

Questions and Answers Series
No. 3

Examination of Text Which Continues to Divide Christendom

Was Peter the Rock Upon Which Christ Built His Church?

By Harold P. Morgan, Ph.D.

Editor of *Questions and Answers*

Author of *Was Peter Ever in Rome?*

QUESTIONS THIS PAMPHLET ANSWERS:

1. Do the Holy Scriptures assign to Peter the office of supreme head and ruler of the Church?
2. Did Christ commit to Peter universal spiritual jurisdiction and absolute power over mankind?
3. Have the long line of successors in the popedom inherited the plenitude of power and authority which is claimed for Peter?
4. Are the popes today precisely what Peter is said to have been officially when he ruled the church from Rome?
5. What is the Pope's present program?

BIBLICAL INFORMATION BUREAU

P. O. Box 185

Bloomington, Illinois, U.S.A.

Copyright, 1944, The Biblical Information Bureau. All rights reserved, no part of this article may be reproduced in any form without permission from the publishers.

Printed in the United States of America

Deacidified

Was Peter the Rock?

THE LATIN inscription in large letters of gold, which encircles the base of Michael Angelo's dome in the great basilica of St. Peter's Rome,⁽¹⁾ proclaims to all Christendom the Magna Charta of the Papacy:

Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam Meam et tibi dabo claves regni caelorum.⁽²⁾

Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church and I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.

The traveller standing beneath this mighty dome, towering into midair some four hundred feet from the marble floor, might well exclaim, "Here is the most gorgeous structure that has been built since the time of Solomon." Its arched roof, from end to end one sweep of carving and gold; its huge twisted columns of Corinthian bronze; blocks of the richest marble and translucent alabaster; abounding wealth of statuary chiseled by the greatest masters; chapels resplendent with mosaics depicting the glory of the Papacy's long, eventful history, — all this marvelous beauty combine to make St. Peter's the transcendent triumph of architectural skill it was designed to be. The visitor, listening to the solemn organ music rolling out on the incense-laden air and reverberating through the shadowy aisles and transepts up to the immensity of the blending dome, cannot but be caught by the liturgical spell of the Gregorian chant.

(1) In order to raise funds for the rebuilding of St. Peter's Church, Rome, according to the plans of Michael Angelo, Pope Leo X, following the example of his predecessor, Julius II, proclaimed a so-called "Plenary Indulgence," phrased in very sweeping terms and offering to believing purchasers all sorts of benefits, including remission of sins, freedom from the necessity of penance, and the release of their deceased friends from purgatory, — the sale of these indulgences was the immediate cause of the Lutheran revolt.

(2) *Biblia Sacra Vulgatae, Matthaeum, XVI :18, 19.*

Peter's Statue

Near the High Altar, by one of the four massive pillars supporting the dome, is a point of interest. On a pedestal about four feet high, is a bronze statue of Peter, — a rudely executed work which some eminent archaeologists maintain was originally the statue of Jupiter Capitolinus. Pope Leo the Great is credited with appropriating and baptizing the ancient bronze, transforming it into the traditional likeness of Peter in commemoration of the deliverance of Rome from the invasion of Attila. However that may be, there it is, seated in a marble chair, the left hand holding the keys, the insignia of the office of gatekeeper of heaven and hell, while the right hand, the two fingers of which are extended, is depicted in the act of bestowing the "apostolic blessing." The right foot of the statue projects a little from the vestment, which in fast wearing away is assuming the appearance of a Chinese lady's lily foot. The faithful offer humble homage to the statue. Here a constant procession of devotees may be seen every day. The extended foot is reverently kissed, then wiped with a more or less clean handkerchief, or oftener with the coat sleeve or wrist-band. The performance recalls to mind the Mussulman on a pilgrimage to Mecca kissing the black stone of the Caaba.

Peter's Chair

Another point of interest is Peter's Chair, mounted on a magnificent throne of bronze and gilt, surmounted by a canopy, and supported by four colossal figures, Augustine, Ambrose, Chrysostom and Athanasius, — strange to relate not one of these Church Fathers ever advocated the supremacy and jurisdiction of the occupant of the Roman See. The relic stands at the extreme end of the basilica, facing the main entrance, and thus dominates the whole building. Its design includes angels floating over the chair; above the angels is the emblem of God the Spirit in the form of a dove, from which rays of divine light pour down upon this seat of ecclesiastical authority. Thus God Him-

self is represented as honoring the chair, notwithstanding that its voice is frequently in direct opposition to the voice of God's Word. It is interesting to note that this sculptured symbolism dates from the year 1659—the Papacy's answer to the Protestant Reformation.

