that we are so to commemorate His death until He returns. The N.T. gives no instruction as to how to offer mass, and in fact there is not so much as one line on the subject in Scripture. Christ sent the apostles to teach and to baptize, not to say mass. His final instructions to the church were " ... make disciples ... baptizing ... teaching them ... " (Matt. 28:19). For centuries the sacrificing priesthood of the O.T. had been typical of the one true Priest who was to come. But after He had come and had accomplished His work there was no further need to continue the empty forms. So the priesthood, having served its purpose, was abolished, and Christ made no provision for His apostles and ministers to continue any kind of sacrifice. The writer of Hebrews has much to say about the endless

repetition and futility of the ancient sacrifices. He shows that their only value was to symbolize and point forward to the one true sacrifice that was to be made by Christ (Heb. 10:10-14).

C. The Mass the Same Sacrifice as on Calvary?

In a Roman Catholic Catechism of Christian Doctrine the question is asked: "Is the Holy Mass one and the same sacrifice with that of the Cross?" (Q 278). And the answer is given:

"The Holy Mass is one and the same sacrifice with that of the Cross, inasmuch as Christ, who offered Himself, a bleeding victim, on the Cross to His Heavenly Father, continues to offer Himself in an unbloody manner on the altar, through the ministry of His priests."

The **RCC** holds that the mass is a continuation of the sacrifice that Christ made on Calvary. The mass, therefore, is not a memorial, but a ritual in which the bread and wine are transformed into the literal flesh and blood of Christ, which is then offered as a true sacrifice.

Rome thus **claims** to continue an act which **the Bible** says was completed nearly 2000 years ago.

In the sacrifice of the mass the Roman priest becomes an "*Altar Christus*," that is, "*Another Christ*," in that he sacrifices the real Christ upon the altar and presents Him for the salvation of the faithful and for the deliverance of souls in purgatory. The **RCC** teaches that Christ, in the form of the "host" (consecrated wafer), is in reality upon the altar, and that the priests have Him in their power that they hold Him in their hands, and carry Him from place to place.

We cannot regard it as anything other than a deception, a mockery, and an abomination before God. There is in the mass no real Christ, no suffering, and no bleeding. And a bloodless sacrifice is ineffectual. See Heb. 9:22 and 1 John 1:7. According to Levitical law a sin offering was never to be eaten, and all eating of blood, even animal blood, and much more the eating of human blood, was strictly forbidden. The fact that in the Lord's supper the elements are eaten is proof in itself that it was never intended to be a sacrifice.

Roman Catholicism

The word "transubstantiation" means a change of substance. The **RCC** teaches that the whole substance of the bread and wine is changed into the literal body and blood of Christ. A Catechism of Christian Doctrine asks the question: "What is the Holy Mass?" and the answer is given:

"The Holy Mass is the sacrifice of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, offered to God for the living and the dead".

The doctrine of transubstantiation and the power of the priests is clearly stated by Liguori in the following words:

"With regard to the power of the priests over the real body of Christ, it is of faith that when they pronounce the words of consecration, the incarnate God has obliged Himself to obey and come into their hands under the sacramental appearance of bread and wine. We are struck with wonder when we find that in obedience to the words of His priests - *hoc est corpus meum* (This is my body) - God Himself descends on the altar, that He comes whenever they call Him, and as often as they call Him, and places Himself in their hands, even though they should be His enemies. And after having come He remains, entirely at their disposal and they move Him as they please from one place to another. They may, if they wish, shut Him up in the tabernacle, or expose Him on the altar, or carry Him outside the church; they may, if they choose, eat His flesh, and give Him for food of others. Besides, the power of the priest surpasses that of the Blessed Virgin because she cannot absolve a Catholic from even the smallest sin" (*The Dignity and Duties of the Priest*).

The Roman Catholics believe this jumble of medieval superstition. They have been taught it from infancy, and they do believe it. It is the very sternest doctrine of their church.

This doctrine of the mass is based on the assumption that the words of Christ (Matt. 26:26-28), must be taken literally. The accounts in the Gospels and in 1 Corinthians 11 make it perfectly clear that He spoke in

figurative terms. See Luke 22:20 and 1 Cor. 11:25,26.

Compare the above two scriptures and you will see a double figure of speech. The cup is put for the wine, and the wine is called the new covenant. The cup was not literally the new covenant, although it is declared to be so as definitely as the bread is declared to be His body. They did not literally drink the cup, nor did they literally drink the new covenant. After giving the wine to the disciples Jesus said, "I shall not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come" (Luke 22:18). So the wine, even as He gave it to them, and after He had given it to them, remained "the fruit of the vine". **Paul** also says that the bread remains bread: "Wherefore whosoever shall eat the bread and drink the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner ..." (1 Cor. 11:27,28). No change had taken place in the elements. This was after the prayer of consecration, when the Church of Rome supposes the change took place, and Jesus and Paul both declare that the elements are still bread and wine.

Another and more important proof that they are not literally changed into the actual flesh and blood of Christ is this: the literal interpretation makes the sacrament a form of cannibalism. For that is precisely what cannibalism is - eating the flesh of humans.

Indeed, how can Christ's words, "This is my body," and "This is my blood," be taken in a literal sense? At the time those words were spoken the bread and wine were on the table before Him, and in His body He was sitting at the table a living man. (Did He pull off a piece of his arm and offer it to them?) The crucifixion had not taken place. Furthermore, we do not, and cannot memorialize someone who is present, as the **RCC** says Christ is present in the mass.

