

# STEPHEN P. BOHR'S NOTES ON DANIEL 7

## Introductory matters

Daniel received the vision of Daniel 7 in the first year of King Belshazzar. This would be 553, fourteen years before the fall of Babylon.

The **great controversy theme** is at the very center of the book of Daniel in general and of Daniel 7 in particular. This central theme can be described in the following way:

SINCE THE INCEPTION OF SIN IN HEAVEN, THERE HAS BEEN AN INVISIBLE, COSMIC CONTROVERSY BETWEEN CHRIST AND SATAN. ALTHOUGH THIS IS A HEAVENLY CONFLICT, IT IS REFLECTED ON EARTH IN A VISIBLE BATTLE BETWEEN THE FOLLOWERS OF CHRIST AND THE FOLLOWERS OF SATAN. IN THE COURSE OF THIS BATTLE, SATAN AND HIS WICKED FOLLOWERS HAVE APPEARED TO PREVAIL OVER GOD AND HIS PEOPLE, BUT IN THE END GOD AND HIS PEOPLE WILL PREVAIL BECAUSE HE CONTROLS AND GUIDES HISTORY TO ITS DESIRED END.

The passive voice of many of the verbs of Daniel 7 clearly points to someone who is directing history from behind the scenes. We will notice this when we do a verse by verse study of the chapter.

## The Links between Daniel Two and Daniel Seven

Before anything else is said, we must recognize that historicism should be the governing principle in the study both outlines (See the charts at the end of this material, *"The Four Prophetic Outlines of Daniel"*, and *"Sequence of Powers in Daniel 2, 7 and Revelation 13."*)

There are several reasons for linking Daniel 2 and Daniel 7: **First** of all, in the chiasmic structure of the book of Daniel, chapters 2 and 7 are on the same branch of the candelabra (See *"The Literary Structure of Daniel 1-7"*) **Secondly**, Daniel 2 and Daniel 7 have the same number of basic elements. Daniel 2 has four metals and Daniel 7 has four beasts. Notice how the enumeration of the basic elements is the same in both chapters:

### *Daniel 2*

"Gold"  
"After thee"  
"Third"  
"Fourth"

### *Daniel 7*

Lion (7:4)  
Bear = "second" (7:5)  
Leopard = "another" (7:6)  
Dragon = "fourth" (7:7)

In the **third** place, the **Iron** characterizes the fourth kingdom in both lists. In Daniel 2 the legs are of iron and in Daniel 7 the dragon beast has great teeth of **iron**. A **fourth** consideration is that

Daniel 2:44, 45 and Daniel 7:14 describe the last kingdom—the everlasting kingdom—with very similar terminology. In both, the everlasting kingdom follows the fourth power in the sequence.

### **A Look at the Literary Structure of Daniel Seven**

Without exception, earthly events in Daniel 7 are described in prose while heavenly events are described in poetry. In Hebrew thinking, extremely important events are frequently depicted in poetic language. We will see in our study of Daniel 7 that earthly events are not isolated from heavenly events. There is a close connection indeed between heavenly and earthly events:

Verses 2-8	Earth	Prose
Verses 9-10	Heaven	Poetry
Verses 11-12	Earth	Prose
Verses 13-14	Heaven	Poetry
Verses 15-22	Earth	Prose
Verses 23-27	Heaven	Poetry

The vision of Daniel 7 is structurally divided into **four parts**, each concluding with the setting up of the everlasting kingdom:

**Vision:** 7:1-14: The full vision in its chronological sequence.

**Explanation:** 7:15-18: Daniel wants to know the meaning of the vision. An angel gives a brief explanation ending with the eternal kingdom

**Inquiry:** 7:19-22: Daniel desires to know about the fourth beast, the ten horns, the little horn and the everlasting kingdom.

**Explanation:** 7:23-27: The angel provides the final and fullest explanation of the fourth beast, the ten horns, the little horn and the everlasting kingdom.

Verses 9-10, 22, and 26 clearly reveal that the judgment occurs immediately after, and as a result of, the malignant work of the little horn in verses 8, 21, and 25. This means that the judgment could not have taken place at the cross or in apostolic times or even when a person dies. The judgment must have begun sometime after 1798.

Another important structural item of Daniel 7 is that the fourth beast has **three periods** of existence. First it rules for a period by itself. Then ten horns grow from its head. Finally, after the ten horns have governed for a period of time, a little horn arises among them to rule over them. This clearly shows that Rome would rule in three consecutive stages (see, Daniel 7:23-24). In Revelation we will find that Rome will have a fourth stage when the beast's deadly wound is healed.

It is also important to remember that the judgment in Daniel seven has three distinct stages:

1. **INVESTIGATIVE:** The books are opened (verses 9, 10).
2. **VERDICT OR SENTENCE:** Given in favor of the saints (verse 22)
3. The time came when the saints **POSSESSED** the kingdom. It is clear that the judgment has an **investigative** stage, a **sentencing** stage and an **execution** stage (verse 22, last part)

Not only does each outline of Daniel expand upon the previous outlines, but each outline also enlarges upon itself as the chapter progresses. For example, as we have already seen, Daniel 7 repeats the same events four times yet each time the final events of the outline are amplified and intensified. The interest of Daniel is clearly focused on the end-time. The first powers of the outline are brought to view primarily to give us a sequence and framework for end-time events. For an exemplification of this, see the chart at the end of this material, *“A Synoptic View of the Four Parts of Daniel 7”*

### **A Verse by Verse Study of Daniel Seven**

#### ***Verse 1:***

The date for this chapter, as we have already seen, is 553. The text clearly states that Daniel had a dream and visions of his head upon his bed. This is what we might call a “prophetic dream”. Daniel also had “prophetic visions” while he was awake. It is remarkable that Ellen White also had both kinds of prophetic communications from the Lord.

#### ***Verse 2:***

“Winds” in prophetic language are symbolic of strife, war, bloodshed and destruction. Jeremiah, a contemporary of Daniel, makes this very clear in Jeremiah 25:31-33. Ezekiel, another of Daniel’s contemporaries, also affirms the same (Ezekiel 7:1-2). In Revelation 7:1-4 when the four angels release the winds, the result is a universal conflagration and destruction (Revelation 6:12-17). Concerning the “winds”, Ellen White remarks:

“Winds are a symbol of strife. The four winds of heaven striving upon the great sea represent the terrible scenes of conquest and revolution by which kingdoms have attained to power.” (The Great Controversy, p. 440)

The “sea” symbolizes multitudes of unconverted peoples who are inimical to the people of God (see, Isaiah 17:12-13; 8:7-8; 60:5; Revelation 17:15). When symbolic winds and waters are placed together the meaning is, “nations which are warring for world dominion.” It is of great importance that these four beasts arise from the sea, while the winds of strife are blowing. In contrast, Revelation 13:11 depicts a beast which arises from the earth, where there are no waters and no winds!!

**Verse 3:**

Several things must be taken into account when we examine this verse.

1) Do the four beasts represent four **kings** or four **kingdoms**? The answer is simple. The four beasts represent four kingdoms which were ruled over by a succession of kings (study carefully, Daniel 2:37-39; 7:17, 23; 8:20-22; Revelation 17:12; 20:4-6; 1:5-6).

2) Why are wild beasts employed as symbols? Notice the following inspired comment:

“Earthly governments prevail by physical force; they maintain their dominion by war; but the founder of the new kingdom is the Prince of Peace. The Holy Spirit represents worldly kingdoms under the symbol of fierce beasts of prey; but Christ is ‘the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.’” (Christ’s Object Lessons, p. 77)

In this context it is significant that the two beasts of Daniel 8, in contrast to the four beasts of chapter seven, are domestic sanctuary animals (more on this when we study Daniel 8).

3) It is worthy of notice that the fulfillment of prophecy moves from east to west. The lion and bear are powers which bear sway in Asia. The leopard governs toward the eastern part of Western Europe and the dragon rules in the western portion of Western Europe. When we study Revelation, we will see that the second beast of Revelation 13 rules west of Europe (the United States of America). While Protestant eyes are fixed on the east as the place for the fulfillment of Bible prophecy, it is fulfilling in the west right before their eyes and they can’t see it because they are looking in the wrong place!!

**Verse 4:**

The lion represents Babylon. Everything connected with Babylon is ‘top of the line’. Gold is the most precious metal, the lion is the king of beasts, the eagle is the king of birds, etc. Archeological excavations have proven that lion sphinxes were very common in ancient Babylon. Jeremiah affirms that the lion represents Babylon (see, Jeremiah 4:7; 50:17).

“Wings” in Bible prophecy represent speed of conquest (see Ezekiel 17:3, 12; Lamentations 4:19; Habakkuk 1:6-8). The plucking of the wings symbolizes the reality that Babylon will no longer be swift to conquer the nations. A lion with a man’s heart is cowardly (even though fictional, the story of the Wizard of Oz picks up on this. Richard the Lionhearted, king of England, was so called because of his great courage). Babylon’s cowardice is clearly displayed by King Belshazzar when the kingdom fell to the Medes and Persians (see Daniel 5:6).

Notice the passive verbs in this verse: “wings **were** plucked”, “it **was** lifted up,” it “**was made** to stand,” and “a man’s heart **was given** to it”. It is clear that someone else is guiding history!!

**Verse 5:**

The bear symbolizes the kingdom of the Medes and Persians (Daniel 8:20). This is made clear in Daniel 5 where the Medes and Persians are described as the conquerors of Babylon. The fact that the bear was higher on one side than on the other indicates that one of these co-ruling kingdoms was to be more powerful than the other. This is made clear in Daniel 8:3 where we are told that the ram has two horns and the highest one comes out last. This is remarkably true to history. When the kingdom began, the Medes were dominant but at the end the kingdom was ruled exclusively by Persian kings and the Medes receded into the background (see the chart at the end of this material, *"The Dynastic Succession of the Medes and Persians"*).

The three ribs in the bear's mouth represent the three provinces which the Medes and Persians conquered in order to ascend to power: **1)** Lydia (ancient Turkey/Anatolia) was conquered in 547. **2)** Babylon, was overcome in 539 and, **3)** Egypt, was forced to submit in 525.

Notice, once again, that someone is active behind the scenes of history: **"they said unto it**, Arise, devour much flesh." It is obvious that someone is giving the Medes and Persians permission to conquer. "They" in this verse no doubt refers to the watchers or angels who are the emissaries of God in the guidance of human events (compare Ezekiel 1 where the angels carry on God's redemptive purpose on earth).

**Verse 6:**

The leopard represents the kingdom of Greece. The leopard in itself is a swift animal, but this leopard has wings. This must mean that Greece would conquer the world in a swifter fashion than Babylon. And this is exactly what happened.

Alexander the Great conquered the whole Near East (from Egypt to the Indus Valley in India) in just 3 years. Nebuchadnezzar took 13 whole years to just reach a stalemate with Tyre. In contrast, Alexander conquered Tyre in just eight months..

It is important to underline that the leopard did not have the four heads when it began to rule. How do we know this? The answer is, by a comparison of Daniel 7 with Daniel 8. In Daniel 8 the he-goat (a symbol of Greece, 8:21) governed for a period with a notable horn on its head (Alexander the Great) Only after that great horn was broken, did four others come out to replace it. So, just as the he-goat governed for a period and then sprouted four horns, so, the leopard ruled for a period and then it grew four heads. It is clear that the four heads and the four horns came up after the leopard and he-goat had ruled for a period of time (see, Daniel 8:5-8).

In Daniel 7 the leopard was swift, but it was made even swifter by wings. In Daniel 8 the he-goat is so swift he does not even touch the ground. Once again we are told that a power outside history is guiding world affairs: "and dominion **was given** to it". Notice that the leopard did not take dominion. Rather, dominion was given to it!!

**Verse 7:**

The dragon beast represents the Roman Empire (168 B. C. - 476 A. D.). This empire came to be known as the “iron monarchy of Rome” (Edward Gibbon, The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, vol. 4, p. 161).

The ten horns represent the ten kingdoms into which the Roman Empire was divided when it fell apart. These ten kingdoms, according to Edward Gibbon, were: The Alemanni, the Franks, the Burgundians, the Vandals, the Suevi, the Visigoths, the Saxons, the Ostrogoths, the Lombards and the Heruli (see, M. H. Brown, The Sure Word of Prophecy, pp. 54, 55).

“The historian Machiavel, without the slightest reference to this prophecy, gives the following list of the nations which occupied the territory of the Western Empire at the time of the fall of Romulus Augustulus [476 A. D], the last emperor of Rome: The Lombards, the Franks, the Burgundians, the Ostrogoths, the Visigoths, the Vandals, the Heruli, the Sueves, the Huns, and the Saxons: ten in all.” (H. Grattan Guinness, The Divine Program of the World’s History, p. 318)

Already in the fourth century, Jerome had spoken of the fragmentation of the Roman Empire in the following terms:

“Moreover the fourth kingdom, which plainly pertains to the Romans, is the iron which breaks in pieces and subdues all things. But its feet and toes are partly of iron and partly of clay, which **at this time** [note that Jerome was living when this was happening] is most plainly attested. For just as in its beginning nothing was stronger and more unyielding than the Roman Empire, so at the end of its affairs nothing is weaker.” (Jerome, Commentary on Daniel, comments on 2:40, column 504).

In the days when Jerome lived, the Roman Empire was falling apart. The barbarian tribes from the north had descended upon the empire with a vengeance and broke it up into the nations which today constitute Western Europe.

**Verse 8:**

We must now take a closer look at the little horn. There are at least eleven identifying characteristics in chapter seven:

- 1) The little horn arises **from the fourth beast** (7:8). The fourth beast represents Rome, so the little horn must be a Roman power.
- 2) The little horn arises **among the ten horns**. The ten horns are the divisions of Western Europe, so the little horn must arise in Western Europe (7:8). Notice that these first two characteristics restrict the geographical location of the little horn to Western Europe.

3) The little horn rises **after the ten horns** (7:24). According to historians, the ten horns were complete in the year 476 A. D., so this must mean that the little horn was to arise to power sometime after 476 A. D.

4) The little horn was to **pluck up three of the first [ten] horns by the roots** (7:8). This means that these three nations would be uprooted from history. Daniel 7:20-21 explains that three of the first horns would **fall** before the little horn, and Daniel 7:24 tells us that the little horn would **subdue** three horns. In other words, three of the first ten nations would disappear from history!!

5) The little horn was to **speak great words against the Most High** (7:21, 25). Revelation 13:5 explains what these words would be, namely, **blasphemy**. And, what is blasphemy according to the Bible? It is when a merely human power claims to be God on earth and when it thinks it can exercise the prerogatives and functions of God (see, John 10:30-33; Mark 2:7).

6) The little horn was to be a **persecuting** power against God's people. This is stated in Daniel 7:21 and repeated in verse 25.

7) The little horn would think it could **change God's "times", that is to say, God's timetable of prophetic events**. (Daniel 2:21). We shall see that the little horn invented false systems of prophetic interpretation to rival historicism.

8) The little horn would even have the audacity to **THINK that it could change God's holy law**. (7:25).

9) The little horn would be different from the ten horns. It would be an amalgamation of church and state (7:24)

10) This power would govern for a **time, times and half a time** (7:25). This comes out to 42 months or 1260 days (see, Revelation 13:5-6; 12:6, 13-15). In Bible prophecy, literal days are symbolic of years, so this power was to govern for 1260 years (we will study the year/day principle later on in this material).

11) The little horn had **eyes like a man**. In Bible Prophecy, eyes are symbolic of wisdom (see, Ephesians 1:18; Revelation 5:6). Even today, an owl is a symbol of wisdom because of its large eyes. In other words, this power was to depend on human wisdom.

## **THE ROMAN CATHOLIC PAPACY AS THE FULFILLMENT OF THE LITTLE HORN PROPHECY:**

*Characteristic # 1:* The Papacy is **Roman** in all its dimensions. Notice the following:

1) The clay in the feet of the image of Daniel 2 represents the church. But notice that the feet also have the iron of the legs. This must mean that the religious system which succeeds the Roman Empire will continue to be Roman

2) The religion of the Roman Catholic Papacy was inherited from Rome. It is well known that Constantine the Great brought all sorts of pagan practices into the church. This is recognized by both secular and church historians. In fact, the name "Supreme Pontiff" (*Pontifex Maximus*) was used by the pagan Roman emperors. After the Edict of Milan was signed in the year 312 A. D., Christians were restored as *bona fide* citizens of the Roman Empire. The result of this is described by Dave Hunt:

"Freedom at last from persecution seemed like a gift from God. Unfortunately, it set the stage for an apostasy that would envelop Christendom for more than a millennium. Christ's bride had been wedded to paganism." (Dave Hunt, *A Woman Rides the Beast*, pp. 202-203)

Constantine, emperor of the Roman Empire, was the architect of this Edict of Milan (313 A. D.). Regarding Constantine, Hunt remarks:

"A brilliant military commander, Constantine also understood that there could be no political stability without religious unity. Yet to accomplish that feat would require a union between paganism and Christianity. How could it be accomplished? The Empire needed an **ecumenical religion** that would appeal to every citizen in a multi-cultural society. Giving Christianity official status was not enough to bring internal peace to the Empire: Christianity had to undergo a transformation so that pagans could 'convert' without giving up their old beliefs and rituals.

"Constantine himself exemplified this expediency. He adopted Christ as the new god that had given him victory in the crucial battle at Milvian Bridge in 312 A. D., and brought him into Rome as its conqueror. Yet, as Caesar, he continued to function as the *Pontifex Maximus* of the Empire's pagan priesthood, known as the Pontifical College. . . As a 'Christian' Emperor, he automatically became the *de facto* civil head of the Christian church and seduced her with promises of power. Thus began the destruction of Christianity and the process that created Roman Catholicism as it is today." (Dave Hunt, *Global Peace*, pp. 106-107)

"It was 'Christianity', in fact, which gave the Empire a unity and continuity that held it together culturally and religiously. When the Empire later disintegrated *politically* under the onslaught of the Barbarians, it was held together *religiously* by the all-pervasive presence of the Roman Catholic Church with its ingenious ecumenical **blend of paganism and Christianity** still headquartered in Rome." (Dave Hunt, *Global Peace*, p. 110)

The great historian, Will Durant, remarks:

"When Christianity conquered Rome, the ecclesiastical structure of the pagan church, the title and vestments of the *pontifex maximus*, the worship of the Great Mother and a multitude of comforting divinities, the sense of super-sensible

presences everywhere, the joy or solemnity of old festivals, and the pageantry of immemorial ceremony, passed like maternal blood into the new religion, and **captive Rome captured her conqueror**. While Christianity converted the world, the world converted Christianity. . ." (Will Durant, Civilization: Caesar and Christ, Volume 3, p. 657.

John Henry Cardinal Newman makes this admission:

"We are told in various ways by Eusebius, that Constantine, in order to recommend the new religion to the heathen, transferred into it the outward ornaments to which they had been accustomed in their own. It is not necessary to go into a subject which the diligence of Protestant writers has made familiar to most of us. The use of temples, and these dedicated to particular saints, and ornamented on occasions with branches of trees, incense, lamps, and candles; votive offerings on recovery from illness, holy water; asylums; holy days and seasons, use of calendars, processions, blessings on the fields; sacerdotal vestments; the tonsure, the ring in marriage, turning East, images at a later date, perhaps the ecclesiastical chant, and the Kyrie Eleisen, are all of pagan origin, and sanctified by their adoption into the church. (Henry Cardinal Newman, An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine, p. 373)

Philip Schaff, one of the greatest church historians ever to wield a pen, wrote the following:

But the elevation of Christianity as the religion of the state presents also an opposite aspect to our contemplation. It involved great risk of degeneracy to the church. The Roman state, with its laws, institutions, and usages, was still deeply rooted in heathenism, and could not be transformed by a magical stroke. The christianizing of the state amounted therefore in great measure to a paganizing and secularizing of the church. The world overcame the church, as much as the church overcame the world, and the temporal gain of Christianity was in many respects cancelled by spiritual loss. The mass of the Roman Empire was baptized only with water, not with the Spirit of the gospel, and it smuggled heathen manners and practices into the sanctuary under a new name. The very **combination** of the cross with the military ensign by Constantine was the most doubtful omen, portending an unhappy **mixture** of the temporal and the spiritual powers." (Philip Schaff, History of the Christian Church, vol. 3, p. 93, bold is mine).

3) The **architecture** at the Vatican is Roman. Recently, I made a visit to the ruins of the old city of Rome and then on the same day visited Vatican City. The architecture is virtually identical. Also, the old city of Rome was filled with statues of gods and heroes as is Vatican City.

4) The Papal church is called the **Roman** Catholic Church.

- 5) The official language of the Vatican is **Latin**, the language of ancient Rome.
- 6) In official documents, the Vatican employs **Roman numerals**.
- 7) The headquarters of the Papacy is **Vatican City**, which is located in the geographical location of ancient Rome. Says the Catholic Encyclopedia:

“It [Vatican City] is within the city of Rome, called the city of seven hills, that the entire area of Vatican State proper is now confined”. (The Catholic Encyclopedia, Tomas Nelson Publishers, 1976. Article: “Rome”)

- 8) Historians and theologians consistently emphasize that Papal Rome inherited and perpetuated the Roman Empire but in a different way: It was a **religious-political** system. Notice the following quotations from church historians and theologians:

“Within three centuries, the Roman Church had transformed the administrative organization of the Roman Empire into an ecclesiastical system of bishoprics, dioceses, monasteries, colonies, garrisons, schools, libraries, administrative centers, envoys, representatives, courts of justice, and a criminal system of intricate laws all under the direct control of the pope. His Roman Palace, the Lateran, became the new Senate. The new senators were the cardinals. The bishops who lived in Rome and the priests and deacons helped the pope to administer this **new imperium**.” (Malachi Martin, The Decline and Fall of the Roman Church, p. 105, italics mine)

*“The Roman Church in this way privily pushed itself into the place of the Roman World-Empire, of which it is the actual continuation; the empire has not perished, but has only undergone a transformation. . . That is no mere ‘clever remark,’ but the recognition of the true state of the matter historically, and the most appropriate and fruitful way of describing the character of this Church. It still governs the nations. . . It is a political creation, and as imposing as a World-Empire, because [it is] the **continuation of the Roman Empire**. The Pope, who calls himself ‘King’ and ‘Pontifex Maximus,’ is Caesar’s successor.”* (Adolph Harnack, What is Christianity? pp. 269-270)

“The Empire was falling into decay. The Barbarians knew that its life was failing, that the old organism was worn out, and they hastened to take possession of the remains. From every direction they came for the spoils. The Saxons and the Angles settled in Great Britain; the Franks invaded Northern Gaul; the Visigoths made Spain and the region south of the Loire their own; the Burgundians took possession of the upper valley of the Rhone; the Vandals made conquests in Africa. The Ostrogoths and Lombards were waiting for their turn to come. Among these new invaders, some were heretics, others were pagans. What is to become of the Church? Are its days numbered, and is the Empire to bring it down as its companion into an open tomb?”

“No, the Church will not descend into the tomb. It will survive the Empire. It will have to pass through days of distress. It will witness calamity after calamity, ruins heaped upon ruins. But in the midst of the greatest sadness, it will receive precious consolations. One after another, these barbarian peoples will submit to its laws, and will count it a glory to be the Church’s children. The frontiers of the Church will be extended; its institutions, for a moment shaken by the Barbarians, will be consolidated, developed, and will adapt themselves to their surroundings. The papacy, most sorely tried of all, will make a new advance. At length a **second empire** will arise, and of this empire the Pope will be the master—more than this, he will be the master of Europe. He will dictate his orders to kings who will obey them.” (Joseph Turmel, The Latin Church in the Middle Ages, p. v, vi. Bold is mine)

“The all-conquering barbarians were storming the gates of Augustine’s city when the saint died in 430. The North African town of Hippo was one of the last imperial outposts to be attacked. Rome had already gone under. Only four years before, St. Augustine’s *City of God* had laid the theological groundwork for the church to **step into the void** left by the collapsing Roman Empire.” (Douglas Auchincloss, *City of God and Man*, Time, 76 (December 12, 1960), p. 64, bold is mine.

“The removal of the capital of the Empire from Rome to Constantinople in 330 left the Western Church, practically free from imperial power, to develop its own form of organization. The Bishop of Rome, **in the seat of the Caesars**, was now the greatest man in the West, and was soon forced to become the political as well as the spiritual head. To the Western world Rome was still the political capital—hence the whole habit of mind, all ambition, pride, and sense of glory, and every social prejudice favoured the **evolution** of the great city into the ecclesiastical capital. Civil as well as religious disputes were referred to the successor of Peter for settlement. Again and again, when barbarians attacked Rome, he was compelled to actually assume military leadership. Eastern Emperors frequently recognized the high claims of the Popes in order to gain their assistance. It is not difficult to understand, how, under these responsibilities, the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, established in the pre-Constantine period, was emphasized and magnified after 313 [Edict of Milan]. The importance of this fact must not be overlooked. The organization of the Church was thus put on the same divine basis as the revelation of Christianity. This idea once accepted led inevitably to the medieval Papacy.” (Alexander Clarence Flick, The Rise of the Mediaeval Church), pp. 168, 169), bold is mine.

“During the whole medieval period there was **in Rome a single spiritual and temporal authority** [the papacy] exercising powers which in the end exceeded those that had ever lain within the grasp of the Roman emperor.” (R. W. Southern, Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages, vol 2), pp. 24-25 Bold is mine.

“The papacy is no other than **the ghost of the deceased Roman Empire**, sitting crowned upon the grave thereof.” (Thomas Hobbes, as quoted in, Dave Hunt, A Woman Rides the Beast, p. 95) Bold is mine.

“Christian Rome was the **legitimate successor of pagan Rome**.... Christ had triumphed [and] Rome was ready to extend its sway to the heavens themselves.” (W. H. C. Frend, The Rise of Christianity, p. 773) Bold is mine.

“The Roman Christian Church was a church of world-wide importance and power, and her bishop the most influential. Out of the ruins of **political Rome** arose the great **moral empire** in the ‘giant form’ of the Roman Church. In the marvelous rise of the Roman Church is seen in strong relief the majestic office of the Bishop of Rome.” (Alexander Clarence Flick, The Rise of the Mediaeval Church, p. 150) Bold is mine

“When the Western empire fell into the hands of the barbarians, the Roman bishop was the only surviving **heir of this imperial past**, or, in the well-know dictum of Hobbes, ‘the ghost of the deceased Roman empire, sitting crowned upon the grave thereof.’” (Philip Schaff, History of the Christian Church, vol. 3, p. 287) Bold is mine

“Long before the fall of Rome, there had begun to grow up within the Roman Empire an **ecclesiastical state**, which was **shaping itself upon the imperial model**. This **spiritual empire**, like the secular empire, possessed a hierarchy of officers, of which deacons, priests or presbyters, and bishops were the most important. . . . Another consequence of the fall of the Roman power in the west was the development of the Papacy. In the absence of an Emperor in the west, the popes rapidly gained influence and power and soon built up an **ecclesiastical empire** that in some respects took the place of the old empire.” (Myers, General History for Colleges, pp. 348, 316) Bold is mine

“St. Thomas. . . says that **the Roman Empire has not ceased**, but is changed from the temporal into the spiritual. . . It was, then, the Apostolic Church, which, spreading throughout the nations, already combined together by the power of the heathen empire of Rome, quickened them with a new life. . . the temporal power in the old heathen empire of Rome, and the spiritual power in the supernatural kingdom of God met together. . . these two powers were **blended and fused together**; they became one authority, the emperor ruling from his throne within the sphere of his earthly jurisdiction, and the Supreme Pontiff ruling likewise from a throne of a higher sovereignty over the nations. . . the material power which once reigned in Rome [was] consecrated and sanctified by the investiture of the Vicar of Jesus Christ with temporal sovereignty over the city where he dwelt. And now for these twelve hundred years the peace, the perpetuity and faithfulness of the

Christian civilization of Europe, has been owing solely in its principle to this consecration of the power and authority of **the great empire of Rome**, taken up of old, perpetuated, preserved, as I have said, by the salt which had been sprinkled from heaven, and continued in the person of the Supreme Pontiff, and in that order of Christian civilization of which he has been the creator.” (Cardinal Manning, The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ, pp. 123-128) Bold is mine

“If we extend our view over the ruins of the Western Empire, such is the spectacle that meets us on every side. . . . the Pax Romana has ceased; it is universal confusion. But wherever a bishop holds his court, religion protects all that is left of the ancient order. **A new Rome ascends slowly above the horizon.** It is the heir of the religion which it has overthrown; it assumes the outward splendours of the Caesars. . . . The emperor is no more. . . . But the Pontifex Maximus abides; he is now the Vicar of Christ, offering the old civilization to the tribes of the north. He converts them to his creed, and they serve him as their Father and Judge supreme. This is the Papal Monarchy, which in its power and its decline overshadows the history of Europe for a thousand years.” (W. F. Barry, The Papal Monarchy, pp. 45, 46) Bold is mine

“As Rome’s role in pagan history came to an end, she was destined to play another, a sacred one, in Christian history. . . . Rome’s part in ecclesiastical history had begun. . . . Thus a Christian Rome, destined, like its pagan predecessor on the Palatine, to conquer a large part of the earth, gradually arose on Vatican Hill. . . . While today the Palatine [the hill of the Roman Emperors’ palaces] is in ruins, St. Peter’s still draws worshipers from all parts of the world.” (Walter Woodburn Hyde, Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire, pp. 6-7)

Notice the following amazing declaration by Cardinal Manning:

“Now the abandonment of Rome was the **liberation** of the pontiffs. Whatsoever claims to obedience the emperors may have made, and whatsoever compliance the Pontiff may have yielded, the whole previous relation, anomalous, and annulled again and again by the vices and outrages of the emperors, was finally dissolved by a higher power. The providence of God permitted a succession of **irruptions**, Gothic, Lombard, and Hungarian, to desolate Italy, and to **efface from it every remnant of the empire** [remember this fact of history. Later on in this paper we will see that Protestant futurists rewrite history and deny that the Roman Empire was ever divided]. The pontiffs found themselves alone, the sole fountains of order, peace, law, and safety. And from the hour of this providential **liberation**, when, by a divine intervention, the **chains fell off** from the hands of the successor of St. Peter, as once before from his own, no sovereign has ever reigned in Rome except the Vicar of Jesus Christ.” (Henry Edward Manning, The Temporal Power of The Vicar of Jesus Christ, Preface, pp. xxviii, xxix. London: Burns and Lambert, 1862). Bold is mine.

This might well be the time to speak of the mysterious “restrainer” that the Apostle Paul refers to in II Thessalonians 2. The early church Fathers were practically unanimous in the opinion that the “restrainer” was a reference to the Roman empire in general and the emperors in particular. Paul indicates that the Church at Thessalonica knew who the restrainer was. And yet Paul speaks in veiled language. And why would this be? Paul could not speak openly about the Empire which was governing in his day. If he had publicly stated that the Roman Empire was going to be taken out of the way, the emperors would have had grounds to accuse Paul of sedition. So Paul had to be cautious in his comments. If the restrainer was the Holy Spirit, as many futurists believe, then why was Paul so cautious? It is clear that Paul could not define the “restrainer” openly. It was not necessary to do so because the Thessalonians knew what he was talking about.

You will notice in the comment by Manning that the fall of the Roman empire led to the “liberation” of the Roman Pontiff. You will also notice that the fall of the Roman empire is described as chains falling off the hands of the successor of St. Peter. The inevitable conclusion we reach from Manning’s words is that the fall of the empire removed the restraint placed upon the Bishop of Rome. But now let us turn to the writings of the early church Fathers. Let us start with **Tertullian** (160-240 A. D.):

“For the mystery of iniquity doth already work; only he who now hinders must hinder, until he be taken out of the way.’ What obstacle is there but the Roman state, the falling away of which, by being scattered into ten kingdoms, shall introduce Antichrist upon (its own ruins)? ‘And then shall be revealed the wicked one.” *“On the Resurrection of the Flesh,”* chapter 24; Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. III, p. 563 [New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1908].

In yet another comment, **Tertullian** states

“The very end of all things threatening dreadful woes is only retarded by the continued existence of the Roman Empire.” (*“Apology,”* chapter 32; Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. III, p. 43)

Now notice the words of **Lactantius** (early fourth century):

“The subject itself declares that the fall and ruin of the world will shortly take place; except that while the city of Rome remains, it appears that nothing of this kind is to be feared. But when that capital of the world shall have fallen, and shall have begun to be a street, which the Sibyls say shall come to pass, who can doubt that the end has now arrived to the affairs of men and the whole world? It is that city, that only, which still sustains all things.” (*“The Divine Institutes,”* book 7, chapter 25; Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. VII, p. 220)

Let’s listen to **Cyril of Jerusalem** (318-386 A. D.):

“But this aforesaid Antichrist is to come when the times of the Roman Empire shall

have been fulfilled, and the end of the world is drawing near. There shall rise up together ten kings of the Romans, reigning in different parts perhaps, but all **about the same time**; and after those an eleventh, the Antichrist, who by his magical craft shall seize upon the Roman power; and of the kings who reigned before him, 'three he shall humble,' and the remaining seven he shall keep in subjection to himself." (*Catechetical Lectures*, " section 15, on II Thessalonians 2:4; Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, vol. VII, p. 108 [New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1895]).

Next we present the testimony of **Ambrose** (died in 398):

"After the falling or decay of the Roman Empire, Antichrist shall appear." (Quoted in, Bishop Thomas Newton, Dissertations on the Prophecies, p. 463 [London: B. Blake, 1840])

Next in line is **Chrysostom** (died in 407):

"When the Roman Empire is taken out of the way, then he [the Antichrist] shall come. And naturally. For as long as the fear of this empire lasts, no one will willingly exalt himself, but when that is dissolved, he will attack the anarchy, and endeavor to seize upon the government both of man and of God." "*Homily IV on 2 Thessalonians 2:6-9*," Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, vol. XIII, p. 389 [New York: Charles Scribner's and Sons, 1905].

Finally we will quote from **Jerome** (died 420):

"He that letteth is taken out of the way, and yet we do not realize that Antichrist is near." (Letter to Ageruchia, written about 409 A. D. Letter 123, section 16; Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, vol. VI, p. 236 [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912]).

Ellen G. White has some interesting statements regarding the restrainer both in history and in prophecy:

"The spirit of compromise and conformity [of the early Christian church] was **restrained** for a time by the fierce persecutions which the church endured under paganism. But as persecution ceased, and Christianity entered the courts and palaces of kings, she laid aside the humble simplicity of Christ and His apostles for the pomp and pride of pagan priests and rulers; and in place of the requirements of God, she substituted human theories and traditions." Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, p. 49. Bold is mine.

"Let the **restraints** now imposed by **secular governments** be **removed** and Rome be reinstated in her former power, and there would speedily be a revival of her

tyranny and persecution.” Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, p. 564. Bold is mine.

“The vast empire of Rome crumbled to pieces, and from its ruins rose that mighty power, the Roman Catholic Church. This church boasts of her infallibility and her hereditary religion.” (Ellen G. White, Manuscript Releases, volume 1, p. 50)

**Characteristic # 2:** The Roman Catholic Church did arise among the ten kingdoms into which the Roman Empire was divided. Notice the following two quotations:

“Even the Romanists themselves admit that the Roman Empire was, by means of the incursions of the northern nations, dismembered into ten kingdoms (Calmet on Revelation 13:1; and he refers likewise to Berangaud, Bossuet, and DuPin. See Newton, p. 209); and Machiavelli (‘History of Florence,’ 1.i) with no design of furnishing an illustration of this prophecy, and probably with no recollection of it, has mentioned these names: 1. The **Ostrogoths** in Moesia; 2. The **Visigoths** in Pannonia; 3. The **Sueves** and Alans in Gascoign and Spain; 4. The **Vandals** in Africa; 5. The **Franks** in France; 6. The **Burgundians** in Burgundy; 7. The **Heruli** and Turingi in Italy; 8. The **Saxons and Angles** in Britain; 9. The **Huns** in Hungary; 10. The **Lombards** at first upon the Danube, afterwards in Italy.” (Albert Barnes, Notes on the Book of Daniel, p. 322)

“Antichrist, then (as the Fathers delight to call him), or the little horn, is to be sought **among the ten kingdoms of the Western Roman Empire**. I say of the western Roman Empire, because that was properly the body of the fourth beast; Greece, and the countries which lay eastward of Italy belonged to the third beast; for the former beasts were still subsisting, though their dominion was taken away. ‘As concerning the rest of the beasts,’ saith Daniel, ‘they had their dominion taken away; yet their lives were prolonged for a season and a time.’ Daniel 7:12. ‘And therefore,’ as Sir Isaac Newton rightly infers, ‘all four beasts are still alive, though the dominion of the three first be taken away.

“The nations of Chaldea and Assyria are still the first beast. Those of Media and Persia are still the second beast. Those of Macedon, Greece and Thrace, Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt, are still the third. And those of Europe, on this side of Greece, are still the fourth. Seeing therefore the body of the third beast is confined to the nations on this side the river Euphrates, and the body of the fourth beast is confined to the nations on this side of Greece; we are to look for all the four heads of the third beast among the nations on this side the river Euphrates; and for **all the eleven horns of the fourth beast, among the nations on this side of Greece**.” (Thomas Newton, Dissertations on the Prophecies, pp. 239, 240) Bold is mine

**Characteristic # 3:** The Roman Catholic Papacy did arise to **supremacy** after the year 476 A. D. The Papal power could not exercise absolute sovereignty until the ten kingdoms were subjected to

its control. When Odoacer, king of the Heruli, deposed Romulus Augustulus in 476 A. D., the fragmentation of the Roman Empire was complete. Yet even though the ten divisions of the Roman Empire were complete by 476 A. D., there were three who were rebellious and refused to submit to the Bishop of Rome (the Vandals, the Heruli and the Ostrogoths).

**Characteristic # 4:** The little horn did uproot three of the ten kingdoms. The story goes like this: Seven of the ten Barbarian kingdoms were converted to Christianity and submitted to the authority of the Bishop of Rome. However, three of the kingdoms converted to Christianity but embraced the heretical teachings of Arius. Arius (who was presbyter in Alexandria around the year 320 A. D.) taught that 'Christ was created out of nothing as the first and greatest of all creatures' (Loraine Boettner, Baker's Dictionary of Theology, pp. 64-65).

The teachings of Arius were condemned in two great church councils, Nicea (325 A. D.) and Constantinople (381 A. D.). These three Arian kingdoms were a threat to the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome [later called the Pope]. To make a long story short, these three kingdoms eventually were uprooted by the imperial power acting under the influence of the Bishop of Rome. The Ostrogoths (originally from Yugoslavia), by order of the emperor, dealt the heretical Heruli a devastating defeat in 493.

It happened like this: The Pope requested the emperor to do something about the unorthodox Heruli. In response, the emperor sent Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths to do battle with Odoacer, king of the Heruli. Odoacer was slain by Theodoric and the Heruli disappeared from history. Then the Vandals were crushed (in 534 A. D.) by Belisarius, general of emperor Justinian's armies.

But there was one remaining horn which needed to be uprooted, and it was the most formidable of all: the Ostrogoths. After the Ostrogoths conquered the Heruli, they became extremely powerful. They were also Arians, so the Bishop of Rome [the Pope] implored Justinian to uproot the Ostrogoths. Justinian, in turn, implored the Franks to help him in his holy enterprise:

"When Justinian first meditated the conquest of Italy, he sent ambassadors to the kings of the Franks, and adjured them, by the common ties of alliance and **religion**, to join in the **holy** enterprise against the Arians." Edward Gibbon, The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, volume 4 [chapter 41, paragraph 32] (New York: Harper & Brothers), p. 175. Bold is mine.

There were several battles between Belisarius and the Ostrogoths. The decisive battle, however, was in February (remember the month, we will come back to it later) of the year 538. The armies of Justinian, as well as the ravages of disease, decimated the armies of the Ostrogoths, they were expelled from Rome and in short order, disappeared from the historical scene in Europe. The third horn had been uprooted once and for all!