Tradition asserts that this chair is the very one upon which Peter sat when he officiated as bishop of Rome, and from whence his utterances issued. Lady Morgan,⁽³⁾ a much travelled and prolific writer, tells quite another story. She states that when the French took possession of Rome at the time of the French Revolution, sacrilegious curiosity induced the soldiery to break through the reliquary. Upon examination the old wooden chair was seen to be of fifth century design, and altogether dissimilar in design and structure from the chairs pictured in the Catacombs. Beneath the dust and cobwebs, so the story runs, was found an inscription in Arabic characters,—the well-known confession of Mohammedan faith. "There is but one God, and Mohammed is his prophet." Lady Morgan suggests that the chair was brought from the East among the spoils of the Crusaders and presented to St. Peter's at a time when antiquarian research was not much in fashion.⁽⁴⁾

(3) *The Critical Dictionary of English Literature* devotes three columns to Lady Morgan's literary activities. (Philadelphia, 1870) pp. 1366-1367.

(4) Morgan, Lady Sydney Owenson, *Italy*, (London, 1821) Vol. II, p. 227. Extended controversy resulted from this exposure. Nicholas, Cardinal Wiseman, Archbishop of Westminster, took a hand at settling the dispute. He wrote very learnedly about the *Cathedra Petri*, declaring that its original owner was a converted Roman Senator, Pudens by name, friend and host to Peter. In 1851, Lady Morgan addressed a clever rejoinder to Wiseman's criticisms, in which she suggested a way of settling the dispute: let the chair be examined by a group of experts, chosen from Catholic and Protestant scholars. Apparently that ended the rather labored controversy. A solemn festival in honor of "Peter's Chair" is held each year on January 19th, when it is publicly displayed, but out of reach of curious, impious hands.

Professor H. Forbes Witherly, who seems to have enjoyed better opportunity for investigation than Lady Morgan, goes into details regarding the structure and composition of the chair. He says in a valuable monograph on the subject: "The ornaments of the chair generally tell their own tale. They are designs on ivory, three rows of

Peter's Tomb

The chief attraction of St. Peter's, however, is the tomb of the apostle, known as "The Great Confession." Underneath the dome and beneath the marble floor lies the reputed remains of the poor, simple, barefooted fisherman of Galilee. Before the chamber upon which a succession of Popes have lavished great stores of wealth, one hundred odd gold and silver lamps burn perpetually. The chamber is entered only by the Pope, and these visits are limited to rare occasions. At such times, "Christ's Vicar" enters on his knees, pausing at different stages, and finally prostrating himself to kiss the revered spot,—the site where, according to tradition, Peter was buried after having been crucified head downwards in the Circus of Nero.

The Text Which for Centuries Has Divided Christendom

Reverting to the Latin inscription on the frieze of St. Peter's dome, the first to apply the text to Peter and his successors was Pope Leo I, bishop of Rome, (440-461). The councils of Ephesus, (431), and Chalcedon, (451), rejected his contention; nevertheless, it had its influence. What may be called the first determined effort to employ the text as warrant for the episcopal supremacy of Rome was made by Pope Gregory I, who, it is generally conceded, laid the cornerstone of what later was to become the gigantic fabric of the Papacy.

six each, the two upper rows are mainly representations of the labors of Hercules. The chair, therefore, in its decorations, is in honor of the pagan hero, the man-god of Roman mythology—the man the pagan Roman loved, the most powerful of men, and the man of the most atrocious morals." Dr. Witherly adds: "Imagine that strong-minded, paganism-hating Jew, seated in honor and honored in the midst of these pagan abominations! No one having read Peter's Epistles and the account of his character and activities in the Acts can tolerate such disreputable slander again him." *The Chair of St. Peter in the Church of St. Peter*, (London, 1905) pp. 83, 84.

The age-old interpretation given to this text in the gospel of Matthew is as follows:

To Peter, the first bishop of Rome,⁽⁵⁾ the office of supreme head and ruler of the Church was committed by Christ; that upon him also was bestowed universal jurisdiction and absolute power over all mankind, and that the long line of successors in the Papal chair inherit the plenitude of power and authority that was his, so that they are today precisely what he was officially when he ruled the Church from Rome.