Jesus' words, "This do in remembrance of me," show that the Lord's supper was not some kind of magical operation, but primarily a memorial, instituted to call Christians

Roman Catholicism

throughout the ages to remember the wondrous cross of the crucified Lord and all its marvellous benefits and lessons for us.

We believe that the real meaning of Christ's words can be seen when they are compared with similar figurative language which He used in John 4:13,14, or John 10:7, 15:5, 10:14, etc. See also James 3:6:4:14; Deut. 16:3, Isa. 30:20. None of these statements is true if taken literally.

"If men think at all, they know that what the papal church requires them to believe in the Eucharist, under penalty of an eternal curse, is a monstrous untruth. They know they are eating bread, not human flesh: and they know that no human priest can offer a real atoning sacrifice for sin". (Henry M. Woods; *Our Priceless Heritage*; p. 107).

A curious and interesting item in connection with this doctrine is that the efficiency of a priest's action in performing any sacrament depends upon his "intention", and that if he does not have the right intention in doing what he professes to do the sacrament is invalid. *The Creed of Pope Pius IV* says:

"If there is a defect in any of these: namely, the due matter, the form with intention, or the sacerdotal order of the celebrant, it nullifies the sacrament." And **cardinal Bellarmine**, who is considered one of the foremost authorities, says: "No one can be certain, with the certainty of faith, that he has received a true sacrament, since no sacrament is performed without the intention of the ministers, and no one can see the intention of another." (*Works*, Vol. 1, p. 488).

In view of the fact that so many priests eventually leave the priesthood - some say as many as one-fourth or one-third - it surely is reasonable to assume that many of those, for considerable periods of time before they leave and while they are in a state of doubt and uncertainty, are often lacking in sincere intention in performing the sacraments.

Dr. Joseph Zacchello, a former priest and editor of *The Convert*, points out that this

doctrine of the intention of the priests undermines the doctrinal basis of the **RCC**. He says:

"This teaching implies that no Roman Catholic, be he priest or layman, can ever be sure that he has been properly baptized, confirmed, absolved in confession, married, received holy communion or extreme unction ...Suppose a child is baptized by a priest who lacks the proper intentions. The baptism is then of no avail, and the child grows up a pagan. If he should enter a seminary and be ordained a priest, his ordination will be invalid. All the thousands of masses he says, all the sacraments he performs, will likewise be invalid. If he becomes a bishop, the priests he ordains, and the other bishops he consecrates will have no such power. If by chance he should become pope, the **RCC** would then have as "Vicar of Christ" and "infallible" head a man who was not even a Christian to start with."

(*Secrets of Romanism*, p. 110).

D. The Cup Withheld From the Laity.

Another serious error of the **RCC** is that in the eucharist or holy communion she withholds the wine from the laity. She thus deprives believers of half of the benefits of the sacrament. That decision was made without any command from the N.T., there being no suggestion of any such distinction between the clergy and laity. Even in the Confraternity Version Christ's command was that "All of you drink this" (Matt. 26:27). And in Mark: "And they all drank of it" (14:23).

In the early church the people partook of both the bread and the wine, and that practice was continued through the first 11 centuries. Then the practice of permitting the priest to drink the wine for both himself and the congregation began to creep in. In 1415 the Council of Constance officially denied the cup to the people. That decision was confirmed by the Council of Trent (1545-1563), and that practice has been continued to the present day.

The reasons given are: (1) that someone might spill a drop (of the "literal" blood of

Roman Catholicism

Christ - a great tragedy); and (2) that the body and blood of Christ is contained complete in either the bread or the wine (no suggestion given in the Bible).

E. The Finality of Christ's Sacrifice.

That Christ's sacrifice on Calvary was complete in that one offering, and that it was never to be repeated is set forth in Heb. 7:9, 10, 27, 9:12, 22-29, 10:10-14. Notice that throughout these verses occurs the statement "once for all," which has in it the idea of completeness, or finality, and which precludes repetition. Christ's work on the cross was perfect and decisive. It constituted one historical event which need never be repeated and which in fact cannot be repeated. The language is perfectly clear: "He offered one sacrifice for sins for ever" (10:12).

We are told that Christ has sat down as token that His work is finished. Depend upon it, He never descends from that exalted place to be a further sacrifice.

Where there is a continual offering for sin, as when the sacrament of the mass is offered daily, it means that sins are never really taken away, and that those who are called priests pretend to continue the unfinished work of Christ. When on Memorial Day we lay a wreath on the tomb of a soldier we may speak of the sacrifice that he made to save his country. But his sacrifice cannot be renewed. He died once and his sacrifice was complete.

The obligation that rests on a Roman Catholic to attend mass is a far different thing from the freedom that Bible believers enjoy in the matter of church attendance. *The Baltimore Catechism* says:

"It is a mortal sin not to hear Mass on a Sunday or a holyday of obligation, unless we are excused for a serious reason. They also commit mortal sin who, having others under their charge, hinder them from hearing Mass without a sufficient reason." (*Answer*, 390).

It becomes, the rule of discipline for all Roman Catholics, a mighty instrument in the

hands of the clergy for the supervision of the laity.

It is not essential (in the mass) that the people understand. Ideas are not important to the mass, may even defeat its purpose. The objective here is to produce through the medium of the miracle allegedly performed by the priest an emotional ecstasy in which thoughts or ideas become superfluous.