It is of great significance that in 533 A. D. Justinian proclaimed a decree which recognized the Pope's headship over all the churches of east and west. This decree was actually a letter written by Justinian to Pope John. The letter was included in *The Code of Justinian* which is a collection of Justinian's laws. It must be remembered that this letter had the force of law. In effect, the *Code of*

*Justinian* was the standard law of all Europe for over one thousand years until it was replaced in the late 1700's by the *Code of Napoleon*. Part of Justinian's decree reads as follows:

“Therefore, **we have exerted ourselves** to unite all the priests of the East and **subject them** to the See of Your Holiness, and hence the questions which have at present arisen, although they are manifest and free from doubt, and, according to the doctrine of Your Apostolic See, are constantly firmly observed and preached by all priests. . . because you are the head of all the Holy Churches, for **We shall exert Ourselves in every way** (as has already been stated), to increase the honor and authority of your See. . .” (S. P. Scott, The Civil Law, vol. 12, pp. 11-13).

The significance of this decree is that the Roman Emperor was legitimizing the spiritual authority of the Pope. The state was using its clout to proclaim that only the Pope was the authentic spokesman for orthodox Christianity. Though this decree was given in 533 A. D., it was not fully implemented until the rebel Ostrogoths were devastated in 538 A. D.

On the devastating defeat of the Ostrogoths in 538 A. D., Thomas Hodgkin remarks:

“Some of them [the retreating Goths] must have suspected the melancholy truth that they had dug one grave deeper and wider than all, the grave of the Gothic monarchy in Italy.” (Thomas Hodgkin, Italy and Her Invaders, book 5, chap. 9, last par. [vol. 4, p. 285]).

Most historians agree that the decimation of the Ostrogoths in Italy marked the beginning of the Middle Ages. Notice the comment by George Finlay:

“With the conquest of Rome by Belisarius, the history of the ancient city may be considered as terminating; and with his defense against Witiges [A. D. 538], commences the history of the Middle Ages.” (George Finlay, Greece Under the Romans, p. 295)

It is important to remember also that historians mark 538 A. D. as the transition between old Imperial Rome and the Rome of the Middle Ages. Notice the words of C. F. Young:

“It was the last time [when Belisarius entered in 536] that Imperial Rome—the old imperial Rome of Italy as distinguished from the new imperial Rome by the Bosphorus, the Rome created by Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Vespasian, Domitian, Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus, Severus, and Caracalla—was to be seen by mankind. . . Rome when it was entered by Belisarius was the Rome that mankind had known for centuries. . . But this Rome was to be seen no more. When eighteen years later the Gothic war was ended, a battered ruin was all that remained; classical Rome had passed away forever, to be succeeded after a time by the squalid and miserable city which is the Rome of the middle Ages.” (C. F. Young, East and West Through Fifteen Centuries, Vol. II, p. 222)

The Ostrogoths did not disappear in 538 A. D., but the decisive battle had been won, the handwriting was on the wall. In 540 A. D. Witiges (king of the Ostrogoths) was dealt a further blow by Belisarius at Ravenna. And in 550 A. D., what was left of the Ostrogoths was totally wiped out and the Ostrogoths were history. It is of great significance that today no trace can be found of the Heruli anywhere in Europe. There is no memory of the Vandals in North Africa. And all that remains of the Ostrogoths is King Theodoric's Mausoleum (built in the early 6<sup>th</sup> century) in Ravenna. Theodoric was buried in this mausoleum in 526 A. D., but today his body is gone. When Belisarius conquered Ravenna in 540 A. D., Theodoric's body was removed from the casket and discarded. So it is literally true that the three horns were uprooted!!

**Characteristic # 5:** The Roman Catholic Papacy does claim to have the right to exercise the prerogatives of God. The Bible is clear that the Antichrist will sit in the Temple of God, showing himself to be God (II Thessalonians 2:3-4). Notice the following evidence which incriminates the Roman Catholic Papacy:

1) Roman Catholic Church historians and theologians have made some rather audacious statements regarding the dignity and power of the Pope. Let's notice a few of them:

In an oration offered to the Pope in the fourth session of the Fifth Lateran Council (1512) **Christopher Marcellus** stated:

“For thou art the shepherd, thou art the physician, thou art the director, thou art the husbandman; finally, thou art **another God on earth.**” (Labbe and Cossart, History of the Councils, Vol. XIV, col. 109). Bold is mine.

The **Catechism of the Council of Trent** states the following:

“Bishops and priests, being, as they are, God's interpreters and ambassadors, empowered in His name to teach mankind the divine law and the rules of conduct, and holding, as they do, **His place on earth**, it is evident that no nobler function than theirs can be imagined. Justly, therefore, are they called not only Angels, but even **gods**, because of the fact that they exercise in our midst **the power and prerogatives of the immortal God.**” (John A. McHugh and Charles J. Callan, Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests, p. 318) Bold is mine

Notice the following words of **Cardinal Robert Bellarmine**:

“All names which in the Scriptures are applied to Christ, by virtue of which it is established that he is over the church, all the same names are applied to the Pope.” (Robert Bellarmine, Disputationes de Controversiis, Tom. 2, “Controversia Prima”, Book 2 (“De Conciliorum Auctoritate” [On the Authority of Councils]), chap. 17 (1628 ed., Vol. 1, p. 266), translated

The New York Catechism states:

“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, the 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, the supreme judge of heaven and earth, the judge of all, being judged by no one, **God himself on earth.**” (Quoted in Lorraine Boettner, Roman Catholicism, p. 127) Bold is mine

Notice the following words in the journal, *La Civiltà Cattolica*,

“The pope is the supreme judge of the law of the land. . . . He is the **viceregent of Christ**, who is not only a Priest forever, but also King of kings and Lord of lords.” (*La Civiltà Cattolica*, March 18, 1871, quoted in Leonard Woolsey Bacon, An Inside View of the Vatican Council (American Tract Society ed.), p. 229, n. Bold is mine.

**Pope Gregory IX** adds his testimony:

“For not man, but God separates those whom the Roman Pontiff (who exercises the functions, not of mere man, but of the true God), having weighed the necessity or benefit of the churches, dissolves, not by human but rather by divine authority.” (The Decretals of Gregory IX, Book 1, title 7, chap. 3, in Corpus Juris Canonici (1555-56 ed.), Vol 2, col. 203, translated).

**John XXIII** at his inauguration address said:

“Into this fold of Jesus Christ no one can enter if not under the guidance of the Sovereign Pontiff; and men can securely reach salvation only when they are united with him, since the **Roman Pontiff is the Vicar of Christ** and represents His person on this earth.” (Quoted in Lorraine Boettner, Roman Catholicism, p. 408)

**Pope Leo XIII** stated in an Encyclical Letter dated June 20, 1894: “We hold upon this earth **the place of God Almighty.**” (The Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII, p. 304)

Notice the following statement by a Roman Catholic scholar:

“The priest is the man *of God*, the minister *of God*, the portion *of God*, the man *called of God*, *consecrated to God*, wholly occupied with *the interests of God*; ‘he that despiseth him despiseth *God*; he that hears him hears *God*: he remits sins *as God*, and that which he calls his body at the altar is adored *as God* by himself and

by the congregation. . .” (A. Nampon, Catholic Doctrine as Defined by the Council of Trent, pp. 543, 544).

Another Roman Catholic scholar states:

“The Pope is the Vicar of Christ, or the visible head of the church on earth. The claims of the Pope are the same as the claims of Christ. Christ wanted all souls saved. So does the Pope. Christ can forgive all sin. So can the Pope. The Pope is the only man who claims the **vicarage of Christ**. His claim is not seriously opposed, and this establishes his authority.

“The powers given the Pope by Christ were given him not as a mere man, but as the **representative of Christ**. The Pope is more than the representative of Christ, for he is the fruit of his divinity and of the divine institution of the church.” (Extract of a sermon by Rev. Jeremiah Prendegast, S. J., preached in the Church of St. John the Baptist, Syracuse, New York, on Wednesday evening, March 13, 1912, as reported in the *Syracuse Post Standard*, March 14, 1912).

The following words, in a recognized Roman Catholic encyclopedia, illustrate the blasphemous claims of the Papacy:

“The Pope is of so great dignity and so exalted that he is not a mere man, but **as it were God, and the vicar of God**. The Pope is of such lofty and supreme dignity that, properly speaking, he has not been established in any rank of dignity, but rather has been placed upon the very summit of all ranks of dignities. The Pope is called **most holy** because he is rightfully presumed to be such. Nor can emperors and kings be called most holy; for although in civil laws the term ‘most sacred’ seems sometimes to have been usurped by emperors, yet never that of ‘most holy.’ The Pope alone is deservedly called by the name ‘most holy’, because he alone is the **vicar of Christ**, who is the fountain and source and fullness of all holiness.

“The Pope by reason of the excellence of his supreme dignity is called bishop of bishops. He is also called ordinary of ordinaries. He is likewise bishop of the universal church. He is likewise the divine monarch and supreme emperor, and king of kings. Hence the Pope is crowned with a triple crown, as king of heaven and of earth and of the lower regions.

“Moreover the superiority and the power of the Roman Pontiff by no means pertain only to the heavenly things, to the earthly things, and to the things under the earth, but are even over angels, than whom he is greater. So that if it were possible that the angels might err in the faith, or might think contrary to the faith, they could be **judged and excommunicated by the Pope**. For he is of so great dignity and power that he forms one and the same tribunal with Christ. So that whatever the Pope does, seems to proceed from the mouth of God, as according to most doctors, etc.

“The Pope is as it were **God on earth**, sole sovereign of the faithful of Christ, chief king of kings, having plenitude of power, to whom has been intrusted by the omnipotent God direction not only of the earthly but also of the heavenly kingdom.

“The Pope is of so great authority and power that he can **modify, explain, or interpret even divine laws**. [In proof of this last proposition various quotations are made, among them these:] The Pope can modify divine law, since his power is **not of man but of God**, and he acts as **viceregent of God** upon earth with most ample power of binding and loosing his sheep. Whatever the Lord God himself, and the Redeemer, is said to do, that his vicar does, provided that he does nothing contrary to the faith.” (Lucius Ferraris, Prompta Bibliotheca Canonica, Juridica, Moralis, Theologica nec non Ascetica, Polemica, Rubricistica, Historica, article, “Papa”.) This encyclopedia is not some offshoot production. The Catholic Encyclopedia, volume VI, p. 48 in its article, “Ferraris” lauds the virtues of this encyclopedia with the following glowing words: It is “a veritable encyclopedia of religious knowledge” and “a precious mine of information.”

Once again, **Pope Leo XIII** stated:

“But the supreme teacher in the Church is the Roman Pontiff. Union of minds, therefore, requires, together with a perfect accord in the one faith, **complete submission and obedience** of will to the Church and to the Roman Pontiff, **as to God Himself**.” (Pope Leo XIII, Encyclical Letter, ‘On the Chief Duties of Christians as Citizens’, dated January 10, 1890, trans. in The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII, p. 193. Bold is mine.

**Pope Nicholas I**, who ruled from 858 to 867 A. D. pronounced the following awesome words:

“It is evident that the popes can neither be bound nor unbound by any earthly power, nor even by that of the apostle [Peter], if he should return upon the earth; since Constantine the Great has recognized that the pontiffs **held the place of God upon earth, divinity not being able to be judged by any living man**. We are, then, infallible, and whatever may be our acts, we are not accountable for them but to ourselves.” (Cormenin, History of the Popes, p. 243, as cited in R. W. Thompson, The Papacy and the Civil Power, p. 248).

Many other quotations could be added to prove that the Papacy claims to have the powers and prerogatives of God.

2) Not only do we have statements from Roman Catholic sources to the effect that the Papacy has the power of God, but the Pope also claims the right to be called “Holy Father”. Jesus warned the Jewish leaders of His day: “And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father which is in heaven” (Matthew 23:9). In the light of this clear statement of Jesus, How can the Pope

demand that he be called “Holy Father”? The name, Pope comes from the Italian, “Papa” which is an abbreviation of *pater patrum* which means “father of fathers” or “principal father” (See, Malachi Martin, The Decline and Fall of the Roman Church, p. 19).

3) The Pope allows people to approach him and bow before him and kiss his ring. In fact, Gregory VII, in his famous *Dictatus Papae* (Dictates of Hildebrand), article # 9 states: “That all princes should kiss his [the Pope’s] feet only.” (Cesare Baronius, Annales, year 1076, secs. 31-33, Vol 17 (1869 ed.), pp. 405, 406, translated)

4) Acts 10:25-26 explains that Peter refused to allow Cornelius to bow before him. And supposedly, Peter was the first Pope!!! Even the angel Gabriel refused to allow John the Apostle to bow before him (see Revelation 19:10; 22:8-9). Jesus said to Satan on the Mount of Temptation, “Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve”. How unlike Jesus is the Pope. Jesus washed the feet of His disciples but the Pope has encouraged people to bow before him and kiss his feet!!

4) The Papacy claims to possess the power to forgive sins. According to the Bible, only God can forgive sins (see Mark 2:7). If only God can forgive sins and the Pope claims to have power to forgive them, then the Pope must claim to be God! Not only does the Papacy claim that the Pope can forgive sins, but it also claims that its priesthood can forgive them. St. Alphonsus de Liguori wrote a book titled, Dignity and Duties of the Priest or Selva. Liguori lived in the mid 1700’s. What makes his book especially significant is that it is a compendium of the Roman Catholic “wisdom” of the previous 1500 years. Thus it presents with clarity, the official position of the Roman Catholic Church on the subject of the power and duties of the priesthood.

Before we look at several blasphemous statements from this book, it is important to understand the Roman Catholic view of the Mass. In their view, **1)** the priest has the power to change the bread into the real flesh of Jesus and the wine into His real blood, **2)** Christ is contained in his totality (known as “ubiquity”) in each host distributed by the priest, **3)** because Christ is totally present in each host, the host is worshiped by the priest and the faithful. Obviously, for these concepts to be true, the priest would have to exercise the powers of Almighty God. And this is just what the Roman Catholic Church believes. Let’s listen to the words of St. Alphonsus de Liguori:

“With regard to the power of the priests over the real body of Jesus Christ, it is of faith that when they pronounce the words of consecration the Incarnate Word has obliged himself to obey and to come into their hands under the sacramental species. We are struck with wonder when we hear that God obeyed the voice of Josue—*The Lord obeying the voice of man*—and made the sun stand when he said *move not, O sun, towards Gabaon. . . . and the sun stood still.*

“But our wonder should be far greater when we find that in obedience to the words of his priests—*HOC EST CORPUS MEUM*—God himself descends on the altar, that he comes wherever they call him, and as often as they call him, and places himself in their hands, even though they should be his enemies. And after having come, he

remains, entirely at their disposal; 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 the food of others.” St. Alphonsus de Liguori, The Dignity and Duties of the Priest or Selva, pp. 26-27

“With regard to the *mystic* body of Christ, that is, all the faithful, the priest has the power of the keys, or the power of delivering sinners from hell, of making them worthy of paradise, and of changing them from the slaves of Satan into the children of God. And God himself is obliged to abide by the judgment of his priests, and either not to pardon or to pardon, according as they refuse or give absolution provided the penitent is capable of it. ‘Such is,’ says St. Maximus of Turin, ‘this judiciary power ascribed to Peter that its decision carries with it the decision of God.’ The sentence of the priest precedes, and God subscribes to it,’ writes St. Peter Damian.” St. Alphonsus de Liguori, Dignity and Duties of the Priest or Selva, pp. 27-28.

“Were the Redeemer to descend into a church, and sit in a confessional to administer the sacrament of penance, and a priest to sit in another confessional, Jesus would say over each penitent, ‘*Ego te absolvo*,’ the priest would likewise say over each of his penitents, ‘*Ego te absolvo*,’ and the penitents of each would be equally absolved.” St. Alphonsus de Liguori, Dignity and Duties of the Priest or Selva, p. 28.

“Thus the priest may, in a certain manner, be called **the creator of his Creator**, since by saying the words of consecration, he creates, as it were, Jesus in the sacrament, by giving him a sacramental existence, and produces him as a victim to be offered to the eternal Father. As in creating the world it was sufficient for God to have said, Let it be made, and it was created—*He spoke, and they were made*—so it is sufficient for the priest to say, ‘*Hoc est corpus meum*,’ and behold the bread is no longer bread, but the body of Jesus Christ. ‘The power of the priest,’ says St. Bernardine of Sienna, ‘is the power of the divine person; for the transubstantiation of the bread requires **as much power as the creation of the world.**” St. Alphonsus de Liguori, Dignity and Duties of the Priest or Selva, pp. 33-34. Bold is mine.

“When he ascended into heaven, Jesus Christ left his priests after him to hold on earth his place of mediator between God and men, particularly on the altar. . . The Priest holds **the place of the Saviour himself**, when, by saying ‘*Ego te absolvo*,’ he absolves from sin.” St. Alphonsus de Liguori, Dignity and Duties of the Priest or Selva, p. 34.

Notice also the blasphemous words of the Baltimore Catechism:

“The priest does not have to ask God to forgive your sins. The priest himself has

the power to do so in Christ's name. Your sins are forgiven by the priest the same as if you knelt before Jesus Christ and told them to Christ Himself." Quoted in Lorraine Boettner, Roman Catholicism, p. 197.

The Council of Trent described the power of priest with the following words:

"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 adored 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" A. Nampon, Catholic Doctrine as Defined by the Council of Trent, pp. 543,544.

5) The Roman Catholic Papacy claims to have changed the law of God. Not even God can change the law He wrote with His own finger (see, Exodus 31:18). It is as eternal as He is. This means that the Papacy not only claims power equal to God's but actually claims a power greater than God's. Obviously this is blasphemy in its most odious form. Notice the following words from the Catholic Encyclopedia, vol. XII, art. "Pope," p. 265:

"Peter and his successors have power to impose laws both preceptive and prohibitive, power likewise to grant dispensation from these laws, and, when, needful, to annul them. It is theirs to judge offenses against the laws, to impose and to remit penalties. This judicial authority will even include the power to forgive sin. For sin is a breach of the laws of the supernatural kingdom, and falls under the cognizance of its constituted judges."

In characteristic # 8 below, we will show how the Papacy claims to have changed God's law. Roman Catholic catechisms ignore the second commandment and split the tenth commandment into two. They also claim to have changed the fourth commandment.

6) The Papacy claims that it has infallibility in faith and morals. The Bible teaches clearly that only God is infallible and does not change (James 1:17; Malachi 3:6; Hebrews 13:8)). If the Pope, speaking *ex-cathedra*, claims to be infallible, then he must also be claiming to be God!! Notice the following evidence:

Gregory VII, in his famous *Dictatus Papae*, makes twenty seven propositions among which is: "That the Roman Church never erred, nor will it, according to the Scriptures, ever err." (Cesare Baronius, Annales, year 1076, secs. 31-33, vol 17 (1869 ed.), pp. 405, 406, translated).

The Roman Catholic Papacy has put itself on the record on this point by proclaiming, in 1870, the famous *Dogma of Papal Infallibility*. The events surrounding this event are described by Norskov Olsen:

"*Viva Pio Nono Papa infallible!*" These words echoed and re-echoed in the basilica

of St. Peter in Rome on the eventful July 18, 1870 when the great crowd, having heard the message of papal infallibility, jubilantly expressed their applause. 'In the midst of one of the fiercest storms ever known to break across the city, accompanied by thunder and lightning, while rain poured in through the broken glass of the roof close to the spot where the Pope was standing, Pius IX read in the darkness, by the aid of a candle, the momentous affirmation of his own infallibility.'

"The fierce storm and dense darkness, the thunder and lightning that accompanied the reading of this document, caused adherents of the papacy to compare the event to the lawgiving at Mount Sinai; on the other hand, opponents saw in the wrath of the elements a sign of God's anger. By both friend and critic the declaration of papal absolutism was considered to be the most momentous event in the long history of the papacy.

"On that day the document entitled *Dogmatic Constitution on the Catholic Faith* was decreed. It contains three fundamental concepts which were made into dogma: the supremacy, the universal jurisdiction, and the infallibility of the pope." (V. Norskov Olsen, Papal Supremacy and American Democracy, p. 2).

The key portion of the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Catholic Faith* stated the following:

"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 or morals to be held by the universal Church, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that his Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church. But if any one—which may God avert—presume to contradict this our definition: let him be anathema." Philip Schaff, Creeds of Christendom, vol. 2, chapter 4, pp. 270-271).

The Roman Catholic theologian, Fritz Leist, comments on this dogma:

"The infallibility of the pope is the infallibility of Jesus Christ Himself. . . whenever the pope thinks, it is **God Himself**, who is thinking in him." (Fritz Leist, Der Gefangene des Vatikanus, p. 344. Quoted in Symposium on Revelation, pp. 340-341).

The proclamation of this Papal Dogma was the most controversial in the history of the Roman Catholic Church. A significant number of the clergy who attended the Vatican Council I were ardently opposed to this dogma and yet in spite of protests, it was passed. If you would like to read

more about how this controversial dogma was passed, despite the opposition, read the opening pages of V. Norskov Olsen's book, Papal Supremacy and American Democracy.

The famous Bible commentator, Adam Clarke, remarks:

“They have assumed infallibility, which belongs only to God. They profess to forgive sins, which belongs only to God. They profess to open and shut heaven, which belongs only to God. They profess to be higher than all the kings of the earth, which belongs only to God. And they go beyond God in pretending to loose whole nations from their oath of allegiance to their kings, when such kings do not please them. And they *go against* God, when they give *indulgences for sin*. This is the *worst* of all blasphemies.” ( Adam Clarke, Commentary, on Daniel 7:25).

This dogma has created numerous problems for the Papacy in recent years. For example, Hans Kung, a leading theologian of the Catholic Church was defrocked from his chair at the University of Tubingen for writing a book titled Infallible?: An Inquiry. In this book, Kung shows that Pope Paul VI's encyclical, *Humane Vitae*, is not only based of bad history but also on bad science. This book provides a plethora of examples which show that popes have made gargantuan mistakes even when they speak *ex-cathedra* on faith and morals. So much for the Dogma of Papal Infallibility!!

7) According to the Bible, it is the prerogative of God alone to place kings on the throne and to depose them (Daniel 2:21) and yet the Papacy, throughout its history has boastfully claimed the right to install kings and depose them. The examples are numerous (under point # 10 we will furnish several of these) but for now, let us examine statements by Popes and theologians to this effect:

In the famous *Dictatus Papae* of Pope Gregory VII, article 12 states: “That it is lawful for him [the Pope] to depose emperors.” Article 27 reads: “That he [the Pope] can absolve subjects from their allegiance to unrighteous rulers.”

In the second sentence of excommunication which Gregory VII passed upon Henry the Fourth are these words:

“Come now, I beseech you, O most holy and blessed fathers and princes, Peter and Paul, that all the world may understand and know that if ye are able to bind and to loose in heaven, ye are likewise able on earth, according to the merits of each man, to give and to take away empires, kingdoms, pryncedoms, marquisates, duchies, countships, and the possessions of all men. For if ye judge spiritual things, what must we believe to be your power over worldly things? And if ye judge the angels who rule over all the proud princes, what can ye do to their slaves?” James Bryce, The Holy Roman Empire, p. 161.

The arrogance of the Papacy over the secular power is illustrated in the famous *Decree of Gratian*.

Even though this Decree is a perversion of fact, it does show the boastful claims of the papacy:

“It is shown with sufficient clearness that by the secular power the Pope cannot in any way be bound or loosed, who it is certain was called God by the pious leader Constantine, and it is clear that God cannot be judged by man.” (Decree of Gratian, part 1, div. 96, chap. 7).

Notice the words of the papal bull of Pius V deposing Queen Elizabeth of England in 1570:

“He that reigneth on high, to whom all power in heaven and earth is given, has with all fulness of power delivered the rule of the one holy catholic and apostolic church, outside of which there is no salvation, to one sole [ruler] upon earth, to wit, Peter, the prince of the apostles, and to the Roman Pontiff, the successor of Peter. Him alone he hath set as prince over all nations and all kingdoms, to pull up, to destroy, to overthrow, and to break down, to plant, and to build, that he may keep the people faithful, bound with the bond of mutual love, and in the unity of the Spirit, and present them unhurt and safe to his Saviour.”

Pope Pius, in articles 4 and 5 of this Bull, states the following:

“*Article 4.* Moreover she herself is deprived of her pretended right to the aforesaid kingdom, and also of all dominion, dignity and privilege whatsoever. *Article 5.* And so we absolve the nobles, subjects, and peoples of the said kingdom, and all others who have taken any oath to her, from the obligation of their oath and besides from all duty of dominion, fidelity and obedience: and we deprive the said Elizabeth of her pretended right to the kingdom and of all other things as is aforesaid: and we charge and order all and every the nobles, subjects, and peoples, and others aforesaid, not to venture to obey her monitions, commands, and laws. And we attach the like sentence of anathema to those who shall act otherwise. . . Given at St. Peter’s at Rome 25<sup>th</sup> February, 1570, in the fifth year of our pontificate.” (Charles Stuteville, Our Brief Against Rome, p. 268.

8) The Bible makes it clear that God the Father has given Jesus Christ the right to judge because He is the Son of Man (John 5:22, 27). In fact, the Father has given Jesus ALL JUDGMENT!! But the Papacy claims that it has been given the right to serve as judge of mankind. In this way, the Papacy, once again, claims to possess the right to exercise the role which belongs to God alone. Notice the following evidence:

In Gregory VII’s *Dictatus Papae*, article 18 reads:

“That his [the Pope’s] sentence is not to be reviewed by any one; while he alone can review the decisions of all others.” Article 19 states: “That he [the Pope] can be judged by no one”.

Augustinus de Ancona, in a document preserved in the British Museum, states the following:

“Therefore the decision of the Pope and the decision of God constitute one [i. e., the same] decision, just as the opinion of the Pope and of his disciple are the same. Since, therefore, an appeal is always taken from an inferior judge to a superior, as no one is greater than himself, so no appeal holds when made from the Pope to God, because there is one consistory of the Pope himself and of God himself, of which consistory the Pope himself is the key-bearer and the doorkeeper. Therefore no one can appeal from the Pope to God, as no one can enter into the consistory of God without the mediation of the Pope, who is the key-bearer and the doorkeeper of the consistory of eternal life; and as no one can appeal to himself, so no one can appeal from the Pope to God, because there is one decision and one court [curia] of God and the Pope.” (From the writings of Augustinus de Ancona (R. C.), printed without title page or pagination, commencing, ‘*incipit summa Catholici doctoris Augustini de Ancona potestate ecclesiastica*’, *Questio VI, De Papalis Sententiae Appellatione*’ (On an Appeal from a Decision of the Pope).

We are also reminded of the words of Lucius Ferraris:

“So that if it were possible that the angels might err in the faith, or might think contrary to the faith, they could be judged and excommunicated by the Pope. For he is of so great dignity and power that he forms one and the same tribunal with Christ.” (Lucius Ferraris, Prompto Bibliotheca, article, “Papa”, II, vol. 6, pp. 26-29).

**Characteristic # 6:** The Roman Catholic Church has been an ardent persecutor of dissenters throughout its history. It has a history stained in blood. The record is there for everyone who wishes to examine it. We will first make a few remarks about the Biblical view of freedom of conscience and then we will trace the historical record of how Roman Catholicism has trampled on this fundamental freedom.

Roman Catholic authors frequently employ two passages to defend the view that it has a right to use the sword to preserve the integrity of the faith: Matthew 10:34-37 and Matthew 16:16-18. In the first passage Jesus says He has not “come to bring peace but a sword”. Many Catholic authors employ this to justify their church’s use of the sword to punish dissenters. But a careful reading of this text shows that the sword is not used by believers against unbelievers but rather by unbelievers against believers. The keys in the second passage are interpreted as the right to exercise spiritual power and temporal power. In other words, the church not only has the right to rule in spiritual matters but also in civil affairs. According to Roman Catholic theology, this gives the church the right to employ the civil power to punish those who dissent from its theology and practice.

A close examination of the Bible indicates that Jesus intended the civil and religious powers to be separate. God is not a God of coercion but of persuasion. God does not violate the conscience of man. This means that God gives every man the right to believe according to the dictates of his own conscience when matters of religion are in play. In this realm, God even gives man the right to be

wrong!! A few biblical texts will suffice to prove the above view:

Matthew 22:21 unequivocally states that we are to render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's and unto God that which belongs to God. A close examination of the text in the light of the totality of Scripture indicates that the realm of Caesar is in civil matters (the second table of the Ten Commandments) and the realm of God is in spiritual matters (the first table of the Ten Commandments).

When Jesus was dragged before Pilate He was asked if He was a king. Jesus assured Pilate that His kingdom was not of this world (John 19:36). He even told Pilate that if His kingdom were of this world, His disciples would fight to deliver Him from the Jews. This clearly shows that Jesus had no intention of establishing an earthly kingdom by employing force. The kingdom could only be established by implanting the Holy Spirit in the heart of His disciples.

It is a sobering fact that the trial and crucifixion of Jesus followed the same pattern as was later used by the Holy Office of the Inquisition. Notice the following points: 1) Jesus was arrested because He refused to accept the traditions and authority of the apostate church of His day, 2) Jesus was interrogated [inquisitioned?] by the religious power in a devious manner. 3) Though no fault was found in Him, He was delivered to the secular power of Rome to be killed.

This is the precise method which was used by the Inquisition. Those who did not agree with the hierarchy of the church and refused to accept tradition above Scripture, were brought before the inquisitor and grilled mercilessly. Then they were delivered to the civil power to be punished (later in this study we will review some of the specific methods which were used by the Inquisition). It is significant that Satan offered Jesus the kingdoms of this world and Jesus refused them. But Satan offered the Bishop of Rome these same kingdoms and he accepted them. This makes the Bishop of Rome the vice-regent of Satan. If Jesus had accepted, he would have become the vice-regent of Satan.

When the mob came to arrest Jesus in the Garden of Gethsemane, Peter took out a sword and tried to defend the cause of Jesus by force. The words of Jesus are very telling: "Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword" (Matthew 26:51-52).

In Luke 9:51-56 we are told the story of James and John who wanted to incinerate those who lived in certain Samaritan villages because they refused to accept Jesus. The words of Jesus to the 'sons of thunder' are very telling: "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of, for the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." Clearly Jesus refused to employ force to advance the cause of His kingdom.

The prophecies of Daniel and Revelation clearly reveal that God's people are always the **persecuted** not the **persecutors**. During the 1260 years the true church was in exile in the desert (see Revelation 12:6, 14). During this period the true church was **persecuted, it did not persecute**. But history reveals, indelibly, that the Roman Catholic Church during this period was the **persecutor**. This makes it crystal clear that the Roman Catholic system was performing the

work of the little horn in making war against and wearing out the saints of the Most High (Daniel 7:21, 25).

What is remarkable is that Daniel 7:21 states that this apostate power would actually prevail against the saints during this period and this is exactly what happened!! We have already seen in another context that the mixture of iron and clay in the feet of the image of Daniel 2 represents the mixture of church and state after the division of the Roman Empire. Revelation 17 reveals a time when the church (the harlot) and the state (the kings of the earth) will once again form an alliance to persecute dissenters.

Let's examine the Roman Catholic view of persecution. It was St. Augustine who laid the foundation for the persecutions of the middle ages. In his own words:

“Originally my opinion was that no one should be coerced into the unity of Christ, that we must act only by words, fight only by arguments, and prevail by force of reason, lest we should have those whom we knew as avowed heretics feigning themselves to be Catholics. **But this opinion of mine was overcome** not by the words of those who controverted it, but by the conclusive instances to which they could point. For, in the first place, there was set over against my opinion my own town [Hippo], which, although it was once wholly on the side of Donatus [a heretic who was leader of a group known as the Donatists], was brought over to the Catholic unity **by fear of the imperial edicts.**” St. Augustine, Letter 93 (to Vincentius), chapter 5, section 17, translated in Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, first series, volume I, p. 388. Bold is mine.

In short, Augustine's monumental work The City of God, presented a radically unbiblical view of the kingdom. For him, the kingdom of God would be established when the church conquered the whole world for Christ. In other words, the kingdom would be established from within history rather than from without. Concerning this concept, Merrill C. Tenney remarks:

“In his famous work, *The City of God*, he [Augustine] advanced the doctrine that the city or commonwealth of the world was doomed to perish, whereas the ‘city of God,’ the church, was continuing and taking its place. He taught that the ‘city of God’ was identical with the church, and that as the latter grew in power and influence it would gradually bring all men under its sway and would introduce the reign of righteousness.

“This doctrine of Augustine became the basis for the temporal claims of the Roman church. If the kingdom was to grow irresistibly until it dominated the earth, and if the visible church was identical with the kingdom, then the visible church could rightfully assume political power, and **could make its conquests by force.**” Merrill C. Tenney, Interpreting Revelation (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1957), pp. 147, 148.

But Daniel 2 makes it clear that the kingdom will be established supernaturally by God from

**without** human history, **not from within!!** This view of St. Augustine provided the church with the excuse to persecute everyone who refused to become a member of this earthly spiritual kingdom.

Now we move to the sixth century. Notice the words of Emperor Justinian (the same Justinian who implemented the decree which began the 1260 years):

**“We declare** forever infamous, and deprived of their rights, and condemned to exile, all heretics of either sex, whatever be their name; their property shall be confiscated without hope of restoration, or of being transmitted to their children by hereditary succession, because crimes which attack the majesty of God are infinitely more grievous than those which attack the majesty of earthly princes. With regard to those who are strongly suspected of heresy, if, after having been ordered **by the church**, they do not demonstrate their innocence by suitable testimony, they also shall be declared infamous, and condemned to exile.” (*Codex Justinianus, lib. 1, tit. 5, n. 19; cited in ‘Library of Translations: The Power of the Pope During the Middle Ages,’ M. Gosselin (R. C.), Vol. I, pp. 83, 84. London: C. Dolman, 1853.*)

Someone might object that it was the emperor who made this decree and not the church. However, a careful reading reveals that the emperor made this declaration because the church wished to extirpate heresy. The particular heresy which the church asked Justinian to extirpate was Arianism. The statement clearly reveals a cooperation of church and state to punish heretics!

We now move on to the pontificate of Pope Nicholas I (858-867). The attitude of the Roman Church is now much bolder! Pope Nicholas encouraged the King of Bulgaria, a new convert to “Christianity”, to force the religion of his new church upon his subjects. Notice the words of Pope Nicholas:

“I glorify you for having maintained your authority by **putting to death** those wandering sheep who refuse to enter the fold; and. . . congratulate you upon having opened the kingdom of heaven to the people submitted to your rule. A king need not fear to command massacres, when these will retain his subjects in obedience, or **cause them** to submit to the faith of Christ; and God will reward him in this world, and in eternal life, for these **murders.**” (Quoted in, R.W. Thompson, The Papacy and the Civil Power, p. 244).

We must now examine the origin and mechanism of the Holy Office of the Inquisition. The origins of this organism can be clearly traced to 1227-1233 A. D., during the pontificate of Gregory IX. In 1229 the church council of Tolouse condemned the Albigenses in France and gave orders to exterminate them. In 1231 Gregory IX in his bull, *Excommunicamus*, condemned all heretics and proclaimed specific laws on how to deal with them. Among the provisions were the following:

- 1) Delivery of heretics to the civil power.
- 2) Excommunication of all heretics as well as their defenders, followers, friends, and even those who failed to turn them in.
- 3) Life imprisonment for all impenitent heretics.
- 4) Heretics were denied the right to appeal their sentence.
- 5) Those suspected of heresy had no right to be defended by counsel.
- 6) Children of heretics were disqualified from holding a church office until the second generation.
- 7) Heretics who had died without being punished were to be exhumed and their bodies burned.
- 8) The homes of convicted heretics were to be demolished. (See, G. Barraclough, The Medieval Papacy, London, 1968, edited by Thames and Hudson, p. 128; and R. I Moore, "The Origins of Medieval Heresy", in History, vol. 55 (1970), pp. 21-36).

In The Decretals of Gregory IX we find the following:

**"Temporal princes** shall be reminded and exhorted, and if need be, compelled by spiritual censures, to discharge every one of their functions; and that, as they desire to be reckoned and held faithful, so, for the defense of the faith, let them publicly make oath that they will endeavor, bona fide with all their might, to extirpate from their territories all heretics **marked by the church**; so that when any one is about to assume any authority, whether **spiritual** or **temporal**, he shall be held bound to confirm his title by this oath. And if a **temporal prince**, being required and admonished **by the church**, shall neglect to purge his kingdom from this heretical pravity, the metropolitan and other provincial bishops shall bind him in fetters of excommunication; and if he obstinately refuse to make satisfaction this shall be notified within a year to the Supreme Pontiff, that then he may declare his subjects absolved from their allegiance, and leave their lands to be occupied by Catholics, who, the heretics **being exterminated**, may possess them unchallenged, and preserve them in the purity of the faith." (The Decretals of Gregory IX, book 5, title 7, chapter 13).

During the pontificate of Innocent IV (1241-1253), the mechanism of the Inquisition was further developed. In the papal bull *Ad Extirpanda* (1252), the following provisions were given the force of law:

- 1) Torture must be applied to heretics so as to secure confessions.

- 2) Those found guilty must be burned at the stake.
- 3) A police force must be established to serve the needs of the Inquisition.
- 4) A proclamation of a crusade against all heretics in Italy. Those participating in this crusade were to be extended the same privileges and indulgences as those who went on crusades to the Holy Land.
- 5) The heirs of heretics were to have their goods confiscated as well.

The Catholic Encyclopedia explains:

“In the Bull ‘Ad extirpanda’ (1252) Innocent IV says: ‘When those adjudged guilty of heresy have been given up to the civil power by the bishop or his representative, or the Inquisition, the podesta or chief magistrate of the city shall take them at once, and shall, within five days at the most, execute the laws made against them’. . . Nor could any doubt remain as to what civil regulations were meant, for the passages which ordered the burning of the impenitent heretics were inserted in the papal decretals from the imperial constitutions *Commissis nobis*’ and *Inconsutibilem tunicam*. The aforesaid Bull ‘Ad extirpanda’ remained thenceforth a fundamental document of the Inquisition, renewed or re-enforced by several popes, Alexander IV (1254-61), Clement IV (1265-68), Nicholas IV (1288-92), Boniface VIII (1294-1303), and others. The **civil authorities**, therefore, were **enjoined by the popes**, under pain of excommunication to execute the legal sentences that condemned impenitent heretics to the stake”. (Joseph Blotzer, article, ‘Inquisition’, vol. VIII, p. 34).

The savagery of Innocent the IV has led the Roman Catholic historian, Peter de Rosa, to state:

“In [Pope] Innocent’s view, it was more wicked for Albigenses to call him the antichrist than for him **to prove it** by burning them—men, women, and children by the thousands.” (Peter de Rosa, Vicars of Christ, p. 225).

Further, de Rosa makes this telling comment:

“Of eighty popes in a line from the thirteenth century on, not one of them disapproved of the theology and apparatus of the Inquisition. On the contrary, one after another added his own cruel touches to the workings of this deadly machine.” (Peter de Rosa, Vicars of Christ, pp. 175-176).

It was during this same period that one of the greatest dogmatic theologians in the history of the Roman Catholic Church added his support to the idea of exterminating heretics. Let’s allow St.

Thomas Aquinas to speak for himself:

“With regard to heretics two elements are to be considered, one element on their side, and the other on the part of the church. On their side is the sin whereby they have deserved, not only to be separated from the church by excommunication, but also to be banished from the world by death. For it is a much heavier offense to corrupt the faith, whereby the life of the soul is sustained, than to tamper with the coinage, which is an aid to temporal life. Hence if coiners or other malefactors are at once handed over by the secular princes to a just death, much more may heretics, immediately they are convicted of heresy, be not only excommunicated, but also **justly done to die.**

“But on the part of the church is mercy in view of the conversion of them that err; and therefore she does not condemn at once, but ‘after the first and second admonition,’ as the apostle teaches. After that, however, if the man is still found pertinacious, the church, having no hope of his conversion, provides for the safety of others, cutting him off from the church by the sentence of excommunication; and further she leaves him to the secular tribunal to be **exterminated from the world by death.**” (Joseph Rickaby, S. J. (R. C.), Aquinas Ethicus; or, The Moral Teaching of St. Thomas, Vol. I, pp. 332, 333. London: Burns and Oates, 1892).

The fourteenth century inquisitor, Bernard Gui explained the purpose of the Inquisition:

“. . . the objective of the Inquisition is to destroy heresy; it is not possible to destroy heresy unless you eradicate the heretics; and it is impossible to eradicate the heretics unless you also eradicate those who hide them, sympathize with them and protect them.” (Salim Japas, Herejia, Colon y la Inquisicion (Siloam Springs, Arkansas: Creation Enterprises, 1992), p. 20; translation is mine).