Colossal Assumptions

The Church of Rome contends for and undertakes to prove:

First, that in the course of His earthly ministry, the Lord Jesus Christ conferred on Simon Peter a primacy of jurisdiction and authority over the rest of the Twelve as well as over the whole Church so that he was entitled to their obedience and submission.

Second, that this primacy was not to be confined to Peter, but was to be transmitted through him to an uninterrupted line of successors for all the later history of the Church.

Third, that by the Lord's special guidance and under His divine sanction, the apostle Peter became bishop at Rome and died in the occupancy of that See.

Fourth, that by the authority of the Lord, Peter did actually entrust to all the future occupants of that bishopric the same jurisdiction over the whole Church that had been committed to him and that he himself had wielded.

The whole contention then turns upon the fundamental issue, namely, that of the rightness of the Papal supremacy.

(5) "Was Peter Ever in Rome?" *QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS*, February, 1943.

If this claim could be substantiated, it would be superfluous, if not presumptuous, to raise any further questions. If the Pope is indeed by divine ordinance the sole, supreme ruler of the whole Church, the "Vicar of Christ on earth," who, when He speaks officially on "faith and morals," is infallible, then he cannot be questioned, whatever he may do. If, indeed, he is so endowed with divine wisdom and knowledge then all his utterances must be wholly accepted. On the other hand, if no divine warrant can be found for these momentous claims, then we must conclude that they are mere assumptions. If the claim to be God's vicegerent is settled, all the rest follows—it is perforce the end of all controversy.

The Vatican Council and the Scriptures

The universal supremacy and jurisdiction claimed by the Popes as the successors of Peter—if it exists at all—must have been asserted from the time of Peter to the present day. It could not be a gradual development, or an invention of later years. For if so, it would not be a heritage handed down from the Apostle. Accordingly, Roman Catholic authorities uniformly maintain that the historic claim made on behalf of the Popes has always been allowed and believed by the whole Church.⁽⁶⁾

Fortunately, the right and proper method of approach to an analysis and evaluation of these claims is pointed out by the very form in which they are made by the last General Council, over which Pope Pius IX himself presided. The Council affirmed that these claims are made on the grounds that they have the express authority of Holy Scriptures. It stated:

We, therefore, teach and declare, according to the

(6) *Conc. Trid. Constitutio dogmatica prima de Ecclesia Christi*. Sess. I. III. The Council of Trent also decreed: "That the gospel which our Lord Jesus Christ first preached with his own mouth, and afterward commanded to be preached by His apostles to every creature, is the fountain of all saving grace and good morals." *Sess. IV.*

testimony of the Gospel, that the primacy of jurisdiction over the whole Church of God, immediate and direct, was promised and given to the blessed Apostle Peter by Christ the Lord."⁽⁷⁾

Gladly we avail ourselves of the invitation, and are willing to join in this appeal, and are prepared to abide by the issue. We heartily accept the challenge to bring our plea before the Final Court of Appeal, for no further appeal is open to us other than the court of the Holy Scriptures.

The point at issue is now clearly before us. We hold that Holy Scripture is the Word of God, and is the revelation in human language to which we must go for doctrines which are the bases of all Christian activity; and that by its records of historical events we are to test all our theories and hold in check all our speculations.

The Final Court of Appeal

As our memory scans the past, we recall a lecture delivered by the eminent Jesuit theologian, Father Joseph Rickaby. In a retreat for the Catholic clergy of the Northern diocese in England, he not only assumed, but plainly declared that anyone who thinks, or professes to think, that the words "upon this rock" can mean anything but

(7) *Documenta Concilium Vaticanum*, Pars ii. The Vatican Council met in Rome in 1870. After considerable debate the theory of Papal Infallibility was adopted. The Council decreed that the Pope himself, when speaking *ex cathedra*, i.e., as the occupant of the chair of Peter, is infallible. It further decreed that: "If any one, therefore, shall say that blessed Peter, the Apostle, was not appointed the Prince of all the Apostles, and the Visible Head of the whole Church militant, or that the same directly and immediately received from the same our Lord Jesus Christ a primacy of honor only, and not of true and proper jurisdiction, *let him be accursed*."

If, then, any should deny that it is by the institution of Christ, the Lord, or by divine right, that blessed Peter should have a perpetual line of successors in the primacy of blessed Peter in this primacy: *Let him be accursed.*
Doc. Con. Vat. Pars ii

Peter, must either be wilfully blind, or else so prejudiced by an unfortunate ecclesiastical position or worldly interests and motives, that he is incapable of seeing the plain Scripture meaning of the text, which he affirmed could not be otherwise understood unless there was some intellectual prejudice or moral obstruction in the way. Let us, therefore, turn to the Scriptures.