F. The Mass and Money.

One very prominent feature of the mass as conducted in the **RCC** is the financial support which it brings in. It is by all odds the largest income producing ceremony in the church. An elaborate system has been worked out. In the U.S. low mass, for the benefit of a soul in purgatory, read by the priest in a low tone of voice and without music, costs a minimum of one dollar. The high mass, on Sundays and holydays, sung by the priest in a loud voice, with music and choir, costs a minimum of ten dollars. The high requiem mass (at funerals), and the high nuptial mass (at weddings), may cost much more, even hundreds of dollars, depending on the number and rank of the priests taking part, the display of flowers, the music, candles, etc. Prices vary in the different dioceses and according to the ability of the parishioners to pay. No masses are said without money. The Irish have a saying: "High money, high mass; low money, low mass; no money, no mass."

The most popular mass is that to alleviate or terminate the suffering of souls in purgatory. The more masses said for an agonizing soul the better. One consequence of this system is that the poor are left to burn in purgatory longer, while the rich can have more and higher grade masses said and so escape more quickly. People with property are sometimes urged to leave thousands of dollars to provide for prayers and masses to be said perpetually for their souls.

One of the worst features about the mass system is that the priest can never give assurance that the soul for which he has said mass is out of purgatory. He admittedly has no criterion by which that can be known. Hence the

Roman Catholicism

offerings may be continued for years - as long as the deluded Romanist is willing to pay.

Stephen L. Testa:

"It would not pay the priest to say that the soul for which he prayed is already out of purgatory and gone to heaven and needs no further masses. It would cut off a rich source of income. Like many unscrupulous physicians who would rather prolong the illness of a wealthy patient, so he could continue to need his treatments - a priest would never tell a bereaved mother that her daughter is "with Jesus" in heaven and needs no more requiem masses. A Protestant or Baptist minister would give that comforting assurance from the Word of God, but never a Catholic priest." (*The Truth About Catholics, Protestants and Jews*, p. 13).

Dr. Zacchello:

"The only 'sacrifice' in the Roman Catholic mass is that of the money of the poor given to the priest to pay for the mysterious ceremonies he performs, in the belief that he will relieve the suffering of their beloved ones in the fires of purgatory" (*Secrets of Romanism*, p. 82).

And **L. J. King** points out that,

"Death doesn't end all with the Roman Church. A member cannot avoid his church dues by dying. His estate or friends have to pay on and on. Even the tax collector lets up on a dead man, but the **RCC** never. It retains its grip on its dupes long after their bodies are reduced to ashes. The priestly threat that the soul is suffering in the 'devouring flames' of purgatory and will remain there for a long, long time, will bring the last dollar from the sorrowing mother, whose only son or daughter is detained in that fiery prison."

Those who contribute money for masses fail to appreciate the fact that the gifts of God cannot be bought with any amount of money. The term "simony" has entered the dictionary, meaning "to make a profit out of sacred things," "the sin of buying or selling ecclesiastical benefices," etc. (See Acts 8:20).

G. Historical Development of the Doctrine.

In view of the prominent place given the mass in the present day **RCC**, it is of particular interest to find that it was unknown in the early church, that it was first proposed by a Benedictine monk, Radbertus, in the ninth century, and that it did not become an official part of **RCC** doctrine until 1215, under pope Innocent III.

H. Seven Sacraments.

What is a sacrament? To answer this question we turn to the *Shorter Catechism of the Westminster Standards*:

"A sacrament is a holy ordinance instituted by Christ; wherein by sensible signs, Christ and the benefits of the new covenant are represented, sealed, and applied to believers" (Answer, 92).

According to the N.T. only two sacraments were instituted by Christ. These are baptism and the Lord's Supper. (Luke 22:19; Matt. 28:19)

To these two sacraments Rome has added five more, so that she now lists them as: (1) baptism, (2) confirmation, (3) eucharist (mass), (4) penance, (5) extreme unction, (6) marriage, and (7) orders (ordination of priests and consecration of nuns).

Rome holds that in the ordinary course of life five of these, baptism, confirmation, mass, penance, and extreme unction are indispensable to salvation, while marriage and orders are optional.

It was not until the Council of Florence, in 1439, that the seven sacraments were formally decreed. Later the Council of Trent declared: "If any one saith that the sacraments of the New Law were not instituted by Jesus Christ, our Lord; or that they are more, or less, than seven, to wit, baptism, confirmation, the eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders and matrimony; or even that any one of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament, let him be anathema." (damned)

Roman Catholicism

What was the purpose of the **RCC** in appointing seven sacraments? Probably in order that it might have complete control over the lives of its people from the cradle to the grave. We will discuss the seven sacraments in order.

1. Baptism.

It is represented as working in a magical way to produce baptismal regeneration and securing automatically the forgiveness of all past sins, and as absolutely necessary to salvation. In the words of the Trent Catechism: "Infants, unless regenerated unto God through the grace of baptism, whether their parents be Christian or infidel, are born to eternal misery and perdition."

2. Confirmation.

In the so-called sacrament of confirmation the bishop lays his hands on the head of a person who previously has been baptized, for the purpose of conveying to him the Holy Spirit. But no apostle or minister in the apostolic church performed that rite, and no man on earth has the Holy Spirit at his command.

3. Eucharist (the mass)

discussed throughout this chapter.

4. Penance.

What is penance? An authorized catechism: "Penance is a sacrament in which the sins committed after baptism are forgiven by means of the absolution of the priest. ... The priest gives a penance after confession that we may satisfy God for the temporal punishment due to our sins. We must accept the penance which the priest gives to us."