One of the most corrupt popes in the history of the Roman Catholic Church was John XXII. A Catholic historian describes him as “full of avarice, more worldly than a pimp, and with a laugh that crackled with unimprovable malice.” (Peter de Rosa, Vicars of Christ: The Dark Side of the Papacy, p. 212).

According to Peter de Rosa, one of John XXII's contemporaries stated:

“The blood he shed would have incarnadined the waters of Lake Constance, and the bodies of the slain would have bridged it from shore to shore.” (Peter de Rosa, Vicars of Christ: The Dark Side of the Papacy, p. 212).

Though this is obviously hyperbole, the fact still remains that Pope John XXII was a formidable murderer. Can we imagine Jesus Christ murdering His enemies in cold blood ?

Moving on to the fifteenth century, we think of John Wycliffe. The Papacy would have been delighted to burn him at the stake during his life, but divine providence ruled otherwise. Forty years after his death, the Council of Constance (1413) ordered his body exhumed and burned. (see

more on this in Foxe's Book of Martyrs, pp. 7-8 and The Great Controversy, pp. 95-96).

Notice the words of Pope Martin V (1417-31), written in 1429 to the King of Poland commanding him to exterminate the Hussites:

“Know that the interests of the Holy See, and those of your crown, make it a duty to exterminate the Hussites. Remember that these impious persons dare proclaim principles of equality; they maintain that all Christians are brethren, and that God has not given to privileged men the right of ruling the nations; they hold that Christ came on earth to abolish slavery, they call the people to liberty, that is to the annihilation of kings and priests.

While there is still time, then, turn your forces against Bohemia; burn, massacre, make deserts everywhere, for nothing could be more agreeable to God, or more useful to the cause of kings, than the extermination of the Hussites.” (Quoted in, Dave Hunt, A Woman Rides the Beast, p. 247). These words were written by Martin V in 1429.

The story of John Hus is very well known. In 1415 he was burned at the stake even though King Sigismund had guaranteed him safe conduct to defend himself at the Council of Constance (1414-1418). The remarkable fact is that Sigismund was encouraged to break his word by the Roman Catholic religious leaders. For a vivid description of the martyrdom of John Hus, read, The Great Controversy, pp. 109-110 and Foxe's Book of Martyrs, pp. 19-30.

A year later, Jerome was also burned at the stake. For the fascinating story of how Jerome recanted his faith and then recanted his recantation, see, The Great Controversy, pp. 112-115 and Foxe's Book of Martyrs, pp. 31-38. In both of these cases, the trial was held in the Roman Catholic Cathedral in Constance. After the trial, Hus and Jerome were delivered to the secular power to be exterminated.

Also in the fifteenth century, Pope Innocent VIII proclaimed a Bull against the Waldenses (1487). The original text of this Bull is found in the library of the University of Cambridge and an English translation can be found in John Dowling's History of Romanism (1871 edition), book 6, chapter 5, section 62. Ellen White, in The Great Controversy, p. 77 quotes a portion of this bull in the following words:

“Therefore the pope ordered **‘that malicious and abominable sect of malignants,’** if they **‘refuse to abjure, to be crushed like venomous snakes.’”**

Another notable martyr of the fifteenth century was Savonarola. He was martyred in the year 1499 for teaching doctrines such as: we are justified by faith in Christ, church members should be given both the bread and the wine, the wicked and filthy cardinals and clergy ought to clean up their act, auricular confession is not necessary, the keys had not been given to Peter alone but to the universal church, the Pope is not the Supreme Pontiff, etc.

It is reported that the bishop in charge of Savonarola's execution, stated:

"I sever you from the church militant and from the church triumphant", to which Savonarola replied: "Not from the church triumphant because it is not in your power to do so." (For more information on Savonarola, see, John Foxe, The Book of Martyrs (London: James Nisbet & Co., Limited, no date), pp. 43-45.

In 1492 Columbus discovered America. Shortly after this time, the Inquisition was planted on its shores. The atrocities committed by the Spanish Conquistadors are legendary. Indians were savagely murdered in order to force them to adopt the Roman Catholic religion. Many of these atrocities are well documented in the book by Salim Japas, Heresy, Columbus and the Inquisition.

In 1992, when Latin America was celebrating the 500<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the discovery of America, many countries refused to participate in the celebration because they remembered the atrocities which the Roman Catholic Church committed in its conquest of the continent. For example, in 1992 John Paul II visited Santo Domingo to dedicate a monument in remembrance of the discovery of America. The visit was not without turmoil. There were heated protests by the populace and the trip was close to being cancelled. Heightened security was necessary to protect the Pope from the protesting crowds. Amazingly, in spite of the fact that the Dominican Republic is a overwhelmingly Catholic country, the attendance at the event was sparse. I have personally visited Palaces of the Inquisition in Cartagena, Colombia and Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic where thousands were tried, tortured and martyred.

When St. Ignatius of Loyola established the Society of Jesus (more commonly known as "the Jesuits") in 1534, it was his avowed purpose to lend his services to the pope in order to extirpate Protestantism. Till this day there is a statue in St. Peter's at the Vatican where Loyola is depicted trampling a Protestant under his feet. It is well known that Loyola was steeped in the occult. In fact, his *Spiritual Exercises* were a type of transcendental meditation. It is of more than academic interest to read the "Extreme Oath" which Jesuits take upon being inducted into the order:

"Now, in the presence of Almighty God, the Blessed virgin Mary, the Blessed Michael, the archangel, the Blessed St. John the Baptist, the Holy Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul and all the saints and sacred hosts of heaven, and to you, my ghostly father, the Superior General of the Society of Jesus, founded by St. Ignatius Loyola, in the pontificate of Paul the Third, and continued to the present, do by the womb of the Virgin, the matrix of God, and the rod of Jesus Christ, declare and swear, that his holiness the pope is Christ's Viceregent and is the true and only Head of the Catholic or Universal Church throughout the earth; and that by virtue of the keys of binding and loosing, given to his Holiness by my Saviour, Jesus Christ, he has power to depose heretical kings, princes, states, commonwealths and governments, all being illegal without his sacred confirmation and that they may safely be destroyed.

“Therefore, to the utmost of my power, I shall and will defend this doctrine and his Holiness’ right and custom against all usurpers of the heretical or protestant authority whatever, especially the Lutheran Church of Germany, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and the now pretended authority and churches of England and Scotland, and branches of the same, now established in Ireland and on the continent of America and elsewhere; and all adherents in regard that they be usurped or heretical, opposing the sacred Mother church of Rome. I do now renounce and disown any allegiance as due to any heretical king, prince or state named Protestants or Liberals or obedience to any of their laws, magistrates or officers.

“I do further declare that the doctrines of the churches of England and Scotland, of the Calvinists, Huguenotes and others of the name Protestants or Liberals to be damnable, and they themselves damned and to be damned who will not forsake the same.

“I do further declare, that I will help, assist and advise all or any of his Holiness’ agents in any place wherever I shall be, in Switzerland, Germany, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, England, Ireland or America, or in any other kingdom or territory I shall come to, and do my uttermost to extirpate the heretical Protestants or Liberals’ doctrines and to destroy all their pretended powers, regal or otherwise.

“I do further promise and declare, that notwithstanding I am dispensed with, to assume any religion heretical for the propagating of the Mother Church’s interest to keep secret and private all her agents’ counsels from time to time, as they may entrust me, and not to divulge, directly or indirectly, by word, writing or circumstance whatever; but to execute all that shall be proposed, given in charge or discovered unto me, by you, my ghostly father, or by any of this sacred covenant.

“I do further promise and declare that I will have no opinion or will of my own, or any mental reservation whatever, even as a corpse or cadaver (*perinde al cadaver*) but will unhesitatingly obey each and every command that I receive from my superiors in the Militia of the Pope and of Jesus Christ.

“That I will go to any part of the world withersoever I may be sent, to the frozen regions of the North, the burning sand of the desert of Africa, or the jungles of India, to the centres of civilizations of Europe, without murmuring or repining, and will be submissive in all things whatsoever communicated to me.

“I furthermore promise and declare that I will, when opportunity presents, make and wage relentless war, secretly or openly, against all heretics, Protestants and Liberals, as I am directed to do, to extirpate and exterminate them from the face of the whole earth; and that I will spare neither age, sex or condition; and that I will

hang, burn, waste, boil, flay, strangle and bury alive these infamous heretics, rip up the stomachs and wombs of their women and crush their infants' heads against the walls, in order to annihilate forever their execrable race. That when the same cannot be done openly, I will secretly use the poisoned cup, the strangulating cord, the steel of the poinard, or the leaden bullet, regardless of the honor, rank, dignity, or authority of the person or persons, whatever may be their condition in life, either public or private, as I at anytime may be directed so to do by any agent of the Pope or superior of the Brotherhood of the Holy Faith, of the Society of Jesus.

"In confirmation of which, I hereby dedicate my life, my soul and all my corporeal powers, and with this dagger which I now receive, I will subscribe my name written in my own blood, in testimony thereof; and should I prove false or weaken in my determination, may my brethren and fellow soldiers of the Militia of the Pope cut off my hands and my feet, and my throat from ear to ear, my belly opened and sulphur burned therein, with all the punishment that can be inflicted upon me on earth and my soul be tortured by demons in an eternal hell forever!

"All of which I, M\_\_\_\_\_ N\_\_\_\_\_, do swear by the blessed Trinity and blessed Sacrament, which I am now to receive, to perform and on my part to keep inviolably; and do call all the heavenly and glorious host of heaven to witness these my real intentions to keep this my oath.

"In testimony thereof I take this most holy and blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist and witness the same further, with my name written with the point of this dagger dipped in my own blood and sealed in the face of this holy covenant. [He receives the wafer from the superior and writes his name with the point of his dagger dipped in his own blood taken from over his heart].

(It was not easy to find this information. I personally researched this material in the rare books division of the Library of Congress. Because no photocopying is allowed, I transcribed this quotation by hand. It comes from the following source: Edwin Allen Sherman [a 32 degree Free Mason], The Engineer Corps of Hell, San Francisco, 1883, pp. 119-122. The book bears the following bibliographical information: Library of Congress copyright, Nov. 23, 1883. Card # 13653-01 (Bx1765.556). Rare book collection. The book reads on the front cover: "Sold by private subscription only, and under stipulated conditions."

Cardinal Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621) of Counter-Reformation fame, wrote the following about punishment due heretics:

"The only effective means against heretics is to convey them to that place provided for them as quickly as possible. In this way one is only doing them a favor as the longer they are allowed to live, the more heresies they will devise, and thus the more believers they will seduce, aggravating their own damnation." (Quoted in,

Symposium on Revelation, volume 2, p. 345).

The story of the martyrdom of William Tyndale is worthy of note. He was convicted of the “crime” of translating and distributing the Bible in the English language. For a description of his life, work and death, read The Great Controversy, pp. 245-247 and also, Foxe’s Book of Martyrs, pp. 108-116.

One of the most infamous acts in the history of Roman Catholicism was the St. Bartholomew Massacre. It took place on August 24, 1572 with the gleeful approval of Pope Gregory XIII and the priesthood. Ellen White calls this the “blackest in the black catalog of crime, most horrible among the fiendish deeds of all the dreadful centuries” (The Great Controversy, p. 272). At the tolling of a bell, Protestants [they were called Huguenotes] were slaughtered without mercy, not only in Paris but also throughout the rest of France. In the course of two months, over 70,000 men, women and children perished. The Huguenotes were the “professionals” of the day. They were the “cream” of France. At the news of the massacre, Pope Gregory XIII, attended by his cardinals and other ecclesiastical dignitaries, went in a long procession to the church of St. Louis, where the cardinal of Lorraine chanted a *Te Deum* [an anthem of praise to God]. A medal was struck to commemorate the massacre. On one side of the medal was the face of Gregory XIII and on the other is the image of the destroying angel. (For more on this savage event, read, The Great Controversy, pp. 272-273).

How could one forget the Piedmont Massacre of the year 1655? On January 25 of this year, the Duke of Savoy gave an edict that the Waldenses must convert to the Catholic faith or leave the valleys and have their properties confiscated within a few days. If they did not leave, they were subject to a death decree. The edict was proclaimed in the middle of the winter. On April seventeenth, 15,000 soldiers invaded the valleys of the Piedmont. Thousands of Waldenses were murdered, tortured and enslaved. Hundreds who were able to escape to the most rugged areas of the mountains were caught and thrown off the jagged cliff of Mount Catelluzo near Torre Pellice. Salim Japas, Herejia, Colon y la Inquisicion (Siloam Springs, Arkansas: Creation Enterprises, 1992), pp. 62-63.

Jean Antoine Llorente was Secretary to the Spanish Inquisition from the year 1790 to 1792. Regarding this monstrous mechanism, Llorente says:

“I was secretary of the Inquisition in the court of Madrid in the years 1789, 1790 and 1791. I knew the establishment well enough to refute it. [It was] vicious in its origin, constitution and laws in spite of the apologies which have been written in its favor.” (Jean Antoine Llorente, Historia Critica de la Inquisicion en Espana, Madrid, 1822, pp. 6-7).

Llorente adds:

“The horrid conduct of this Holy Office [Inquisition] weakened the power and diminished the population of Spain by arresting the progress of the arts, sciences,

industry and commerce, and by compelling multitudes of families to abandon the kingdom; by instigating the expulsion of the Jews and Moors, and by immolating on its flaming shambles more than three hundred thousand victims" (Quoted in, Dave Hunt, A Woman Rides the Beast, p. 244).

Llorente was not some Protestant enemy of the Roman Catholic Church. He was an insider being privy to the inner workings and statistics of the Inquisition in Spain. According to Llorente, of the 300,000 who were killed by the Inquisition in Spain, 31,912 were burned at the stake (Llorente, p. 583).

In Pius IX's Encyclical and Syllabus (December 8, 1864) we find the following words:

"Cursed be they who assert liberty of conscience and of worship, and such as maintain the church should not employ force. The State has not the right to leave every man free to embrace whatever religion he shall deem true."

Or again, listen to the words of Leo XIII in his encyclical, *Libertas Humanan*:

"From what has been said, it follows that it is quite unlawful to demand, to defend, or to grant unconditional freedom of thought, of speech, of writing, or of worship, as if these were so many rights given by nature to man." Quoted in, Seventh-day Adventist Bible Students' Source Book, "Church and State," Paragraph 496 (Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1962), p. 273.

Notice the words of the Roman Catholic historian J. H. Ignaz Von Dollinger:

"Through the influence of Gratian. . . and unwearied activity of the Popes and their legates since 1183, the view of the Church had been. . . [that] every departure from the teaching of the Church, and every important opposition to any ecclesiastical ordinances, must be punished with death, and with the most cruel of deaths, by fire. . .

"Innocent III declared the mere refusal to swear, and the opinion that oaths were unlawful, a heresy worthy of death, and directed that whoever differed in any respect from the common way of life of the multitude should be treated as a heretic.

"Both the initiation and carrying out of this new principle must be ascribed to the Popes alone. . . It was the Popes who compelled bishops and priests to condemn the heterodox to torture, confiscation of their goods, imprisonment, and death, and to enforce the execution of this sentence on the civil authorities, under pain of excommunication.

"From 1200 to 1500 the long series of Papal ordinances on the Inquisition, ever increasing in severity and cruelty, and their whole policy towards heresy, runs on without break. It is a rigidly consistent system of legislation; every Pope confirms

and improves upon the devices of his predecessor. All is directed to the one end, of completely uprooting every difference of belief. . . .

“It was only the absolute dictation of the Popes, and the notion of their infallibility in all questions of Evangelical morality, that made the Christian world. . . . [permit] the Inquisition, which contradicted the simplest principles of Christian justice and love to our neighbor, and would have been rejected with universal horror in the ancient Church.” (J. H. Ignaz Von Dollinger, The Pope and the Council, pp. 190-192).

Notice the words of Dr. Marianus de Luca, a Jesuit, formerly a professor of Canon Law at the Gregorian University in Rome:

“The Catholic Church has the right and duty to kill heretics because it is by fire and sword that heresy can be extirpated. Mass excommunication is derided by heretics. If they are imprisoned or exiled they corrupt others. The only recourse is to put them to death. Repentance cannot be allowed to save civil criminals; for the highest good of the church is the duty of the faith, and this cannot be preserved unless heretics are put to death” (Quoted in Lorraine Boettner, Roman Catholicism, p. 426).

Dr. de Luca further remarked:

“Heretics despise excommunication and say that that bolt is powerless; if you threaten them with a pecuniary fine, they neither fear God nor respect men, knowing that they will find fools enough to believe them and support them. If you imprison them or send them into exile, they corrupt those near them with their words and those at a distance with their books. So THE ONLY REMEDY IS TO SEND THEM SOON TO THEIR OWN PLACE [capitals are the author's]. And what does de Luca mean with the expression “send them soon to their own place”? He approvingly quotes Tanner: “The civil magistrate, *by the command and commission of the Church*, ought to punish the heretic with the penalty of death. . . .” (Marianus de Luca, Institutes of Public Ecclesiastical Law, (1901) vol. I, pp. 143, 261).

It is worthy of note that de Luca's book contains a warm letter of commendation from Pope Leo XIII as well as the *Imprimatur* of the Roman Catholic Church.

The Roman Catholic professor, Alfred Baudrillart makes the following comment about the role of the Church in the incitation of violence during the 1260 years:

“She [the Church] has, and she loudly proclaims that she has, a ‘horror of blood’. Nevertheless when confronted by heresy she does not content herself with persuasion; arguments of an intellectual and moral order appear to her insufficient

and she has recourse to force, to corporeal punishment, to torture. She creates tribunals like those of the Inquisition, she calls the laws of the State to her aid, if necessary she encourages a crusade, or a religious war and all her 'horror of blood' practically culminates into urging the secular power to shed it, which proceeding is almost more odious—for it is less frank—than shedding it herself.

“Especially did she act thus in the sixteenth century with regard to Protestants. Not content to reform morally, to preach by example, to convert people by eloquent and holy missionaries, she lit in Italy, in the Low Countries, and above all in Spain the funeral piles of the Inquisition. In France under Francis I, and Henry II., in England under Mary Tudor, she tortured heretics, whilst both in France and Germany during the second half of the sixteenth and the first half of the seventeenth century if she did not actually begin at any rate she encouraged and actively aided the religious wars.” (Alfred Baudrillart, The Catholic Church, the Renaissance and Protestantism, trans., by Mrs. Philip Gibbs [London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., 1908], pp. 182, 183.

Now notice the words of Alexis M. Lepicier, professor of sacred theology in the Pontifical Urban College of the Propaganda in Rome:

“He who publicly avows a heresy and tries to pervert others by word or example, speaking absolutely, can not only be excommunicated but even justly put to death, lest he ruin others by pestilential contagion; for a bad man is worse than a wild beast, and does more harm, as Aristotle says. Hence, as it is not wrong to kill a wild beast which does great harm, so it must be right to deprive of his harmful life a heretic who withdraws from divine truth and plots against the salvation of others.” (Fr. Alexis M. Lepicier, De Stabilitate et Progressu Dogmatis, [printed at the official printing office in Rome in 1910], p. 194.

The following words from *The Tablet*, the official newspaper of the Roman Catholic diocese of Brooklyn, New York are very telling:

“Heresy is an awful crime against God, and those who start a heresy are more guilty than they who are traitors to the civil government. If the State has the right to punish treason with death, the principle is the same which concedes to the spiritual authority the power of capital punishment over the arch-traitor to truth and divine revelation. . . A perfect society has the right to its existence. . . and the power of capital punishment is acknowledged for a perfect society. Now. . . the Roman Catholic Church is a perfect society, and as such has the right and power to take means to safeguard its existence.” (*The Tablet*, November 5, 1938).

Louis Veuillot expressed the Roman Catholic view of freedom with the following words:

“Be we Catholics in the minority, we will then demand freedom on the basis of *your* principles; be we Catholics in the majority, we will then refuse it on the basis

of *our* principles.” (Quoted in Symposium on Revelation, vol. II, p. 347).

The Catholic Encyclopedia admits:

“. . . judged by contemporary standards, the Inquisition, especially as it developed in Spain toward the close of the Middle Ages, can be classified only as one of the darker chapters in the history of the Church.”

The same encyclopedia acknowledges the killing of 2000 Protestants within 50 years in the Netherlands and admits the death of perhaps 3000 to 4000 French Huguenotes in the Massacre of Saint Bartholomew, which commenced on the night of August 23, 1572. Quoted from the New Catholic Encyclopedia by C. Mervyn Maxwell, God Cares , volume I (Boise, Idaho: Pacific Press, 1981), p. 132.

An article in the Roman Catholic journal *The Rambler*, gives us a picture of what would happen if the Roman Catholic Church were in the majority in England:

“You ask, if he [the Roman Catholic] were lord in the land, and you were in the minority, if not in numbers yet in power, what would he do to you? That, we say, would entirely depend upon the circumstances. If it would benefit the cause of Catholicism, he would tolerate you: if expedient, he would imprison you, banish you, fine you; possibly even hang you. But be assured of one thing: he would never tolerate you for the sake of the ‘glorious principles of civil and religious liberty’. . .

“Catholicism is the most intolerant of creeds. It is intolerance itself, for it is truth itself. We might as rationally maintain that a sane man has a right to believe that two and two do not make four, as this theory of religious liberty. Its impiety is only equalled [sic] by its absurdity. . . .

“A Catholic temporal government would be guided in its treatment of Protestants and other recusants solely by the rules of expediency, adopting precisely that line of conduct which would tend best to their conversion, and to prevent the dissemination of their errors.” *Civil and Religious Liberty*, The Rambler, 8 (September, 1851), pp. 174, 178.

We must now make a few remarks about the recent apology of Pope John Paul II. In a remarkable moment at St. Peter’s Basilica on the first Sunday of Lent, March 12, 2000, the Pope, in a carefully choreographed mass, leaning against the crucifix and with agonizing voice, seemed to apologize for the sins which the church has committed against Protestants, Jews, non-Christians, immigrants, ethnic minorities, women, abused children and the unborn. We quote the key portion of his homily:

“We forgive and we ask forgiveness! . . . We cannot not recognize the betrayals of the Gospel committed by **some of our brothers**, especially during the **second millennium**. We ask forgiveness for the divisions between Christians, for the use

of violence that **some** have resorted to in the service of truth and for the acts of dissidence and of hostility **sometimes** taken towards followers of other religions.” (As quoted in, The New York Times, *Pope Asks Forgiveness for Errors of the Church Over 2,000 Years*, Monday, March 13, 2000, Section A, pp. 1, 10; bold is mine).

Several remarks must be made at this juncture. First, this was a general, sweeping apology. No specific persons are mentioned as culprits. No specific events are brought to light. For example, the Crusades are not mentioned. The Inquisition is not mentioned. The forced conversions of the natives in Africa and the Americas are not mentioned. The Bible teaches that sincere and true repentance and confession must be specific and complete. The Pope’s apology misses the mark in this respect.

Furthermore, and more importantly, the apology never blames *the church* for these sins. It will be noticed that the Pope’s paragraph quoted above is carefully worded. It blames “*some of our brothers*”, but never blames the Church as such. In other words, in the Pope’s mind, the Church was not to blame but rather certain individuals in the church. Regarding this, Thomas Reeves, editor of the Jesuit magazine America, remarks:

“The document should have put it in bold print that ‘children of the church’ includes popes, cardinals and clergy, and not just people in the pews. . . The pope had a great idea that some in the Vatican are obscuring with a fog machine.” (Quoted in the New York Times article referred to above, Section A, p. 10).

It is significant that the Pope mentions the betrayal of the Gospel “*especially during the second millennium*”. This was the millennium during which the Roman Catholic Church was guilty of the Crusades, the Inquisition and the forced conversions of the natives in the Americas and Africa. Thus, though the Pope is nebulous about specific persons and events, he does admit that many wrongs were committed.

It is interesting that the Pope refers to “the violence [he does admit there was violence] that some [notice the unspecific “some”] have resorted to in the service of truth”. It is clear that the Pope is saying that those who committed these crimes were right in their cause (the service of truth) but were wrong in their method (violence). However, when you defend the truth with violence, are you really defending the truth? Are you not rather smearing the truth? And then there is the question as to whether the truth which was being defended was really the truth at all!!

Also worthy of note is that this apology was not a spontaneous gesture. In fact, it was the culmination of a long, drawn out process. The apology was written and re-written, edited and re-edited, worded and re-worded, debated and analyzed for years before the Pope presented it on March 12. Regarding this, the aforementioned article in The New York Times gives us a little history:

“The need for Catholics to examine their collective conscience is something that

this pope has been thinking about for years, and he laid out his rationale for it in a 1994 apostolic letter called, 'The Coming of the Third Millennium.' He also raised the subject privately in meetings with key cardinals, and his proposal was sufficiently ground-breaking that they requested that the theological and historical implications first be studied in depth.

"The result was a dense 31-page treatise by the International Theological Commission which, with Vatican oversight, **ground out** the theological precedents and also the **limits** to the apology.

"Written by a committee and released earlier this month, the document addresses concerns that the apology will be misunderstood or misused by those 'hostile to the church'. It also reflects other worries of theologians, who had to grapple with such complex issues as how a church that considers itself holy can admit mistakes, and whether it is fair for today's church to condemn acts by previous generations made in good if misguided faith." (Bold is mine)

The Bible teaches that confession should be spontaneous, complete, unconditional and without measuring the consequences. It is obvious that the process which was followed had the intention of preserving the self-image of the Church and at the same time, giving the impression that the church was sorry for the sins of the past! This leads us to one final consideration. Why did the apology come at this particular moment in history? Why didn't any of the previous popes in the history of the Roman Catholic Church offer this apology? Why now?

The simple explanation is that we live in an ecumenical age. The Roman Catholic Church enjoys more popularity today than at any previous moment in the last 200 years. This apology gives the impression that the Roman Church is docile and repentant. It enhances its image among Protestants and other non-Catholics. In the same New York Times article, Alessandra Stanley remarks that the Pope "has said repeatedly that the new evangelization he is calling for in the third millennium can take place only after what he has described as a church-wide 'purification of memory.'" By the expression, "new evangelization" the Pope simply means, the conversion of the world to the Roman Catholic Church. Rev. Lorenzo Albacete, who teaches theology at St. Joseph's Seminary in Yonkers, New York stated:

"Because it reflects this pope's desire to reconcile with other Christians and other religions, people are tempted to view it as a tactic, but its immense spiritual importance to this pope lies in the fact that it did not come within diplomatic or theological agreement, but in the liturgy of the Mass during Lent and the Holy Year." (Quoted in the same article above).

Though Albacete and others deny that the Pope's apology is a "tactic", Bible prophecy makes it very clear that it is just that!! The real reason why the Pope chose St. Peter's Basilica as the place and the Mass of the first day of Lent as the occasion to offer the apology is that he knew that the media would come out *en masse* to hear the apology. A pastoral letter, an encyclical or a

theological proclamation would never have had the same impact!!

Notice the chilling prophetic words of Ellen G. White in the 1911 edition of The Great Controversy, p. 571:

“The Roman Church now presents a **fair front** to the world, **covering** with apologies her record of horrible cruelties. She has clothed herself in **Christlike garments**; but she is unchanged. Every principle of the papacy that existed in past ages exists today. The doctrines devised in the darkest ages are still held. Let none deceive themselves. The papacy that Protestants are now so ready to honor is the same that ruled the world in the days of the Reformation, when men of God stood up, at the peril of their lives, to expose her iniquity. She possesses the same pride and arrogant assumption that lorded it over kings and princes, and claimed the prerogatives of God. Her spirit is no less cruel and despotic now than when she crushed out human liberty and slew the saints of the Most High.

“The papacy is just what prophecy declared that she would be, the apostasy of the latter times. 2 Thessalonians 2:3,4. It is part of her policy to **assume the character** which will best accomplish her purpose; but beneath the variable appearance of the chameleon she conceals the invariable venom of the serpent.”

As an addendum to this section, I would like to underline that almost two weeks after the Pope's apology, he visited the *Yad Vashem* [Holocaust Memorial] in Jerusalem. Once again he expressed regret over the Holocaust but he never affirmed that the church was to blame nor did he deplore the silence of Pope Pius XII while 6 million Jews were being slaughtered!! An article in the Los Angeles Times (March 24, 2000, section A, pages 1 and 10) bears the title: *John Paul Laments the Horrors of Holocaust*. The subtitle of this article is very telling. It reads: *“Israeli premier hails visit as ‘historic journey of healing’ between Christians and Jews. Pontiff’s message at memorial, however, falls short of apology for Vatican’s wartime silence”*. According to this article, the Pope said:

“No one can forget or ignore what happened; no one can diminish its scale. We wish to remember. But we wish to remember for a purpose—namely, to ensure that never again will evil prevail.”

Nothing here about the sinful silence of the Church during the Holocaust nor any ascription of blame to Pius XII. The article furthermore continues:

“His categorical and at times poetic message **fell short of the apology** that some Jewish leaders had demanded for the failure of his World War II-era predecessor, Pius XII, to speak out during the extermination of 6 million European Jews.

“Instead, John Paul uttered a **sweeping lament** ‘as bishop of Rome,’ assuring the Jewish people that his church ‘is deeply saddened by the hatred, acts of persecution

and displays of anti-Semitism directed against the Jews by Christians at **any time** and in **any place.**" (Bold is mine)

Once again, one marvels at how John Paul can make such generalized statements in such a specific place!! Incidentally, neither Hitler, nor Mussolini nor Himmler nor any other key player in the Holocaust was ever excommunicated by the Roman Catholic Church. Silence certainly speaks louder than words in this case!!

**Characteristic # 7** Daniel 7:25 tells us that the little horn would also **think** to change the **times**. We must now ask the question: What are these "times"? Our answer will consist of two parts: 1) We will try to ascertain what the word "times" means when it is used in a Biblical/prophetic context, 2) We will trace the fulfillment of this characteristic in the history of the Roman Catholic Papacy (at this point, refer to pastor Stephen P. Bohr's document: *"The Changing of the Times: Futurism's Incredible Journey and its Implications for Seventh-day Adventist Apocalyptic Interpretation."*

**Characteristic # 8:** We must now move on to the eighth characteristic of the little horn. Daniel 7:25 also tells us that the little horn thought he could change the law. It is clear in Daniel seven that the little horn is guilty primarily of transgression of the law. We offer the following examples: The little horn slays the saints [sixth commandment], blasphemes the name of God [third commandment], thinks he can change the law [fourth commandment], and proclaims himself God [first commandment]. Revelation 13 adds the fact that this power demands worship to the image he has raised up [second commandment] and Revelation 17 adds that this power fornicates with the kings of the earth [seventh commandment]. In II Thessalonians 2, the Apostle Paul informs us that this power

performs lying wonders [ninth commandment]. It is obvious that this little horn stands accused of trampling upon God's law.

The question might legitimately be asked, how can the little horn be judged by the ten commandments starting in 1844 if the law was nailed to the cross when Jesus died? Daniel 7 provides indisputable proof that the law was still binding in 1844!

A careful examination of church history reveals that the Roman Catholic Church has attempted to change God's holy Law. And how did this happen?

In 1993 I was holding an evangelistic crusade in Albuquerque, New Mexico and I decided to visit Garsten's Catholic Book Store at San Mateo and I-40. The purpose of my visit was to examine as many catechisms as possible in order to determine how the Roman Catholic Church teaches the Ten Commandments. I examined at least 20 different catechisms and discovered some very interesting information. All these catechisms delete the second commandment. The absence of this commandment in the catechisms is understandable. It forbids the worship of idols and the Roman Catholic churches are filled with idols.

By deleting the second commandment, the Roman Catholic Church ends up with only nine, but the Bible makes it clear that there are ten!! So the catechisms divide the tenth commandment in two [9. Do not covet your neighbor's wife, 10. Do not covet your neighbor's goods] and thus end up with ten again. The recent Catechism of the Catholic Church has tried to soften this change by saying that the first and second commandments are really one and the tenth is really two. However, the undeniable fact remains that the catechisms rarely, if ever, discuss the second commandment.

But the Roman Catholic catechisms go even further. Invariably, they encourage the faithful to attend mass and rest on **Sunday** in fulfillment of the third commandment!! First of all, it is the fourth commandment which commands us to rest. But this same commandment also commands us to worship on the 7<sup>th</sup> day, Sabbath, and not on Sunday, the first day of the week! How can the Roman Catholic Church blatantly command the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, when, **in their own Bibles**, the commandment clearly commands us to worship on Sabbath, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of the week? The answer is simple. The Roman Catholic Church claims to have the authority to change the day from Sabbath to Sunday (more on this when we speak about the 11<sup>th</sup> characteristic of the little horn). In this way, the Roman Catholic Church is guilty of attempting to change the Law of God.

Before we examine Roman Catholic publications on the change of the Sabbath, we must make a few remarks about the manner in which the change took place. The shift from Sabbath to Sunday did not happen overnight. It was a slow, though relentless process. Regarding this, Ellen White remarks:

“The archdeceiver had not completed his work. He was resolved to gather the **Christian world** under his banner and to exercise his power through his viceregent, the proud pontiff who claimed to be the representative of Christ. Through half-converted pagans, ambitious prelates, and world-loving churchmen he accomplished his purpose. Vast councils were held from time to time, in which the dignitaries of the church were convened from all the world. **In nearly every council the Sabbath which God instituted was pressed down a little lower, while the Sunday was correspondingly exalted.** Thus the **pagan festival** came finally to be honored as a divine institution, while the Bible Sabbath was pronounced **a relic of Judaism**, and its observers were declared to be accursed.”  
Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, p. 53. Bold is mine.

Ellen G. White has provided three significant insights in this quotation which have been irrefutably corroborated by the exhaustive research of Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi in his books, From Sabbath to Sunday and Anti-Judaism and the Origin of Sunday. The first is that Sunday was bequeathed to the Christian Church by **paganism**. Secondly, Sunday was adopted because of strong feelings **against the Jews**, and third, the process of the change **was slow** but steady. Space will now allow me to amplify points one and two but we must dedicate some time to point # 3.

Even though some Early Church Fathers (not the Apostolic Fathers!) admittedly advocated the observance of Sunday in honor of the resurrection, not one of them ever provided any Biblical justification for the practice. They simply stated that because Jesus resurrected the first day of the week, it should be the day to honor Him.

Emperor Constantine's famous Sunday law is well known. It was given on March 7, A. D. 321:

"Let all the judges and town people, and the occupation of all trades, rest on the venerable day of the sun; but let those who are situated in the country, freely and at full liberty attend to the business of agriculture, because it often happens that no other day is so fit for sowing corn and planting vines; lest the critical moment being let slip, men should lose the commodities granted by heaven. Given the seventh day of March, Crispus and Constantine being consuls, each of them for the second time." *Corpus Juris Civilis* 2.127, quoted in, Henry Bettenson, ed., Documents of the Christian Church, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (London: Oxford University Press, 1963).

It must be remembered that this decree was proclaimed by the civil power. It was not a decree given by the church. However, the church would soon put itself officially on the record as a strong supporter of this decree.

This decree of Constantine is preserved with some slight modifications in the *Code of Justinian*:

"All judges and city people and the craftsmen shall rest upon the venerable Day of the Sun. Country people, however, may freely attend to the cultivation of the fields, because it frequently happens that no other days are better adapted for planting grain in the furrows or the vines in trenches. So that the advantage given by heavenly providence may not for the occasion of a short time perish." *Code of Justinian*, b. 3, title 12,3; translated in Ayer's Source Book for Ancient Church History, item 59 (g).

It will be noticed that this decree did not forbid Sabbath worship. That was still to come. It was at the Council of Laodicea [celebrated sometime between 343 and 381 A. D.], that the Church put itself on the record as enjoining Sunday worship and forbidding Sabbath worship. Canon 29 of this Council reads as follows:

"Christians shall not Judaize and be idle on Saturday [Greek *sabbaton*, the Sabbath] but shall work on that day, but the Lord's day [Sunday] they shall especially honor, and, as being Christians, shall, if possible, do no work on that day. If, however, they are found Judaizing, they shall be shut out from Christ." (Translated in, Charles Joseph Hefele, A History of the Christian Councils, vol. 2, translated and edited by H. N. Oxenham [Edinburg: T. and T. Clark, 1896], p. 316).

As the centuries passed, the Sabbath was pressed lower and lower and the Sunday was exalted higher and higher. We next present a statement by St. Thomas Aquinas, a theologian unparalleled in the history of the Roman Catholic Church:

“In the New Law the keeping of the Sunday **supplants** that of the Sabbath, not in virtue of the precept of the law, but through determination by the **church** and the **custom** of the Christian people.” (*Summa Theologica* of Thomas Aquinas, quoted in *The Sabbath in Scripture and History*, pp. 205-206). Bold is mine.

Around the year 1400 A. D., Petrus de Ancharano offered the following justification for the modification of God’s Law:

“. . . the pope *can modify divine law*, since his power is not of man, but of God, and he acts in the place of God upon earth, with the fullest power of binding and loosing his sheep.” (Lucius Ferraris, *Prompta Bibliotheca*, 8 volumes, vol. 2, article “Papa”). The power of binding and loosing is discussed under point # 11.

When Martin Luther debated John Eck, Luther brought forth the weapons of Scripture whereas Eck brought forth the weapons of tradition. As long as Luther stood on the solid rock of *Sola Scriptura*, his arguments were unanswerable. However, there was one area where Eck took Luther’s own weapon and turned it against him:

“The Scripture teaches ‘Remember that you sanctify the day of the Sabbath; six days shall you labor and do all your work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord your God.’, etc. But the **Church** has **changed** the Sabbath into the Lord’s [day] by its own authority, concerning which you have no scripture. . . The Sabbath is commanded many times by God; neither in the Gospels nor in Paul is it declared that the Sabbath has ceased; nevertheless the **Church** has instituted the Lord’s day through the **tradition** of the apostles without Scripture.” (Johann Eck, *Enchiridion Locorum Communium . . . Adversus Lutheranos* [Handbook of Common Places Against the Lutherans]. Venice: Ioan. Antonius & Fratres de Sabio, 1533, fols. 4v, 5r, 42v. Latin. Trans. by Frank H. Yost. Used by permission of Mrs. Frank Yost. [FRS No. 127].

This quotation can be found in the *SDA Source Book*, paragraph # 1445. Bold is mine.

Also from Dr. Eck we find the following:

“If, however, the church has had power to **change** the Sabbath of the Bible into Sunday and to command Sunday keeping, why should it not have also this power concerning other days, many of which are based on the Scriptures—such as Christmas, circumcision of the heart, three kings, etc. If you omit the latter, and turn from the church to the Scriptures alone, then you must keep the Sabbath with the Jews, which has been kept from the beginning of the world.” Johann Eck, *Enchiridion Locorum Communium. . . Adversus Lutheranos*, pp. 78, 79. [Quoted in Andrews and Conradi, *History of the Sabbath*, 1912 edition, p. 587].

Chalk one up for doctor Eck! His argument is powerful. Luther, however, tried to get off the hook by claiming that the specific day was ceremonial while the principle of rest on one day in seven was still binding. This unbiblical argument has been picked up by Protestants, but the fact still remains that it is based on human reasoning and not upon the Word of God!!

We now turn to the longest church council in the history of the Roman Catholic Church (1545-1563). It was the avowed purpose of the Council of Trent to stem the phenomenal growth of Protestantism. On January 18, 1562, Gaspare de Fosso, archbishop of Reggio spoke the following words:

“The authority of the church is illustrated most clearly by the Scriptures for while on the one hand she [the church] recommends them, declares them to be divine, [and] offers them to us to be read, . . . on the other hand, the legal precepts in the Scriptures taught by the Lord have ceased by virtue of the same authority [the church]. The Sabbath, the most glorious day in the law, has been **changed** into the Lord’s day. . . These and other similar matters have not ceased by virtue of Christ’s teaching (for He says He has come to fulfill the law, not to destroy it), but they have been **changed** by the authority of the **church**.” (Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum*, 33:529-530).

We will now quote a great number of Roman Catholic publications which explain why Sunday is kept instead of the Sabbath. Please pay careful attention to the number of times these publications claim that the **Church** has made the **change**, **transfer** or **substitution** of Sunday in place of the Sabbath. The bold is mine unless otherwise indicated.