The earthly ministry of Jesus was approaching its close. Everyone had discussed Him. To what purpose had He come? What was the popular feeling? Christ approached His disciples with the question, "Whom do men say that I the Son of Man am?" *Matthew 16:13*. What views do they hold? From His followers came the answers, "Some say that thou art John the Baptist; some, Elias; and others Jeremias, or one of the prophets." *Matthew 16:14*. Christ now appealed from the opinions of the nation to that of the disciples themselves: "But whom say ye that I am?" *Matthew 16:15*. Peter, repeating what he and all the disciples had avowed a few days before in the ship, *Matthew 14:33*, said: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," *Matthew 16:16*. And as if to prevent Peter from becoming puffed up with pride, Christ answered, "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee." *Matthew 16:17*. Peter had not formed this in his own mind, God the Father had revealed it unto him. Then followed a further revelation which the Lord Himself gave.

The whole passage is really a simple one. The crux of the text is the figurative word "rock." The Roman Church maintains that the word "rock" refers to Peter, upon whom Christ built His Church, and bases her interpretation on a play on words. The word "Peter" and the word "rock" closely resemble each other in the original, of which similarity of sound the Church of Rome has taken full advantage to the confusion of sense, substituting the one for the other. In a footnote to the *Douay* version of the Holy Scriptures, Roman Catholic authorities added the following paragraph:

The words of Christ to Peter, spoken in the vulgar

language of the Jews, which our Lord made use of, were the same as if he had said in English, 'Thou art a rock, and upon this rock I will build my church.' So that by the plain course of the words, Peter is here declared to be the rock upon which the Church was to be built.⁽⁸⁾

This comment is at direct variance with the original. These two words, which have a similar sound, are different in meaning, of different genders and the accidents opposite — mobility opposed to immobility. So, too, the words "thou" and "this," differ in person and case. "Thou" is in the second person, and "this" is in the third. The word "this," therefore, must refer to something antecedent, different from "thou." If the original Greek had been, "*Ἐπὶ τούτῳ τῷ Πέτρῳ*" — upon this Peter, the Church of Rome might have some plea for her contention. But the words of Christ are, "*Σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ Πέτρῳ*" — thou art Peter, and upon this rock. The Latin *Vulgate*, declared by the Council of Trent⁽⁹⁾ to be authentic, so that "no one may dare or presume to reject it," makes the same distinction as does the Greek — "*Tu es Petrus et super hanc Petram.*" "*Petrus*" is in the masculine gender, and "*Petram*" is in the feminine. The philology of a word or two can profoundly change the meaning.

(8) The Douay Version of the Scriptures was translated not from the original Hebrew and Greek, but from the Latin Vulgate of Jerome. The version was published in Douay in 1609, with Annotations.

(9) The Canon of the Council of Trent, *De Canonis Scripturis*, Sess. IV, decreed that: "no one shall presume to interpret the Scriptures contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers." It is doubtful whether any instance of that unanimous consent is to be found. But should we accept this rule we would be forced to abandon Rome's exposition of the words, "Upon this rock I will build my church." There are five different interpretations of the word *rock* by the Church Fathers. First, that the rock was built on Peter. This interpretation is followed by seventeen Fathers. Second, that the Church was built on all the apostles. This opinion is followed by eight Fathers. Third, that the faith which Peter professed is the immovable foundation of the Church. This interpretation is followed by forty-four Fathers and Doctors. Fourth, that the Church was built on Christ. This interpretation is followed by sixteen Fathers and Doctors. Fifth, that the name of *rock* is the whole body of the faithful, five Fathers hold.

Important law cases have often hinged upon a comma more or less.

How the Passage Is Rendered In Other Versions

We have before us as we write several versions of this passage, which it is proper here to point out to the Bible student. Thus in the German version of the passage we read: "*Du bist Petrus, und auf diesen Felsen will ich bauen meine Gemeinde.*" Here, as in the English, the thought of the original is almost lost, for the structure of the German did not allow of its being translated. The Spanish version is more exact, it reads, "*Tu eres Pedro, y sobre esta piedra edificaré mi Iglesia.*" The same may be said of the Italian, which renders the passage, "*Tu sei Pietro, e sopra questa io edifichero la mia chiesa.*" Of all the versions we have consulted, one only, the French, makes the resemblance between the two terms, "Peter" and "rock." We read in this version, "*Tu es Pierre, et sur cette pierre je bâtirai mon Eglise.*" Literally: "Thou art Peter, and on this stone I will build my Church." In order to maintain the play upon the word "*Pierre*," the word "rock" is omitted and a word substituted that signifies a stone.