The Word of God teaches that the sinner must truly repent from the heart for his sin. Otherwise there can be no forgiveness. The **RCC** substitutes penance for Gospel repentance. Penance consists of outward acts, such as repeating certain prayers many times, e.g., the Hail Mary or the rosary, self-inflicted punishments, fastings, pilgrimages, etc. Penance represents a false

hope, for it relates only to outward acts. True repentance involves genuine sorrow for sin, it is directed toward God, and the person voluntarily shows by his outward acts and conduct that he has forsaken his sin.

5. Extreme Unction.

Extreme Unction is described as "the anointing by the priest of those in danger of death by sickness, with holy oil, accompanies with a special prayer ... It is called extreme because it is administered to sick persons when thought to be near the close of life."

6. Orders.

The ordination of church officials was appointed by Christ, but not the specific orders adopted by the **RCC** - priests, bishops, archbishops, cardinals, and popes. Furthermore, no sacramental sign was appointed to accompany the appointment of church officials.

7. Matrimony.

Matrimony, too, is a divine ordinance, but was given no outwardly prescribed sign. It was in fact instituted thousands of years earlier, even before the fall, and is therefore not an institution of the new covenant. See Eph. 5:31-32. The Latin Vulgate substituted the word "mystery" for "sacrament". Even though the new Confraternity Version corrected the error, the **RCC** continues to teach otherwise.

VI. THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE.

A. Definition.

The Vatican Council which met in Rome in 1870, defined the doctrine of the infallibility of the pope as follows:

"... We teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when in discharge of the office of pastor and doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith

Roman Catholicism

and morals to be held by the universal Church, by the divine assistance promised him in Blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed for defining doctrines regarding faith and morals, and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff of themselves - and not by virtue of the consent of the Church - are irreformable."

To this pronouncement there was attached the inevitable anathema of the church to all who dare to disagree.

It is interesting to notice that the popes, in issuing their decrees or pronouncements, do not label them *ex cathedra* or not *ex cathedra*. We may be sure that if this power were a reality they would not hesitate so to label them, that is fact they would find it very advantageous to do so.

The doctrine of infallibility appeals to many people who are poorly informed and who are adrift spiritually. These people know practically nothing about the Bible. Consequently, they have no sound theology on which to base their actions.

B. Infallibility Not Taught in the Bible.

The silence of Scripture concerning an infallible church or concerning Peter as an infallible pope is sufficient to disprove the idea. That Peter, the alleged first pope, was not infallible as a teacher of faith and morals is evident from his conduct at Antioch when refused to eat with Gentile Christians lest he offend certain Jews from Jerusalem (Gal. 2:11-16).

The fact is that we have our infallible rule of faith and morals in the N.T. Scriptures. And having that it is not necessary to bestow infallibility on any man.

C. History of the Doctrine Before 1870.

We may well ask: If the doctrine of infallibility was taught by Christ or by any of the apostles, why did the **RCC** wait for more than 18 centuries before stating it?

Edward J. Tanis, in his booklet, *What Rome Teaches*: "Gregory the Great was one of the

most powerful and influential popes, bishop of the congregation in Rome from 590 to 604. He made a large contribution to the improvement of the preaching and music of the church and was an ardent defender of the Catholic traditions, but Gregory never taught that he was the infallible head of the whole church. He said, in fact, that the title of pope as 'Ecumenical Bishop' (bishop of the whole church) was 'proud and foolish' and 'an initiation of the devil'" (p. 17).

D. Errors of the Popes.

It is difficult to say whether a **claim** such as that of infallibility is more wicked or ridiculous. It certainly is wicked, because it gives to a man one of the attributes of God and usurps the headship of Christ in the church. And it is ridiculous, because the history of the popes reveals many grievous errors, moral and doctrinal, with one often denying what another has affirmed.

Many of the popes have taught heretical doctrines. Some have been grossly immoral, although the theologians say that this does not affect their official powers. Several have been condemned by later popes and church councils, and some have been declared "anti-popes", that is fraudulently chosen or elected, and later dropped from the official record. Among popes committing serious errors are the following:

Callistus (bishop of Rome, 221-227) is said by Hippolytus, a third century writer, to have been a kind of Unitarian, identifying the Father and the Son as one indivisible Spirit.

Vigilinus (538-555) refused to condemn certain heretical teachers at the time of the monophysite controversy, and boycotted the fifth Ecumenical Council which met at Constantinople in 553. When the Council preceded without him and threatened to excommunicate and anathematize him, he submitted to its opinions, confessing that he had been a tool of Satan (by. Hefele, one of the best known **RCC** writers, *History of the Christian Councils*, Vol. 4, p. 345).

Roman Catholicism

Gregory I (590-604) called anyone who would take the title of Universal Bishop an antichrist; but Boniface III (607) compelled the emperor Phocas to confer that title upon him, and it has been used by all later popes.

Haddrian II (867-872) declared civil marriages to be valid; but Pius VII (1800-1823) condemned them as invalid.

Sixtus V (1585-1590) recommended the reading of the Bible, but Pius VII (1800-1823) and various other popes condemned that practice.

As regards infallibility in the moral sphere, consider these cases, Pope John XI (931-936) was the illegitimate son of pope Sergius III by a wicked woman named Marozia. The nephew of John XI, who took the name John XII (956-964), was raised to the papacy at the age of 18 through the political intrigue of the Tuscan party which was then dominant in Rome, and proved to be a thoroughly immoral man. His tyrannies and debaucheries were such that, upon complaint of the people of Rome, the emperor Otho tried and deposed him. Some of the sins enumerated in the charge were murder, perjury, sacrilege, adultery, and incest. Yet he is reckoned as a legitimate pope through whom the unbroken chain of apostolic authority descends from Peter to the pope of the present day.