“*Question:* Have you any other way of proving that the church has power to institute festivals of precept?”

“*Answer:* Had she not such power, she could not have done that in which all modern religionists agree with her,—she could not have **substituted** the observance of Sunday the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday the seventh day, a **change** for which there is no Scriptural authority.” Stephen Keenan, *A Doctrinal Catechism*, approved by the Most Reverend John Hughes, D. D., Archbishop of New York (New York: Edward Dunigan & Brother, 1851), p. 174.

“*Question:* By whom was it [the Sabbath] **changed**?”

“*Answer:* By the governors of the church, the apostles, who also kept it; for St. John was in the Spirit on the Lord’s day (which was Sunday). Apoc. 1:10.

“*Question:* How prove you that **the church** hath power to command feasts and holy days?”

“*Answer:* By the very act of **changing** the Sabbath into Sunday, which Protestants

allow of; and therefore they fondly contradict themselves by keeping Sunday strictly, and breaking most other feasts commanded by the same **church**.

*“Question:* How prove you that?

*“Answer:* Because by keeping Sunday, they acknowledge the **church’s** power to ordain feasts, and to command them under sin; and by not keeping the rest [of the feasts] by her commanded, they again deny, in fact, the same power. Reverend Henry Tuberville, D. D. (New York: Edward Dunigan and Brothers, An Abridgment of the Christian Doctrine, approved in 1833), p. 58.

“The first precept in the Bible is that of sanctifying the seventh day: ‘God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it’ (Gen. 2:3). This precept was confirmed by God in the Ten Commandments: “Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God’ (Exodus 20). On the other hand, Christ declares that He is not come to destroy the law, but to fulfill it (Matt. 5:17). He Himself observed the Sabbath: ‘and, as His custom was, He went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day’ (Luke 4:16). His disciples likewise observed it after His death: ‘They rested on the Sabbath day according to the commandment (Luke 23:56). Yet with all this weight of Scripture authority for keeping the Sabbath, or seventh day, holy, Protestants of all denominations make this a profane day, and transfer the obligation of it to the first day of the week, or the Sunday. Now what authority have they for doing this? None, whatever, except the **unwritten word**, or **tradition** of the **Catholic Church** which declares that the apostles made the change in honor of Christ’s resurrection, and the descent of the Holy Ghost on that day of the week.” John Milner, End of Religious Controversy, (New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1897), p. 89.

“This observance of the Sabbath [here the author refers to Sunday as the Sabbath] in which, after all, the only Protestant worship consists—not only has no foundation in the Bible, but it is in flagrant contradiction with its letter, which commands rest on the Sabbath, which is Saturday.

“It was the **Catholic Church** which, by the authority of Jesus Christ, has **transferred** this rest to the Sunday in remembrance of the resurrection of our Lord. Thus the observance of Sunday by Protestants is an **homage** they pay, in spite of themselves, to the **authority of the Church**. Monsignor Segur, Plain Talk About the Protestantism of Today (Boston: Thomas B. Noonan & Co., 1868), p. 213.

*“Question:* Is the observance of Sunday as the day of rest a matter clearly laid down in Scripture?

*“Answer:* It is certainly not; and yet all Protestants consider the observance of this particular day as essentially necessary to salvation [in this, Keenan is clearly overstating his case. Most Protestants believe no such thing]. To say we observe the Sunday because Christ rose from the dead on that day, is to say we act without warrant of Scripture; and we might as well say that we should rest on Thursday, because Christ ascended to heaven on that day, and rested in reality from the work of redemption.” Stephen Keenan, The Controversial Catechism, (London: Burns & Oates, 1896), p. 160.

*“Question:* Which is the Sabbath day?

*“Answer:* Saturday is the Sabbath day.

*“Question:* Why do we observe Sunday instead of Saturday?

*“Answer:* We observe Sunday instead of Saturday because the **Catholic Church**, in the Council of Laodicea (A. D. 336), **transferred** the solemnity from Saturday to Sunday.” Rev. Peter Geiermann, The Convert’s Catechism of Catholic Doctrine, (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Company, 1957 edition), p. 50. It is to be noted that this book received the “apostolic blessing” of Pope Pius X on January 25, 1910.

“Protestants often deride the authority of **Church tradition**, and claim to be directed by the Bible only; yet they, too, have been guided by the customs of the ancient Church, which find no warrant in the Bible, but rest on **Church tradition only!** A striking instance of this is the following: The first positive command in the Decalogue is to ‘Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy’, and this precept was enforced by the Jews for thousands of years. But the Sabbath day, the observance of which God commanded, was our Saturday. Yet who among either Catholics or Protestants, except a sect or two, like the ‘Seventh Day Baptists’, ever keep that commandment now? None. Why is this: The Bible which Protestants claim to obey exclusively, gives no authorization for the **substitution** of the first day of the week for the seventh. On what authority, therefore, have they done so? Plainly on the authority of that very **Catholic Church** which they abandoned and whose traditions they condemn.” John L. Stoddard, Rebuilding a Lost Faith (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1922), p. 80.

“What Bible authority is there for **changing** the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week? Who gave the Pope authority to **change** a command of God? If the Bible is the only guide for the Christian, then the Seventh-day Adventist is right in observing the Saturday with the Jew. But Catholics learn what to believe and do from the divine, infallible authority established by Jesus Christ, the

**Catholic Church**, which in Apostolic times made Sunday the day of rest to honor our Lord's resurrection on that day and to mark off clearly the Jew from the Christian. St. Justin Martyr (Apol., c. 67) speaks of the early Christians meeting for the holy sacrifice of the Mass on Sunday.

"Is it not strange that those who make the Bible their only teacher should inconsistently follow in this matter the **tradition of the Church**?" Bertrand L. Conway, The Question Box Answers, (New York: The Columbus Press, 1910), pp. 254, 255. This book has a preface by James Cardinal Gibbons.

"Because the origin of our faith is not the Bible alone, but the **Church** which gives us both the written and the unwritten word.

"So in the New Law, Catholics believe some things not in the Scriptures, although wholly in accord with them, because of the infallible witness of **the Church** as to their divine or apostolic origin. Why do Protestants accept the Scriptures as inspired? Why do they honor the first day of the week instead of the seventh? Why do they baptize children? Contrary to their principles, they must look **outside the Bible to the voice of tradition**, which is not human, but divine, because guaranteed by the divine, infallible witness of the **Catholic Church**." Bertrand Conway, The Question Box Answers (New York: The Columbus Press, 1910), pp. 75, 76.

"The Jews' Sabbath Day was Saturday; we Christians keep Sunday holy. The **Church**, by the power our Lord gave her, **changed** the observance of the Saturday to the Sunday.

"A word about Sunday. God said: 'Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day!' The Sabbath was Saturday, not Sunday; why, then, do we keep Sunday holy instead of Saturday? The **Church altered** the observance of the Sabbath to the observance of Sunday. . . Protestants who say that they go by the Bible and the Bible only, and that they do not believe anything that is not in the Bible, must be rather puzzled by the keeping of Sunday when God distinctly said, 'Keep holy the Sabbath day.' The word Sunday does not come anywhere in the Bible so, without knowing it, they are **obeying the authority of the Catholic Church**." H. Canon Cafferata, The Catechism Simply Explained (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne Ltd., 1938), p. 89.

"One practice we have, which Protestants observe, and there is not a word about it in the Bible—that is the keeping of Sunday holy.

"The Bible tells us to keep Saturday holy. The **change** was made by Christian

**tradition** dating back to the time of the Apostles. But not one of them said a single word about making the **change**, when writing the New Testament.” W. Freaan “Majellan” Office, (Ballarat, Victoria [Australia]: Redemptorist Fathers, 1959), p. 88. This book comes with a foreword by His Eminence, Cardinal Gilroy.

“You will tell me that Saturday was the Jewish Sabbath, but that the Christian Sabbath has been **changed** to Sunday. **Changed!** but by whom? Who has authority to **change** an express commandment of Almighty God? When God has spoken, and said, Thou shalt keep holy the seventh day, who shall dare to say, Nay, thou mayest work and do all manner of worldly business on the seventh day; but thou shalt keep holy the first day in its stead? This is a most important question, which I know not how you can answer.

“You are a Protestant, and you profess to go by the Bible and the Bible only; and yet in so important a matter as the observance of one day in seven as a holy day, you go against the plain letter of the Bible, and put another day in the place of that day which the Bible has commanded. The command to keep holy the seventh day is one of the ten commandments; you believe that the other nine are still binding; who gave you authority to tamper with the fourth? If you are consistent with your own principles, if you really follow the Bible and the Bible only, you ought to be able to produce some portion of the New Testament in which this fourth commandment is expressly altered.” Library of Christian Doctrine: Why Don't You Keep Holy the Sabbath Day? (London: Burns and Oates), pp. 3, 4.

“In the year A. D. 321, the Roman Emperor Constantine decreed that the first day of the week, Sunday, was to be observed as a civic day of rest from ordinary work and business. That did not impose any obligations of religious observance upon Christians. But in A. D. 336 the **Catholic Church**, at the Council of Laodicea, made the ecclesiastical law obliging the faithful to attend mass and to abstain from servile work on Sundays.” Dr. Leslie Rumble, Tract titled: Seventh-day Adventists, pp. 23, 24.

“Now the Scriptures alone do not contain all the truths which a Christian is bound to believe, nor do they explicitly enjoin all the duties which he is obliged to practice. Not to mention other examples, is not every Christian obliged to sanctify Sunday and to abstain on that day from unnecessary servile work? Is not the observance of this law among the most prominent of our sacred duties? You may read the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, and you will not find a single line authorizing the sanctification of Sunday. The Scriptures enforce the religious observance of Saturday, a day which we [Catholics] never sanctify.” James Cardinal Gibbons, The Faith of Our Fathers (Baltimore: James Murphy Company, 110<sup>th</sup> edition revised and enlarged) p. 80.

“The word *Sabbath* means rest, and is Saturday, the seventh day of the week.

“Why then do Christians observe Sunday instead of the day mentioned in the Bible? In order to make clear to the Jews that they are no longer under the Old Law of Moses, with its requirements of circumcision, abstinence from certain meat and the scrupulous observance of the Jewish sacrifice in the Sabbath; but under the New Law of Christ, the **infant Church changed** the day to be kept holy from Saturday to Sunday. . .

“The **Church** received the authority to make such a **change** from her Founder, Jesus Christ. He solemnly conferred upon His Church the power to legislate, govern and administer. . . the power of the keys [we will deal more with this concept when we make our comments on characteristic # 11 of the little horn]. It is to be noted that the Church **did not change the divine law** obliging men to worship, but **merely changed the day** in which such public worship was to be offered; thus the law involved was merely a ceremonial law.

“But since Saturday, not Sunday, is specified in the Bible, isn't it curious that non-Catholics who profess to take their religion directly from the Bible and not from the Church, observe Sunday instead of Saturday? Yes, of course, it is inconsistent; but this **change** was made about fifteen centuries before Protestantism was born, and by that time the custom was universally observed. They have continued the custom, even though it rests upon the **authority of the Catholic Church** and not upon an explicit text in the Bible. That observance remains as a reminder of the **Mother Church** from which the non-Catholic sects broke away—like a boy running away from home but still carrying in his pocket a picture of his mother or a lock of her hair.” John O'Brien, *The Faith of Millions* (Huntington, Indiana: Our Sunday Visitor, Inc., 1974) p. 400, 401.

“Why did the Church **change** the Lord's day from the Sabbath to Sunday? The **Church**, using the power of binding and loosing which Christ gave to the Pope, **changed** the Lord's day to Sunday.” Killgallen and Weber, *Life in Christ—Instructions in the Catholic Faith*, p. 243.

“It was the **Holy Catholic Church** that **changed** the day of rest from Saturday to Sunday, the first day of the week. And it not only compelled all to keep Sunday, but urged all persons to labor on the seventh day under pain of anathema. Protestants. . . profess great reverence for the Bible, and yet by their solemn act of keeping Sunday, they acknowledge the power of the Catholic Church. The Bible says, 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.' But the **Catholic Church says**,

‘NO: Keep the first day of the week and lo, the entire civilized world **bows down in reverent obedience** to the command of the holy Catholic church.” Words of Father Enright, longtime President of Redemptorist College in America, quoted in, Joe Crews, The Beast, the Dragon and the Woman (Frederick, Maryland: Amazing Facts, Inc., thirteenth edition, June 1991), p. 33.

“Nothing is said in the Bible about the **change** of the Lord’s day from Saturday to Sunday. We know of the **change** only from the tradition of the **Church**—a fact handed down to us from the earliest times by the living voice of the **Church**. That is why we find so illogical the attitude of many non-Catholics, who say that they will believe nothing unless they can find it in the Bible and yet will continue to keep Sunday as the Lord’s day on the **say-so of the Catholic Church**.” Rev. Leo J. Trese and John J. Castletot, S. S., Salvation History and the Commandments (1963 edition), p. 294.

“Ten precepts. . . embodying the revealed expression of the Creator’s will in relation to man’s whole duty to God and to his fellow creatures. . . . Christ resumed these Commandments in the double precept of charity—love of God and of the neighbor; He proclaimed them as binding under the New Law in Matthew 19 and in the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5) . . . . The **Church**, on the other hand, after **changing** the day of rest from the Jewish Sabbath, or seventh day of the week, to the first, made the third commandment refer to Sunday as the day to be kept holy as the Lord’s Day.” The Catholic Encyclopedia, article, “*The Commandments of God*”.

“Q. What day was the Sabbath?”

A. The seventh day, our Saturday.

Q. Do you keep the Sabbath?

A. No: we keep the Lord’s Day.

Q. Which is that?

A. The first day: Sunday.

Q. Who changed it?

A. The Catholic Church.” James Bellord, A New Catechism of Christian Doctrine, pp. 86, 87.

“Q. Has the [Roman Catholic] Church a power to make any **alterations** in the commandments of God?

A. . . . **Instead** of the seventh day, and other festivals appointed by the old law, **the Church** has prescribed the Sundays and holidays to be set apart for God’s worship: and these we are now obliged to keep in consequence of God’s commandment,

**instead of** the ancient Sabbath.” Richard Challoner, The Catholic Christian Instructed, p. 211.

“There is not a word in the Gospels about **changing** the day of worship from Saturday to Sunday. Up to the time of the establishment of the Church of Christ, the day of worship was Saturday which in Hebrew is Sabbath. The Christian day of worship is Sunday, not Saturday. We call Sunday the Sabbath sometimes, because that was the established name for the day of worship in the Old Testament. To **change** the day of worship was a momentous thing for the new **Church to do**. Unless it was by the authority of God it would not and could not have been done. Yet, there is no special authorization for this **change** in Scripture. Those who affirm that the Bible is the sole rule of Faith, should leave off Sunday church-going and worship on the Sabbath, as the Jews do to this day, and as the Old Testament ordains.

“None but God could authorize the **abolition** of an ordination made by God Himself. It was God who commanded: ‘Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day’ (Exodus 20:8). The **Church** of Christ **abolished Sabbath worship** because she received authorization from Him who proclaimed the Ten Commandments. Christ said of His Church: ‘He that heareth you, heareth Me (Luke 10:16). That was a tremendous power for the Creator to delegate to a creature. But in giving the power Christ had also promised the dwelling of the Holy Ghost with His Church, which was to make it **immune to error**.

“Not only did **the Church institute Sunday** as the day of special public worship, but she also abolished many other rites and ceremonies prescribed by the Old Testament.” Martin J. Scott, S. J., Christ’s Own Church, pp. 44, 45.

“The **Catholic Church** for over one thousand years before the existence of a Protestant, by virtue of her divine mission, **changed** the day from Saturday to Sunday. We say by virtue of her divine mission, because he who called himself the ‘Lord of the Sabbath,’ endowed her with his own power to teach, ‘he that heareth you, heareth me;’ commanded all who believe in him to hear her under penalty of being placed with the ‘heathen and publican;’ and promised to be with her to the end of the world. She holds her charter as teacher from him—a charter as infallible as perpetual. The Protestant world at its birth [in the Reformation of the sixteenth century] found the Christian Sabbath too strongly entrenched to run counter to its existence; it was therefore placed under the necessity of acquiescing in the arrangement, thus implying the **church’s right to change the day**, for over three hundred years. The Christian Sabbath is therefore to this day, the acknowledged **offspring of the Catholic Church** as spouse of the Holy Ghost, without a word of remonstrance from the Protestant world.” *The Catholic Mirror* (Baltimore,

September 23, 1893).

The *Mirror* was the official organ of Cardinal Gibbons and the article from which this is taken was one of a series of four, printed September 2, 9, 16 and 23, 1893 , under the general heading: 'The Christian Sabbath: the Genuine Offspring of the Union of the Holy Spirit and the Catholic Church His Spouse. The Claims of Protestantism to Any Part Therein Proved to be Groundless, Self-contradictory, and Suicidal.' These articles were subsequently printed by the *Mirror* as a tract. The *Mirror* was discontinued in 1908, and five years later was succeeded by the *Catholic Review*, which is now the organ of the archdiocese of Baltimore.

"By what authority did the **Church change** the observance of the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday?"

The **Church changed** the observance of the Sabbath to Sunday by right of the divine, infallible authority given to her by her Founder, Jesus Christ. The Protestant, claiming the Bible to be the only guide of faith, has no warrant for observing Sunday. In this matter the Seventh-day Adventist is the only consistent Protestant. Sunday as the day of rest to honor our Lord's resurrection dates to Apostolic times and was so established among other reasons, to mark off the Jew from the Christian. St. Justin the Martyr, speaks of it in his Apologies." The Catholic Universe Bulletin, "The Question Box," (Volume 69, August 14, 1942), p. 4.

"Q. (a) The Bible says 'The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord,' and we read in your literature that it is the only Bible Sabbath there is. Will you please explain how the Sunday observance originated? (b) Do you think the Seventh Day Adventists keep the right day?"

A. (a) If you follow the Bible alone there can be no question that you are obliged to keep Saturday holy, since that is the day especially prescribed by Almighty God to be kept holy to the Lord. In keeping Sunday, non-Catholics are simply following the practice of the **Catholic Church** for 1800 years, a **tradition**, and **not a Bible ordinance**. What we would like to know is: Since they deny the authority of the Church, on what grounds can they base their faith of keeping Sunday. Those who keep Saturday, like the Seventh Day Adventists, unquestionably have them by the hip in this practice. And they cannot give them any sufficient answer which would satisfy an unprejudiced mind. With the Catholics there is no difficulty about the matter. For, since we **deny that the Bible is the sole rule of faith**, we can fall back upon the constant practice and **tradition of the Church** which, long before the reign of Constantine, even in the very days of the apostles themselves, were accustomed to

keep the first day of the week instead of the last." F. G. Lentz, The Question Box

(New York: Christian Press Association, 1900), pp. 98, 99.

“All of us believe many things in regard to religion that we do not find in the Bible. For example, nowhere in the Bible do we find that Christ or the Apostles ordered that the Sabbath be **changed** from Saturday to Sunday. We have the commandment of God given to Moses to keep holy the Sabbath Day, that is the 7<sup>th</sup> day of the week, Saturday. Today most Christians keep Sunday because it has been revealed to us by **the Church outside the Bible.**” The Catholic Virginian, “*To Tell You the Truth*,” volume 22 (October 3, 1947), p.

“I am going to propose a very plain and serious question, to which I would entreat all who profess to follow ‘the Bible and the Bible only’ to give their most earnest attention. It is this: Why do you not keep holy the Sabbath day?”

“You will tell me that Saturday was the *Jewish Sabbath*, but that the *Christian Sabbath* has been changed to Sunday. Changed! but by whom? Who has authority to change an express commandment of Almighty God? When God has spoken and said, Thou shalt keep holy the seventh day, who shall dare to say, Nay, thou mayest work and do all manner of worldly business on the seventh day; but thou shalt keep holy the first day in its stead? This is a most important question, which I know not how you can answer.

“You are a Protestant, and you profess to go by the Bible and the Bible only; and yet in so important a matter as the observance of one day in seven as a holy day, you go against the plain letter of the Bible, and put another day in the place of that day which the Bible has commanded. The command to keep holy the seventh day is one of the ten commandments; you believe that the other nine are still binding; who gave you authority to tamper with the fourth? If you are consistent with your own principles, if you really follow the Bible and the Bible only, you ought to be able to produce some portion of the New Testament in which this fourth commandment is expressly altered, or at least from which you may confidently infer that it was the will of God that Christians should make that change in its observance which you have made.” The Clifton Tracts, “*Why Don’t You Keep Holy the Sabbath Day?*” (New York: T. W. Strong, volume 4, 1869), pp. 3-15.

“The fact, however, that Christ until His death, and His Apostles at least for a time after Christ’s Ascension, observed the Sabbath is evidence enough that our Lord Himself did not substitute the Lord’s day for the Sabbath, during His lifetime on earth. Instead, as most agree, He simply gave His **Church** the power to determine the days to be set aside for the special worship of God. . . . It is easy to surmise that this preference of Christ for the first day of the week greatly influenced the Apostles and the early Christians to keep that day holy, and eventually moved them

to make a complete **substitution** of the Sabbath for Sunday. There is no conclusive evidence, however, that the Apostles made this change of days by a definite decree." Vincent J. Kelly, Forbidden Sunday and Feast-Day Occupations, copyright 1943, pp. 19, 20.

"Like two sacred rivers flowing from Paradise, the Bible and divine tradition contain the word of God, the precious gems of revealed truths. Though these two divine streams are in themselves, on account of their divine origin, of equal sacredness, and are both full of revealed truths, still, of the two, tradition is to us more clear and safe." Joseph Faa di Bruno, Catholic Belief, p. 45.

"But the **Church of God** has thought it well to **transfer** the celebration and observance of the Sabbath to Sunday, or, as on that day light first shone on the world, so by the Resurrection of our Redeemer on the same day, by whom was thrown open to us the gate to eternal life, we were called out of darkness into light; and hence the Apostles would have it called *the Lord's day*.

"We also learn from the Sacred Scriptures that the first day of the week was held sacred because on that day the work of creation commenced, and on that day the Holy Ghost was given to the Apostles." Translation by John A. McHugh and Charles J. Callan (1958), Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests, (New York: Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., 1934), pp. 402, 403.

"Sunday. . . . is purely a creation of the **Catholic Church**. . . .

"For ages all Christian nations looked to the **Catholic Church**, and, as we have seen, the various states enforced by law her ordinances as to worship and cessation of labor on Sunday. Protestantism, in discarding the authority of the Church, has no good reason for its Sunday theory, and ought, logically, to keep Saturday as the Sabbath." John Gilmary Shea, "*The Observance of Sunday and Civil Laws for its Enforcement*," in, The American Catholic Quarterly Review, volume 8 (January 1893), pp. 139, 152.

"The Third Commandment.

Q. What does the word 'Sabbath' mean?

A. It means the day of rest.

Q. When did the Sabbath begin to be kept?

A. From the very creation of the world; for then God blessed the seventh day, and rested on it from all His work.—Gen. ii. 2, 3,

Q. When was this Commandment renewed?

A. In the Old Law, when God gave the commandments to Moses on Mount Sinai,

written with His own finger on two tables of stone.—Exodus xx.

Q. Why was the Jewish Sabbath **changed** into Sunday?

A. Because Christ was born on a Sunday, arose from the dead on a Sunday, and sent down the Holy Ghost on a Sunday—works not inferior to the creation of the world.

Q. By whom was it **changed**?

A. By the Governors of the Church, the Apostles, who also kept it; for St. John was in the spirit on the Lord's day (which was Sunday)—Apoc. i. 10.

Q. How do you prove that the Church has power to command Feasts and Holy-days?

A. By this very act of **changing** the Sabbath into Sunday, which is admitted by Protestants, and therefore contradict themselves by keeping Sunday so strictly, and breaking most other Feasts commanded by the same Church.

Q. How do you prove that?

A. Because by keeping Sunday they acknowledge the power of the Church to ordain Feasts and to command them under sin, and by not keeping the remainder, equally commanded by her, they deny in fact the same power." Daniel Ferris, Manual of Christian Doctrine: or, Catholic Belief and Practice (Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd., 1916), pp. 67, 68.

Let us now examine two statements from church historians on the change of the Sabbath:

"The festival of Sunday, like all other festivals, was always only a human ordinance, and it was far from the intentions of the apostles to establish a divine command in this respect, far from them, and from the early apostolic church, to transfer the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday." Augustus Neander, The History of the Christian Religion and Church, translated by Henry John Rose, p. 186.

"Thus do we see upon what grounds the Lord's day stands; on custom first, and voluntary consecration of it to religious meetings: that custom countenanced by the authority of the church of God, which tacitly approved the same; and finally confirmed and ratified by Christian princes throughout their empires." Peter Heylyn, The History of the Sabbath, part 2, chapter 3, section 12.

Though we are dealing with Roman Catholic statements on the change of the Sabbath, perhaps it would be good to offer a few representative statements from the pen of Protestant expositors as well. We will begin with Isaac Williams:

"Where are we told in Scripture that we are to keep the first day at all? We are commanded to keep the seventh; but we are nowhere commanded to keep the first day. . . . The reason why we keep the first day of the week holy instead of the seventh is for the same reason that we observe many other things, not because of the Bible, but

because **the church**, has enjoined it.” Isaac Williams, Plain Sermons on the Catechism, volume I, pp. 334-336.

“The day called Sabbath by both Jewish and Christian writers is not Sunday, but the day previous—that is, Saturday. There is no indication whatever that the apostles in any sense substituted the Christian Sunday [a misnomer and oxymoron to be sure] for the Jewish Sabbath; no trace of any such transference is to be found in history. And there is nothing in Holy Scripture or in early Christian history to identify Sunday with the Sabbath, or to make the fourth commandment a mere precept for the observance of Sunday.” Vernon Staley, The Seasons, Fasts and Festivals of the Christian Year, p. 54.

“The reason why we observe the first day instead of the seventh is based on no positive command. One will search the Scriptures in vain for authority for changing from the seventh day to the first.” Clovis G. Chappell, The Rules for Living, p. 61.

“The Sabbath was founded on a specific divine command. We can plead no such command for the obligation to observe Sunday.” R. W. Dale, The Ten Commandmentes, p. 100.

“Jesus, after his resurrection, changed the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week; thus showing his authority as Lord even of the Sabbath. Matt. xii, 8: not to *abrogate* or *break it*, but to *preside over* and *modify*, or give new form to it, so as to have it commemorate his resurrection, when he ceased from his redeeming work as God did from his creation work. Heb. iv, 10.

“When Jesus gave instructions for this change we are not told, but very likely during the time when he spake to his apostles of the things pertaining to is kingdom. Acts i, 3. **This is probably one of the many unrecorded things which Jesus did.** John xx, 30; xxi, 25.” Amos Binney and Daniel Steele, Theological Compend (New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1902), p. 171. Does such a statement from an avowed Protestant really merit a reply? Where is the Biblical proof for his statement?

Notice the following astounding statement by Dr. Edward T. Hiscox, author of the Baptist Manual:

“There was and is a commandment to keep holy the Sabbath day, but that Sabbath day was not Sunday. It will be said, however, and with some show of triumph, that

the Sabbath was transferred from the seventh to the first day of the week, with all its duties, privileges and sanctions. Earnestly desiring information on this subject, which I studied for many years, I ask, Where can the record of such a transaction be found? Not in the New Testament, absolutely not. There is no Scriptural evidence of the change of the Sabbath institution from the seventh to the first day of the week.

“I wish to say that this Sabbath question, in this aspect of it, is the gravest and most perplexing question connected with Christian institutions which at present claims attention from Christian people; and the only reason that it is not a more disturbing element in Christian thought and in religious discussions, is because the Christian world has settled down content on the conviction that somehow a transference has taken place at the beginning of Christian history. . . .

“To me it seems unaccountable that Jesus, during three years’ intercourse with his disciples, often conversing with them upon the Sabbath question, discussing it in some of its various aspects, freeing it from its false glosses, never alluded to any transference of the day; also, that during forty days of his resurrection life, no such thing was intimated. Nor, so far as we know, did the Spirit, which was given to bring to their remembrance all things whatsoever that he had said unto them, deal with this question. Nor yet did the inspired apostles, in preaching the gospel, founding churches, counseling and instructing those founded, discuss or approach this subject.

“Of course, I quite well know that Sunday did come into use in early Christian history as a religious day, as we learn from the Christian Fathers and other sources. But what a pity that it comes branded with the **mark of paganism**, and christened with the name of the **sun-god**, when adopted and sanctioned by the **papal apostasy**, and bequeathed as a sacred legacy to Protestantism.” From a speech given before the New York Ministers’ Conference, November 13, 1893.

Philipp Melanchthon, the close colleague of Martin Luther, seems to have been the first to directly connect the change of the Law in Daniel 7:25 with the work of the Papacy:

“He changeth the times and laws that any of the six work days commanded of God will make them unholy and idle days when he list, or of their own holy days abolished make work days again, or when they changed the Saturday into Sunday. . . . They have changed God’s laws and turned them into their own traditions to be kept above God’s precepts.” Quoted by George Joye, in Exposition of Daniel the Prophet, 1545, p. 110.

Reputable church historians recognize the connection between the Sunday which Christians observe and the ancient pagan day of the Sun. Let’s quote a few:

“Sunday (*dies solis*. . . ‘day of the sun,’ because dedicated to the sun), the first day of the week, was adopted by the early Christians as a day of worship. The ‘sun’ of Latin adoration they interpreted as the ‘Sun of Righteousness.’ . . . No regulations for its observance are laid down in the New Testament, nor, indeed, is its observance even enjoined.” The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, volume 4, article, ‘*Sunday*,’ third edition, 1891), p. 2259.

“The early Christians had at first adopted the Jewish seven-day week, with its numbered week days, but by the close of the third century A. D. this began to give way to the planetary week; and in the fourth and fifth centuries the pagan designations became generally accepted in the western half of Christendom. The use of the planetary names by Christians attests the growing influence of astrological speculations introduced by converts from paganism. . . . During these same centuries the spread of Oriental solar worship, especially that of Mithra, in the Roman world, had already led to the substitution by pagans of *dies solis* for *dies Saturni*, as the first day of the planetary week. . . . Thus gradually a pagan institution was ingrafted on Christianity.” Hutton Webster, Ph. D., Rest Days (New York: Macmillan & Co., 1916), pp. 220, 221.

“It is not necessary to go into a subject which the diligence of Protestant writers has made familiar to most of us. The use of temples, and these dedicated to particular saints; . . . holy water; asylums; holy days and seasons, use of calendars, processions, . . . are all of pagan origin, and sanctified by their adoption into the church.” John Henry Cardinal Newman, The Development of Christian Doctrine (London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1906), p. 373.

“The first day of the week, named after the sun, and therefore an evident relic of sun worship. In French it is *Dimanche*, in Italian *Dominica*, both from *Dominus*, ‘the Lord.’ Christians, with the exception of Seventh-day Adventists, have substituted it as a day of rest and prayer in lieu of the Jewish Sabbath.” William S. Walsh, Curiosities of Popular Customs, article, ‘*Sunday*,’ (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1898), p. 901.

“The Gentiles were an idolatrous people who worshiped the sun, and Sunday was their most sacred day. Now, in order to reach the people in this new field, it seems but natural, as well as necessary, to make Sunday the rest day of the Church. At this time it was necessary for the Church to either adopt the Gentiles’ day or else have the Gentiles change their day. To change the Gentiles’ day would have been an

offense and stumbling block to them. The Church could naturally reach them better by keeping their day." Dr. William Frederick, Sunday and the Christian Sabbath, pp. 169, 170.

"The Church made a sacred day of Sunday. . . . largely because it was the weekly festival of the sun; for it was a definite Christian policy to take over the pagan festivals endeared to the people by tradition, and to give them a Christian significance." Arthur Weigall, The Paganism in Our Christianity (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, copyright in 1928), p. 145.

Notice the following fourth century challenge written by the pagan, Faustus, to the Christian, St. Augustine:

"You celebrate the solemn festivals of the Gentiles, their calendars and their solstices; and as to their manners, those you have retained without any alterations. Nothing distinguishes you from the pagans except that you hold your assemblies apart from them." Cited in John William Draper, History of the Intellectual Development of Europe, volume I, (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1876), p. 310.

Recently, Pope John Paul II has made a valiant attempt to justify the observance of Sunday on Biblical grounds. In this ecumenical age, when John Paul has called upon Protestants to become one with the Roman Catholic Church, it would not be popular to accuse Protestants of keeping Sunday in honor of the Papacy. For this reason, John Paul tones down the "tradition rhetoric" and **does his best** to provide Biblical evidence for the change. However, a careful reading of his pastoral letter, *Dies Domini*, betrays his dependence on oral tradition as the main justification for the observance of Sunday. In the letter, he quotes church tradition and theologians 212 times! Without going into a full analysis of this pastoral letter, I would like to submit five places where John Paul clearly betrays this dependence on tradition:

Paragraph 6: "Given this array of new situations and the questions which they prompt, it seems more necessary than ever to recover the deep doctrinal foundations underlying the **Church's precept**, so that the abiding value of Sunday in the Christian life will be clear to all the faithful." Here John Paul II clearly states that Sunday is the Church's precept.

Paragraph 18: "Because the Third Commandment depends upon the remembrance of God's saving works and because **Christians** saw the definitive time inaugurated by Christ as a new beginning, **they made the first day** after the Sabbath a festive day, for that was the day on which the Lord rose from the dead." Here John Paul attributes the change to Christians.

Paragraph 27: “This Christocentric vision sheds light upon another symbolism which **Christian reflection and pastoral practice** ascribed to the Lord’s Day. **Wise pastoral intuition** suggested to the Church the christianization of the notion of Sunday as ‘the day of the sun’. . . .” Here John Paul attributes Sunday observance as resulting from Christian reflection and pastoral practice and wise pastoral intuition.

Paragraph 63: “This is why **Christians** , called as they are to proclaim the liberation won by the blood of Christ, felt that **they had the authority to transfer** the meaning of the Sabbath to the day of the Resurrection.” Here John Paul once again attributes the change to Christians, not to Christ!!

Paragraph 81: “The spiritual and pastoral riches of Sunday as it has been **handed down** to us by **tradition**, are truly great.” In this statement John Paul, without apology or qualification, attributes the “riches” of Sunday observance to tradition.

In short, these five statements clearly show that the change was made by the church and not by Christ or the Apostles!

I would like to provide two statements from Roman Catholic sources, where the claim is made that Sunday is a sign or mark of the authority of the Church:

“The Divine institution of a day of rest from ordinary occupations and of religious worship, transferred by the **authority of the Church** from the Sabbath, the last day, to Sunday, the first day of the week, . . . is one of the most patent **signs** that we are a Christian people.” James Cardinal Gibbons, as quoted in, John Gilmary Shea and others, *The Cross and the Flag, “The Claims of the Catholic Church in the Making of the Republic,”* (New York: The Catholic Historical League of America, 1899), pp. 24, 25.

In 1895, J. F. Snyder, of Bloomington, Illinois, wrote to Cardinal Gibbons asking the following question:

“Does the Roman Catholic Church claim the act of changing the observance of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week as a mark of her power?” Cardinal Gibbons answered through his Chancellor, H. F. Thomas: “Of course the Catholic Church claims that the **change** was **her act**. It could not have been otherwise, as none in those days would have dreamed of doing anything in matters spiritual and ecclesiastical and religious without her. And the act is a **mark** of her ecclesiastical power and authority in religious matters.” Signed by Chancellor H. F. Thomas, November 11, 1895.

It is of more than passing interest that the Roman Catholic Church has a special fascination with the sun. It probably would be better to call it an obsession. As one visits Roman Catholic

Cathedrals in various countries of the world one is struck by the frequent icons, statues and paintings with sun-bursts. In St. Peter's Basilica in Rome, there is a huge sun-burst in the front which 'jumps out' at the observer the moment one walks in. In the Vatican Museum there are literally thousands of sun-bursts everywhere one looks.

Most Roman Catholic believers are probably not aware that the round wafer used in the Eucharist is a solar symbol. When the Roman Catholic faithful worship the host [wafer], they think they are worshipping Christ when in reality they are worshipping the sun!! The round tonsure on the head of the Roman Catholic priests is also a representation of the fact that they are priests of the sun-god. Roman Catholic altars are constantly adorned with a sun-burst on the front side. The place where the host is kept is invariably adorned with the sun. This obsession with the sun can be traced directly to ancient Roman paganism. In fact, as Bacchiocchi has irrefutably shown, the observance of the Sunday came into the Christian Church from paganism.

One final confirmatory statement from the pen of Ellen G. White:

"The special characteristic of the beast, and therefore of his image, is the breaking of God's commandments. Says Daniel, of the little horn, the papacy, 'He shall think to change the times and the law.' Dan. 7:25, Revised Version. And Paul styled the same power the 'man of sin' who was to exalt himself above God. One prophecy is a complement of the other. Only by changing God's law could the papacy exalt itself above God. And whoever should understandingly keep the law as thus changed would be giving supreme honor to that power by which the change was made. Such an act of obedience to papal laws would be a mark of allegiance to the pope in the place of God." Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, p. 446.

**Characteristic # 9:** We shall now see that the Roman Catholic Church is a different power than the kingdoms which came before her. The fundamental difference lies in the fact that the Papacy is an amalgamation of church and state.

We will begin with a quotation from the pen of Malachi Martin, Jesuit theologian, who describes the relationship between Constantine and pope Sylvester after the Edict of Milan in 313:

"All anti-church laws will be revoked. Constantine abolishes crucifixion as the supreme capital punishment—no criminal should die in the same way as Jesus the Christ died for men's sins. Sunday will be a public holiday in honor of Jesus' resurrection. Throughout the West, Constantine decides, he will use the bishops of the church just as former Roman emperors used the pontiffs of the old Roman College of Pontiffs, with the pope being supreme pontiff. All local bishops will have **civil jurisdiction**. Pope Sylvester and his successors will have **supreme civil jurisdiction** over all localities in the western half of the Roman Empire. . . . These two men, the pope and the emperor, have now set the stage for the next 1,600 years. **The Church of Rome will always be allied with some temporal power.** At

one stage, it will even claim to be the source of all worldly power—political, civil, military, diplomatic, financial, cultural. And it will make that claim stick for quite some time. But what a price it will pay!” (Malachi Martin, The Decline and Fall of the Roman Church, p. 37).

Martin is not alone in his assessment. Other church historians have clearly written about this church/state alliance which began in the days of Constantine. Notice the words of James Conroy:

“Long ages ago, when Rome through the neglect of the Western emperors was left to the mercy of the barbarous hordes, the Romans turned to one figure for aid and protection, and asked him to rule them; and thus, in this simple manner, the best title of all to kingly right, commenced the temporal sovereignty of the popes. And meekly stepping to the throne of Caesar, the vicar of Christ took up the scepter to which the emperors and kings of Europe were to bow in reverence through so many ages.” James P. Conroy, American Quarterly Catholic Quarterly Review, April, 1911.

Cardinal Henry Edward Manning, writing about the papacy’s emancipation from the power of the state in the days of Constantine, states:

“But from the hour when Constantine, in the language of the Roman law, *Deo jubente*, by the command of God, translated the seat of the empire to Constantinople, from that moment there never reigned in Rome a temporal prince to whom the Bishops of Rome owed a permanent allegiance. From that hour God Himself liberated His Church. It was from the first involved in the principles of the supernatural sovereignty of the Church on earth, that it should be one day free from all temporal allegiance, though as yet its liberation was not accomplished. . . . It [the papacy] waited until such a time as God should break its bonds asunder, and **should liberate it from subjection to civil powers** [in the words of the apostle Paul, the ‘restrainer’ was ‘taken out of the way’], **and enthrone it in the possession of a temporal sovereignty of its own.**” Henry Edward Manning, The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ (London: Burns & Lambert, second edition, 1862), pp. 11-13. Bold is mine.

Alexander Clarence Flick echoes the same idea in the following quotation:

“The removal of the capital of the Empire from Rome to Constantinople in 330, left the Western Church, practically free from imperial power, to develop its own form of organisation. The Bishop of Rome, **in the seat of the Caesars** was now the greatest man in the West, and was soon forced to become the **political as well as the spiritual head**. To the Western world Rome was still the political capital—hence the whole habit of mind, all ambition, pride, and sense of glory, and every social prejudice favoured the evolution of the great city into the ecclesiastical capital. **Civil as well as religious disputes were referred to the successor of**

**Peter** for settlement. Again and again, when barbarians attacked Rome, he was compelled to actually assume military leadership. Eastern Emperors frequently recognised the high claims of the Popes in order to gain their assistance. It is not difficult to understand how, under these responsibilities, the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, established in the pre-Constantine period, was emphasised and magnified after 313 [Edict of Milan].” Alexander Clarence Flick, The Rise of the Mediaeval Church (New York: Reprinted by Burt Franklin, 1959), pp. 168, 169.