The fidelity of the *Vulgate* is well retained in the Spanish and Italian versions, and do not justify the *Douay* comment. The French approaches the nearest to Rome's annotation, but there, as we have noted, instead of changing "Peter" into the "rock," the translators have changed the "rock" into a "stone," in order to make it agree with Peter.

How Should the Verse Be Rendered?

The translators of the King James version, in making the passage to read, "And I say unto thee that thou art Peter," incorrectly worded the sentence. This freedom in translation may at first appear trifling in the face of harmonious English expression. The word *Cephas*, Peter, stands in the verse as a mere name, without connotation. It should be kept clearly in mind that though Jesus gave Peter this name,

He never afterward addressed him by it, but always by the name of Simon. The passage should read, "And I say unto thee, that thou art a stone, and upon this rock." Here another mis-translation confronts us, to which the former has given rise. Kindly bear with this important bit of philology. The Greek article *kai* is often used as an adversative conjunction, in English, "but," and so it must be used there, because Jesus manifestly contrasts *petros*, a movable stone, from *petra*, an immovable rock. "But upon this rock," rather "the rock" for the Greek article is put to it, which always points to a particular person or thing, already known. The Greek word *de*, rendered in English "also," being a disjunctive conjunction, is meant, therefore, to distinguish between things that are spoken about. The whole verse will then read:

"And I say unto thee, that thou art a stone, but upon this, the Rock, I will build my Assembly, and the gates of the underworld shall not prevail against it."

Jesuit Jugglery

Before leaving this part of the argument, it might be well to consider an ingenious plea put forth by the Jesuit, Cardinal Bellarmine, to offset the evidence against the Papal interpretation. Bellarmine argues and his line of reasoning has been often reproduced since, that our Lord, speaking in Syraic or Aramaic, actually used the same word in both clauses, saying, "Thou art *Kepha*, and upon this *Kepha* I will build my Church." An American theologian employs the argument thus:

Now, clearly, these words are spoken to Peter—to the same person, Peter, who had just acknowledged the Saviour's Divinity. All the old, musty nonsense about the Greek words 'petros' and 'petra' is long on the scrap heap. Christ, speaking in the Aramaic language, said, 'thou art Kepa, and upon this Kepa I will build my church. And, just as clearly do

these words contain a promise of the primacy.⁽¹⁰⁾

Every scholar well knows it cannot be proved with absolute certainty that our Lord spoke in Syraic or Aramaic.⁽¹¹⁾ In any case, if the original words are not those found in the Greek text of Matthew's gospel, they are forever lost to us. This plea is invalid. Moreover, no Roman Catholic theologian is at liberty to raise the plea at all. He is bound by the decrees of the Council of Trent to accept the *Vulgate* as holy and canonical, and all controversies are to be settled by that text.⁽¹²⁾ The Old Latin version, as we have seen, is against this argument.

But lest we be charged with evading the issue, we might turn briefly to the words found in the Hebrew and the Syriac. The words *Cepa* and *Kepha*, when they mean "rock" or "stone," are of the feminine gender, which *Cephas* or Peter, as a masculine certainly is not. In the ancient Syraic version, *Peshito*⁽¹³⁾ the feminine pronoun is found with the second *Kepha*.

This line of reasoning, generally adapted by present-day Roman controversialists, implies that Matthew did not quote the Saviour correctly. But the passage is in the form of a direct quotation. Please observe, when the inspired writers made use of a direct quotation from another language, the exact words of the speaker are given, followed by the explanation, "which being interpreted," and then

(10) Sheehy, Rev. Patrick Joseph, D.D., *The Primacy of St. Peter*. (International Truth Society) New York, 1942) p. 3.

(11) The Greek was as much in use by the common people of Palestine in the days of Jesus as was the Aramaic. Greek had been forced by Alexander the Great upon the countries he conquered, and at this time it was to be heard not only in Greece but in Asia Minor, Palestine and in Europe.

(12) Con. Trid. Sec. IV.