VII. BY WHAT MORAL STANDARD?

A. Basic Principles.

One of the strong contrasts between Protestantism (and Baptists) and Roman Catholicism is found in the moral codes which distinguish the differing systems. In Protestantism (and Baptists) this code is taken directly from the Bible. But the **RCC** bases its moral code primarily on Canon Law and only secondarily on the Bible. The authority of the church as interpreted by the priest is what counts. The result is the **RCC** has developed a standard of morality that is designed, not to stir the conscience, but to maintain papal power.

In the study of morals the **RCC** takes the teachings of the theologian Alphonsus Liguori as authoritative. Liguori was canonized among the saints in heaven by the pronouncement of pope Gregory XVI, in 1839. It was written of him that:

"... he outlines the ways in which falsehood can be used without really telling a lie; the ways in which the property of others can be taken without stealing; how the Ten Commandments can be broken without committing deadly sin."

Samples of Liguori's "moral" teachings are: "A servant is allowed to help his master to climb a window to commit fornication" (*St. Alphonsus*, 1, 22, 66).

"It is not a mortal sin to get drunk, unless one loses completely the use of his mental faculties for over one hour" (1, 5, 75).

"It is lawful to violate penal laws" (hunting, fishing, etc.). ... It is asked whether prostitutes are to be permitted ... They are to be permitted because, as a distinguished priest, Remove prostitutes from the world, and all things will be disordered with lust. Hence in large cities, prostitutes may be permitted" (3, 434).

B. Liquor.

We do not need to belabor the point that the **RCC** fights almost every movement throughout the nation (USA) that is designed to restrict the use of alcoholic liquors. Protestants and Baptists are often regarded as "killjoys", because they oppose even a limited license for any of these. The **RCC**, however, holds that drinking and gambling are not sinful of themselves, but that they become so only when carried to excess.

We have called attention to the De La Salle Institute, at Napa, California, which is only one of several properties in the US producing commercial wine or brandy or both. In the Philippines the San Miguel Corporation does the same.

C. Oaths.

According to Liguori, a Roman Catholic can lie, he:

"Notwithstanding, indeed, although it is not lawful to lie, or to feign what is not, it is lawful

Roman Catholicism

to dissemble what is, or to cover the truth with words, or other ambiguous and doubtful signs, for a just cause."

D. Theft.

In regards to theft. Liguori teaches that a Roman Catholic may steal, providing the value of the thing stolen is not excessive. He says:

"If any one on an occasion should steal only a moderate sum either from one or more, not intending to acquire any notable sum, neither to injure his neighbor to any great extent, by several thefts, he does not sin grievously, nor do those, taken together, constitute a mortal sin ..." (Vol. 3, p. 258).

This doctrine has been interpreted for American Roman Catholics to mean that it is not a mortal sin if one steals less than \$40.00 worth at any one time.

Theft is excused for (1) extreme necessity, and for (2) secret compensation.

L. H. Lehmann comments very appropriately on such conduct:

"Moral conduct can be no better than the moral principles upon which it is based. Most crimes are distinctly connected with thievery and robbery. If a Roman Catholic youth, for instance, can persuade himself that he had 'extreme necessity' for an automobile, he will consider himself justified in stealing it legitimately according to the above teaching, provided he knows that the owner will not be thereby impoverished. The doctrine of 'secret compensation' applies mostly to employees who consider they are being underpaid for their labor. A twenty dollar a week cashier in a sidestreet cafeteria may consider herself underpaid and apply this principle to justify her pilfering of odd dimes and quarters from the cash register whenever she can safely do so. Many a cashier in a large bank or commercial business corporation has done just this until he found himself in jail for large-scale embezzlement. A desperate man could also easily argue himself into thinking that he is justly entitled to some of the surplus money of a rich victim and will go after it with a gun. Likewise

grafting politicians seize upon the argument implicit in this teaching to justify their conviction that they are worth much more to the community than their elected offices pay them.

"This doctrine of 'secret compensation' was, of course, unheard of in Christianity, even in the Catholic Church, prior to the Jesuits of the 17th century. It was invented by them along with other unethical doctrines such as 'mental reservation', 'the end justifies the means', and 'the end sanctifies the means' etc., to make Catholicism popular among the masses. It also helped to rationalize their own exploits. Thus Catholic textbooks of moral theology today make no pretension of showing that these principles of conduct take their origin from the Ten Commandments or from Christian revelation. They merely propound them as accepted Catholic doctrine and trace them back to Gury, the Jesuit fountainhead

"The blunt fact, confirmed by countless cases, is that many Catholics get the one idea from this teaching, namely that stealing is not essentially evil at all times, but, on the contrary, fair and reasonable if one needs something badly enough and the owner does not ..."

E. Gambling.

Another very serious defect in the moral armor of the **RCC** is its fondness for games of chance, particularly its strong defence of bingo as played in the churches, which, in whatever light it may be viewed, is a form of gambling. The primary feature about gambling, bingo, raffles, etc., is that it is an attempt to get something for nothing, an attempt to live, not by honest toil, but at the expense of others. As such it is a moral disease, a covetous greed or lust to get possession of what another had. Anything that induces people to take money needed for food and clothing and risk it on games of chance is wrong in principle.