And Carl Conrad Eckhardt has stated:

“Under the Roman Empire the popes had no temporal powers. But when the Roman Empire had disintegrated and its **place had been taken** by a number of rude, barbarous kingdoms, the Roman Catholic church not only became independent of the states in **religious affairs** but dominated **secular affairs** as well. At times, under such rulers as Charlemagne (768-814), Otto the Great (936-73), and Henry III (1039-56), the civil power controlled the church to some extent; but in general, under the weak political system of feudalism, the well-organized, unified, and centralised church, with the pope as its head, was not only independent in **ecclesiastical affairs** but also controlled the **civil affairs**. The church **interfered in secular affairs** on the basis of its theory of the relation of church and state, which was formulated in substance by Augustine (354-430) and given wider and more definite application by such popes as Gregory VII (1073-85), Innocent III (1198-1216), Boniface VIII (1294-1303), and others.” Carl Conrad Eckhardt, The Papacy and World Affairs (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1937), p. 1. Bold is mine.

This early view eventually led to the blasphemous claims of later popes. For example, here are the words of pope Nicholas I who ruled from 858 through 867:

“It is evident that the popes can neither be bound nor unbound by any earthly power, nor even by that of the apostle [Peter], if he should return upon the earth; since Constantine the Great has recognized that the pontiffs held the place of God upon earth, the divinity not being able to be judged by any living man. We are, then, infallible, and whatever may be our acts, we are not accountable for them but to ourselves.” (Quoted in, R. W. Thompson, The Papacy and the Civil Power (New York, 1876), p. 248.

And once again, Nicholas blasphemously boasted:

“Fear, then, our wrath and the thunders of our vengeance; for Jesus Christ has appointed us [the popes] with his own mouth absolute judges of all men; and kings themselves are submitted to our authority.” (Quoted in, Dave Hunt, A Woman Rides the Beast, p. 228).

The controversy between Henry IV, emperor of the Holy Roman Empire (technically he was king of Germany though he claimed to be Holy Roman Emperor), and pope Gregory VII is legendary. Gregory VII decided to enforce strict laws forbidding simony (buying and selling church offices) and marriage of the clergy. This meant that clergy with wives were required to put them away and the children had to be disowned. Henry rebelled against Gregory and wrote him the following stinging words:

“Henry, King not by usurpation, but through holy ordination of God, to Hildebrand, at present not Pope but false monk. This is the salutation you deserve, for you have never held any office in the Church without making it a source of confusion and a curse to Christian men, instead of an honor and a blessing.” The letter ended with the following words: “I, Henry, King by the grace of God, do say unto thee: ‘Come down, come down, and be damned through all the ages.’” (Quoted in, Louis L. Snyder, ed., Documents of German History (New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1958), pp. 31-33.

This challenge could not go unanswered so Gregory VII promptly excommunicated Henry and placed his realm under interdict [basically, in the view of the day, this doomed the whole population to eternal condemnation in hell because churches were closed and the sacraments could not be received]. Gregory's letter in the form of a prayer addressed to the apostle Peter invokes the curse of the apostle upon the rebellious king. The letter stated in part:

“St. Peter, prince of the apostles, incline thine ear unto me, I beseech thee, and hear me, thy servant, whom thou hast nourished from mine infancy and hast delivered from mine enemies that hate me for my fidelity to thee. Thou art my witness, as are also my mistress, the mother of God, and St. Paul thy brother and all the other saints, that thy holy Roman church called me to its government against my own will, and that I did not gain thy throne with violence; that I would rather have ended my days in exile than have obtained thy place by fraud or for worldly ambition. It is not by my efforts, but by thy grace, that I am set to rule over the Christian world which was especially intrusted to thee by Christ. It is by thy grace and as thy representative that God has given me the power to bind and to loose in heaven and in earth. Confident of my integrity and authority, I now declare in the name of omnipotent God, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, that Henry, son of the emperor Henry, is deprived of his kingdom of Germany and Italy; I do this by thy authority and in defence of the honor of thy church, because he has rebelled against it. He who attempts to destroy the honor of the church should be deprived of such honor as he may have held. He has refused to obey as a Christian should, he has not returned to God from whom he had wandered, he has had dealings with excommunicated persons, he has done many iniquities, he has despised the warnings which, as thou art witness, I sent to him for his salvation, he has cut himself off from thy church, and has attempted to rend it asunder; therefore, by thy authority, I place him under the curse. It is in thy name that I curse him, that all people may know that thou art Peter, and upon thy rock the Son of the living God

has built his church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. . . ." (Quoted in, Oliver J. Thatcher and Edgar Holmes McNeal, eds., A Source Book for Mediaeval History (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1905), pp. 146, 155-159.)

Henry already had many enemies among the nobility in Germany. These were envious of his position and resented his power so they took advantage of this opportunity to turn the people against Henry. The clamor of the people and the opposition of the nobles soon became unbearable. Henry heard that Gregory VII was on his way to Germany. Fearing that he would be permanently deposed if the pope came to Germany and sat with his rebellious subjects in judgment on him, Henry agreed to go to Canossa, Italy and beg for Gregory's forgiveness. Henry arrived in Canossa in January of 1077. Though it was the dead of winter, Gregory forced Henry to stand in the freezing cold for three days and three nights barefoot and clad only in wretched woollen garments. Remarks one historian:

"The spectacle of the mightiest king in Christendom humbling himself in this sensational fashion was one to amaze the whole Christian world—king, lord, and peasant alike." (Oliver J. Thatcher and Edgar Holmes McNeal, eds., A Source Book for Mediaeval History (New York: Scribner's and Sons, 1905), pp. 146, 155-159.

After the three days, Gregory absolved Henry, removed the interdict and wrote a letter to the nobles of Germany:

"Gregory, bishop, servant of the servants of God, to all the archbishops, bishops, dukes, counts, and other princes of the German kingdom, defenders of the Christian faith, greeting and apostolic benediction.

"Since you have made common cause with us and shared our perils in the recent controversy, we have thought it only right that you should be informed of the recent course of events, how king Henry came to Italy to do penance, and how we were led to grant him absolution.

"According to the agreement made with your representatives we had come to Lombardy and were there awaiting those whom you were to send to escort us into your land. But after the time set was already passed, we received word that it was at that time impossible to send an escort, because of many obstacles that stood in the way, and we were greatly exercised at this and in grave doubt as to what we ought to do. In the meantime we learned that the king was approaching. Now before he entered Italy he had sent to us and had offered to make complete satisfaction for his fault, promising to reform and henceforth **to obey us in all things**, provided we would give him our absolution and blessing. We hesitated for some time, taking occasion in the course of the negotiations to reprove him sharply for his former sins. Finally he came in person to Canossa, here we were staying, bringing with him only a small retinue and manifesting no hostile intentions. Once arrived, he presented himself at the gate of the castle, barefoot and clad only in wretched woollen garments, beseeching us with tears to grant him absolution and

forgiveness. This he continued to do for three days, until all those about us were moved to compassion at his plight and interceded for him with tears and prayers. Indeed, they marvelled at our hardness of heart, some even complaining that our action savored rather of heartless tyranny than of chastening severity. At length his persistent declarations of repentance and supplications of all who were there with us overcame our reluctance, and we removed the excommunication from him and received him again into the bosom of the holy mother church.” (Quoted in Oliver J. Thatcher and Edgar Holmes McNeal, eds., A Source Book for Mediaeval History (New York: Scribner’s and Sons, 1905), pp. 155-159.

Besides begging forgiveness of Gregory, Henry agreed to submit to the authority of Gregory VII in all things. He also called upon his subjects to submit to the pope’s authority and rescinded the edicts whereby he had deposed Gregory. This whole episode is remarkable. By crossing the Alps in the dead of winter and standing outside the castle at Canossa in the cold for three days waiting for an audience with Gregory VII, Henry was admitting that the Pope was the lord of kings. Even though Henry was king of Germany, the whole of Europe was really under his control because he was Holy Roman Emperor. By humbling himself, Henry was thus admitting that the pope was sovereign over all the kings of Europe.

Pope Alexander III (1159-81) also wielded enormous power over Frederick I, Holy Roman Emperor and king of Germany and Italy. Frederick’s attempt to chastize the pope backfired when his armies were defeated by the papal forces. For his rebellion, Frederick was promptly excommunicated and deposed by the pope. In penitence and humiliation, the emperor had to travel to Venice to beg for Alexander’s forgiveness and absolution. The scene is described by Roman Catholic historian, Fortunatus Ulmas:

“When the emperor arrived in the presence of the pope, he laid aside his imperial mantle, and knelt on both knees, with his breast on the earth. Alexander advanced and placed his foot on his neck, while the cardinals thundered forth in loud tones, ‘Thou shalt tread upon the cockatrice, and crush the lion and the dragon. . . . The next day Frederick Barbarossa. . . . kissed the feet of Alexander, and, on foot, led his horse by the bridle as he returned from solemn mass, to the pontifical palace. . . . The papacy had now risen to a height of grandeur and power which it had never reached before. **The sword of Peter had conquered the sword of Caesar!**” (Quoted in Dave Hunt, A Woman Rides the Beast, pp. 29-30). Bold is mine.

Another pope who wielded gigantic power over kings and princes was Innocent III (1198-1216). Notice the analogy Innocent provided to justify the dominion of church over state:

“The Creator of the universe set up two great luminaries in the firmament of heaven; the greater light to rule the day, the lesser light to rule the night. In the same way for the firmament of the universal Church, which is spoken of as heaven, he appointed two great dignitaries; the greater to bear rule over souls, . . . the lesser to bear rule over bodies. . . . These dignitaries are the pontifical authority and

the royal power. Furthermore, the moon derives her light from the sun, and is in truth inferior to the sun in both size and quality, in position as well as effect. In the same way, the royal power derives its dignity from the pontifical authority.” (Henry Bettenson, Documents of the Christian Church, p. 158).

In the year 1302 pope Boniface VIII proclaimed a very significant bull (personal letter) bearing the name, *Unam Sanctam*. In it, Boniface refined the idea of the two swords which had originally been proposed by St. Bernard. We will quote only the portions of the bull which are apropos to the subject we are dealing with

“In this Church and in its power are two swords, to wit, a **spiritual** and a **temporal**. . . . Both, therefore, the spiritual and the material swords, are in the power of the Church, the latter indeed to be used **for** the Church, the former **by** the Church, the one by the priest, the other by the hand of kings and soldiers, but **by the will and sufferance of the priest**. It is fitting, moreover, that one sword should be under the other, and the **temporal authority subject to the spiritual power**. . . . It behooves us, therefore, the more freely to confess that the spiritual power excels in dignity and nobility any form whatsoever of earthly power, as spiritual interests exceed the temporal in importance. . . . For the truth bearing witness, **it is for the spiritual power to establish the earthly power and judge it**, if it be not good. . . . Therefore, if the earthly power shall err, it shall be **judged by the spiritual power**; if the lesser spiritual power err, it shall be judged by the higher. But if the supreme power err, it can be judged by God alone and not by man, the apostles bearing witness saying, the spiritual man judges all things but he himself is judged by no one. Hence this power, although given to man and exercised by man, is **not human, but rather a divine power**, given by the divine lips to Peter, and founded on a rock for Him and his successors in Him [Christ] whom he confessed, the Lord saying to Peter himself, ‘Whatsoever thou shalt bind,’ etc. Whoever, therefore, shall resist this power, ordained by God, resists the ordination of God. . . . We moreover, proclaim, declare and pronounce that it is altogether necessary to salvation for every human being to be **subject to the Roman Pontiff**.” (Pope Boniface VIII, Bull *Unam Sanctam*, 1302 in Translations and Reprints From the Original Sources of European History, volume 3 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 189-), Number 6, pp. 20-23. The original Latin text can be found in Mury, *Revue des Questions Historiques*, volume 46, pp. 255, 256, based on the facsimile from the Papal Regesta. Bold is mine.

Clarence Alexander Flick offers the following comment about the same pope:

“The papal theory. . . . made the Pope alone God's representative on earth and maintained that the Emperor received his right to rule from St. Peter's successor. . . . It was upheld by Nicholas I, Hildebrand, Alexander III, Innocent III, and culminated with Boniface VIII at the jubilee of 1300 when, seated on the throne of Constantine, girded with the imperial sword, wearing a crown, and waving a

sceptre, he shouted to the throng of loyal pilgrims: 'I am Caesar-I am Emperor.'" (Clarence Alexander Flick, The Rise of the Mediaeval Church (reprint: New York: Burt Franklin, 1959), p. 413.)

And Flick comments further about the power of the popes during the thirteenth century:

"During this period the organisation of the papal hierarchy was perfected. At the head stood the all-powerful and absolute Pope as God's agent on earth; hence, at least in theory and claim, he was the ruler of the whole world in **temporal and spiritual affairs**. He was the defender of Christianity, the Church, and the clergy in all respects. He was the supreme censor of morals in Christendom and the head of a great spiritual despotism. He was the source of all earthly justice and the final court of appeal in all cases." (Clarence Alexander Flick, The Rise of the Mediaeval Church (reprint: New York: Burt Franklin, 1959), pp. 575, 576. Bold is mine.

Historian John N. Figgis adds this testimony about the Medieval power of the Church:

"[In] the Middle Ages the Church was not a State, **it was the State**; the State, or rather the **civil authority** (for a separate society was not recognized), **was merely the police department** of the Church. . . . [The Church] took over **from the Roman Empire** its theory of the absolute and universal jurisdiction of the supreme authority, and developed it into the doctrine of the *plenitudo potestatis* of the Pope." John N. Figgis, From Gerson to Grotius, p. 4. Bold is mine.

R. W. Southern makes this statement:

"During the whole medieval period there was in Rome a **single spiritual and temporal authority** [the papacy] exercising powers which in the end exceeded those that had ever lain within the grasp of a Roman emperor." R. W. Southern, Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1970), pp. 24-25.

Lucius Ferraris, in his acclaimed work, Prompta Bibliotheca, makes the following remarks:

"The common opinion teaches that the Pope has power over two swords, namely, the **spiritual and the temporal**, which jurisdiction and power Christ himself gave to Peter and his successors (Matt. 16:19), saying, 'I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven,' concerning which the doctors remark that he did not say 'key' but 'keys,' including both the **temporal and the spiritual power**.

"This opinion is most widely confirmed by the authority of the holy Fathers, by the teaching of the canon and civil law, and by the apostolic constitutions.

“It is not to be wondered at if to the Roman Pontiff, as to the vicar of Him whose is the earth and the fullness thereof, the world and all who dwell therein, etc., there have been granted, when just cause demands, the most complete authority and power of transferring kingdoms, of dashing in pieces scepters, of taking away crowns, not only unsheathing the **spiritual** but also the **material** sword. Which power in its fullness, not once but frequently, the Roman pontiffs have used, as occasion required, by girding the sword upon the thigh most effectively, as is perfectly well known; and to this not only do theologians give most complete testimony, but also the professors of pontifical and imperial law, and many historians of undoubted credibility, both profane and sacred, both Greek and Latin.” Lucius Ferraris, *Prompta Bibliotheca*, article, “Papa” Bold is mine.

And the Roman Catholic writer, Henry Edward, gives this testimony:

“The authority of princes and the allegiance of subjects in the civil state of nature is of divine ordinance; and therefore, so long as princes and their laws are in conformity to the law of God, the church has no power of jurisdiction against them, nor over them. If princes and their laws deviate from the law of God, the church has authority from God to judge of that deviation, and to oblige to its correction.” (Henry Edward, *The Vatican Decrees* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1875), p. 54.

The Roman Catholic papacy, which terrorized kings during the 1260 years, received a deadly blow from the state in 1798, when pope Pius VI was taken prisoner at the very climax of the French Revolution. At this point temporal power was removed from the papacy though it still continued to exist as a church. John Adolphus described this significant event only five years after it occurred:

“Berthier advanced to the city by forced marches; summoned the castle of St. Angelo [Feb. 10<sup>th</sup>.], allowing only four hours for its evacuation by the papal troops; the convicts were set at liberty; the gates of the city secured by the French; the pope, all the cardinals except three, and the whole people of Rome, made prisoners at discretion. . . .

“Shortly afterwards [Feb. 15<sup>th</sup>], Berthier made his triumphal entry into Rome; and a tree of liberty being planted on the capitol, . . . . a proclamation was issued, declaring. . . . a free and independent republic, under the special protection of the French army. A provisional government was acknowledged, as established by the sovereign people; and every other temporal authority emanating from the pope was suppressed, nor was he any longer to exercise any function. . . . The territory of the Roman republic was declared to comprehend all that remained under the temporal authority of the pope after the treaty of Campo Formio.

“As a refinement in the art of insult, the day selected for planting the tree of liberty

and deposing the pontiff was the anniversary of his accession to the sovereignty; and while he was, according to custom, celebrating divine service in the Sistine chapel and receiving the congratulations of the cardinals, Haller, the commissary-general of the French army, and Cervoni, abruptly rushed in, and announced the termination of his authority. The pope had scarcely recovered from the shock of this intelligence, when Cervoni offered him a national cockade, which he rejected with dignity; and he heard with fortitude that his Swiss guards were dismissed, and republican soldiers placed in their stead. Pursuing the same style of mockery, the invaders compelled the cardinals to perform a grand mass and Te Deum, to thank God for events which they could not fail most severely to deplore; public preachers were employed to reconcile the people to the change, and to argue from Scripture that, as the disciples of reason and votaries of religion, they were bound to submit to whatever form of government it had pleased Providence to set over them. . . .

“Whether retained by force, deluded by promises, or rendered inert by age, the pope remained, after the abrogation of his authority, a prisoner in his own palace. The French first seized on it as barracks, and in less than a week confined him to his own rooms, putting the seal of confiscation on all his effects. Even the furniture of his apartments was at length contemplated with a greedy eye, and the unfortunate pontiff was removed from Rome to Sienna [Feb. 20<sup>th</sup> to 25<sup>th</sup>], where he was received with consolatory sympathy by the Augustine monks, and lodged him in their convent. [Note: . . . He was removed, according to the caprice or policy of his persecutors, at all hours in the night and day, to many cities in Italy, where he was exhibited in chains, and at length confined in a fortress at the top of the Alps, where, under the old French government, it was sometimes customary to send regiments by way of punishment. In the course of the ensuing year it was deemed necessary to remove him to Valence, where he terminated his days amid the horrors of neglect and insult. . . .]” (John Adolphus, The History of France, volume 2 (London: George Kearsley, 1803), pp. 364-369.

Other historians describe this event in similar terms. Notice the following examples:

“The object of the French directory was the destruction of the pontifical government, as the irreconcilable enemy of the republic. . . . The aged pope [Pius VI] was summoned to surrender the temporal government; on his refusal, he was dragged from the altar. . . . His rings were torn from his fingers, and finally, after declaring the temporal power abolished, the victors carried the pope prisoner into Tuscany, whence he never returned (1798).

“The Papal States, converted into the *Roman Republic*, were declared to be in perpetual alliance with France, but the French general was the real master at Rome. . . . The territorial possessions of the clergy and monks were declared national property, and their former owners cast into prison. **The papacy was extinct; not a vestige of its existence remained;** and among all the Roman Catholic powers not a

finger was stirred in its defence. The Eternal City had no longer prince or pontiff; its bishop was a dying captive in foreign lands; and the decree was already announced that no successor would be allowed in its place.” (George Trevor, Rome: From the Fall of the Western Empire (London: The Religious Tract Society, 1868), pp. 439, 440. Bold is mine.

“When, in 1797, Pope Pius VI fell grievously ill, Napoleon gave orders that in the event of his death no successor should be elected to his office, and that the **Papacy should be discontinued**.

“But the Pope recovered; the peace was soon broken; Berthier entered Rome on 10<sup>th</sup> February 1798, and proclaimed a Republic. The aged Pontiff refused to violate his oath by recognizing it, and was hurried from prison to prison into France. Broken with fatigue and sorrows, he died. . . . [in] August 1799, in the French fortress of Valence, aged 82 years. No wonder that half of Europe thought Napoleon’s veto would be obeyed, and that with the Pope **the Papacy was dead**.” (Joseph Rickaby, Lectures on the History of Religion, “The Modern Papacy,” volume 3, [lecture 24], p. 1.) Bold is mine.

“The tricoloured flag floated on the top of the Castle of St. Angelo. The successor of St. Peter was carried away captive by the unbelievers. He died a prisoner in their hands; and even the honors of sepulture were long withheld from his remains.

“It is not strange that, in the year 1799, even sagacious observers should have thought that, at length, the hour of the Church of Rome was come. An infidel power ascendant, the Pope dying in captivity, the most illustrious prelates of France living in a foreign country on Protestant alms, the noblest edifices which the munificence of former ages had consecrated to the worship of God turned into temples of Victory, or into banqueting-houses for political societies, or into Theophilanthropic chapels, such signs might well be supposed to indicate **the approaching end of that long domination**.

“But the end was not yet. Again **doomed to death**, the milk-white hind was still fated not to die. Even before the funeral rites had been performed over the ashes of Pius the Sixth, a great reaction had commenced, which, after the lapse of more than forty years, appears to be still [in 1840] in progress.” (Thomas B. Macauley, “Ranke’s History of the Popes” (first published 1840), in his Critical and Historical Essays, volume 2 (London: Longmans, 1865), pp. 147, 148. Bold is mine.

“One of the first measures of the new government was to despatch an order to Joseph Bonaparte at Rome, to promote, by all the means in his power, the approaching revolution in the papal states; and, above all things, to take care that, at the pope’s death [he was ill, 1797], **no successor should be elected** to the chair of St. Peter.” (Archibald Alison, History of Europe, volume 1, chapter 26 (New York:

Harper, 1852), pp. 543, 544). Bold is mine.

“That the head of the church might be made to feel with more poignancy his humiliating situation, the day chosen for planting the tree of liberty on the capitol was the anniversary of his election to the sovereignty [Feb. 15]. Whilst he was, according to custom, in the Sistine chapel, celebrating his accession to the papal chair, and receiving the congratulations of the Cardinals, Citizen Haller, the commissary-general, and Cervoni, who then commanded the French troops within the city, gratified themselves in a peculiar triumph over this unfortunate potentate. During that ceremony they both entered the chapel, and Haller announced to the sovereign Pontiff on his throne, that his reign was at an end.

“The poor old man seemed shocked at the abruptness of this unexpected notice, but soon recovered himself with becoming fortitude; and when General Cervoni, adding ridicule to oppression, presented him the national cockade, he rejected it with a dignity that shewed he was still superior to his misfortunes. At the same time that his Holiness received this notice of the dissolution of his power, his Swiss guards were dismissed, and Republican soldiers put in their place.” (Richard Duppa, A Brief Account of the Subversion of the Papal Government, second edition (London: G. G. and J. Robinson, 1799), pp. 46, 47).

“The time, however, was arrived, when it became more desirable to send him [the Pope] out of the way, in order that his effects might be disposed of with a better grace. . . .

“It was decreed that he should go; and on the morning of the 20<sup>th</sup> of February, about seven o'clock, he left Rome, accompanied by three coaches of his own suite, and a body of French cavalry, to escort him safe into Tuscany; and on the 25<sup>th</sup> arrived in Siena, where he was requested to remain till further orders. Here he was received into the monastery of S. Barbara of the order of S. Augustin, whose members sorrowfully welcomed him at the gate, and offered all that their Convent could bestow, to console him under his misfortunes.

“An earthquake having taken place at Siena in the month of May, the Pope was removed to a Carthusian Convent within two miles of Florence. . . .

“He was suffered to remain in the Carthusian Convent until the 27<sup>th</sup> of March, 1799. He was then removed to Parma; from whence he was conducted to Briancon in France, and afterward to Valence, where he died on the 29<sup>th</sup> of August of the same year.” (Richard Duppa, A Brief Account of the Subversion of the Papal Government. 1798, third edition (London: John Murray, 1807), pp. 50-52, 54).

“Multitudes imagined that the papacy was **at the point of death** and asked, would Pius VI be the last pontiff, and if the close of the eighteenth century would be signalized by the fall of the papal dynasty.”(T. H. Gill, The Papal Drama, book 10).

Bold is mine.

According to historian M. Weitlauff, when Pius VI died in Valence in 1799, “the Papacy had suffered its deepest humiliation. . . . [and] appeared to be annihilated. . . . The Revolution also dealt it the wound which, it seemed did not want to heal until far into the twentieth century.” (Quoted in, Frank B. Holbrook, editor., Symposium on Revelation, volume 2 (Hagerstown, Maryland: Review and Herald, 1992), p. 337)

Historians from this period describe Pius VI as “the last pope” and refer to 1798 as “the end of an era.” Bible expositors also understood that 1798 marked the end of the 1260 years of papal dominion. But prophecy foretold that the papacy would regain its lost dominion once again.

At this point it might be well to explain what is meant by the “deadly wound.” It does **not** mean that the Roman Catholic Church would cease to exist as a religious institution. This simply did not happen in 1798; the papacy continued to exist as a church. What it does mean is that the papacy would no longer be able to exert dominion over the state. In other words, its political power would be arrested. The healing of the deadly wound means that the papacy, at some point after 1798, will once again be able to employ the power of the state to accomplish her purposes.

Has the deadly wound been completely healed yet? The answer is no. The healing is to be understood as a process rather than as one particular event. The process began as early as 1801 when Napoleon returned the papal states and gave pope Pius VII temporal power. Notice the words of Arthur Robert Pennington:

“Many of the men in those days [1798] imagined that the dominion of the Pope had come to an end, and that the knell of the temporal power was then sounding among the nations. This supposition, however, proved to be erroneous. The French republicans were very anxious that Rome should not have another Pope. But as the reverses of the revolutionary armies had left southern Italy to its ancient masters, the cardinals were able to proceed to an election at Venice. They elected, on March 14<sup>th</sup>, 1800, Barnabas Chiaramonti, who assumed the name of Pius VII.

“The first transaction of this Pope was a negotiation with the government of France, of which Napoleon Buonaparte was the First Consul. . . .

“He [Napoleon] felt that, as the large majority of the inhabitants of France knew no other form of faith than Romanism, it must become the **established religion of the country**. Accordingly we find that he now began negotiations with the Pope, which issued in a Concordat in July, 1801, whereby the Roman Catholic religion was once more **established** in France. He also left Pius in **possession of his Italian principality**.” (Arthur Robert Pennington, Epochs of the Papacy (London: George Bell and Sons, 1881), pp. 450, 452). Bold is mine.

Even though the papacy had the Vatican and its principality once again, it exerted very little political power between 1801 and 1870. Very few nations wished to have any relations whatsoever with a wounded and humiliated papacy. In 1870, the papacy suffered a further blow when Victor Emmanuel confiscated the Papal States, including Vatican City, and formed the unified kingdom of Italy. The pope, in protest, declared himself under house arrest and no pope left Vatican City for the next 59 years. But on February 11, 1929 a historic event took place. A treaty was signed by Mussolini and Gasparri which restored full political control of Vatican City to the papacy. In part the treaty provides for

“. . . the *de iure* and *de facto* **international sovereignty** of the Holy See with its **absolute and sole jurisdiction** over a **state** called the City of the Vatican and guarantees its freedom and independence. . . .the person of the pope is inviolable and sacred, and cardinals enjoy the honours of **princes** of royal blood, and wherever resident in Rome are Vatican citizens; certain other ecclesiastics residing outside the City are given **immunities**; the Vatican and Italy have ordinary **diplomatic relations**. . . . the Vatican City is therefore a permanently neutral and inviolable territory. . . . (Donald Attwater, *A Catholic Dictionary*, third edition, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958), p. 282). Bold is mine.

The *San Francisco Chronicle*, dated February 12, 1929, included a front page article titled: “MUSSOLINI AND GASPARRI SIGN HISTORIC ROMAN PACT.” In part, the article reads:

“The Roman question tonight was a thing of the past and the Vatican was at peace with Italy. The formal accomplishment of this today was the exchange of signatures in the historic Palace of St. John Lateran by two noteworthy plenipotentiaries, Cardinal Gasparri for Pope Pius XI and Premier Mussolini for King Victor Emmanuel III.

“In affixing the autographs to the memorable document, **healing the wound** which has festered since 1870, extreme cordiality was displayed on both sides.” (*The San Francisco Chronicle*, February 12, 1929, p. 1). Bold is mine.

It must be underlined that the deadly wound was not fully healed in 1929 but at that time the process was well under way. After 1929 the nations of the world slowly began establishing diplomatic relations with the Vatican once again. One after another chose to ignore the lessons of the past when the papacy lorded it over kings and princes. But the two superpowers [the United States and the Soviet Union] refused to do so. In 1867 the United States had officially banned diplomatic relations with the Vatican and the Soviet Union, a declared atheistic state, refused to recognize a church with diplomatic status.

A subtle change in mood on the part of the United States government was seen when in 1951, president Harry Truman suggested that it would be a good idea to formalize diplomatic relations with the Vatican. But Truman was not prepared for the uproar and backlash from the American people who were still well aware of the antagonism between the principles of Protestantism and

Romanism. When Truman nominated General Mark W. Clark to be our ambassador to the Vatican, the public opposition was so strong that General Clark withdrew his name and the nomination was killed before it reached confirmation in the Senate. In 1970 President Richard Nixon asked Henry Cabot Lodge to make periodic visits to the Vatican for the purpose of exchanging views on international and humanitarian projects but he did so without diplomatic status. But on September 22, 1983 the ban on diplomatic relations came to an end when Ronald Reagan (with barely a whimper from an inclusive and pluralistic American people) appointed William A Wilson the first United States ambassador, not to the State of Vatican City, but to the Holy See itself. Now, for the first time, one of the two world superpowers had contributed to the healing of the deadly wound. Just six years later, the other superpower would cave in when in 1989 the Soviet Union also established full diplomatic relations with the Holy See.

Though the appointment of William A. Wilson did not awaken the furor which the nomination of General Mark W. Clark had, there was still much discussion in the Senate before his confirmation. The discussion revolved around the issue of how the United States could send an ambassador to a church and yet not violate the constitutional separation of church and state. Some senators tried to obviate this problem by insisting that the ambassador was being sent to Vatican State rather than to the Holy See. Concerning this crafty argument, Norskov Olsen remarks:

“While Vatican City is subordinated to the Holy See and ambassadors are accredited not to the former but to the latter, it is acknowledged that the pope could not claim the prerogatives of a temporal ruler without the Vatican City State. Referring to the international juristic personality of the Catholic Church and the Lateral Treaty, Cardinal Hyginus Eugene, apostolic nuncio to Belgium and the European Economic Council, writes that the latter ‘merely once more provided the Pope, who is the spiritual sovereign of the Church, with another title to sovereignty, that of temporal sovereignty, which would immediately cease to exist if the Vatican State became extinct.’” (V Norskov Olsen, Papal Supremacy and American Democracy (Riverside, California: Loma Linda University Press, 1987), p. 52.

What Olsen is saying is simply this: It is impossible to say that the ambassador is being sent to Vatican State without at the same time saying that the ambassador is being sent to the Holy See. The reason is simple: Vatican State gives the Pope, as the religious leader of Holy See, a legitimate right to claim temporal power. You cannot any more separate the pope’s secular power from his religious power than you can separate the body from the spirit!

Another controversial issue had to do with how the United States could show preferential treatment to one church above all the others. This problem was simply ignored and was never resolved. Yet in spite of these two problems, the nomination went through with few objections. The United States had prepared the way for the full healing of the deadly wound!

A few words about the Vatican. Vatican City is the smallest sovereign state in the world and yet its size is disproportionate to its worldwide power and influence. It is a city within a city whose area covers only 108.7 acres. Its total population is approximately one thousand. It has its own

ambassadors, flag, language, laws, currency, postal system, army, traffic laws, police, baking system, newspaper [*Osservatore Romano*] and radio station. It is an absolute monarchy and theocracy with the pope, Vicar of Christ, as its absolute sovereign. Notice the following description of the pope's power as leader of the Vatican church/state:

“All laws are a sovereign emanation of the will of the pope, who is the ultimate source of all power, even though this is at times delegated to others for practical reasons. The pope alone has the fullness of legislative, executive, and judicial power and represents Vatican City in international relations.” L Barbarito, “Vatican City, State of,” New Catholic Encyclopedia, volume 14, p. 557.

One might ask how such a small city/state can exert so much worldwide clout. The answer lies in its hierarchical organizational system. Ellen White has described it well:

“The Roman Catholic Church, with all its ramifications throughout the world, forms one vast organization under the control, and designed to serve the interests, of the papal see. Its millions of communicants, in every country of the globe, are instructed to hold themselves as bound in allegiance to the pope. Whatever their nationality or their government, they are to regard the authority of the church as above all other. Though they may take the oath pledging their loyalty to the state, yet back of this lies the vow of obedience to Rome, absolving them from every pledge inimical to her interests.

“History testifies of her artful and persistent efforts to insinuate herself into the affairs of the nations; and having gained a foothold, to further her own aims, even at the ruin of princes and people.” (Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, p. 580).

Malachi Martin concurs with Ellen White's assessment when he states that the Roman Catholic Papacy:

“. . . places at the personal disposal of the Pope a supranational, supracontinental, supra-trade-bloc structure that is so built and oriented that if tomorrow or next week, by a sudden miracle a one-world government were established, the Church would not have to undergo any essential structural change in order to retain its dominant position and to further its global aims.” (Malachi Martin, The Keys of This Blood, p. 143).

We will complete our survey of church/state amalgamation in Roman Catholicism with several quotations from church historians and theologians starting with Pope Leo XIII.

“The church cannot give countenance or favor to those. . . who make it their aim and purpose to tear asunder the alliance that should, by the very nature of things, connect the interests of religion with those of the state.” (Pope Leo XIII, The Great

Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII, "*On the Chief Duties of Christians as Citizens*," third edition (New York: Benziger, 1903), p. 198.

"No can We hope for happier results either for religion or for the civil government from the wishes of those who desire that the Church be separated from the State, and the concord between the secular and ecclesiastical authority be dissolved. It is clear, that these men, who yearn for a shameless liberty, live in dread of an agreement which has always been fraught with good, and advantageous alike to sacred and civil interests." (Pope Leo XIII, The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII, "*The Christian Constitution of States*," third edition, (New York: Benziger, 1903), p. 125.

Henry Edward Cardinal Manning makes the following telling statement:

"Since the Council of Trent, the revolutions in France, Austria, and Italy have separated the civil powers from the unity of the Church. The nations remain Catholic as before, but many public laws are at variance with the laws of the Church. . . . It is of the highest moment to the civil powers of the world to readjust their relations with the Catholic Church; for so long as the public laws are at variance with its divine rights and liberties, internal peace and fidelity are hardly to be secured." Henry Edward Cardinal Manning, Petri Privilegium: Three Pastoral Letters to the Clergy of the Diocese (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1871), first pastoral letter, pp. 82

"The textbook on public ecclesiastical law used at the Pontifical University in Rome, where the elite of the American clergy are trained, makes the duty of Catholics in the United States very clear: 'Catholics must make all possible efforts to bring about the rejection of this religious indifference of the State and the instauration, as soon as possible, of the wished-for union and concord of State and Church. . . . Whether tolerance of non-Catholic religions is promised under oath by statutory law or not, it can never be admitted.'" (James Hastings Nichols, Democracy and the Churches (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1951), p. 266. The quotation which Hastings provides is from, La Piana, *Shane Quarterly*, April, 1942, pp. 92ff.

"What the papacy aimed at was not simply to *be* a temporal power by reason of sovereignty over a little Italian state, but to exercise a universal sovereignty over all sovereigns by reason of the spiritual office of the pope, who was to be the master and arbiter of all other temporal authorities.

"The development of that ideal, the partial achievement of it, and some of the reactions against it are what we must now consider. Lest this should seem to the modern reader a threshing over of old straw and a discussion of dead issues, there

should perhaps be inserted here a reminder that all the popes of the last six centuries have worn the triple tiara. According to present-day Roman Catholic authorities, its three crowns signify 'universal episcopate, supremacy of jurisdiction, and universal supremacy.' In the coronation of all popes—including Pius XII, on March 12, 1939—[and presumably any thereafter]—the tiara is placed on the candidate's head with the words: 'Receive the tiara adorned with three crowns and know that thou art Father of princes and kings, Ruler of the world, Vicar of our Savior Jesus Christ.' If this phraseology had not been sanctified by long usage, it would not have been coined in this generation to express the relation of the pope to the political and social order; but it would not have been created in the first place if it had not meant then what it says—'Ruler of the world.'" (Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, Twenty Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History, first edition (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1959), p. 120.

Notice the following chilling words from the official Jesuit journal *La Civiltà Cattolica*:

"The Roman Catholic Church convinced, through its divine prerogatives, of being the only true church, must demand the right to freedom for herself alone, because such a right can only be possessed by truth, never by error. As to other religions, the church will certainly never draw the sword [a declaration which is suspect in the light of Roman Catholic history], but she will require that by legitimate means they shall not be allowed to propagate false doctrine. Consequently, in a state where the majority of the people are Catholic, the church will require that legal existence be denied to error, and that if religious minorities actually exist, they shall have only a *de facto* existence, without opportunity to spread their beliefs. If, however, actual circumstances, either due to government hostility or the strength of dissenting groups, makes the complete application of this principle impossible, then the [Catholic] church will require for herself all possible concessions, limiting herself to accept as a minor evil, the *de jure* toleration of other forms of worship. In some countries, Catholics will be obliged to ask full religious freedom for all, resigned at being forced to cohabit where they alone should rightfully be allowed to live. But in doing this the church does not renounce her thesis, which remains the most imperative of her laws, but merely adapts herself to *de facto* conditions which must be taken into account in practical affairs. Hence arises the great scandal among Protestants, who tax the Catholics with refusing to others freedom and even *de jure* toleration, in all places where they are in the majority, while they lay claim to it as a right when they are in a minority. We ask Protestants to understand that the Catholic Church would betray her trust if she were to proclaim, theoretically and practically, that error can have the same rights as truth, especially where the supreme duties and interest of man are at stake. The church cannot blush for her own want of tolerance, as she asserts it in principle and applies it in practice." (Quoted in, Robert McAfee Brown, American Catholics: A Protestant-Jewish View, "The Issues Which Divide Us," edited by Philip Scharper (New York: Sheed and Ward, Inc., 1959), pp. 82-86.

In recent years a very significant book has been written by Malachi Martin, Jesuit priest. This book [The Keys of this Blood] discusses the struggle for world dominion among three globalist contenders: Capitalism, Communism and Roman Catholicism. Martin states:

“There is one great similarity shared by all three of these globalist competitors. Each one has in mind a particular grand design for one world governance. . . . Their geopolitical competition is about which of the three will form, dominate and run the world system that will replace the decaying nation system.” (Malachi Martin, The Keys of This Blood, p. 18).

And Martin makes it clear that this is an all-out, three way war for all the marbles:

“No holds barred because, once the competition has been decided, the world and all that’s in it—our way of life as individuals and as citizens of the nations; our families and our jobs; our trade and commerce and money; our educational systems and our religions and our cultures; even the badges of our national identity, which most of us have always taken for granted—all will have been powerfully and radically altered forever. No one can be exempted from its effects. No sector of our lives will remain untouched. . . . Nobody who is acquainted with the plans of these three rivals has any doubt but that only one of them can win” (Malachi Martin, The Keys of This Blood, p. 16).

Martin then explains how soon we can expect the winner to take over world control:

“As to the time factor involved, those of us who are under seventy will see at least the basic structures of the new world government installed. Those of us under forty will surely live under its legislative, executive and judiciary authority and control.” (Malachi Martin, The Keys of this Blood, pp. 15-16).