(13) *Peshito*, a translation of a Greek MS. of the New Testament into Syraic. The word "Peshiti," means "simple," "direct," its root meaning is to "lay bare," i.e., to make plain.

the meaning of the foreign tongue is given in the Greek. When Jesus said to the daughter of Jarius, "*Talitha cumi*," (Aramaic), the inspired record adds, "which is being interpreted, Damsel, I say unto thee arise," *Mark 5:41*. See also *Mark 15:22*; *John 1:38,41*; *Acts 4:36*.

In the use of this plausible argument based on what the Lord might have said in the Hebrew or Aramaic, the Church of Rome would make us dependent upon her feigned oral traditions.⁽¹⁴⁾ It implies that the original monographs which were written in the Greek are not our only sure authority. We possess no valid copy of Matthew's gospel other than the Greek in which all the rest of the New Testament was written.⁽¹⁵⁾ We cannot be led from this position to the supposed words which Jesus might have used. To argue on other than the Greek text would prostrate the authority of the Holy Scriptures.

The Corner Stone

In Hebrew the word which is used for rock is *tzur*. It refers particularly to flint, "an impassible, firm rock." "*Hatzur*" is the word we find in *Deuteronomy 32:4*, where the inspired writer says: "He is the Rock, his work is perfect: for all his ways are judgment: a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is he." "*Ha*" stands for the definite article "the," having the same import in Hebrew as in the Greek where it is applied to Jesus as "the" Son of God. The passage quoted by

(14) The Council of Trent declared that: "All saving truth is not contained in the Holy Scriptures, but partly in the Scripture and partly in unwritten traditions, which, who-soever doth not receive, with like piety and reverence as he doth the Scriptures, *Let him be accursed!* *Conc. Trid. Sess. IV.*

(15) A tradition, founded on a passage in Papias, (130 A.D.) credits Matthew with the composition of a book written in Hebrew, from which a translation into Greek was made. But Dr. Hugh J. Schonfield, in a work entitled, *An Old Hebrew Text of St. Matthew's Gospel*, points out that the passage properly construed should read: "And I say unto thee, That thou art Kepha, and upon this rock I will build my assembly; and the gates of the nether world shall not prevail against it." (Edinburgh, 1927) pp. 120, 121.

Peter in his *First Epistle*, 2:6-8, is taken from *Isaiah 28:16* and *8:14*, where the word "rock" is translated from the Hebrew *tzur*.

A brief survey of the Old Testament Scriptures where the word *tzur* occurs will show that in a number of places it has reference to Christ Himself. Paul affirms, in speaking of God's ancient people, that "They drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ." *I Corinthians 10:4*. Now, suppose we change the wording, and read: "They drank of that Spiritual Rock, that followed them, and *that rock* was Peter." The change is not a whit more at variance with the whole scope of Scriptures than Rome's interpretation of "upon this rock." One is to Christian feeling as repugnant as the other.

Again, in reference to the Remnant Church, Paul declares that it was built "upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner stone." *Ephesians 2:20*. Peter, likewise, speaking of the same church, interprets *Psalms 98:22*, "This is the stone which was set at naught of you builders, which is become the head of the corner," *Acts 4:11*. See also *Romans 9:33*; *I Corinthians 3:11*.

Luke, Mark and John Knew Nothing of Supremacy

Now, the figure in which Jesus is represented as the "corner stone" is incompatible with the theory that the Church could be built upon Peter. If Peter were the "rock," then the "corner stone" must be Peter. Instead, therefore, of Peter being built upon Christ, Christ would be built on Peter. According to the Papal theory the prophecy of the founding of the remnant assembly, "Behold, I lay in Zion, for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation," *Isaiah 28:16*, refers to Peter,—but Peter applies it to Christ. So also Paul, *Ephesians 2:19,20*.

A point to be remembered is that Mark wrote his gospel under Peter's special direction. Mark says not a word

about Peter being the "rock," or anything whatever about primacy, or universal jurisdiction. If the omission is to be laid to Peter's modesty, then, here, surely the Popes of Rome are quite unlike Peter in this respect. But was Peter the man to suppress, or cause to be suppressed, the publication of any mark of his Master's favor and approbation?

More likely the omission occurred because neither Peter nor Mark attached to the declaration the importance and meaning that the advocates of Papal autocracy ascribe to it. In either case the absence of any reference to the "rock" seems to be fatal to the Papal view. If the passage in Matthew conveyed the authority for which the Roman Catholic Church contends, modesty is no justification for the omission. If it were intended to teach a prerogative, then neither Peter nor Mark had any right to ignore or omit it.