Gambling is a violation of one of God's first commands to man: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread" (Gen. 3:19). It is also a violation of other Scripture commands and of the general spirit of Scripture teaching: "Thou

Roman Catholicism

shalt not steal" (Ex. 20:15); "Thou shalt not covet" (Ex. 20:17); "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself"; see also Matt. 19:19; Isa. 55:2; and 1 Cor. 10:31.

The ideal constantly held before us in Scripture is that we should earn our property by honest labor and fair exchange.

F. The Roman Church and the U. S. Prison Population.

When we mention prison statistics it must be acknowledged, of course, that men and women in all religions occasionally go wrong, that no one is above criticism, and that good and bad people are found in all denominations. There are, however, certain points of contrast between the Roman and Protestant and Baptist churches. Points which, we believe, arise primarily because of their different moral codes.

Various studies indicate that of the white prison population Roman Catholics constitute a higher percentage than those of any other church operating on the American scene, and that while the Roman Catholic percentage in the general population is about 22%, their percentage in the jails and penitentiaries and in juvenile delinquency is approximately twice that. For example, one-fifth of the people in Michigan are Catholics but 50% of the boys in the Industrial School for Boys at Lansing, Michigan are Catholics.

The Mafia had its origin hundreds of years ago in Italy where for centuries the **RCC** almost exclusively has provided the religious background.

One might further note that the "Catholic" countries of the world are all "3rd world" countries with the possible exception of Spain and Italy; but that even these countries exist on aid from the "Protestant" countries; most of which are industrialized and fairly prosperous.

G. Questionable Hospital Practices.

A Roman Catholic hospital practice which very definitely has a moral aspect to it is that of baptizing Protestants and others who are thought to be in danger of death. An article in a **Catholic magazine states**: "... it is proper, and in some cases even mandatory, to baptize into the **RCC**, even without their knowledge or

consent, unbaptized persons or patients concerning whom it is not known whether they have been baptized or not, if they are thought to be in danger of death.

One of the most important doctrines in the Catholic medical code is the doctrine of the equality of mother and fetus. This doctrine is of special interest to every potential mother who has a Catholic physician. Most of our citizens (in the U. S.) assume without discussion that every possible effort should be made to save the life of both mother and child, but that if a choice is forced upon the physician the mother should be given first consideration.

The Catholic hierarchy does not endorse this choice, nor can a good Catholic physician leave such a choice to the husband and father and be true to the dogmas of his church.

Mr. Blanshard remarks:

"It should be noted that under this statement of the complete doctrine, both mother and child must be allowed to die rather than allow a lifesaving operation that is contrary to the code of the priests. There is no choice here between one life and another; it is a choice between two deaths and one. The priests choose the two deaths presumably in order to save the souls of both mother and child from a sin that would send the mother's soul to hell and the child's to the twilight hereafter known as limbo. Even if the fetus would die anyway because it is 'inviabile,' which means incapable of life. It may be a six-weeks old embryo about the size of a small marble, without a face. Nevertheless, the life of the mother must be sacrificed for this embryo that by definition, is dying or will die."

CONCLUSION

There are many more subjects that could be taken up about the doctrines and errors of the **RCC**. Surely these are sufficient to convince us that the **RCC** is in reality a cult and not a member of the Christian family at all, whatever they may call themselves.

We earnestly hope and pray that the above information will help you better know how to pray for and witness to your Catholic friends and family.

Roman Catholicism

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

THE ROMAN CHURCH CLAIMS SHE NEVER CHANGES.

1. Prayers for the dead A. D. 330
2. Making the sign of the cross 330
3. Wax candles 330
4. Veneration of angels, dead saints & use of images 375
5. The mass, as a daily celebration 394
6. Beginning of the exaltation of Mary, term "Mother of God" first used by Council of Ephesus 431
7. Priests began to dress differently from laymen 500
8. Extreme unction 526
9. Doctrine of purgatory, est. by Gregory I 593
10. Worship in the Latin language 600
11. Prayers to Mary, dead saints, angels 600
12. Title of pope, or universal bishop, given to Boniface III by Emperor Phocas 607
13. Kissing the pope's feet 709
14. Temporal power of the popes, conferred by Pepin, King of the Franks 750
15. Worship of the cross, images and relics 786
16. Adoration of Mary and Saints 788
17. Holy water, mixed with pinch of salt, blessed 850
18. Worship of St. Joseph 890
19. College of Cardinals est. 927
20. Baptism of bells, instituted by Pope John XIII 965
21. Canonization of dead saints, first by Pope John XV 996
22. Fasting, lent, advent, and Fridays 998
23. The mass as a sacrifice developed gradually. Attendance made obligatory in the 11th century.
24. Marriage of priests forbidden by Pope Gregory VII 1079
25. The rosary, mechanical praying with beads, invented by Peter the hermit 1090
26. The Inquisition, Instituted by Council of Verona 1184
27. Sale of Indulgences 1190
28. Transubstantiation proclaimed by Innocent III 1215
29. Auricular confession of sins to a priest 1215
30. Adoration of the wafer (host) Pope Honorius III 1220

31. Bible forbidden to laymen, placed on the Index of forbidden books by Council of Valencia 1229
32. The Scapular, invented by Simon Stock an English monk 1251
33. Cup forbidden to the people at communion 1414
34. Purgatory proclaimed a dogma by Council of Florence 1439
35. Doctrine of Seven Sacraments affirmed 1439
36. The Ave Maria 1508
37. Tradition declared as equal authority with Bible 1545
38. Apocryphal books added to Bible 1546
39. Immaculate Conception of Mary, Pope Pius IX 1854
40. Infallibility of Pope in matters of faith and morals 1870
41. Public schools condemned by Pope Pius XI 1930
42. Assumption of Mary - bodily resurrection shortly after death 1950