The question still remains, Which of the three contenders is destined to prevail? Martin entertains no doubts that it will be the Roman Catholic Papacy. In fact, the basic thesis of the book is that Roman Catholicism will once again rule the world as she did during the Middle Ages.. This result, according to Martin, has been predestined by God and is inevitable because Jesus promised Peter and his successors that not even the gates of hell would be able to triumph over the Church. Let’s examine a few of Martin’s astounding statements concerning the Roman Catholic papacy:

“In all phases of education, in all aspects of moral behavior and in all questions about the ultimate truths undergirding the life and death of every human being, this man [John Paul II] claims for his papal persona the right, the privilege, the duty and the due authority to stand **as judge**. . . . For, in the final analysis, John Paul II as the claimant Vicar of Christ does claim to be the **ultimate court of judgment** on the society of states as a society.” (Malachi Martin, The Keys of this Blood, pp. 345, 375). Bold is mine.

“The final prerequisite for georeligious capability is authority. The institution, in its organizational structures and undertakings, must have unique authority: an authority that is **centralized**; an authority that is **autonomous**, vis-a-vis all other authority on the supranational plane; an authority that carries with it such **sanctions** as are effective in maintaining the unity and the aims of the institution as it goes about its business of serving the greatest good of the community as a whole and in its every part.” (Malachi Martin, The Keys of this Blood, p. 138). Bold is mine.

Martin repeatedly affirms that John Paul II and the Roman Catholic papacy wish to return to the arrangement which existed in the Middle Ages where the Church was in control of all spheres of life. Notice the following example:

“In that world of early Europe, everything—politics, commerce, civil law, legitimate government, art, learning—all depended on the ecclesiastical structure that stretched from the pope to cardinals and bishops, priests and monks, and outward through all the ramifications of life.” (Malachi Martin, The Keys of this Blood, p. 518).

Speaking about the christianization of Europe in the fourth century and its aftermath, Martin remarks:

“Out of this new population, the Church diligently formed the matrix from which came the civilization that developed all those higher civil, political, artistic and cultural values treasured today as marks of progress and civilization—justice, compassion, democracy, dignity, the rights of man, even medicine and science. A new Europe now enjoyed a unity and a verve that the ancient Roman Empire, even at its apogee, had never been able to create.

“The centerpiece of it all was the man who sat on the throne of Simon Peter in the Holy See of Rome. Among the major players at the Round Table of international politics, no ruler could take command, no government could govern, no commerce could function, without the spiritual blessing and the imperial nod of the Roman Pope.

“Moreover, whatever overlordship this man, the Roman Pontiff, exercised—whatever armies or fleets he commanded or could assemble; whatever binding laws he laid down governing civil, political, artistic and personal life throughout Europe—ultimately his right and claim to do so was based on his possession of Peter’s Keys of supreme spiritual authority.” (Malachi Martin, The Keys of this Blood, p. 134).

Here Martin presents a rosy picture of a peaceful, democratic Europe where science flourished and

democracy led to the respect of human rights and dignity. This picture is an aberration of the facts. Europe was really ravaged by disease, illiteracy, poverty and strife. Human rights were violated by horrendous mechanisms such as the Inquisition and wars were the order of the day. Is this the order to which modern nations wish to return?

And for those who think that the Roman Catholic papacy is an archaic system of bygone times, Martin has this ominous warning:

“Any world leader who discounts the eternal revelations on which papal power claims to be based flirts with problems. But, at the same time, any world leader who takes the Roman Pontiff as possessing only the spiritual weapons of the unseen world and the afterlife with which to deal in practical, this worldly matters is making a strategic error of great proportions.” (Malachi Martin, The Keys of this Blood, p. 132).

Martin makes it clear that the Roman Catholic papacy aims to recover her lost position as the geopolitical and georeligious leader of the world. In other words, she plans to gain both religious and political control of the world. Dave Hunt has discerned this intent in the following comment in his book, Global Peace:

“Why do world leaders want to get into bed with the Vatican? The heads of state in today’s world all recognize that the Pope wields a power which in many ways is even greater than their own. It is not only Catholicism’s 900 million subjects and enormous wealth that causes the world’s most powerful governments to cultivate friendly relations with the Roman Catholic Church; it is because Vatican City’s citizens are found in great numbers in nearly every country. They constitute an international network that reaches into the inside circles of the world’s power centers.” (Dave Hunt, Global Peace, p. 116).

And in remarks which could very well have been written by a Seventh-day Adventist [though Hunt is an Evangelical whose prophetic views are, for the most part, inimical to Adventism], Dave Hunt makes the following chilling remarks about the whole world wondering after the beast:

“This indicates that not only Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy will be united, but that Protestants will join together with them, along with all of the world’s religions, including even the Muslims to form one new world religion. . . . It has become quite clear that the world religion under the Antichrist will not be atheism, Hinduism, Islam, Buddhism, or even New Age. It will be *Christianity*, but in a paganized form—exactly what it became under the leadership of Constantine and his successors, the popes. The coming world religion will have its headquarters in Rome.” (Dave Hunt, A Woman Rides the Beast, pp. 39, 200).

The papacy has come a long way since the French Revolution. The states which then withdrew their support from her are now flirting with her once again. Truly those who forget the lessons of

history are doomed to repeat its mistakes. Little do the political systems of the world realize the geopolitical and georeligious aspirations of the papacy. Tragically, prophecy predicts that they will wake up to realize their colossal mistake only when it is too late to do anything about it. Truly, the papacy is a different power because it is an amalgamation of church and state!

**Characteristic # 10:** The little horn was to govern for a period expressed as “time, times and the dividing of time” (Daniel 7:25; see also, Revelation 12:14) This period is also spoken of as 1260 days (Revelation 11:3; 12:6) and 42 months (Revelation 11:2; 13:5). Virtually all Bible scholars agree that “time” means one year, “times” is a dual form which means “two years” and “the dividing of time” means one half year. But very few contemporary scholars believe that the year/day principle must be applied to these time periods. Both preterists and futurists take these periods as three and a half literal years. Seventh-day Adventists, on the other hand, apply the year/day principle and with good reason (at this point, study the document by Stephen P. Bohr, *“Twenty Reasons to Apply the Year/Day Principle”*).

We have already noted (characteristic # 4), how the Roman Catholic papacy came to power. Through the help of the state, the papacy overthrew the unorthodox Heruli (493) and Vandals (534). But one rival power remained, the Arrian Ostrogoths.

As we have previously seen, Justinian gave his famous decree in **533** making the pope the “head of all the holy churches” in the East and in the West and promising to exert all his power to “increase the honor and authority” of the pope’s See. But this official decree of the state could not be fully enforced until the rebel Ostrogoths were uprooted. In **February of 538** (note the date!) the Ostrogoths were dealt a devastating defeat from which they never recovered. At this point the state’s decree could be fully enforced.

It seems more than coincidence that 1260 years after Justinian’ decree, on November 26, **1793**, the French government, through its Legislative Assembly, proclaimed an official decree abolishing religion and forbidding its free exercise. Churches were closed and Bibles were burned in the public plaza. Concerning this, Sir Walter Scott states:

“And as the recognition of the supremacy of the Pope seemed thus to be complete in the year 533, on the part of the emperor [Justinian] who put the power in his hands, so, in like rapid and yet graduated progress, with the same appointed space intervening, the dominion of the Papacy was destroyed and disannulled in that kingdom which had been its chief stay for ages, in the year 1793, the power was wholly taken out of the hands of the Pope, and infidelity, or rather atheism, was proclaimed, and popery was abolished.

“The churches were in most districts of France closed against priests and worshipers—the bells were broken and cast into canon—and the whole ecclesiastical establishment destroyed.” (Sir Walter Scott, Life of Napoleon, volume 2, p. 306; cited in, Alexander Keith, The Signs of the Times, volume 2 (Edinburgh: William Whyte & Co., 1833), pp. 93, 94).

W. H. Hutton also comments on the significance of 1793:

“On November 26, 1793, the Convention, of which seventeen bishops and some clergy were members, decreed the abolition of all religion.” (W. H. Hutton, Age of Revolution, p. 156).

And, exactly 1260 years after the Ostrogoths had been uprooted by Justinian, general Berthier entered Vatican City, removed Pope Pius VI from his throne and told him that his power was finished. Notably, the date was **February 10, 1798** (for more on the meaning of Berthier's act and documentation from historians, see characteristic # 9).

Thus 538 and 1798 are closely related. In 538 the pope was given universal sovereignty by the implementation of an imperial decree and in 1798 the pope was removed from that sovereignty by an official act of the emperor, Napoleon Bonaparte. And the power was removed exactly 1260 years, to the month, after it was given. Surely this is more than a historical coincidence!! The acid test of historical fulfillment requires that the year/day principle be applied to the 1260 days.

In 1986, Malachi Martin, a Roman Catholic Jesuit priest, made the following remarkable statement about the papacy:

In this statement, Martin makes three very important points: 1) Though we would dispute the historical accuracy of the universal dominion of the papacy for **fifteen hundred** years, it is significant that Martin does admit that the papacy had a career of over one thousand years of dominion, 2) for two hundred years the papacy has been inactive (two hundred years before 1986 would place us approximately at the French Revolution). This fits perfectly with Ellen White's statement, previously quoted, where she warns that if secular powers remove their restraint, the papacy will regain its power, and 3) this inactivity was imposed by the major secular powers of the world.

Even Dave Hunt, a futurist who believes that the little horn represents a literal person who will sit in a rebuilt Jewish temple for three and a half literal years admits that the papacy had an apostate career which lasted over one millennium. Speaking about the reaction of the church when the Edict of Milan was proclaimed by Constantine, Hunt remarks:

“Freedom at last from persecution seemed like a gift from God. Unfortunately, it set the stage for an apostasy that would envelop Christendom for **more than a millennium**. Christ's bride had been wedded to paganism.” Dave Hunt, A Woman Rides the Beast, p. 202-203.

Again, Hunt writes:

“Rome's dominance of Church and world for **more than a thousand years** through

excommunication, torture and death had led to corruption of such proportions that even the secular world recoiled in shame and horror. . . . The truth is that Roman Catholicism *did not represent Christ and was not His Church*. For **at least a thousand years** before the reformation the true church was composed of *multitudes of simple Christians who were not part of the Roman system*.” (Dave Hunt, *A Woman Rides the Beast*, pp. 190, 254. Bold is mine and italics are his.

It is perplexing indeed that Hunt is not able to see the fulfillment of the little horn in the Roman Catholic papacy. Above, he speaks of more than 1000 years of papal dominion, of the persecution of the saints, of a faithful church during this period, and of a corrupt system which claimed to represent Christ and yet was apostate. Though he apparently doesn't realize it, his description of this period fits perfectly with the depiction in Revelation 12:6, 13-15 and Daniel 7:25. But Hunt fails to see the connection between prophecy and history because he is looking at prophecy through futurist eyeglasses.

Hunt's blindness is all the more amazing when we consider his description of what, in his view, the final individual Antichrist will be like:

“While the Greek prefix ‘anti’ generally means ‘against’ or ‘opposed to,’ it can also mean ‘in the place of’ or ‘a substitute for.’ The Antichrist will embody both meanings. He will oppose Christ while **pretending to be Christ**. . . . When the time has come for his ascension to power—it will be in the midst of an **unprecedented global crisis**—he will be hailed as the world's savior, and so he will appear to be. . . . Instead of a frontal assault against Christianity, the evil one will **pervert the church from within** by posing as its founder. He will cunningly misrepresent Christ while **pretending to be Christ**. And by that process of **substitution** he will undermine and pervert all that Christ truly is. . . . If the Antichrist will indeed pretend to be the Christ, then his **followers must be ‘Christians’!** The church of that day will without dissenting voice, hail him as its leader.” Dave Hunt, *Global Peace*, pp. 7-8, 45, 200. Bold is mine and italics are his.

The fact is, we do not have to wait until the future for Hunt's description of the Antichrist to be fulfilled. Every single characteristic of Antichrist given by Hunt has already been fulfilled in the Roman Catholic papacy. Someone might question if the institution of the papacy arose in the midst of an unprecedented global crisis. Even a cursory glance at the history of the Roman empire will reveal that the papacy arose when the Roman empire was crumbling to pieces. It appeared that the empire was about to disappear from history. But it did not. It found in the papacy a unifying and saving force which kept the empire together. And the papacy governed exactly 1260 years!

What Hunt and other futurists fail to realize is that, according to Bible prophecy, the papacy was to have two periods of existence.. It governed in the past for three and a half prophetic times and then was dealt a deadly wound. But it will also govern in the future when its deadly wound is

healed. The only way the future career of the Antichrist can be understood is by discerning its past history. That is to say, only the method of historicism can provide a full and complete understanding of the Antichrist!

In contrast to Hunt, the historicist J. A. Wylie did see the papacy as the Antichrist. Notice Wylie's words:

"It is clear that Antichrist, as depicted by our Lord and by his apostle John, is to wear a mask, and to profess one thing and act another. He is to enter the church as Judas entered the garden—professedly to kiss his Master, but in reality to betray him. He is to come with words of peace in his mouth, but war in his heart. He is to be a counterfeit Christ—Christ's likeness stamped on base metal. He is to be an imitation of Christ,—a close, clever, and astute imitation, which will deceive the world **for ages**, those only excepted who, taught by the Holy Spirit, shall be able to see through the disguise and detect the enemy under the mask of the friend." J. A. Wylie, The Papacy is the Antichrist (Edinburgh: George M'Gibbon), pp. 17, 18. Bold is mine.

Wylie shows that the word Antichrist does not mean primarily 'against Christ' but rather, 'in place of Christ.' Notice how Wylie's connects the word Antichrist with the expression 'Vicar of Christ':

"The apostle John. . . speaking of the apostasy, the coming of which he predicts, styles it the 'Antichrist.' And we have also said that the Papacy, speaking through its representative and head, calls itself the 'Vicar of Christ.' The first, 'antichrist,' is a Greek word; the second, 'vicar,' is an English word; but the two are in reality one, for both words have the same meaning. Antichrist translated into English is vice-Christ, or vicar of Christ; and vicar of Christ, rendered into Greek, is Antichrist—*Antichristos*. If we can establish this—and the ordinary use of the word by those to whom the Greek was a vernacular, is decisive on the point—we shall have no difficulty in showing that this is the meaning of the word 'Antichrist,' even a vice-Christ. And if so, then every time the Pope claims to be the vicar of Christ, he pleads at the bar of the world that he is the Antichrist." J. A. Wylie, The Papacy is the Antichrist (Edinburgh: M'Gibbon), p. 2.

Wylie is not inventing a new meaning for the word 'Antichrist.' It is true that in the Greek the preposition *anti* can mean 'against.' But it is equally true that this preposition can mean 'instead of,' 'in place of,' or 'a substitute for.' In classical Greek, for example, the word *antibasileus* means 'one occupies the place of the king.' One who fills the place of a consul is called *anthupatos*. In the New Testament, the name Herod Antipas means that Herod ruled 'in place of' his father. The word *antitype* means 'that which takes the place of the type.' Christ is spoken of as having given His life a ransom in place of all (*antilutron*).

In all honesty we ask, How many powers arose after the fragmentation of the old Roman empire, ruled for 1260 years and had a leader who claimed to occupy the place of Christ on earth? There is

one and only one: THE ROMAN CATHOLIC PAPACY!!!

One final statement on the 1260 days from the inspired writings of Ellen White:

“The forty two months are the same as the ‘time and times and the dividing of time,’ three years and a half, or 1260 days, of Daniel 7—the time during which the papal power was to oppress God’s people. This period, as stated in preceding chapters, began with the supremacy of the papacy, A. D. 538, and terminated in 1798. At that time the pope was made captive by the French army, the papal power received its deadly wound, and the prediction was fulfilled, ‘He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity.’” Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, p. 439

**Characteristic # 11:** Daniel 7:8 describes the little horn as having “**eyes** like the **eyes** of a man.” We must remember that in Daniel 7 we are dealing with symbols. The horn, the mouth, the actions are all symbolic, therefore the eyes must also represent something beyond the literal. The question is, what do eyes represent, symbolically speaking? Let’ see.

It is common knowledge that “eyes” in Scripture are employed to represent “wisdom” “knowledge” or “understanding.” Many examples of this exist. With relation to God, eyes are employed to depict His all encompassing understanding, that is, His omniscience. (Revelation 5:6; Hebrews 4:12-13; Psalm 139:16; Proverbs 15:3). With respect to man, eyes are also employed to represent discernment or understanding, but, of course, man’s understanding is finite. (Ephesians 1:18; Psalm 19:8; Luke 11:34-37; Psalm 69:23; 119:18; Isaiah 29:10; Proverbs 3:19-21; Acts 26:18). Even today the owl is employed as a symbol of intelligence or understanding because of its large **eyes!**

Now, if “eyes” represent “wisdom” or “understanding”, then **human** eyes must represent **human** wisdom or understanding. This must mean that the little horn depends on human wisdom or understanding even though it claims to exercise the power and prerogatives of God! This dependence on human wisdom can be seen in Daniel 8:23 where we are told in **literal language** that the little horn represents a king who will “**understand** dark sentences,” and in Daniel 11:30 where the king of the north will “have **intelligence** with them that forsake the covenant.”

Now, in order to fully comprehend how the Roman Catholic papacy fulfills this specification of the little horn, we must first understand the Jewish view of divine revelation in the times of Christ, particularly the view of the Scribes and Pharisees.

The Scribes and Pharisees believed that when God spoke to Moses at Mt. Sinai, He not only revealed what Moses actually wrote but He also revealed many traditions which were not committed to writing. Thus, in their view, there was an original **deposit** of truth composed of two sources: the written revelation and the unwritten traditions. Though at first the written revelation was given a position of higher authority than the unwritten traditions, in the time of Christ, the unwritten traditions were given a position of higher authority than what Moses actually wrote.

Furthermore, according to the Pharisees, a **transmitting agent** was needed to faithfully relay the deposit of revealed truth to succeeding generations. And so the Pharisees believed and taught that the written and unwritten revelation was passed on from generation to generation by an unbroken succession of spiritual leaders culminating with the rabbis in the days of Christ. At this point we will quote several authorities who describe the process referred to above. We will begin with the Interpreter's Bible Dictionary:

“The Talmud which was at first mainly oral, grew out of the conviction that besides the written Torah (Law)–the Bible–there had been from the first, from the divine communications to Moses at Sinai onward, an **oral Torah handed down from generation to generation**, which lawgiver and prophets sought to engrave on the hearts of the people. As teacher **succeeded** teacher in the synagogue and school, their teachings and often conflicting opinions, all based on the Bible, were treasured. Through long practice the power of memorizing had been greatly strengthened, but the accumulated mass of oral traditions and teachings became so unwieldy that the best memory could not be trusted.” (The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, volume 4, p. 511).

Josephus tells us that “the Pharisees had **passed on** to the people certain regulations **handed down** by former generations and not recorded in the law of Moses.” (Flavius Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews, 13.10.6, bold is mine). Marcel Simon, in his book Jewish Sects, explains this concept of Josephus. After stating that the Pharisees went beyond the written text of the Scriptures and qualified and expanded it, Simon remarks:

“In their eyes, the tradition that they invoked in doing this, far from opposing the Torah [written Revelation], was the natural prolongation and explication of it. This tradition **went back to Moses himself**, just as did the Torah. An **oral law** was revealed to Moses along with the written law, and this oral law was **faithfully transmitted** from generation to generation.” (Marcel Simon, Jewish Sects, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), p. 34-35.

Simon then quotes the famous words in the *Talmud* found in *Aboth* 1:1-2:

“Moses received the Law from Sinai and committed it to Joshua, and Joshua to the elders, and the elders to the Prophets; and the Prophets committed it to the men of the Great Synagogue.”

It is remarkable that after these words from the *Talmud* “comes the enumeration of several pairs of teachers (‘Antigonus of Soko received the Law from Simeon the Just, etc.’) whose historical existence is more or less certain. The list finally ends with Hillel and Shammai, famous leaders of schools (Beth Hillel and Beth Shammai).” (Marcel Simon, Jewish Sects (Philadelphia: Fortress Press), p. 35. It is obvious that the *Talmud* is attempting to prove that oral tradition was transmitted in an unbroken succession of scholars from the time of Moses till the days of the Scribes and Pharisees.

According to Simon this idea of the transmission of oral tradition “made Pharisaism the **living element** of official Judaism. It was the **tradition** that allowed the Pharisees to justify all the **elaborations** that they introduced regarding the scriptural precepts, on the level of observances as well as on the level of doctrine.” (Simon, pp. 35-36). We find here the idea of the need for an authoritative **living interpreter** of both the written Torah and the oral traditions which had been handed down.

George Foot Moore, in his monumental work, Judaism, concurs with Simon:

“The Book of the Law of Moses might be a final law, but it was **not a finished law**. Many things which had, from a time when the memory of man ran not to the contrary, been generally observed and were regarded as necessary and binding were not contained in it at all. Some of these figure in later times as ‘traditions of Moses from Sinai’; others as ordinances of Ezra, or of the prophets of his time, or the men of the Great Synagogue, or more indefinitely of the Soferim, or the Early Elders.” (George Foot Moore, Judaism, volume 1 (New York: Schocken Books, 1974), p. 30).

“In tracing the **continuous tradition** of the Law from Moses to the days of Shammai and Hillel—Moses, Joshua, the elders, the prophets,—the *Pirke Abot* has, ‘The prophets **transmitted** it to the men of the Great Synagogue. The last in the prophetic **succession** Haggai and Zechariah, who had a leading part in the rebuilding of the temple, and Malachi, whom the Jews made a contemporary of the other two. These were the link between their predecessors in the prophetic tradition and the Great Synagogue. . . . ‘Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi received the tradition from the prophets; the men of the Great Synagogue received it from Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi.’” (George Foot Moore, Judaism, volume 1, p. 31).

The question is, how did the men of the Great Synagogue pass on these traditions to the succeeding generations? Moore answers:

“Ezra and the Men of the Great Synagogue were believed to have introduced these institutions and regulations by ordinances having the force of law, as their **successors**, the Soferim, and the Rabbis who **succeeded** them did.” (George Foot Moore, Judaism, volume 1, p. 33).

Thus, in the minds of the compilers of the *Talmud*, the process of unbroken transmission was complete: Moses, Joshua, Elders, Prophets, Men of the Great Synagogue [of which Ezra was the originator, according to the Jewish interpretation of Ezra 7:11-12], Soferim and Rabbis. Moore underlines the fact that “to be of any use such a **chain of tradition** must possess **unbroken continuity**.” (George Foot Moore, Judaism, p. 35). He also points out that these regulations of oral law came to be venerated even more than the written Revelation:

“We have seen how the ordinances (*takkanot*) attributed to the leaders of the restoration [after the Babylonian captivity] and of the authorities in later generations formed in reality a body of legislation **supplementary** to the written law in the Pentateuch. . . . The distinction between the ordinances and decrees of the Scribes (Soferim) and the biblical law is constantly made in the juristic literature, but the authority of the Scribes or the Learned to make such regulations was not questioned, nor was the transgression or neglect of their rules a venial offense. On the contrary, a **more serious matter** is made of the words of the Scribes than of the words of the (written) law.” (George Foot Moore, Judaism, volume 1, pp. 33-34).

In the same vein, Dr. Geike in his excellent work, Life and Words of Jesus, states:

“From their pupils the rabbis demanded the most profound reverence. ‘The honor,’ says the Talmud, ‘due to a teacher borders on that due to God’ . . . . The common discourse of a rabbi was to be revered **as much as the law**. To dispute with one, or to murmur against him, was a crime as great as to do the same toward the Almighty. Their WORDS must be received as WORDS OF THE LIVING GOD.” (Quoted in, E. J. Hibbard, The Two Laws: Object Function and Duration of Each (Mountain View, California, reprinted in 1989 by Leaves of Autumn), p. 46.

The teachings of the rabbis were also reckoned practically infallible as we can see from the following quotation also from Dr. Geike:

“It was a principle universally accepted that ‘*the sayings of the scribes were weightier than those of the law.*’ The **transmission** of the as-yet-unwritten opinions of former rabbis—forming an ever-growing **mass of tradition**—was the special aim of the rabbis of each age. . . . Once uttered, a rabbi’s words remained **LAW FOREVER**, though they might be explained away and virtually ignored while affected to be followed.” (Quoted in, E. J. Hibbard, The Two Laws: Object, Function and Duration of Each (Mountain View, California, reprinted in 1989 by Leaves of Autumn), p. 46.

Furthermore, the Pharisees believed, as we have briefly suggested before, that a living voice or **teaching office** (the word “rabbi” means “teacher”) was needed in each generation to authoritatively interpret and explain God’s revelation and apply it to contemporary life. The role of this teaching office, however, went far beyond just explaining and applying the written revelation. The rabbis frequently brought forth religious practices and beliefs which were not implicitly, much less explicitly, contained in the written revelation. When they did this, Were they claiming to bring forth new truth not previously revealed by God? Not at all! They taught that these truths were part of the deposit of unwritten traditions which God had previously revealed to Moses. They believed that though these traditions had not previously been brought to light, they had been preserved in the deposit of truth which had been handed down from generation to generation. In other words, the rabbis believed that they were merely bringing these truths to light or discovering

them in the deposit of tradition.

This brings us to the issue of **authority**. The Pharisees believed that only an elite *cadre* of carefully trained theological experts guided by God could bring to light, explain, interpret and apply the written Scriptures as well as the unwritten traditions. This was what Jesus was speaking to when He remarked that the Pharisees “sit on Moses’ *kathedra*.” (Matthew 23:2). Concerning this *kathedra*, the Roman Catholic Jerome Bible Commentary states:

“The phrase is most probably a metaphor for the authority of the scribes to teach. In rabbinical tradition the interpretation of the Law was carried on in a scribal tradition that theoretically went back through an **unbroken chain** of scribes to Moses. This view is, of course, entirely unhistorical.” (The Jerome Bible Commentary, volume 2 (New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1968), p. 102).

When the Pharisees and Scribes spoke *ex-cathedra*, that is, “from the throne,” their word was to be accepted as final. The general populace was required to accept these rabbinical views and interpretations and to obey them without question. Thus the genuine meaning of both the written Scriptures and the unwritten traditions could only be determined by the rabbis and the general populace had no say in the matter! Concerning this, George Foot Moore remarks:

“Learning is the privilege of leisure. Husbandmen and artisans are the support of the social structure, but, wholly occupied as they must be in their several callings and often highly expert in them, they have no time for the wide-ranging studies that make the scholar. They are therefore not qualified to be called to the council or to take the lead in the assembly; they cannot sit on the judge’s bench, for they do not understand the principles of the law, and cannot bring out the rights of the case and a just judgment. Different is the case of the man who gives his whole mind to it, and concentrates his thought on the law of the Most High. He will seek out the wisdom of all the ancients and occupy himself with the study of the prophecies, and pay attention to expositions of famous men, and will penetrate into the elusive turns of parables. He will search out the hidden meaning of proverbs, and will be versed in the enigmas of parables.” (George Foot Moore, Judaism, volume 1, pp. 40-41).

In this way the religious leaders had absolute control over every person and sphere of public and private life. Whoever questioned the opinion or authority of the rabbis was in danger of being cast out of the synagogue, as we can see from the story of the man who was born blind (John 9:22). Jesus spoke to this problem in Matthew 23:12 when He accused the Scribes and Pharisees of closing the kingdom of heaven to men as well as to themselves. What Jesus meant by this is found in the parallel passage of Luke 11:52 where He accused the doctors of the law of taking away the key of knowledge which would have opened the door to the kingdom of heaven to the themselves and the people.

Jesus’ rebuke of the Scribes and Pharisees in Matthew 23 had the intention of breaking the stranglehold which they had over the people. George Foot Moore speaks about the influence

which the Scribes and Pharisees had on the people:

“The Scribes, on the other hand, had the support of the Pharisaean party, to which many of them belonged. The Pharisees in turn had **the people behind them**, and with the growing importance of the synagogue, the **professionally educated class** gained increasing influence as the teachers of the people.” (George Foot Moore, Judaism, volume 1, p. 43).

Flavius Josephus adds this testimony:

“The Pharisees have delivered to the common people by tradition from a **continuous succession of fathers** certain legal regulations which are not written in the Law of Moses, on which account the Sadducean sort rejects them, affirming that what is written is to be regarded as law, but what comes from the tradition of the fathers is not to be observed. On this point the Pharisees **have the mass of the people on their side**, and they have **so much influence that anything they say, even against a king or a high priest, finds ready credence.**” (Flavius Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews, xvii.2.4.,parr. 41).

Ellen White concurs with this in the following words:

“The interest of the people in Christ and His work had steadily increased. They were charmed with His teaching, but they were also greatly perplexed. They had respected the priests and rabbis for their intelligence and apparent piety. In all religious matters they had ever **yielded implicit obedience to their authority**. Yet they now saw these men trying to cast discredit upon Jesus, a teacher whose virtue and knowledge shone forth the brighter from every assault. . . . Through their reverence for tradition and their **blind faith in a corrupt priesthood, the people were enslaved.**” (Ellen G. White, The Desire of Ages, p. 611, 612).

From the extant sources we know that much of the scholarship in Christ’s day consisted in quoting from what previous rabbis and fathers had said about Scripture and tradition rather than from the Scripture itself. Thus the opinions of men took the place of the Word of God. Regarding the teaching method of the rabbis Ellen White makes this telling statement:

“The teaching of the scribes and the Pharisees was a continuous repetition of fables and childish traditions. Their opinions and ceremonies rested on the authority of ancient maxims and rabbinical sayings which were frivolous and worthless. Christ did not dwell on weak and insipid saying and theories of men.” (Ellen G. White, The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, “The Word of God,” August 22, 1907).

She states further:

“The teaching of the scribes and elders was cold and formal, like a lesson learned

by rote. They explained the law as a matter of custom, but no authority from God sanctified their utterances, no holy inspiration stirred their own hearts and those of their hearers." (Ellen G. White, The Spirit of Prophecy, volume 2, p. 176).

In Matthew 7:28-29 we are told: "And it came to pass, when Jesus had ended these sayings, the people were astonished at his doctrine; for He taught them as one having authority, and **not as the scribes.**" The people were constantly wondering where Jesus had gotten His knowledge, not having studied under any of the great rabbis: "And when he was come into his own country, he taught them in their synagogue, insomuch that they were astonished, and said, **Whence** hath this man this wisdom, and these mighty works?" (Matthew 13:54). "And the Jews marvelled, saying, **How knoweth** this man letters, having never learned?" (John 7:15). When the officers of the temple returned to the Pharisees to render their report about Jesus, they exclaimed, "Never man spake like this man" (John 7:46).

The right or authority of Jesus to act and speak was constantly questioned by the Scribes and Pharisees: "And they come again to Jerusalem: and as he was walking in the temple, there come to him the chief priests, and the scribes, and the elders, and say unto him: By what authority doest thou these things? And **who gave thee** this authority to do these things?" (Mark 11:27-28). It is clear here that the religious leaders believed that the right to teach was an authority which belonged to them alone and which they alone could delegate. It is of great significance that Jesus never attended the rabbinical schools and never quoted the traditions of the rabbis. His authority came exclusively from the **written** Word of God.

From the time of his first visit to the temple, Jesus appealed to the written word of God. Regarding this incident, Ellen White remarks:

"In every gentle and submissive way, Jesus tried to please those with whom He came in contact. Because He was so gentle and unobtrusive, the scribes and elders supposed that He would be easily influenced by their teaching. They urged Him to receive the maxims and traditions that had been **handed down** from the ancient rabbis, but He asked for their authority in **Holy writ**. He would hear every word that proceeds from the mouth of God; but He could not obey the inventions of men. Jesus seemed to know the Scriptures from beginning to end, and He presented them in their true import. The rabbis were ashamed to be instructed by a child. They claimed that it was **their office to explain** the Scriptures, and that it was His place to accept **their interpretation**. They were indignant that He should stand in opposition to their word." (Ellen G. White, The Desire of Ages, p. 85).

When Jesus was tempted of the devil, His defense was, "it is **written**" (Matthew 4:4, 6, 7). When Jesus began His public ministry He authenticated it by quoting Isaiah 61:1, 2 and then saying: "This day is this **scripture** fulfilled in your ears" (Luke 4:21). When a certain lawyer asked Jesus what he needed to do to inherit eternal life, He answered: "What is **written** in the law? How readest thou?" (Luke 10:26). In the parable of the vineyard, Jesus asked the religious leaders: "Did ye never read in the **Scriptures**, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes?" (Matthew 21:42). In a

dispute over the resurrection, Jesus told the Sadducees: “Ye do err, not knowing the **Scriptures**, nor the power of God” (Matthew 22:29) His cleansing of the temple was justified by the **written** Word (Matthew 21:13). When any religious dispute was to be settled, Jesus quoted from the **written** Word (see, John 5:39-46; Matthew 19:4-6; John 8:17, 18; Matthew 22:41ff). After His resurrection Jesus explained His mission to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus by quoting from the **written** Scriptures (see, Luke 24:25-27, 32, 44-46).

In the following statement, Ellen White contrasts the teaching methods of Jesus with those of the Scribes:

“Jesus preached the truth of the Old Testament Scriptures with freshness and power, and elevated the word of God above the traditions and maxims of men. All that he said fell upon the ears of his hearers as a new revelation. He did not repeat the common-place traditional maxims after the manner of the rabbis, nor did he speak with hesitation and uncertainty as they did. He spoke with calm assurance and with marked independence. The religion that prevailed in the time of Christ’s public ministry was lifeless. Tho it was taught by men of education and talent, yet their instruction in large degree consisted in senseless repetitions. . . .” (Ellen G. White, “Human Traditions Unprofitable,” Signs of the Times [March 26, 1896]).

This contrast between the Word of God and the traditions of men can be discerned most clearly in Mark chapter seven, to which we must now turn

Mark 7 begins with a controversy between Jesus and the **scribes and Pharisees** over the issue of ritual cleansing. But three times we are told that the issue is **much broader** than this. It really involves “many other such like things” (Mark 7:4, 8, 13). In other words, this specific conflict is only the tip of the iceberg!

We are immediately struck by the technical terminology we have already found in rabbinical sources. “**Holding** the **Tradition** of the **elders**” (7:3), “which they have **received** to **hold**” (7:4), “**Tradition** of the **elders**” (7:7:3, 5, 8, 9, 13), “ye **hold**” (7:9), “ye **received**.” The word “received” indicates a process of transmission from previous generations as does the word “Tradition.” In fact, the word “Tradition” is used only in the singular in this passage thus indicating that we are dealing here with a body or deposit of Tradition of which the washing of hands is only one element. The word “hold” also indicates the existence of a deposit which they preserved in their own day. As to the meaning of the expression “Tradition of the elders,” the Roman Catholic Jerome Bible Commentary states:

“A rabbinical term for the body of unwritten laws that the Pharisees considered as **equally binding** as the written Torah.” (The Jerome Bible Commentary, volume 1, “The Gospel According to Mark,” 42:42, p. 36.

The fact that the scribes and Pharisees expected Jesus to compel His disciples to obey the Tradition of the elders indicates that this Tradition of the elders had the force of law (Mark 7:5).

Rabbis were expected to make their disciples obey this Tradition by precept and example.

The issue in this passage is crystal clear. The battle is between the **written** Word of God and **unwritten** Tradition. It is between the commandments of God and the Tradition of men. The way Jesus faced this conflict is significant. He quoted the **written** Word of God twice. The first quotation comes from Isaiah 29:13. Here Jesus tells the scribes and Pharisees: "Isaiah had you in mind when he said: 'This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.'"

The second quotation comes from Exodus 21:17 where Moses said: "Honour thy father and thy mother; and, Whoso curseth father or mother, let him die the death." The purpose of this second quotation is to prove that the commandments of men which come from the deposit of **unwritten** Tradition really conflict with the commandments of God which come from the deposit of the **written** Word of God. Jesus, in unmistakable language, shows that the law of Corban which is found in the body of unwritten tradition, not only **conflicts** with the fifth commandment of the written law of God but actually abolishes it!!

Significantly, Jesus also says that following the **unwritten** Tradition of men not only annuls the **written** Word of God but also constitutes **false worship**: "Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men. . . ." (Mark 7:7-8). Does this ring a bell?

Allow me, for a moment at least, to get ahead of myself. We know that the great issue in the final controversy will involve the commandments of God versus the commandments of men and true worship to God versus false worship to the beast! Is it just possible that the conflict between Jesus and the scribes and Pharisees will be repeated on a much larger scale between the Remnant Church and apostate christianity?

Before we answer this question we must say a few words about the rabbinical Sabbath. It is well known that Jesus was in constant conflict with the scribes and Pharisees over the issue of Sabbath observance. Most of these controversies dealt with the issue of healing people with chronic illnesses on the Sabbath. Jesus said it was **lawful** to do so (for example, Matthew 12:12) while the scribes and Pharisees said it was unlawful. The same can be said about the time the disciples plucked grain on the Sabbath. The Pharisees complained that this act was unlawful but Jesus said that it was perfectly allowable. The critical question to be answered is this, On what basis did Jesus say it was lawful and on what basis did the scribes and Pharisees say it was unlawful? In other words, what source of authority did the scribes and Pharisees use to prove that it was unlawful and which authority did Jesus use to prove that it was lawful?

Nowhere in the Old Testament are we told that it is wrong to bring healing to a sick person on the Sabbath. Nowhere are we told that it is wrong for a person to pluck an ear of corn to satisfy hunger on the Sabbath [though it was wrong to harvest your crop for commercial purposes on the Sabbath]. Then, Where did these rules and regulations of the scribes and Pharisees come from? The answer is: From the Deposit of unwritten Tradition! Samuele Bacchiocchi has shown that

Jesus broke four rabbinical rules when He allowed His disciples to satisfy their hunger. These rules were: reaping, threshing, winnowing and preparing a meal (see, Samuele Bacchiocchi, From Sabbath to Sunday (Rome: Pontifical Gregorian University Press, 1977, p. 49). In fact, after the Babylonian captivity, a fence of regulations was placed around the written law of God in order to prevent people from transgressing it.

The question is, How did Jesus face this issue? The answer is simple. On several occasions Jesus referred to written Scripture to justify his behavior on the Sabbath (Mark 2:25-27 [I Samuel 21:6; Genesis 2:1-3]; Luke 13:15 [Deuteronomy 5:14]; John 7:22-23 [Leviticus 12:3]). Jesus made it clear that by not helping the needy, the Pharisees were actually breaking the Sabbath while He was keeping it. In other words, their Tradition had made of none effect the written Word of God. Their rules which had the intention of protecting the Sabbath from being broken actually led them to break it! The Sabbath of the Pharisees was actually a false sabbath because it was made by man and not by God. Keeping this sabbath was really false worship because it glorified man instead of God!

Allow me now to get ahead of myself once again. Will the final conflict involve a false sabbath and a true Sabbath? Yes. The only difference between the times of Jesus and ours is that in those days the ones who claimed to be the people of God kept the Sabbath in the **wrong way** while in the end-time the Christian world will keep the **wrong day**. But the principle is the same. In both cases it is a sabbath of human devising and not the Sabbath which God made at creation. The conflict in Christ's day was actually over the Sabbath made by God versus the sabbath made by human tradition, and to keep a sabbath made by man is to practice false worship!!

It must be underlined that the Pharisees not only broke God's Sabbath by abstaining from doing good on the Sabbath but they also broke the Sabbath by intending to kill Jesus on it (Mark 3:6; Matthew 12:14; John 5:14). Irony of ironies, they condemned Jesus for healing on the Sabbath but they wanted to kill on it!! Certainly their rules of sabbath observance had made of none effect the commandment which says: "Thou shalt not kill." In other words, it is as if they were saying: "You either keep our sabbath or we will kill you." Does this also ring a bell? Is there a time when the Christian world will want to kill those who do not keep **their** sabbath, that is, a sabbath of human invention?

It has always been an enigma to me how the Christian world can accuse Seventh-day Adventists of being legalists for keeping the Sabbath and then turn right around and say, "You either keep the Sunday or we will kill you!" What worse legalism could exist than to keep the Sunday for fear of death rather than out of love for God? We also know that the Christian world will teach that the increasing natural disasters in the world are due to God's wrath because of the desecration of Sunday as the day of worship. They will say: "Let us return to God, keep Sunday, and then God will bless America once again." This is legalism—earning God's favor or turning away His disfavor by keeping Sunday!

Not only from Mark 7 but also from passages such as Matthew 23 we know that the rabbis had developed a system of rigorous casuistry which became so burdensome and oppressive that no one

could obey it. Regarding this Ellen White remarks:

“The requirements had become so complicated that it was impossible for them to be fulfilled.” (Ellen G. White, The Desire of Ages, p. 617).