Luke says nothing about the "rock." It is generally conceded that Luke wrote under the direction of Paul. Are we to assume that either Paul or Luke knew nothing of a supremacy?

John, in his gospel record, which was written thirty odd years after the other three evangelists penned their narratives, says nothing about the conversation between the Lord and Peter. John wrote about A.D. 90,—the time element is important, for the supremacy of Peter, if he had any, must not only by then have been conspicuous and acknowledged, but of the greatest ecclesiastical importance.

Facts Are Stubborn Things

Something of the circumstances surrounding Peter's confession of the Deity of Christ is now to be considered. This was made in Caesarea Philippi, which was the greatest distance to which our Lord went from Jerusalem. In a spot far remote from all danger, Peter confessed the Christ. When, however, he was questioned about Christ at Jerusalem, at the hour and place of greater danger, Matthew

says, "But Peter followed him afar off." *Matthew 26:58*. Peter is the only one that denied Christ. *Peter, the foundation of the Church, shaken by the voice of a maid!*

Is it possible that the Lord appointed Peter to be the foundation of the Church, and then, soon after, called him an adversary? Is it possible that Christ appointed a man to be the supreme ruler of His Church, and directly afterward turned and rebuked him? Christ was compelled to say, "Get thee behind me Satan." Peter, with presumptuous zeal, had dared to gainsay the prophetic declaration of the Saviour. So the "rock" is at once transformed into an adversary. Stability vanishes and the father of lies appears in its stead! Furthermore, according to the Roman Catholic version of the Scriptures, Christ says, "Thou art a scandal unto me." *Is it possible that the Head of the Visible Church should be a scandal to Christ?*

On different occasions there had arisen a "strife" among the apostles as to who should be greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven. *Matthew 18:1*. They were anxious, it seems, about the point of supremacy. But Jesus in every instance discouraged them. Then on several occasions afterward he inculcated an humble equality. Thus when the mother of James and John desired a superior place for her sons, which moved the other apostles to indignation, it is recorded that, "Jesus called them to him and said: Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant." *Matthew 20:25*.

Again, warning his apostles against the love of superior station, He said: "Be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren." *Matthew 23:8*.

And again, we read that "there arose a reasoning among them, which of them should be greatest. And Jesus perceiving the thought of their heart, took a child and set

him by him, and said unto them, 'Whosoever shall receive this child in my name receiveth me: and whosoever shall receive me receiveth him that sent me; for he that is least among you all, the same shall be great.' Luke 9:46-48.

It should be noted that these incidents took place subsequent to the declaration to Peter of which the Papacy makes so much. Neither Peter nor his brethren could have understood this promise of Christ, as the vast organization of the Roman Catholic Church professes to do; for if they had, they surely would not afterward have disputed which of them should be the greatest. They could not have done otherwise than look upon the question as perfectly settled in Peter's favor, and would most certainly have regarded him with the greatest deference. Further, the Lord instead of discouraging the whole inquiry would, according to Rome's supposition, have reproved their want of acquiescence in His declared will, and have reminded them that He had constituted Peter the Supreme Governor already. But here is no allusion to any superiority of Peter over the rest, rather there is a stringent exclusion of any superiority. If the Church of Rome's theory is correct, our Lord could not have used these declarations without specific reservations in favor of Peter, the "Prince of Apostles."

In the matter of priority, Andrew ought not to be overlooked, for he it was who first came to Jesus. James, not Peter, was the first to be called to martyrdom, *Acts 12:3*. Herod saw fit to put James to death, thus giving him the most glorious of all primacy. But he seems to have been content with merely putting Peter in prison.

We have already taken up at some length the election of Matthias.⁽¹⁶⁾ We saw then that in this first official act

(16) "Was the Appointment of Matthias Premature and Unwarranted?" *Questions and Answers*, May, 1943. The Roman Catholic Church has always a ready answer to any objection raised against her interpretations. In a book entitled *Another Thousand Radio Replies*, given over the Catholic Broadcasting Station, Sydney, Australia, by the Reverend Leslie Rumble, D.D., in answer to the question,

of the apostolate all those present, and not Peter, nominated and chose one to fill the vacancy left by the treachery of Judas Iscariot. "They" appointed two; "they" offered up prayer; "they" gave forth their lots. Matthias is numbered with *the eleven apostles*. Why does not the evangelist write here, "Peter, and the rest," or "Peter and the apostles"? What we do read is that Peter "stood up in the midst of the disciples." No peculiar place is appointed to him, or taken by him. Where, we would ask, is the primacy in this equal vote?