Cardinal Newman, in his book, *The Development of the Christian Religion*, admits that, "Temples, incense oil, lamps, votive offerings, holy water, holidays and seasons of devotion, processions, blessings of fields, sacerdotal vestments, the tonsure (of priests, monks and nuns), images ... are all of pagan origin." (p. 359)
(The above dates are approximate)

1. THE MASS

- a). A false sacrifice for sin - Heb. 10:10-18, 77:27.
- b). No bloodshed means no forgiveness - Heb. 9:22,25-28.
- c). Cannot be repeated - John 19:20, Rom. 6:9; 1 Peter 3:18.
- d). It came from ancient idolatry - Isa. 44:15-18.
- e). Jew and gentile alike are forbidden to eat the literal body and blood of Christ - John 6:35, 63; Gen. 9:4; Lev. 19:11-15; Acts. 15:28,29.
- f). The priest killing the sacrifice (Christ) becomes a murderer - Ex. 20:13.
- g). Christ is not present at the sacrifice - Matt. 24:23-26, 26:29, Acts 19:26 (the wafer), 1 Thess. 4:16-18.

2. CELIBACY

- a). A demonic practice of those who ignore the truth - 1 Tim. 4:1-3

Roman Catholicism

- b). A bishop must be married - 1 Tim. 3:2, 5, 12.
- c). Peter was married - Matt. 8:14.
- d). God's clear verdict - Gen 2:18, 23,24.

3. MARY, QUEEN OF HEAVEN

- a). Ancient Idolatry - Jer. 7:18, 44:17-22.
- b). No mediator but Christ - 1 Tim. 2:5; John 14:6; Heb. 9:15; 1 John 2:1
- c). A sinner in need of a Saviour - Luke 1:46-47; Rom. 3:10, 23
- d). Not always a virgin - Matt. 1:25 (1st. born); Mark 6:1-3 (townspeople knew her children); Gal. 1:19.
- e). To receive no worship - Rom. 1:25; Isa. 42:8; Luke 9:35; Rosary - Matt. 6:7.
- f). Could not be a co-redemptrix - Acts. 4:12; 1 Cor 3:11; John 17:3; Jer. 17:7; Isa. 43:11.
- g). Christ is our hope - 1 Tim. 1:1; Col. 1:27; Heb. 7:25.
- h). Not the mother of God - Matt. 12:46-50; John 2:3,4; Gen. 1:1; John 1:1-3.

4. PETER

- a). Not a rock - John 1:42.
- b). Paul's confession - 1 Cor. 10:4; Eph. 2:20.
- c). Peter's confession - 1 Pet. 2:6-8; Acts 4:10-12.
- d). Christ's confession - Matt. 21:42-44.
- e). Not to be shown special honor - Acts 10:25,26
- f). Not infallible - Gal. 2:11.
- g). Peter never at Rome - Rom. 1:15, 15:20-21.

5. STATUES

- a). Hated by God - Deut. 16:22; Lk. 26:1.
- b). Show your hatred of God - Ex. 20:2-5.
- c). To get no worship - Isa. 42:8.
- d). Medals and images are unprofitable - Isa. 44:9.
- e). You are deceived if you trust in them rather than Christ - Psa. 115:4-8; Deut. 4:16.

6. PURGATORY

- a). Sin was purged by Christ at Calvary - Heb. 1:1-3.
- b). Death ends any hope - Isa. 38:18.
- c). No mass cards can buy a man from death into heaven - Psa. 49:7-9.
- d). Christians go directly to heaven - 2 Cor. 5:8.
- e). Unbelievers wait only for wrath - John 3:36.
- f). No need of a place, we need cleansing of Christ's blood - 1 John 1:7, 9.

7. CONFESSION

- a). Go to God only - Psa. 32:5; Ezra 10:10.
- b). He alone can forgive - Mark 2:7; Isa. 55:7.
- c). Only one man can help - 1 John 2:1,2 (Christ).
- d). Paul said go to Christ - Acts 13:38, 39.
- e). Peter said go to God not confessional - Acts 8:21, 22.
- f). Christ the only judge and forgiver - Acts 10:42,43
- g). Let us obey God and stop listening to men - Acts. 5:29-32.

8. TRADITION

- a). Christ called them vain worship - Matt. 15:3-9.
- b). Following traditions causes disobedience to God's commands - Mark 7:7-9.
- c). Beware traditions - Col. 2:8; Jer. 17:5-7.
- d). Traditions can be confused - John 21:21-24.
- e). His Word will never pass, but traditions will - Matt. 24:35.
- f). You cannot add to His Word - Rev. 22:18, 19; Deut. 4:2.

9. PRAYER FOR THE DEAD

- a). Now while the person is alive - 2 Cor. 6:2.
- b). Once dead, no hope - Isa. 38:18.
- c). No change of heart in death - Prov. 29:1.
- d). No ransom in death - Psa. 49:7-9.

10. SALVATION

- a). Not by the 10 Commandments - Gal. 2:16; Rom. 3:27-28.
- b). Not by good deeds or works - Eph. 2:8,9; Tit. 3:5.
- c). Not in the church - Acts. 4:10-12; John 14:6.
- d). Not by prayers of others - 11 Tim. 2:5.
- e). Not by your intentions - Prov. 14:12, 3:5,6.
- f). Not by sincerity - Matt. 7:21-23; Luke 16:15.
- g). By being born again - John 3:3
 - 1). Repent - Mark 1:14, 7:7-9.
 - 2). Believe - John 3:16; Rom. 10:9,10.
 - 3). Receive - John 1:12.
 - 4). Call - Rom. 10:13.
- h). Condemned only for disbelief in Christ and His work - John 3:18, 36; Rev. 21:8.
- i). You can be sure of salvation today, it is on record - 1 John 5:11-13.
- j). We must get the Word - Rom. 10:17; 1 Pet. 1:23.