No dimension of life escaped their prescriptions and proscriptions. Most often the rabbinical regulations majored in minors and minored in the “weightier matters of the law.” (Matthew 5:20; 23:23; 23:16-22). Jesus spoke of these burdens too heavy to bear in Matthew 23:4 and Ellen G. White describes this trend as well:

“They [the Pharisees] presumed to make **nice distinctions** as to the **comparative guilt** of various sins, passing over some lightly, and treating others of perhaps less consequence as unpardonable. For a money consideration, they excused persons from their vows. And for large sums of money they sometimes passed over aggravated crimes. At the same time these priests and rulers would in other cases pronounce severe judgment for trivial offenses.” (Ellen G. White, The Desire of Ages, p. 616).

“They occupied men’s minds with **trifling distinctions** and turned their attention from essential truths . . . . Among other things the people were required to strain all the water used, lest it should contain the smallest insect, which might be classed with the unclean animals. Jesus, contrasting these **trivial exactions** with the magnitude of their actual sins, said to the Pharisees, ‘Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat and swallow a camel.’” (Ellen White, The Desire of Ages, p. 617).

Furthermore, Jesus made it clear that these religious leaders relished the recognition their position accorded them. Their religion consisted mainly of externals—trying in this way, to impress the populace. According to Jesus they enjoyed being called “rabbi” (Matthew 23:7) and “father.” Regarding this, Jesus warned that the people should call no one on earth their “father.” (Matthew 23:9). Jesus also accused them of devouring the material possessions of the widows (Matthew 23:14) and of reciting long repetitious prayers learned by rote (Matthew 6:5, 6; 23:14). He also rebuked them for showing off their piety and generosity in giving alms to the poor (Matthew 6:1-2).

It might appear that we have made a long and unnecessary detour from the subject at hand. After all, What possible relationship could there be between the Jewish view of Tradition in Christ’s day and the Roman Catholic view of Tradition? For those who are conversant with Roman Catholic theology and practice, this question has already been answered. The similarity between the Jewish nation in Christ’s day and today’s Roman Catholic Church is striking indeed!!

Have you ever wondered how the Roman Catholic Church can justify beliefs and practices which do not have even one iota of evidence in the written Scripture? Where, for example, is the Biblical evidence for infant baptism, baptism by sprinkling, prayers for the dead, the canonization of saints, purgatory, limbo, the celibacy of the priesthood, the sale of indulgences, the worship of images, the rosary, the immaculate conception of Mary, Mary as mediatrix and co-redemptrix,

Mary as the mother of God, the assumption of Mary, the perpetual virginity of Mary, the observance of Sunday, Lent, auricular confession, among other things? Hang on to your seat, we are about to see that the Roman Catholic Church is repeating the history of ancient Israel!

The Roman Catholic view of Tradition is virtually identical with that of the Jews in the time of Christ. However, in place of Moses, the Roman Catholic Church substitutes Peter. According to Roman Catholic theology there are many teachings of Jesus which were never recorded in the Gospels. This much is true for we are told in John 21:25 and 20:30-31 that Jesus said and did many things which were not written in the Gospel of John. The Roman Catholic Church, however, carries this a step further. They explain that these teachings, given to Peter **orally**, were to be transmitted to succeeding generations along with the **writings** of the New Testament.

The Roman Catholic Church employs Matthew 16:18, 19 to support this view (for a full analysis and evaluation of this passage, refer to Stephen P. Bohr's audio tape 'Peter and the Rock', available from Prophetic Ministries, P. O. Box 8057, Fresno, California 93747). They say that Christ built His church upon Peter, the rock, and then gave him the keys of the kingdom to bind and loose. What this means in Roman Catholic theology, is that Peter was given the authority to define and explain, not only the written Word of God but also the unwritten Tradition.

But the Roman Catholic Church goes one step further. They say that not only did Jesus give this power to Peter but also to all of his successors in an unbroken chain until our day. Thus Peter's ***Kathedra*** is alive and well today!!

Let's put this in practical terms. The Roman Catholic Church believes that there is a **deposit** of the faith which is contained in the written Scriptures and in the unwritten Tradition. They also believe there is a **transmitting element** from generation to generation. This transmitting element is known as **apostolic succession** where one bishop places his hands in ordination upon another bishop in unbroken succession from the time of Peter till our day. But, according to Roman Catholic theology, there must also be an authoritative **living voice** in the church to explain, define, interpret and amplify Tradition both in its written and unwritten form. This is done by the **Magisterium** or teaching office of the church, an elite cadre of scholars especially trained for the task. We can immediately see the similarity between this Roman Catholic view and the Jewish concept in Christ's day. But there is more.

The Roman Catholic Church also teaches that when the Pope speaks **ex-cathedra**, that is, from Peter's throne, his declarations must be accepted as final and infallible. In other words, the populace must render implicit obedience to the will of the Pope and the Magisterium under pain of being anathema or excommunicated! This is, as we have seen, precisely what was expected of the populace in the days of Christ. In this way, the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church exerts full and total control over the masses and governs them according to their will.

We must now provide extensive evidence, from Roman Catholic sources, that this is indeed the view which the Roman Catholic Church espouses. We will begin with several statements from chapter two of the Vatican II declaration *Dei Verbum*. We will place the key words in bold print:

“But in order to keep the gospel forever whole and alive within the Church, the apostles left bishops as their **successors; handing over** their own **teaching office** to them. . . . And so the apostolic preaching, which is expressed in a special way in the inspired books, was to be preserved by a **continuous succession** of preachers until the end of time. Therefore, the apostles **handing on** what they themselves had **received**, warn the faithful to **hold fast** to the traditions which they have learned either by **word of mouth** or by letter (cf. 2 Th. 2:15), and to fight in defense of the faith **handed on** once and for all (cf. Jude 3). Now what was **handed on** by the apostles includes everything which contributes to the holiness of life, and the increase in faith of the People of God; and so the Church, in her teaching, life, and worship, perpetuates and **hands on** to all generations all that she herself is, all that she believes.

“This **tradition** which comes from the apostles develops in the Church with the help of the Holy Spirit. For there is a growth in understanding of the realities and the words which have been **handed down**. This happens through the contemplation and study made by believers, who treasure these things in their hearts (cf. Lk. 2:19, 51), through the intimate understanding of spiritual things they experience, and through the preaching of those who have **received** through **episcopal succession** the sure gift of truth. For as the centuries succeed one another, the Church constantly moves forward toward the fullness of divine truth until the words of God reach their complete fulfillment in her. . . .

“Hence there exist a close connection and communication between **sacred tradition** and **sacred Scripture**. For both of them, flowing from the same divine wellspring; in a certain way merge into a unity and tend toward the same end. For sacred Scripture is the word of God inasmuch as it is consigned to writing under the inspiration of the divine Spirit. To the successors of the apostles, sacred tradition **hands on** in its full purity God’s word, which was entrusted to the apostles by Christ the Lord and the Holy Spirit. Thus, led by the light of the Spirit of truth, these **successors** can in their preaching preserve this word of God faithfully, explain it, and make it more widely known. Consequently, it is not from sacred Scripture alone that the Church draws her certainty about everything which has been revealed. Therefore both **sacred tradition** and **sacred Scripture** are to be accepted and venerated with the **same sense** of devotion and reverence.

“Sacred tradition and sacred Scripture form one **sacred deposit** of the word of God, which is committed to the Church. **Holding fast** to this **deposit**, the entire holy people **united with their shepherds** remain always steadfast in the teaching of the apostles, in the common life, in the breaking of the bread, and in prayers (cf. Acts 2:42, Greek text), so that in **holding to**, practicing, and professing the heritage of the faith, there results on the part of the bishops and faithful a remarkable common effort.

“This task of **authentically interpreting** the word of God whether written or **handed on**, has been entrusted **exclusively** to the living **teaching office** of the Church, whose authority is exercised in the name of Jesus Christ. This **teaching office** is not above the word of God, but serves it, teaching only what has been **handed down**, listening to it devoutly, guarding it scrupulously, and explaining it faithfully by divine commission and with the help of the Holy Spirit; it draws from this one **deposit of faith** everything which it presents for belief as divinely revealed.

“It is clear, therefore, that sacred tradition, sacred Scripture, and the **teaching authority** of the Church, in accord with God’s most wise design, are so linked and joined together that **one cannot stand without the others**, and that all together and each in its own way under the action of the one Holy Spirit contribute effectively to the salvation of souls.” (Walter M. Abbott., general editor, The Documents of Vatican II, “Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation,” (The America Press, 1966), pp. 115-118.

We will now turn to article # 2 of the Catechism of the Catholic Church which deals with “the transmission of divine revelation”:

**“76** In keeping with the Lord’s command, the Gospel was **handed on** in two ways:

–*orally* ‘by the apostles who **handed on**, by the spoken word of their preaching, by the example they gave, by the institutions they established, what they themselves **received**—whether from the lips of Christ, from his way of life and his works, or whether they had learned it at the prompting of the Holy Spirit,’

–*in writing* ‘by those apostles and other men associated with the apostles who, under the inspiration of the same Holy Spirit, committed the message of salvation to writing.’”

**. . . . continued in apostolic succession**

**“77** ‘In order that the full and living Gospel might always be preserved in the Church the apostles left bishops as their **successors**. They gave them ‘their own position of teaching authority.’ Indeed, ‘the apostolic preaching, which is expressed in a special way in the inspired books, was to be preserved in a **continuous line of succession** until the end of time.’”

**“78** This living **transmission**, accomplished in the Holy Spirit, is called **Tradition** since it is distinct from Sacred Scripture, though closely connected to it. Through **Tradition**, ‘the Church, in her doctrine, life, and worship perpetuates and **transmits** to every generation all that she herself is, all that she believes. The

sayings of the holy Fathers are a witness to the life-giving presence of this **Tradition**, showing how its riches are poured out in the practice and life of the Church, in her belief and her prayer.' . . . .

#### **One common source. . . .**

**"80** 'Sacred Tradition and Sacred Scripture, then, are bound closely together and communicate one with the other. For both of them **flowing out from the same divine well-spring**, come together in some fashion to form one thing and move towards the same goal.' Each of them makes present and fruitful in the Church the mystery of Christ, who promised to remain with his own 'always, to the close of the age.'"

#### **. . . . two distinct modes of transmission**

**"81** *Sacred Scripture* is the speech of God as it is put down in writing under the breath of the Holy Spirit."

"And [Holy] *Tradition* **transmits** in its entirety the Word of God which has been entrusted to the apostles of Christ the Lord and the Holy Spirit. It **transmits** it to the **successors** of the apostles so that, enlightened by the Spirit of truth, they may faithfully preserve, expound, and spread it abroad by their preaching."

**"82** As a result the Church, to whom the **transmission** and **interpretation** of Revelation is entrusted, 'does not derive her certainty about all revealed truths from the holy Scriptures alone. Both Scripture and Tradition must be accepted and honored with **equal sentiments** of devotion and reverence.'"

#### **Apostolic Tradition and ecclesial traditions**

**"83** The **Tradition** here in question comes from the apostles and **hands on** what they **received** from Jesus teaching and example what they learned from the Holy Spirit. The first generation of Christians did not yet have a written New Testament, and the New Testament itself demonstrates the process of **living Tradition**. . . .

#### **The heritage of faith entrusted to the whole of the Church**

**"84** The apostles entrusted the '**Sacred deposit**' of the faith (the *depositum fidei*), contained in Sacred Scripture and Tradition, to the whole of the Church. 'By adhering to [this heritage] the entire holy people, **united to its pastors**, remains always faithful to the teaching of the apostles, to the brotherhood, to the breaking of bread and the prayers. So, in maintaining, practicing, and professing the faith that has been **handed on** there should be as remarkable harmony between the **bishops and the faithful**.'"

## The Magisterium of the Church

**“85** ‘The task of giving an **authentic** interpretation of the Word of God, whether in its written form or in the form of Tradition, has been entrusted to the living, teaching office of the Church **alone**. Its authority in this matter is exercised in the name of Jesus Christ.’ This means that the task of interpretation has been **entrusted to the bishops in communion with the successor of Peter, the Bishop of Rome.**”

**“86** ‘Yet this **Magisterium** is not superior to the Word of God, but is its servant. It teaches only what has been **handed on** to it. At the divine command and with the help of the Holy Spirit, it listens to this devotedly, guards it with dedication, and expounds it faithfully. All that it proposes for belief as being divinely revealed is drawn from this single **deposit** of faith.’”

Concerning this Magisterium, Pope Pius XII once stated:

“Together with these sacred sources of Scripture and tradition, God has given a living *magisterium* to His Church, to illumine and clarify what is contained in the deposits of faith **obscurely** and **implicitly**.” Quoted in, Jaroslav Pelikan, The Riddle of Roman Catholicism (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959), p. 83.

Before we move on to analyze the official Roman Catholic statements presented above, perhaps it would be well to include several additional quotations from Roman Catholic sources.

“Like two sacred rivers flowing from Paradise, the Bible and divine Tradition contain the Word of God, the precious gems of revealed truths.

“Though these two divine streams are in themselves, on account of their divine origin, of **equal sacredness**, and are both full of revealed truths, still, of the two, **Tradition is to us more clear and safe.**” Joseph Faa di Bruno, Catholic Belief, revised by Louis A. Lambert (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1884), p. 45.

“Some of the truths which God has revealed and which have always been taught by the Catholic Church, are not contained in the Bible. These truths have **come down** to us by what is called oral tradition; that is, they have been **handed down** by word of mouth. By Catholic Tradition, therefore, we understand all those truths which the Church **received** from Jesus Christ and the Apostles, but which are not found in the Bible. These truths we firmly believe, because they were revealed by God and are proposed to us by the Church.

“Some of the truths that have been **handed down** to us by **Tradition** and are not

recorded in the Sacred Scripture, are the following: that there are just seven Sacraments; that there is a Purgatory; that, in the New Law, Sunday should be kept holy instead of the Sabbath; that infants should be baptized, and that there are precisely seventy-two books in the Bible.

“The truths of Catholic Tradition have been **handed down** in the Church by means of the writings of the ‘Fathers of the Church,’ as well as by the decrees of Councils, by approved Creeds and by the prayers and ceremonies of the Church. These ancient writings and institutions show plainly what has been the faith of the Church from the earliest times.

“However, it is only the **infallible teaching office** of the Church that secures us against error as to the truth contained in Tradition as well as in the Holy Scripture. **The voice of the Church is the voice of God.**” Francis J. Butler, Holy Family Series of Catholic Catechisms (Boston: Thomas J. Flynn & Co., 1904), p. 63.

“From all of which it must be abundantly clear that the Bible alone is not a safe and competent guide because it is not now and has never been accessible to all, because it is not clear and intelligible to all, and because it does not contain all the truths of the Christian religion.

“The simple fact is that the Bible, like all dead letters, calls for a living interpreter. . . . Just as the supreme court is the authorized living interpreter of the constitution, so the Catholic Church is the living authoritative interpreter of the Bible. She has been the preserver and custodian of the Bible through the centuries, and she interprets it for us in the name and with the authority of Jesus Christ.” (John O’Brien, The Faith of Millions (Huntington, Indiana: Our Sunday Visitor, Inc., 1974), pp. 137, 138.)

“By TRADITION we do not mean a mere report, a hearsay, wanting sufficient evidence to deserve belief; or a local tradition started by men, and therefore merely human, as were those traditions of the Pharisees condemned by our Lord; but we mean a Tradition first coming from God, continually taught, recorded, and in all desirable ways kept alive by a **body of trustworthy men successively chosen** in a divine, or divinely appointed manner, well instructed, and who are, **as a body**, protected by God from teaching what is wrong, or handing down unfaithfully to others the doctrine committed to them.” Joseph Faa di Bruno, Catholic Belief, revised by Louis A. Lambert (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1884), pp. 39, 40.

“Since the truths contained in Scripture and those **handed down** by Tradition both come from God, Scripture and Tradition are of **equal value** as sources of faith. Both deserve the same reverence and respect. Each **alone** is sufficient to establish a truth of our holy faith. . . .

“Scripture and Tradition are called the *remote rule of faith*, because the Catholic does not base his faith *directly* on these sources. The *proximate rule of faith* is for him the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, which **alone** has received from God the authority to interpret **infallibly** the doctrines He has revealed, whether these be contained in Scripture or in Tradition.” John Laux, A Course in Religion for Catholic High Schools and Academies, part 1 (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1936), pp. 50, 51.

“The sacred and holy, ecumenical, and general Synod of Trent,—lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost,—seeing clearly that this truth and discipline [of the gospel] are contained in the written books, and the unwritten traditions which, received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ himself, or from the Apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating, have **come down** even unto us, **transmitted as it were from hand to hand**; [the Synod] following the examples of the orthodox Fathers, receives and venerates with an **equal affection** of piety and reverence, all the books of the Old and New Testament—seeing that one God is the author of both—as also the said traditions, as well those appertaining to faith as to morals, as having been dictated, either by Christ’s own word of mouth, or by the Holy Ghost, and preserved in the Catholic Church by a **continuous succession**.” Council of Trent, Session IV (April 8, 1546), Decree Concerning the Canonical Scriptures, translated by, Philip Schaff, The Creeds of Christendom (4<sup>th</sup> ed., revised, New York: Harper, 1919), volume 2, pp. 79, 80.

“Because the origin of our faith is not the Bible alone, but the Church which gives us both the written and the unwritten word. . . .

“So in the New Law, Catholics believe some things not in the Scriptures, although wholly in accord with them, because of the **infallible** witness of the Church as to their divine or apostolic origin. Why do Protestants accept the Scriptures as inspired? Why do they honor the first day of the week instead of the seventh? Why do they baptize children? Contrary to their principles, they must look outside the Bible to the voice of tradition, which is not human, but divine, because guaranteed by the divine, **infallible** witness of the Catholic Church.” Bertrand L. Conway, The Question Box Answers (New York: The Columbus Press, 1910), pp. 75, 76.

The Profession of Faith of the Council of Trent states:

“The apostolic and ecclesiastical **traditions** and all other observances and constitutions of that same Church I most firmly admit and embrace. I likewise accept Holy Scripture according to that sense which our holy Mother Church has held and does hold, whose [office] is to judge of the **true meaning and interpretation** of the Sacred Scriptures; I shall never accept nor interpret it otherwise than in accordance with the unanimous consent of the **Fathers**.” Quoted in, Jaroslav Pelikan, The Riddle of Roman Catholicism (Nashville: Abingdon

Press, 1959), p. 82

Thus the Roman Catholic Church claims that the Bible is subservient to her rather than to the Bible. Regarding this, Keith Fournier states:

“I believe the Bible is the Book of the church, not that the church is the church of the book.” (Keith Fournier, Evangelical Catholics, p. 17.)

Regarding this supremacy of the church over the Bible, John A. O'Brien---for many years a professor of theology at the University of Notre Dame---has stated:

“She [the Church] is not the child of the Bible, as many non-Catholics imagine, but its mother. She derives neither her existence nor her teaching authority from the New Testament. She had both before the New Testament was born: she secured her being, her teachings, her authority directly from Jesus Christ.

“If all the books of the Bible and all the copies thereof were blotted out, she would still be in possession of all the truths of Christ and could still continue to preach them as she did before a single word of the New Testament was written; for those truths are deep in her mind, heart and memory, in her liturgical and sacramental life, in the traditions, written and unwritten, which go directly back to Christ.” (John A. O'Brien, The Faith of Millions (Huntington, Indiana: Our Sunday Visitor, Inc., 1974), p. 129.

From the foregoing quotations and from the empirical observation of contemporary Roman Catholicism, we can reach the following conclusions:

8. Roman Catholicism has a virtually identical view of divine revelation as did apostate Judaism in the days of Christ. The three elements of a **sacred deposit**, a **transmitting mechanism** and an authoritative **living interpreter** are all present in both systems. Strikingly, the terminology is virtually identical as well (“Tradition,” “handed down,” “passed on,” “received,” “hold,” “unbroken succession,” etc).
9. In both systems the oral traditions supposedly go back to an original source. In the case of the Jews, that source was Moses; in the case of the Roman Catholic Church it was Peter. Amazingly, the Pope speaks *ex-cathedra* and his word is considered infallible and final. When the rabbis spoke from Moses' *kathedra*, their word was considered infallible and final as well. In both systems the oral tradition and the written word were given equal authority and in some cases oral tradition even transcended the authority of the written word.
10. In Judaism, the people were expected to render implicit and unquestioning submission to the theological views of the scholars. Any divergence was swiftly punished with expulsion from the synagogue. In Roman Catholicism the same is true. Any disagreement with the

theological *cadre* is punished with excommunication. In fact, even theologians who disagree with the *magisterium* are defrocked from their teaching positions, as can be seen, for example, in the case of Hans Kung. By controlling the *magisterium*, Satan can control de masses. Notice this amazing statement by Ellen G. White:

“Satan is constantly endeavoring to attract attention to man in the place of God. He leads the people to look to bishops, to pastors, to professors of theology, as their guides, instead of searching the Scriptures to learn their duty for themselves. Then, by controlling the minds of these leaders, he can influence the multitudes according to his will.” (Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, p. 595).

Interestingly, Ellen White then compares the plight of the populace in Christ’s day with the condition of the people who belong to the Roman Catholic system today. Regarding the control the Jewish leaders exerted over the populace in Christ’s day, she states:

“When Christ came to speak the words of life, the common people heard Him gladly; and many, even of the priests and rulers, believed on Him. But the chief of the priesthood and the leading men of the nation were determined to condemn and repudiate His teachings. . . . These opponents of Jesus were men whom the people had been taught from infancy to reverence, to whose authority they had been accustomed implicitly to bow. ‘How is it,’ they asked, ‘that our rulers and learned scribes do not believe on Jesus? Would not these pious men receive Him if He were the Christ?’ It was the influence of such teachers that led the Jewish nation to reject their Redeemer.

And regarding the control of the Roman Catholic and Protestant clergy over their masses, Ellen White says:

“Christ foresaw that the undue assumption of authority indulged by the scribes and Pharisees would not cease with the dispersion of the Jews. . . . The Roman Church reserves to the clergy the right to interpret the Scriptures. On the ground that ecclesiastics alone are competent to explain God’s word, it is withheld from the common people. Though the Reformation gave the Scriptures to all, yet the selfsame principle which was maintained by Rome prevents multitudes in Protestant churches from searching the Bible for themselves. They are taught to accept its teaching *as interpreted by the church*; and there are thousands who dare receive nothing, however plainly revealed in Scripture, that is contrary to their creed or the established doctrine of their church. . . .

“There are today thousands of professors of religion who can give no other reason for points of faith which they hold than that they were so instructed by their religious leaders. They pass by the Savior’s teachings almost unnoticed, and place implicit confidence in the words of the ministers. But are ministers infallible? How can we trust our souls to their guidance unless we know from God’s word that they

are light bearers? A lack of moral courage to step aside from the beaten track of the world leads many to follow in the steps of learned men; and by their reluctance to investigate for themselves, they are becoming hopelessly fastened in the chains of error. They see that the truth for this time is plainly brought to view in the Bible; and they feel the power of the Holy Spirit attending its proclamation; yet they allow the opposition of the clergy to turn them from the light. Though reason and conscience are convinced, these deluded souls dare not think differently from the minister; and their individual judgment, their eternal interests, are sacrificed to the unbelief, the pride and prejudice, of another." (Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, pp. 595-597).

11. Like in Judaism, Roman Catholicism is caught up in a system of oppressive casuistry. Notice the following two examples from canon law:

"Question 1: Is there any reason to fear that lip-stick will break the eucharistic fast?

"Question 2: If the lips of a woman who is receiving Extreme Unction are coated with lip-stick, is there any danger that the anointing of the mouth will not be valid?

"Answer 1: . . . . It is not conformable with theological teaching to warn women against the use of lip-stick before receiving Holy Communion on the ground that they are likely to break their fast.

"Answer 2: If there is a thick coating of lip-stick on the lips, there would be grave danger that the anointing of the mouth performed on the lips would not be valid; and in that event the validity of the sacrament would be doubtful. . . ." (Quoted in, Jaroslav Pelikan, The Riddle of Roman Catholicism (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959), p. 87).

Commenting on this prescription of canon law, Pelikan remarks on the same page:

"The penitent can never be certain of whether he has been obedient to every detailed prescription of the law, and yet he must be certain in order to find salvation and peace."

This is the same problem which existed in the days of Christ. The Jews had developed so many prescriptions and proscriptions that not even the most pious believer could obey them all. Thus the Jewish laws contained in the Mishnah are paralleled by the laws contained in Roman Catholic canon law. And there are thousands of casuistic regulations in Roman Catholic canon law!! Now let's take a look at the second example from the sphere of marriage:

"Divorce is forbidden. But this general principle is subject to all sorts of qualifications: separation 'from bed and board' is permitted under certain circumstances and may become permanent; a marriage may be declared null and void if upon investigation it is determined that it was not valid; a convert may, after baptism, avail himself of the 'Pauline privilege' of separation from his unbaptized spouse and may obtain permission to remarry." (Jaroslav Pelikan, The Riddle of

Roman Catholicism, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959), p. 89.

Does this sound like the problem of Mark 7? A mockery is made of marriage when qualifications and exceptions (traditions of men) are added to the commandment of God.

12. Many times the traditions of the Roman Catholic Church contradict the clear Word of God. For example, one of the declarations of the Council of Trent stated:

“If anyone saith that the marriage state is to be placed above the state of virginity or of celibacy, and that it is not better and more blessed to remain in virginity or in celibacy than to be united in matrimony; let him be anathema.” (Council of Trent, Session XXIV (November 11, 1563), Canons of the Sacrament of Matrimony, canon 10, in Dogmatic Canons and Decrees (New York: Devin Adair Company, 1912), p. 164.

The fact is that this statement is a blatant contradiction of Genesis 1:28 where God blessed marriage and commanded man to be fruitful and multiply. It is also in flat contradiction to the fact that all the bishops, elders, deacons and pastors of the early church were married, even the apostle Peter who supposedly was the first Pope!!! This is a clear example of making of none effect the Word of God by tradition.

The same could be said about Bible study. Even though the Roman Catholic Church in this age of enlightenment allows, and in some cases even encourages, reading the Bible, it was not always so. In the Council of Valencia in 1229 A. D., the Bible was first placed on the *Index of Forbidden Books*:

“We prohibit also the permitting of the laity to have the books of the Old and New Testament, unless any one should wish, from a feeling of devotion, to have a psalter or breviary for divine service, or the hours of the blessed Mary. But we strictly forbid them to have the above mentioned books in the vulgar tongue.” (Quoted in, Lorraine Boettner, Roman Catholicism, p. 97).

The Council of Trent reaffirmed the same position:

“In as much as it is manifest, from experience, that if the Holy Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue, be indiscriminately allowed to everyone, the temerity of men will cause more evil than good to arise from it; it is, on this point, referred to the judgment of the bishops, or inquisitors who may, by the advice of the priest or confessor, permit the reading of the Bible translated into the vulgar tongue by Catholic authors, to those persons whose faith and piety, they apprehend, will be augmented, and not injured by it; and this permission they must have in writing.” (Quoted in, Lorraine Boettner, Roman Catholicism, p. 97).

How is it that the Roman Catholic system, in its church councils, can condemn the reading of the

Bible, by the common lay person when Jesus said, “search the Scriptures” and Paul said that they are able to make one “wise unto salvation?” Once again, tradition has made of none effect the Word of God!

The world renowned theologian Karl Barth once stated that the difference between Protestants and Catholics can be reduced to one simple conjunction: **“AND.”** Protestants say that the source of truth is found in: “the Bible alone.” Roman Catholics say, “the Bible **AND** tradition.” Protestants say that we are saved by, “faith alone.” Roman Catholics say that we are saved by “faith **AND** works.” Protestants say that all we need is “Christ alone.” Roman Catholics assure us that we need “Christ **AND** Mary.” The Bible teaches that the church has only one head, Jesus Christ (Ephesians 1:22-23). The Roman Catholic Church teaches that it has two heads: Christ and the Pope. The Bible teaches that Christ is the Rock (I Peter 2:4-8; I Corinthians 10:4). The Roman Catholic Church teaches that Peter is the rock. The Bible teaches that there is only one true foundation of the Church—Himself (I Corinthians 3:11). The Roman Catholic system teaches that Peter is the foundation. The Bible teaches that there is a one and only sacrifice of Christ once and for all at Calvary (Hebrews 7:27). The Roman Catholic system teaches that Christ continues to be sacrificed in the Mass. The Bible teaches that there is only one intercessor between God and men, Jesus Christ (I Timothy 2:5). The Roman Catholic system teaches that we need human priests as intercessors besides Christ.

The Bible teaches that there is only one representative of Christ on earth, the Holy Spirit (John 16:7; 16:13; 14:15-17). The Roman Catholic system teaches that the representative of Christ on earth is the Pope. The Bible teaches that we are saved by grace alone through faith alone (Ephesians 2:8-9). The Roman Catholic system teaches that we are saved by faith plus works. The Bible teaches that Jesus is the only way to reach the Father (John 14:6). The Roman Catholic system teaches that one must go through Mary to reach Christ who then intercedes with the Father. The Bible teaches that there is only one name by which we must be saved, the name of Jesus (Acts 4:12). The Roman Catholic system teaches that we must be saved in the name of Mary, the mediatrix, the co-redemtrix!! The Bible teaches that we have only one true High Priest who ministers in a heavenly temple (Hebrews 8:1-5). The Roman Catholic system teaches that there is an earthly supreme pontiff (which means literally means, “high priest.”) who offers an earthly sacrifice on an earthly altar in an earthly temple!!

The Roman Catholic system prides itself on its litanies and vain repetitions (for example, the Rosary). Its priests enjoy being called “father.” This church also professes great piety in giving alms to the poor while it has billions of dollars tied up in gold, silver, precious stones and works of art. Most of the scholarship in Catholic seminaries consists in studying the wisdom of earlier church fathers. I once had living proof of this.

In 1978 I was called to teach theology at our Seventh-day Adventist University in Medellin, Colombia. It just so happens that one week each year is chosen when all the churches in Medellin, both Catholic and Protestant, gather for what is known as “National Bible Week.” A central theme is chosen and scholars from the different denominations are invited to lecture on the chosen theme. In 1978 I was one of those invited to lecture. The chosen theme was “Work and Rest in the Bible.”

I sensed a golden opportunity to prepare a lecture on “working six days and resting the seventh.” The meeting was held in a Roman Catholic Church. There was standing room only, with about 400 people in attendance, among them many nuns, priests and pastors from various denominations. Six Roman Catholic scholars lectured before I did. Their lectures were seeped in Patristic philosophy and theology. They employed big words and complex phrases which not even I could understand. When my turn came, I simply used the Bible. No fancy quotations, no big erudite words, no complex philosophical ideas. Beginning in Genesis and ending in Isaiah 66:22-23 I showed how God had commanded man to work six days and to rest on the seventh in recognition of His great power and love. I still have the original of that presentation in my file. What happened after I finished was totally unexpected. At first there was silence and then the applause began in a thundering crescendo which culminated in a standing ovation. It was strange indeed to see nuns standing and enthusiastically applauding a presentation of God’s holy Sabbath. Why this response? Not because the presentation was outstanding but rather because the source of truth was the Bible and the Bible alone!!

The Bible, in terms too clear to be misunderstood, repeatedly tells us that the **SEVENTH** day is the Sabbath of the Lord! And yet the Roman Catholic Church informs us that Sunday is the Sabbath. On what ground can it do this? Certainly not on Biblical grounds! John Paul II, in his recent pastoral letter, *Dies Domini* has made a valiant effort to defend Sunday sacredness from a Biblical perspective. He appeals to philosophical arguments based on human reason. Yet none of his arguments are persuasive to those who take the Bible as their only reliable standard of truth. Nowhere in the Bible are we told that Sunday is holy, or that we are to keep it in honor of Christ’s resurrection nor that we are to attend church regularly on that day. It is a telling fact that John Paul II quotes 212 scholars, church councils, creeds and church fathers to bolster his weak Biblical case! Once again, tradition has made of none effect the clear Word of God!

The great final battle on planet earth will not be over oil, or ethnicity. It will be the same battle which Adam and Eve faced in the Garden. Will man live by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God or will he listen to other voices? The Lord’s servant has states:

“The last great conflict between truth and error is but the final struggle of the long-lasting controversy concerning the law of God. Upon this battle we are now entering—a battle between the law of men and the precepts of Jehovah, between the religion of the Bible and the religion of fable and tradition.” (Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, p. 582).

As in the days of Christ, the religious leaders were filled with wrath because Christ contradicted their traditions, so in the last days, the religious powers of the world will be filled with wrath because God’s people will not “drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication.” (Revelation 14:8). As in Christ’s day, the issue will be God’s Sabbath or man’s sabbath. In Christ’s time the Pharisees kept the day in the wrong way and hated Jesus for keeping it the right way. In the end-time, the religious leaders will enforce the wrong day and will hate the remnant who keep the right day.

One final comment. Perhaps it is a coincidence or perhaps not, but the Greek word “tradition” has

a numerical value of 666. Thus, the beast whose number is 666 (Revelation 13:8) bases its whole system of error on tradition whose numerical value is 666. The Greek word for tradition is *paradosis*. and the number value of each letter is as follows:

**P=80; A=1; R=100; A=1; D=4; O=70; S=200; I=10; S=200 = 666**

***Certainly the Roman Catholic Papacy has the "eyes of man" in the sense that it supplants the Word of God and in its place substitutes human wisdom!***

### **Daniel Seven's View of the Judgment**

The first question we must ask is: Where does the judgment of Daniel 7 take place, in heaven or on earth? There are at least three reasons why this judgment transpires in heaven. 1) As we have already seen (page 2), the prose sections of Daniel 7 describe earthly events while the poetry sections describe heavenly scenes.. All judgment passages in Daniel 7 are in poetry—a clear indication that the judgment is taking place in heaven. 2) The Son of Man goes before the Ancient of Days for the judgment. It is clear that the Ancient of Days is God the Father whose dwelling place is in heaven not earth (Matthew 6:9). 3) The timing of the judgment also helps us understand that it is transpiring in heaven.

Three times in Daniel 7 we are told that the judgment would take place after the nefarious work of the little horn. In fact, we are told that the judgment was to be God's response to the evil dominion of the little horn (verse 8 followed by verses 9-14; verse 21 followed by verse 22; verse 25 followed by verses 26-27). As we have previously shown, the dominion of the little horn represents the Papacy's supremacy from 538-1798. Obviously, the little horn cannot be judged before its period of dominion is over, so the judgment must have begun sometime after 1798.

This judgment not only transpires after 1798 but it also takes place before the second coming. And why is this? Because in Daniel 7:13 Christ goes **to the Father in heaven** to judge and only after He has finished does He come back **to earth** to give the kingdom to His people. The same sequence is found in the book of Revelation. In Revelation 14:6-12 we find God's final warning message to the world. Three angels are seen descending from heaven to deliver this three-part message.. The first angel (Revelation 14:7) announces that the hour of God's judgment "**has come**" (past tense in Greek). It is clear that the judgment begins before the second and third angel have delivered their messages. If the judgment begins before the second and third angels' messages are delivered, then the judgment must be before the second coming. It would be nonsensical to say that Jesus will come before the second and third angels' messages have been delivered Not until all three messages have been delivered is Jesus seen seated on the cloud coming to the earth! (Revelation 14:14)

Needless to say, this proves that the judgment did not take place at the cross or in the time of the apostles because the little horn had not yet ruled. Paul makes it crystal clear that the judgment was still future in his day (Acts 17:30-31; I Corinthians 5:10). The above perspective also proves that we are not judged the moment we die. After all, why would God proclaim a specific hour for the

judgment to begin if people already went to heaven or hell when they died? If the judgment begins after 1798 and before the second coming, then it did not take place when people died.

The Bible is very clear that the **location** of the judgment is the most holy place of the sanctuary where the Ark of the Covenant and the law are found. Since 1798 there has been no earthly most holy place so the judgment must have begun in heaven, not on earth!

Another question comes to the fore: Who is the judge in this heavenly judgment? The Bible **seems** to be equivocal on this point. But is it really? Let's take a look at the evidence.

Daniel 7 informs us three times that the Ancient of Days is the judge (verses 9, 13, 22). This would seem to indicate that God the Father is the judge. However, there are other Biblical texts which indicate that the Father judges no man but has committed all judgment to the Son of Man. In II Corinthians 5:10 the apostle Paul tells us that we must all stand before the great judgment seat of Christ. And John 5:22, 27 unequivocally states that the Father has committed all judgment to the Son. What is all the more amazing about these verses in the gospel of John is that they have three clear links with the judgment scene in Daniel 7: God, the Son of man, and judgment. How do we solve this **apparent** discrepancy? Let's look at an analogous case.

In the Bible, God the Father is identified as the Creator (Revelation 4:11). Yet the Bible tells us that the Father executed the works of creation **through** Jesus (John 1:1-3; Colossians 1:16-17; Hebrews 1:2). In other words, the Father performed the work of creation through the instrumentality of His Son. The Father is the Master Architect and the Son is the Master Builder. In similar fashion, the apostle Paul tells us in Acts 17:30-31 that the Father will judge the world **through** "that Man whom He has appointed." Ellen White clarifies:

"Says the Psalmist: 'Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God.' Psalm 90:2. It is He, the source of all being, and the fountain of all law, that is to **preside** in the judgment. And the holy angels as ministers and witnesses, in number 'ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands,' attend this great tribunal." (Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, p. 479, bold is mine).

"Above the distractions of the earth He sits enthroned; all things are open to His divine survey; and from His great and calm eternity He orders that which His providence sees best." (Ellen G. White, The Ministry of Healing, p. 417).

We conclude, then, that the Father presides the judgment in a supervisory role, while the Son is the active agent who deals with the "nuts and bolts."

Two things strike us about this judgment scene: its awesome **solemnity** and the intense **movement**. The expression "Ancient of Days" underlines the Father's eternity, while the white garments and hair represent His spotless moral purity and uprightness. The throne ablaze with flames and the wheels as burning fire represent the purging process of the judgment (see, Malachi

3:3-5; Matthew 3:12; Psalm 50:3; 97:1-14; Isaiah 30:27-28). The Father's sovereign will is implemented by millions of angels who stand before His throne, an idea to which we will return shortly.

The emphasis on movement is obvious. Notice the progression: First thrones are "cast down." At this point no one is sitting on them (7:9). The Chaldee word for "cast down" is the same that is used to describe Daniel being "cast" into the lions' den and his three friends being "cast" into the fiery furnace. It is also the same word which Daniel used to depict the work of casting down that the little horn performed in Daniel 8: 10, 11, 12 The little horn cast down the place of the sanctuary, the stars and the truth but now God will respond by turning the tables and "casting down" thrones to judge it for its misbehavior. After the thrones were "cast down," (which clearly shows that they were not there before!) the Ancient of Days "did sit." The question immediately suggests itself: Where was the Father before He sat down? Was He just standing there where the thrones were put in place or was He in some other location and then came to where the thrones were placed? Daniel 7:9 does not tell us but Daniel 7:22 does. We are told there, that the Ancient of Days **came** to the place of judgment which means He was not there before (The same Aramaic word is used in Daniel 7:13 where the Son of man "**came**" and was "**brought**" before the Father). Once again we ask, Where was the Father before he sat down on his newly placed throne?

The answer to this question is found in the Hebrew sanctuary. There were four key places in the Hebrew sanctuary: the encampment, the court, the holy place and the most holy place. The **encampment** was the place where needy sinners resided. The **court** was the location where the sacrifices were offered. In the **holy place** the blood of the sacrifices was applied by the priest and in the **most holy place** sins were blotted out once a year at the end of the year.

It is obvious that the encampment and the court symbolized the earth. It is on earth where needy sinners reside and it was on earth where Jesus Christ was sacrificed for sin. Where did Jesus go upon His ascension? The Bible tells us that He sat down at the right hand of God (his role as king of the kingdom of grace. After all, kings **sit** on thrones) and that He was standing at the right hand of God (His role as ministering High Priest, because priests **stand** ministering before God) [Acts 7:55; Hebrews 1:3]. Obviously, both the Father and the Son were in the same place upon the ascension. But, which place? There can be no doubt that it is the holy place. And why? The geography of the Hebrew sanctuary dictates it because after the court was the holy place.

Those who believe that Jesus went directly into the most holy place upon His ascension are at a loss to explain why Jesus would leap from the court to the most holy place upon His ascension thus totally bypassing the holy place. Both Peter and Paul clearly inform us that Jesus went to heaven with His blood to be our intercessor, a work which clearly belongs to the holy place (Hebrews 7:25-26; I Timothy 2:5; Romans 8:34; Acts 2:16-39). This is why Jesus, after His ascension, is depicted as one walking among the seven candlesticks and ministering before the golden altar of incense (Revelation 1; 8:3-5). It doesn't take the brain of a rocket scientist to figure out that if the Father and the Son were in the holy place in 1798 and then moved for the judgment at some point thereafter, they must have moved to the most holy place. There are no other options because the work of judgment must be performed in the most holy place where the Ark of the

Covenant and the Law of God are found!! (study Revelation 11:15-19 where this is made crystal clear). Thus we conclude that both the Father and the Son were in the holy place until the beginning of the judgment.

But sometime after 1798, the Father moved from the holy to the most holy place. This movement is highlighted by the fact that the Father's throne, as seen in the synonymous parallelism, has wheels—fiery wheels!! ["His throne was ablaze with flames, **Its** wheels were a burning fire," [NASB] The angels actually move the wheels (Daniel 7:10; see the description of the same throne in Ezekiel 1) as they bring the Father into the most holy place. But note that there is not only one throne. There are thrones [plural]. How many are there and who sits upon them? We are not told in Daniel 7 but one thing is certain, it is not the angels who sit on the thrones. How do we know this? The Bible makes it clear that the angels are constantly on the move. They are ministering spirits sent out to minister to those who will inherit salvation (Hebrews 1:14). In the Bible the angels always **stand** before God and are **sent** to minister throughout the universe. In fact, in Ezekiel 1 the angels are in constant movement, never having a restful moment! Notice the following awesome description given by Ellen G. White:

“The Bible shows us God in His high and holy place, not in a state of inactivity, not in silence and solitude, but surrounded by ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands of holy beings, all waiting to do His will. Through these messengers, He is in active communication with every part of His dominion. By His Spirit He is everywhere present. Through the agency of His Spirit and His angels He ministers to the children of men.” (Ellen G. White, The Ministry of Healing, p. 417).

Revelation 5:11 makes it abundantly clear that God is surrounded by ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands of angels. But it is not the angels who sit upon the thrones but rather the 24 elders (Revelation 4:4). As we study Daniel 7 and Revelation 4-5 together, we discover that there are 24 thrones and the elders sit upon them. But who these elders are and what their role is, remains to be seen. There is undoubtedly a close link between Daniel 7 and Revelation 4-5 which we must return to later, but before we do, we must make a few remarks about the relationship between Daniel 7 and Ezekiel 1-11. Even a hasty glance at these two passages will reveal their close relationship. In both we have a chariot-throne, angels who guide the wheels, fire, clouds, and an awesome being who sits on the chariot-throne. In both, the idea of judgment is at the forefront.

It should not surprise us that Daniel and Ezekiel spoke in similar terms because they were contemporaries. A thorough study of Ezekiel 1 is far beyond the scope of this paper, but as William Shea has shown elsewhere, Ezekiel 1 describes the journey of God from heaven to earth to judge apostate Jerusalem. The date for Ezekiel 1 is 592 B. C. It is of critical importance to remember that in Ezekiel it is God's **apostate people** who are in view. They are committing **abominations**, the greatest of which is sun-worship (8:16), they are called a **harlot** (chapter 16), they are shedding **innocent blood**, the priests do violence to the **law**, and prophets and kings are corrupt. But in their midst is a **remnant** who sigh and cry because of the abominations which are

being committed. These will be **sealed** for salvation while the apostate ones will be marked for destruction (9:1-6). Finally, the **Shekinah** departs (11:22-23), the city is left **desolate** and Nebuchadnezzar comes and executes God's judgment upon it in 586 B. C.. Like Daniel, Ezekiel presents three steps in the judgment process: Investigation (9:1-4), sentence (11:22-23, the Shekinah leaves), execution of the sentence (9:5-6).

I believe that what happened with Jerusalem locally and historically (Ezekiel's view) is a type of what will take place universally and prophetically (Daniel's view). In other words, Ezekiel depicts the type while Daniel presents the antitype. In Ezekiel God comes to judge Jerusalem, but in Daniel 7 God comes to judge a worldwide apostate Christianity.

As we have already shown, Daniel seven's little horn symbolizes an **apostate Christian power**. This power is committing **abominations** (Matthew 24:15; Revelation 17:5; Daniel 11:31), it is described as a **harlot** (Revelation 17:1), it sheds **innocent blood** (Revelation 17:6), it thinks it can change the **law** (Daniel 7:25), it persecutes a **remnant** who remain faithful to God (Daniel 7:21, 25). God's faithful ones will be **sealed** for salvation (Revelation 7:1-4) whereas the apostates will be marked for **destruction** (Revelation 14:9-11). The **Shekinah** will depart the heavenly temple (Revelation 15:5-8) and then **desolation** and destruction will come upon the apostates in the form of the seven last plagues (Revelation 16-19). The key point we should remember here is that both Daniel and Ezekiel portray a judgment process which has God's professed people in view. Clearly, among those who claim to be God's people, there are genuine and counterfeit believers. The judgment process has the purpose of separating these two groups.

Now let's take a look at the relationship between Daniel 7 and Revelation 4-5. The striking similarities between these two passages have led some scholars to conclude that they are both describing the same historical event. Is this true? Are both Daniel 7 and Revelation 4-5 describing the judgment which begins sometime after 1798? I believe the answer to this question is a resounding no!! Why, then, are there so many similarities? Simply because the two passages are portraying two distinct events where the **same beings** are present.

It is clear that the scene of Revelation 4-5 is describing the inauguration of Christ's priesthood upon His ascension to heaven. We are told in Acts 1:9-11 that Jesus was taken to heaven in a cloud. Before Jesus arrives, the Father is seen sitting upon His throne by himself (Revelation 4:2). Surrounding Him are elders on 24 thrones (4:4). There is no evidence that the Father moved to this throne from somewhere else, He is simply there. At this point Jesus has not yet arrived. But in 5:6 Jesus appears on the scene, not as the Son of man of Daniel 7, but as a lamb "as if it had been slain." A song is then sung extolling Jesus as the one who was slain to redeem mankind (5:9). Revelation 5:11 uses almost the same terminology as Daniel 7 to describe the angelic hosts.

As we have already seen, Jesus ascended to the Father in the holy place for His inauguration. Upon His arrival, the Father was waiting for Him as were the 24 elders, and the angelic hosts to celebrate His work of redemption as the lamb of God. This is the glorious event which Peter described in his eloquent sermon of Acts, chapter 2. Ellen G. White makes this clear in her book, The Desire of Ages, pp. 831-835. All the beings who would later be present for the beginning of

the judgment were also present for His inauguration. This is why the two scenes appear so similar.

In Daniel 7 the entire heavenly entourage moves from the holy to the most holy place. Notice that when this happens, a different song is sung extolling God as judge and king! (Revelation 11:15-19). Ellen White describes this glorious movement in Early Writings, pp. 54-56 where she is clearly making reference to the vision of Daniel 7. In other words, Revelation 4-5 describes Jesus going from **earth** to **heaven** on a **cloud** to His **Father** upon His **ascension** to be invested as **High Priest**. On the other hand, in Daniel 7, He is portrayed as coming on **clouds** from the **holy** to the most **holy place** to His **Father** in 1844 to be invested as **King**. The same beings are present on both occasions and this is why the scenes are so similar.

In summary, Daniel 7 presents a clear sequence of events. First, thrones are put in place. Then, the angels bring the Father on His chariot-throne from the holy to the most holy place and He sits down on His throne. The 24 elders then sit on their thrones. Then the Son of man is brought by the clouds of angels in the chariot-throne to where the Father had been brought. This movement of the Son of man is expressed by the verbs, "**came**. . . . **came**. . . . they [notice the plural, the clouds] **brought** Him near before Him." (Daniel 7:13). Then the judgment sits [is inaugurated] and the books are opened (Daniel 7:10). The text is very clear that Jesus does not come to the earth at this point, rather, He goes to the Ancient of Days. Regarding this, Ellen G. White affirms:

"The coming of Christ here described is not His second coming to the earth. He comes to the Ancient of Days in heaven to receive dominion and glory and a kingdom, which will be given Him at the close of His work as a mediator. It is this coming, and not His second advent to the earth, that was foretold in the prophecy to take place at the termination of the 2300 days in 1844." (Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, pp. 479-480)

The Millerites and most contemporary Christians have erroneously assumed that Daniel 7:13-14 is describing the second coming of Jesus to this earth. One reason for this misunderstanding is that Jesus is here spoken of as coming on the clouds of heaven, an expression which clearly refers to the second coming in other contexts (Revelation 1:7; Matthew 24:30, 31). However, when Jesus ascended to heaven, he was received by a cloud (Acts 1:9-11) and on the day of atonement [Israel's day of judgment] the pillar of cloud moved into the most holy place (Leviticus 16:1-2). Furthermore, when God came down from heaven to the Jerusalem temple to judge Israel in the days of Ezekiel, He was surrounded by a cloud. The distinction between cloud [singular] and clouds [plural] does not seem to be significant because Revelation 14:14 describes Jesus' second coming on a cloud [singular] whereas the same event is described in Revelation 1:7 as Jesus coming with clouds [plural]. Needless to say, the Bible identifies clouds as symbolic of angels (see, Psalm 104:3-4 and compare Matthew 24:30, 31) and Daniel 7:13 personifies [or should we say, "angelifies"] the clouds by saying that **they** brought Jesus into the presence of the Ancient of Days.

Significantly, there is no evidence that the Son of man sits down during this judgment and the reason for this is that Jesus is the Advocate and will not occupy the throne until He receives the kingdom at the conclusion of the judgment.

And what is the nature of this heavenly judgment? In other words, What takes place during this investigative pre-Advent judgment? Before we can answer this question, we must ask another: Is the judgment of Daniel 7 restricted to the little horn and those whom it oppressed during the 1260 year period or does it include all believers from all periods of human history as well?

There can be no doubt that the central focus of the judgment scene in Daniel 7 is upon the little horn and the people whom it oppressed during the 1260 years. But does this exclude other believers from other historical periods? Not necessarily.

Perhaps an analogy will help us understand what I mean. When we read the Sabbath commandment as it is recorded in Deuteronomy 5:12-15 we might be led to conclude that it was given only to literal Israel because it refers to their specific historical situation. God, in essence, is saying to Israel: "I delivered you from slavery and gave you rest, therefore you are to keep the Sabbath in commemoration of your emancipation." Does this restricted use of the Sabbath commandment mean that it was given only to literal Israel? Was it not given also for the entire human race? Other texts make it abundantly clear that the Sabbath was given for all people of all ages (Exodus 20:8-11; Genesis 2:1-3; Mark 2:27). Does the restricted use of the Sabbath commandment in Deuteronomy 5 cancel out its broader use in other texts of Scripture? Absolutely not. We might just as well ask: Does the restricted use of the judgment in Daniel 7 to the period of the little horn cancel out the broader application to the entire human race? Of course not! At the conclusion of this judgement we are told that the saints received the kingdom. Are we to understand that only the saints who lived during the 1260 years will receive this kingdom? Of course not. Other texts of Scripture broaden the view by telling us that all the redeemed will inherit the kingdom. So we conclude that the specialized view of the judgment in Daniel 7 does not exclude the broader view in other portions of the Bible.

Now let's return to our original question. What is the nature of the judgment?. In order to understand what takes place during this judgment we must first understand the relationship between the "books" [plural] and the "book" [singular]. Let's take a look at the "books" first.

Daniel 7:10 informs us that the judgment sat and "the books [plural] were opened." And, what is in the books? The answer is actually quite simple. The books contain a complete record of our lives. Nothing is missing—not a thought, a feeling, an act, a word. God keeps an exact transcript of each person's life from conception till death. Our life story is there (Psalm 139:16), our secrets (Ecclesiastes 12:13), our words (Matthew 12:34-37), our works (Revelation 22:12), our evil deeds (Isaiah 65:5-6), our tears (Psalm 56:8). Our good deeds are written in the books of remembrance (Malachi 3:16). So to speak, God has another Stephen P. Bohr in heaven in written form. This record of each person's character, self-identity or individuality is carefully preserved in the heavenly books. Regarding this, Ellen G. White remarks:

"The grand judgment is taking place, and has been going on for some time. Now the Lord says, Measure the temple and the worshipers thereof. Remember when you are walking the streets about your business, God is measuring you; when you are

attending your household duties, when you engage in conversation, God is measuring you. Remember that your words and actions are being daguerreotyped [photographed] in the **books** of heaven, as the face is reproduced by the artist on the polished plate. . .” ( The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary, “Ellen G. White Comments,” volume 7, p. 972, bold is mine).

“Accurately recorded in the **books** of heaven are the sneers and trivial remarks made by sinners who pay no heed to the call of mercy when Christ is represented to them by a servant of God. As the artist takes on the polished glass a true picture of a human face, so God daily places upon the **books** of heaven an exact representation of the character of every individual.” (Ellen G. White, Manuscript 105, 1901 as found in The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary, volume 4, p. 1171, bold is mine).

“Remember that this world is God’s daguerreotyped [photography] office. The pictures of all who live here, old and young, are being made in the **books** of heaven. What shall the likeness be?” (Ellen G. White, Manuscript Releases, volume 3, p. 352, bold is mine).

This exact transcript of every nook and cranny of our lives is what the Bible calls “the spirit.” Notice the following awesome statement:

“Our personal identity is preserved in the resurrection, though not the same particles of matter or material substance as went into the grave. The wondrous works of God are a mystery to man. The **spirit**, the **character** of man, is **returned** to God, there to be **preserved**. In the resurrection every man will have his own **character**. God in His own time will call forth the dead, giving again the breath of life, and bidding the dry bones live. The same form will come forth, but it will be free from disease and every defect. It lives again bearing the same individuality of features, so that friend will recognize friend. There is no law of God in nature which shows that God gives back the same identical particles of matter which composed the body before death. God shall give the righteous dead a body that will please Him.” (The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary, “Ellen G. White Comments,” volume 6, p. 1093, bold is mine).

Notice that it is not only the breath of life which returns to God when we die. It is our self-identity [that which makes me “me” in distinction to others] which is preserved there until the day of the resurrection. Does the Bible corroborate this view of Ellen White that the spirit is the character of man? Absolutely!

In the above statement, Ellen White is actually commenting on Job 19:25-27 where Job expresses the assurance that when he resurrects, it will be **he himself** and not another. In other words, he will receive his own self-identity at the resurrection. Besides Job 19:25-27, there are three other texts which show that Ellen White was correct in her assessment. Luke 8 contains the story of the resurrection of Jairus’ daughter. When Jesus called her to rise, we are told that “**her** spirit returned

to her.” (8:55) Notice that it does not say: “**the** spirit returned to her.” What God gave back to her was the breath of life along with **her own self-identity**. This is why the flow of her thoughts picked up exactly where it had left off when she died. She was hungry when she died and she was hungry when she rose from the dead

The same can be said about Jesus when He died on the cross. When He cried out: “Father, into your hands I commend **my** spirit,” (Luke 23:46). He was not merely saying: “Into your hands I commend my breath of life.” He was really saying, “Into your hands I commend my **self-identity**, my individuality, my character.” When Jesus resurrected, He picked up at the very instant where he had left off when He died.

The same can be said of Stephen. As he was being stoned, he cried out, “Lord Jesus, receive **my** spirit.” (Acts 7:59). Notice that he does not say “**the** spirit” but rather, “**my** spirit.” It was His self-identity or the record of his life that he wanted Jesus to preserve until the day of the resurrection. Similarly, when Jesus resurrected Lazarus, there can be no doubt that Lazarus’ thoughts began where they had left off when he died. The exact character or self-identity which God had preserved in the books was returned to him intact!! Though not directly related to the pre-Advent judgment, the same can be said about the wicked when they resurrect after the millennium. Notice the following statement:

“There are kings and generals who conquered nations, valiant men who never lost a battle, proud, ambitious warriors whose approach made kingdoms tremble. In death these experienced no change. As they come up from the grave, **they resume the current of their thoughts just where it ceased**. They are actuated by the same desire to conquer that ruled them when they fell.” (Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, p. 664).

Why do wicked resurrect wicked and the righteous, resurrect righteous? Simply because they are given the very “spirit,” character or **self-identity** they went into the grave with. So, we conclude that the “books” contain an exact transcript of each person’s life. But, what about the “book [singular]?”

An examination of the Biblical evidence clearly reveals that the “book” contains the **names** of all who have professed the name of Jesus (Philippians 4:3; Daniel 12:1; Psalm 69:28; Exodus 32:32-33; Luke 10:20; Revelation 13:8; 17:8; 21:27). There are righteous people who have claimed the name of Jesus and also wicked people who have claimed His name (Matthew 7:21-23). The purpose of the pre-Advent judgment is to weed out the professors from those who truly received Jesus.

Now that we have identified what is in the “books” and what is in the “book,” we can study how they relate to each other in the judgment process. Let’s use Abel as our example. Ellen White has made it very clear that the pre-Advent investigative judgment began in 1844 with the dead. She also informs us that the dead are judged chronologically, that is, starting with those who first lived on the earth. Notice the following statement:

“As the **books** of record are opened in the judgment, the lives of **all who have believed** on Jesus come in review before God. Beginning with those who **first lived** upon the earth, our Advocate presents the cases of each **successive generation**, and closes with the living.” (Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, p. 482, bold is mine).

If the judgment began in 1844 with those who first lived upon the earth and continues with each successive generation in chronological order, then it is certain that Abel (the fourth person to live on the earth), was judged in 1844 or shortly thereafter. The Bible tells us that all must appear before the great judgment seat of Christ (II Corinthians 5:10). The question is, How could Abel appear before the judgment seat of Christ when he was dead in 1844? The answer is quite simple: Abel did not need to appear there in person because the exact transcripts of his life—with not a jot or tittle missing—are there in the books. He is judged *in absentia* just like a person can graduate from school *in absentia*. Ellen White states the following with Biblical corroboration:

“Those who in the judgment are ‘accounted worthy’ will have a part in the resurrection of the just. Jesus said: ‘They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, . . . are equal unto the angels; and are the children of the resurrection.’ Luke 20:35, 36. And again He declares that ‘they that have done good’ shall come forth ‘unto the resurrection of life.’ John 5:29. The righteous dead will not be raised until after the judgment at which they are accounted worthy of the ‘resurrection of life.’ Hence **they will not be present in person** at the tribunal when their records are examined and their cases decided.” (Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, p. 482, bold is mine).

Now, Abel’s name is found in the Book of Life [singular] because he claimed to receive Jesus as his personal Savior (Hebrews 11:4). As the books [plural] are opened, it is shown, beyond any doubt, that Abel truly confessed and overcame sin by the blood of Jesus. The sins he has truly repented of and confessed are registered in the books of heaven but they are covered with the blood of Jesus. In fact, Jesus represents Abel in court as his Advocate. Regarding this, Ellen White remarks: “Jesus will appear as their [the righteous] advocate, to plead in their behalf before God.” (Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, p. 482). Abel’s case is examined by the heavenly court and he is pronounced “not guilty” by virtue of Christ’s blood. At this moment, all of Abel’s sins are blotted out from the books to be remembered no more. The name of Abel will then be secure in the Book of Life forever and when Jesus returns, He will resurrect Abel (Hebrews 11:35) and give him back the self-identity (“spirit”) he possessed before he died. But there is one thing which will not be given back to him-- his sins—for these have been blotted out from the books in the judgment!! Notice how Ellen White continues the statement above:

“Every name is mentioned, every case closely investigated. Names are accepted, names rejected. When any have sins remaining upon the books of record, unrepented of and unforgiven, their **names will be blotted out of the book of life**, and the record of their **good deeds** [notice that the bad deeds are not erased at this

time because they will come up during the millennium. We will come back to this when we analyze Revelation 20:11-15] will be erased from the book of God's remembrance [Ellen White quotes Exodus 32:33 and Ezekiel 18:24 as the Biblical foundation for what she has just stated]. . . . All who have truly repented of sin, and by faith claimed the blood of Christ as their atoning sacrifice, have had pardon entered against their names in the books of heaven; as they have become partakers of the righteousness of Christ, and their characters are found to be in harmony with the law of God, their sins will be blotted out, and they themselves will be accounted worthy of eternal life." [Ellen White provides Isaiah 43:25; Revelation 3:5; Matthew 10:32, 33 as the Biblical corroboration for the blotting out of the sins of the righteous]" (Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, p. 482-483).

But the story of Abel would be incomplete without Cain. After all, we always speak of Cain and Abel. What about Cain? Did he profess to worship and serve God? As a matter of fact, he did. Genesis 4 tells us that Cain came to worship God. He brought an offering but contrary to Abel's offering, it was bloodless, and "without the shedding of blood, there is no remission" of sin (Hebrews 9:11). By neglecting to offer blood, Cain was rejecting Jesus as his Savior. Yet he claimed to be a true worshiper and so, his name must have been in the Book of Life until his name came up in the judgment

When Cain killed Abel a great injustice was done. This is why Genesis 4:11 tells us that the blood of Abel cried out from the ground. The righteous Abel was slain by unrighteous Cain and yet both of them claimed to worship the true God. Obviously, this terrible wrong had to be righted, but how?

When Cain's name came up in 1844 the entire universe saw that while he had claimed to serve God he really had clung to sin and refused to be cleansed by the blood. His lawless life and impenitence were clearly revealed, as the books of record were opened. Jesus could not be his Advocate because Cain had refused to be cleansed by the blood. His vile act of murder was seen in all its hideousness and it was determined that Abel was right and Cain was wrong. This was the moment of Abel's vindication and the cry of his innocent blood was answered. Now all the good deeds which Cain had performed in his life were blotted out and then his name was blotted out from the Book of Life. However, all his evil deeds remained on the books of record to be examined in heaven during the millennium and in the white throne judgment after the millennium (more on this in a few moments).

Though we have spoken first of Abel and then of Cain, we must remember that in point of time, Cain was judged first and then immediately after (Abel was the next person born after Cain) Abel was judged. Thus the murderer was found guilty of Abel's innocent blood and then immediately afterwards, Abel was vindicated and reckoned worthy of eternal life. In other words, the judgment on earth was reversed—the martyr whom Cain had reckoned to be worthy of death, was reckoned in the heavenly court as worthy of life in the future kingdom while the murderer who had lived in sin was accounted worthy of death and will be deprived of the kingdom.

In the light of the story of Cain and Abel we can now better comprehend the judgment in Daniel 7. In this chapter, the little horn plays the role of Cain while the saints of the Most High play the role of Abel. While in Genesis we have two individuals, in Daniel 7 we have two corporate groups composed of individuals. But the process and principles of the judgment are the same. Let's take a look.

In Daniel 7 the little horn is judged first and then the saints are judged afterwards. The character of the little horn resembles the character of Cain—it is lawless, it murders the saints of the Most High, it tramples on the sanctuary and its services—particularly the daily (which represents the sacrifice of Christ for sin). And yet, as we have seen, the little horn (those individuals who belong to this system) claims to worship and serve the true God. Those who belonged to this vile power must have had their names in the Book of Life because they claimed to be doing the work of Christ!! During the 1260 years this power slew the saints of the Most High and their blood, like Abel's, cried out for justice (Revelation 6:9-11). In earthly tribunals God's people were falsely accused and condemned to die. There was no one to plead their cause. The wicked were portrayed as righteous and the righteous were portrayed as wicked. Obviously this was a travesty in justice which needed to be rectified. Ellen White tells us that every single act of injustice done to God's people during the 1260 years, was written in the books of record. Speaking of the Inquisition, she remarks:

“In the thirteenth century was established that most terrible of all engines of the papacy—the Inquisition. The prince of darkness wrought with the leaders of the papal hierarchy. In their secret councils Satan and his angels controlled the minds of evil men, while unseen in the midst stood an angel of God, **taking the fearful** record of their iniquitous decrees and writing the history of deeds too horrible to appear to human eyes.” (Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, p. 59, bold is mine).

Once again, speaking of the dark record of the papacy, the Lord's servant comments:

“The history of God's people during the ages of darkness that followed upon Rome's supremacy **is written in heaven**, but they have **little space in human records**. Few traces of their existence can be found, except in the accusations of their persecutors. It was the policy of Rome to obliterate every trace of dissent from her doctrines or decrees. Everything heretical, whether persons or writings, she sought to destroy. Expressions of doubt, or questions as to the authority of papal dogmas, were enough to forfeit life of rich or poor, high or low. Rome endeavored also to destroy every record of her cruelty toward dissenters. Papal councils decreed that books and writings containing such records should be committed to the flames. Before the invention of printing, books were few in number, and in a form not favorable for preservation; therefore there was little to prevent the Romanists from carrying out their purpose.” (Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, pp. 61-62, bold is mine).

On May 5, 1487, pope Innocent VIII sent a Bull to the archbishops of France encouraging them to invoke the support of the king of France, of the Duke of Savoy and of the Lords "in order to proceed with armed hand against the said Waldenses and all other heretics, and to crush them like venomous serpents." The pope offered a plenary indulgence to all who participated in this crusade against the Waldenses and gave the crusaders permission to seize all the possessions of the heretics and to loose all neighbors and servants from all obligations to them. Referring to the author of this Bull, Ellen White states:

"Did this haughty potentate expect to meet those words again? Did he know that they were **registered in the books of heaven**, to confront him at the judgment?" (Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, p. 77, bold is mine).

And when were these deeds of injustice to be rectified? Why were records of their deeds kept in the minutest detail? Because they will have to face them again in the judgment of Daniel 7!!

What about the righteous who were mowed down by this evil power? In conjunction with the condemnation of their oppressors, the righteous will receive a heavenly verdict in their favor. To the wicked oppressors, Christ now becomes the judge and to the righteous martyrs Jesus now assumes the role of Advocate. How wonderful! The judge will be our Advocate!! Rather than fearing the judgment, we should relish it. The apostle Paul made it clear that those who are in Christ have peace with God (Romans 5:1) and are no longer under condemnation (Romans 8:1, 34; John 5:24) The books of record will reveal that the martyrs are worthy of inheriting the kingdom and enjoying everlasting life. Their cause will be vindicated. The verdicts of earthly courts will be reversed. It will be shown that they truly laid hold of Christ even in the times of their greatest peril. We know this is true because they are called the "martyrs of Jesus" (Revelation 17:6) They have not loved their lives even unto death because they have overcome the devil with the blood of the lamb and the word of their testimony (Revelation 12:10-12). At this point, all their sins will be blotted out and their names will be made secure in the Book of Life forever!! All that remains is for Jesus to come from heaven to raise them from the dead (I Thessalonians 4:15-17; Revelation 20:4) and give them back their "spirit" or self-identity minus the sins which were blotted out in the pre-Advent judgment. Christ will then give them the kingdom and everlasting life as an actual possession.

This scenario shows that neither the wicked persecutors nor the martyrs are present personally in heaven for the judgment. This is made clear by Daniel 7 itself. This judgment is taking place in heaven while the little horn and the saints are on earth. Furthermore, Revelation 6:10-11 explicitly tells us that the righteous martyrs were given white robes—that is, they were reckoned worthy of everlasting life—and told to **rest** a while until the last martyr is slain. Revelation 14:13 explicitly tells us that this "rest" takes place when a person dies. Notice that the white robe is given to those who are dead, because they are told to rest **yet** a little while. They have been resting to that point and they will continue to rest until the last martyr dies and then they will be resurrected to reign with Christ a thousand years (Revelation 20:4). At this time those who ruled on earth will lose their dominion (God's people will be kings—Revelation 20:4-6) and God's people will be given dominion. This will be the judgment's great reversal of fortunes!! Incidentally, we can now see

how closely related the doctrines of the judgment and the state of the dead are: If the righteous go to heaven when they die, why even bother to have a heavenly judgment? And if the wicked go to hell when they die, why bother to judge them if their destiny has already been determined at death?

Further evidence that the righteous and the wicked are judged *in absentia* is found in the parables of Jesus. In Matthew 25 we find the story of the ten virgins. The bride in this parable cannot represent the faithful members of the church because these go into the wedding as guests! Obviously they cannot be guests and the bride at the same time! In Matthew 22:8-14 we find the same idea. The redeemed are spoken of as the guests so they cannot be the bride. Furthermore, the righteous and the wicked are not there personally for the wedding for the man without a wedding garment could not have sneaked into heaven inadvertently! In Luke 12:35-37 we are told that we should be ready when the Lord **returns** from the wedding. This must mean that Christ's wedding takes place in heaven while God's people wait for His return on earth. Luke 19:11-15, just like Daniel 7, makes it absolutely clear that Jesus will receive His kingdom before He comes. The same idea is set forth in Luke 22:29-30. If the church is not the bride, then who is? Revelation 21:2, 9-10 states that the New Jerusalem is the bride and Revelation 19:9 indicates that the saved are the guests who are invited to the wedding so they cannot also be the bride. We cannot emphasize enough that the saved do not attend the wedding in person but *in absentia*. Just like we can now by faith come boldly to the throne of grace (Hebrews 4:16) though we are on earth, even so we can enter the most holy place by faith to be present for Christ's wedding with the New Jerusalem.

But someone might object, How is it possible that Jesus marries a city? After all, when we get married, we marry a person, not an impersonal city. This objection betrays a desire to impose a western mind-set on an eastern book. You see, in ancient times when a prince was coronated as king, it was considered that he had married the kingdom. This is seen, for example, in Exodus 19:5-6 where God chooses Israel as his **kingdom** of priests at Mount Sinai. But this establishment of the kingdom is identified as God's **wedding** with Israel in Jeremiah 31:32. Thus, Israel is referred to as God's bride and as God's kingdom in the Old Testament. There is no contradiction; they are two different ways of describing the same reality. Thus, when Israel played the harlot and broke her wedding vows, God went to divorce court and took away the kingdom. When Israel returned to the Lord, He gave them back the kingdom, that is to say, he remarried them.

Though not directly related to our present study, the day of a king's coronation was also considered the day of his birth. This is why, when David was crowned king, God said to him: "You are my son, today I have begotten thee" (Psalm 2:9). This is also why, when God made the covenant with Israel at Mt. Sinai, he employed the analogy of birth to describe the event (Ezekiel 16:8-13). It is no coincidence that when a king took over the kingdom in antiquity, he began counting his regnal years afresh just like we begin counting our years when we are born or count the number of anniversaries since we got married. All of this sounds strange to the analytical western mind but it makes perfect sense to those who are trained to think in eastern categories.

The portrayal of Daniel 7 is clear. Jesus goes to His father to perform the work of judgment. In the

heavenly court the Father legally takes away the kingdom from the little horn and gives it to Jesus, to whom it rightfully belongs. Then Jesus gives it back to man who lost it in the first place. God does not take the kingdom back by force. Rather, he takes the little horn to court! This process is made clear in Daniel 7:14, 18, 22. Notably, Daniel 7:27 employs both the singular and the plural LOOK UP THIS TEXT IN ENGLISH AND QUOTE IT.

The above analysis helps us better understand how it is that the Father has a kingdom (Matthew 26:29; Luke 9:27), the Son has His kingdom (Matthew 16:28), and Jesus will give His people the kingdom (Luke 12:32; Matthew 25:34). Are there really three kingdoms? No. A careful study of the Bible reveals that the kingdom originally belonged to the Father. When the world was created, the Father delegated rulership to Adam and Eve (Genesis 1:26-28; Psalm 8:5-8) Satan then stole the rulership of this world from Adam and Eve (Luke 4:5-8). At the second coming, this kingdom will be restored to Jesus (Matthew 16:28) Who will then restore it to His people (Revelation 20:4; Daniel 7:26-27) At the end of the Millennium, Jesus will then give it to His Father to whom it belonged in the first place (I Corinthians 15:24-28; Matthew 26:29; Luke 9:27; For more on this, study carefully, Luke 22:29-30).

This study of the judgment would not be complete without taking into account the relationship between Daniel 7 and 8 and Daniel 12. When the judgment **began** in 1844, (as described in Daniel 7:9-10, 13; and 8:14) Jesus is portrayed as High Priest. He is seen ministering in the heavenly sanctuary in both the daily and yearly services in behalf of His people. There is not a hint in these passages that Jesus has assumed His position as **king**. In fact, Daniel 7:14, 18, 26-27 makes it abundantly clear that only at the conclusion of this judgment does Jesus receive the kingdom. So if Jesus will not become king (we are speaking here, not of the kingdom of grace but of the kingdom of glory) until after the judgment, then what is He now? The book of Hebrews clearly indicates that Jesus has been our High Priestly Advocate since His ascension (Hebrews 8:1-2; I Timothy 2:5; Hebrews 7:25-26; Romans 8:34). In 1844 Jesus did not cease being our High Priestly Advocate but rather added another function to His ministry—that of Judge. In the Old Testament cultus the High Priest retained his high priestly garments until the Day of Atonement was over. If we are now in the antitypical Day of Atonement, Jesus must still be garbed in the garments of the High Priest. But at the conclusion of the judgment Jesus will lay aside His priestly vesture and garb himself with the raiment of a king.

And when will this take place? Daniel 12:1 pinpoints the time: It will be when Michael “**stands up**.” The expression “stand up” is employed in other places of Daniel 11 to refer to a king who takes the throne or begins to reign (11:2-3). Notice here that Jesus stands up or begins to reign before the time of trouble. This must mean that Jesus will receive the kingdom in heaven at the close of probation before He comes back at the end of the time of trouble.

This fits perfectly with Daniel 7 where Jesus goes to His Father to receive the kingdom but only delivers it to His people upon His return to the earth. It also squares with the parables of the kingdom we have previously referred to. This must be the time when He changes His priestly garments to His kingly robes.

A crucial point has been missed by virtually all commentators and it is this: Jesus is now garbed as

High Priest but when He comes He will be garbed as King of kings and Lord of lords. Revelation 19:11-16 actually describes his raiment. Now, you don't need the wisdom of a king Solomon to figure out that if Jesus is now garbed as High Priest but at His coming will be garbed as king, He must have changed at some point in between. Ellen White was biblically accurate when she stated that when Michael stands up He will change his priestly garments to kingly ones!!

In summary: Daniel 7:9-10, 13; 8:14 describes the **beginning** of the heavenly judgment in 1844. At this time Jesus goes **to His Father** to receive the kingdom. During the judgment He is both Advocate and Judge and wears his **High Priestly attire**. Daniel 12:1, on the other hand, describes the moment when this judgment **comes to an end**. Probation closes, Jesus begins to reign and removes his priestly robes and garbs himself with the **garments of a king**. Then the time of trouble (before the second coming) transpires at the end of which Jesus returns **to earth** to give the kingdom to His people.

This Danielic scenario fits also with the perspective of the book of Revelation. In Revelation 14:7 the announcement is made, "the hour of His judgment is come." At this point probation has not closed because the second and third angels' messages have not yet been proclaimed. This proves beyond the shadow of any doubt that the judgment begins in heaven before the Advent. After the three angels' messages have been proclaimed, the door of probation closes (Revelation 15:5-8) and Jesus changes His raiment from priestly to kingly robes. The plagues are then poured out (Revelation 16-18). This is the same time of trouble which is mentioned in Daniel 12:1. Then Jesus returns triumphantly as King of kings and Lord of lords (Revelation 19:11-21) and gives the kingdom to His people (Revelation 20:4).. Don't miss the point: When Jesus comes He is no longer garbed as High Priest but rather as King so at some point **before** His coming He must have changed His garments.

In order to fully understand the relationship between the coming of the Son of man to the Father in Daniel 7:13 and the standing up of Michael in Daniel 12:1 it is necessary to keep in mind that the little horn has two periods of dominion. The first was during the 1260 years when millions of God's true children were mowed down. Daniel 7:9-10, 13 describes the moment when Jesus began the process of vindicating those who were unjustly judged by the little horn.

But prophecy affirms that the little horn will have a second period of dominion when it will once again slay the children of God. Jesus will also defend these in the heavenly court in the ongoing process of the judgment before the close of probation (there will be no martyrs after the close of probation).

This two-stage dominion of little horn is brought out clearly in Revelation 6:9-11 where the martyrs of the past cry out for judgment and vengeance and they are told to rest a while until the rest of the martyrs are slain like they were. Thus two groups of martyrs are brought to view: the martyrs who were slain by the little horn in the **past** and the martyrs who will be slain by this power in the **future**.

Revelation 13 also describes these two stages of the little horn power (now called "the beast").

This horn slew the saints of the Most High during the period of the 42 months (Revelation 13:5, 7). But after its deadly wound is healed, it will once again proclaim a death decree against God's people (Revelation 13:15)..

The same panorama can be seen in Daniel 7 and 11. In Daniel 7 the little horn slays the saints of God for a period of 1260 years. In Daniel 11:31-39 we find a description of the same period only now the little horn is called "the king of the north." But at the time of the end (1798) the king of the south (atheistic communism in the French Revolution) arises against the king of the north (the papacy) and gives it a deadly wound. But then we are told that the king of north regains its power and once again goes out to slay many (11:40-45).

Now the main point is this: In Daniel 7:13 Jesus comes to the Father in heaven to vindicate the cause of those who have been slain by the little horn (as well as the cause of all his children from all ages who have died before the close of probation). Once all His dead children have been vindicated, He then turns to vindicate the righteous saints who are alive and to condemn the wicked powers of the earth who wish to slay his living saints. As soon as this work of separation is finished, probation closes, and Michael (Jesus) stands up and begins to reign. His kingdom is made up because He has already determined who His subjects are. When the judgment began in Daniel 7:13 Jesus came to vindicate his dead children. In Daniel 12:1 Jesus stands up to defend his living saints from annihilation by the king of the north!!

We must now come to our last consideration. Though the post-millennial judgment does not directly come to view in the book of Daniel, it would be well at this point to say a few words about it because it relates to what we have said about the *modus operandi* of the judgment in Daniel 7. At the end of the millennium the holy city will descend from heaven and the wicked will be resurrected (Revelation 20:6). Though some of these wicked people undoubtedly performed good deeds in their lifetimes, they now resurrect only with their evil traits. And why is this? Simply because they are given their own self-identity minus their good deeds which were deleted when their cases were reviewed during the millennial judgment. The righteous at the second coming will be given all the good of their lives but nothing of the bad. On the other hand, at the end of the millennium the wicked are given all the bad of their lives and nothing good. Thus those outside the city are totally wicked and those inside the city are totally righteous.

Interestingly, Ellen White informs us that the very same prelates and priests who condemned the saints during the Middle Ages will be gathered outside the city. What a judgment reversal has taken place!! Those who were rulers in the Middle Ages are now lost while those who were trampled upon are royalty. This work of reversal is what Jesus performed when he went into the most holy place in 1844. Now, after the millennium the results of the pre-advent judgment are clearly revealed to the enemies of God's children.

Let's turn to Revelation 20:11-15 and examine this post-millennial judgment more closely. At the end of the 1000 years all the wicked will be summoned to the judgment bar of God. The books (which, we are clearly told, contain their works) will be opened and the record of their lives will be laid open before the whole universe. Some have wondered why the book of life is brought to view in this judgment. The passage clearly indicates that the purpose is to show the wicked that their names are not found in it. And why are their names absent? Simply because they have been deleted from this book during the millennial judgment.

Summarizing the biblical view of the judgment: The righteous dead and living are vindicated in the heavenly court during the pre-Advent investigative judgment. The wicked oppressors of God's people are found wanting in this same judgment. At the second coming Jesus will resurrect the righteous dead and glorify them along with the righteous living. All their sins have been deleted in the pre-advent judgment and therefore they receive only the positive traits of their self-identity. They are now given the kingdom by Jesus (Revelation 20:4). During the 1000 years the saints (who are now kings, priests and judges) will participate in the sentencing of their wicked oppressors. Their judges on earth are now judged in heaven. All the good deeds of the wicked will be deleted at this time. The wicked at this point do not know that their cases are being examined in heaven because they are dead. They are judged in heaven, *in absentia*. But after the millennium the wicked will be resurrected from the dead. Their own self-identity will be returned to them at this time minus all the good deeds they performed in their life. They will then see, in person, the justice of their sentence and with one accord will proclaim the justice and love of God. Then, and only then, can God destroy sin and sinners.