Roman Catholicism

11. PRIESTS

- a). Not to be called "father" - Matt. 23:8,9.
- b). His ministry is useless - Heb. 10:11.
- c). Christ has no more need of priests - Heb. 8:4.
- d). "Altar Christos" - another Christ is condemned by Jesus - Matt. 24:23-26.
- e). We go directly to God - Heb. 4:14-16.

12. POPE

- a). Not the head of the church - Col. 1:18; Eph. 5:23.
- b). Must act as a servant - Matt. 20:25-28.
- c). Is not infallible - Gal. 2:11-14.
- d). Peter disobeyed God's order - Acts. 10:14, so can any pope.
- e). Not to be trusted - Jer. 17:5,6 - trust God's Word - Prov. 30:5,6
- f). Sets himself up as God - 2 Thess. 2:3, 4, 9-12.
- g). Keep from idols - 1 John 5:21.

Study Questions for Roman Catholicism

I. The Priesthood.

1. The essential idea of a priest is that of a _____.
2. Who is the "holy priesthood" mentioned in 1 Pet. 2:5, 9? _____
3. What does it mean that Christ is now seated in heaven? _____

II. Peter.

4. Who is the "rock" mentioned by Christ in Matt. 16:18? _____
5. What are the "keys" mentioned in Matt. 16:19? _____

III. The Papacy.

6. The first man to be called pope was _____ in _____ A. D.
7. According to the **RCC**, the pope takes the place of _____ on earth.
8. Worship should be given to the pope as he demands _____ true _____ false.

IV. Mary.

9. List 3 names given by the **RCC** to Mary 1) _____ 2) _____ 3) _____
10. During Jesus' public life he called Mary _____ never _____.
11. How many children did Mary have _____ give a verse to prove _____

V. The Mass.

12. According to the **RCC**, the mass is the same _____ as the _____ of the cross.

Is that true _____ or false? _____

13. Transubstantiation means _____
14. Give one reason why we know the bread and wine do not really change into Christ's body _____
15. The largest income producing ceremony in the **RCC** is the _____
16. How many sacraments does the Bible say the church is to have _____ and what are they? _____

Study Questions for Roman Catholicism

VI. The Infallibility of the Pope.

17. What does it mean according to the **RCC** when the pope speaks "EX CATHEDRA"? _____

18. What is our true infallible rule of faith and morals? _____

19. In what century was "infallibility" proclaimed? _____

VII. By what moral standard?

20. The **RCC** takes its moral standard from _____

21. Baptists and Protestants take their moral standard from _____

22. Name 2 common "sins" the **RCC** allows, 1) _____ 2) _____

23. Two reasons given to excuse theft by the **RCC** are: 1) _____ 2) _____.

24. I have read _____ pages of the printed notes.

25. I have looked up _____% of the Scripture references.

Exam for Roman Catholicism

Student's Name: _____ Teacher's Name: _____ Date: / /

I. The Priesthood.

1. The essential idea of a priest is that of a _____.
2. Who is the "holy priesthood" mentioned in 1 Pet. 2:5, 9? _____
3. What does it mean that Christ is now seated in heaven? _____

II. Peter.

4. Who is the "rock" mentioned by Christ in Matt. 16:18? _____
5. What are the "keys" mentioned in Matt. 16:19? _____

III. The Papacy.

6. The first man to be called pope was _____ in _____ A. D.
7. According to the **RCC**, the pope takes the place of _____ on earth.
8. Worship should be given to the pope as he demands _____ true _____ false.

IV. Mary.

9. List 3 names given by the **RCC** to Mary 1) _____ 2) _____ 3) _____
10. During Jesus' public life he called Mary _____ never _____.
11. How many children did Mary have _____ give a verse to prove _____

V. The Mass.

12. According to the **RCC**, the mass is the same _____ as the _____ of the cross.

Is that true _____ or false? _____

13. Transubstantiation means _____
14. Give one reason why we know the bread and wine do not really change into Christ's body _____
15. The largest income producing ceremony in the **RCC** is the _____
16. How many sacraments does the Bible say the church is to have _____ and what are they? _____

Exam for Roman Catholicism

VI. The Infallibility of the Pope.

17. What does it mean according to the **RCC** when the pope speaks "*ex cathedra*"? _____

18. What is our true infallible rule of faith and morals? _____

19. In what century was "infallibility" proclaimed? _____

VII. By what moral standard?

20. The **RCC** takes its moral standard from _____

21. Baptists and Protestants take their moral standard from _____

22. Name 2 common "sins" the **RCC** allows, 1) _____ 2) _____

23. Two reasons given to excuse theft by the **RCC** are: 1) _____ 2) _____.

24. I have read _____ pages of the printed notes.

25. I have looked up _____% of the Scripture references.

Roman Catholicism

by Loraine Boettner



and

What the BIBLE says.



This material is
copyrighted and
used by
permission.

B. A. M. A. Bible Institutes, Inc.

(Baptist Asian Missions Association, Inc.)

133 Isarog Street, LaLoma, Quezon City 1114 R.P.