In the *Acts* we shall surely find proof of Peter's primacy; otherwise it exists nowhere. Consider for a moment the organization of the group; James and not Peter was regarded as its leader. We read in one of Paul's letters the names of the apostles, each one designated in proper order, James, Peter and John, *Galatians 2:9*; Luke, in referring to Paul's visit to Jerusalem, says he went, "in with us to James and all the brethren were present." There is here no special mention of Peter. He is certainly not regarded as being of more importance than the others.

Peter, we find, was in some respects subject to the direction of the apostles. Thus we read that when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the Word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John. Observe, if you please, it was James with the others that sent Peter and John into Samaria. Most extraordinary treatment to be accorded to the Prince of the Apostles! Observe, if you please, that the apostles commanded Peter, and Peter obeys. Where is the headship? Where is the government? Peter quits the seat of episcopal authority at

"If Peter was head, why didn't he appoint Matthias straight out, instead of joining with the other Apostles in electing him?" The answer given is, "It was under Peter's directions that the election by ballot took place. We see here the providential care of St. Peter for the flock. He has the chief authority in this election, since all were entrusted to him. But although he takes the initiative, he refrains from using his full authority. He alone could have appointed Matthias. But in a spirit of humility, and to avoid appearing high minded, he graciously permits all to partake." (Rumble and Carty, Kensington, N.S.W. 1940) Question 342, p. 90.

the bidding of those over whom he presides! Imagine, if you will, the bishop of one of the little dioceses about Rome proposing to send the Supreme Pontiff upon a mission to Florence or Naples. Shade of Innocent III!

Again, draw upon your imagination. Picture, if you will, the apostle Peter crowned, as was the present Pope, with the triple tiara on the central balcony overlooking the square of St. Peter, surrounded with all the pomp of the Papacy, Cardinals, Archbishops, Abbots and representatives and special envoys of many nations, the Noble and Swiss guards, and in the presence of over a hundred thousand spectators. Picture, if you will, Peter, robed in cope of rich brocade, adorned with triple crown of gold, ablaze with diamonds, emeralds and rubies, giving his Apostolic Benediction to the kneeling throng, "Urbi et Orbi,"—(to the City and the World), heralded by a blast from silver trumpets, all of which effectually destroy any analogy of the man who said, "Silver and gold have I none." How different is all this from the Scripture record! The writer of the Acts states that when Cornelius would have done obeisance, Peter in horror exclaimed, "Stand up, I myself also am a man." *Acts 10:25,26*. No Pontifex Maximus here!

Jewish Converts Ignorant Of Peter's Supremacy

In the *Acts*, we read that when Peter returned from the conversion and baptism of the gentile, Cornelius, "they that were of the circumcision disputed against him." *Acts 11:2*. These Jewish believers, who still clung to the Mosaic law, found fault with Peter and questioned the propriety of what he had done. Neither he nor the converts who accused him seem to have had any notion of his superior authority. Now in all this, where is the least appearance of Peter's supremacy? What is here that looks like the Papal assertion that "Peter bore the authority, not of a mere man, but of the true God, holding the place of the Redeemer himself upon the earth."? Does he inform these ignorant people of the supreme authority

entrusted to him by Almighty God, and of his right and duty to rule the Church? His act of humility thus was a gross infringement of Peter's prerogatives! An error that he ought immediately have corrected, not only on account of his own dignity, or his Master's honor, but the salvation of those who were in the act of violating one of those articles which Pope Boniface VIII was afterward to pronounce as indispensable to salvation.

The Flock Arraigns the Chief Shepherd

What language from spiritual subjects to a spiritual sovereign! The supreme Head of the Church rebuked and called to account by common believers! Is it possible that those murmurers had never heard of Supremacy? Why did not Peter assert his headship and threaten to excommunicate them? It was his imperative duty to do so. Pope Gregory VII, "in direct line of Peter," speaking of the sacred person of the occupant of the Roman See, declared "the Pope ought to be judged by no man." But Peter felt bound to rehearse the matter from the beginning. Then, by virtue of the *reasons* advanced, not his *supremacy*, "they held their peace, and glorified God."

Council at Jerusalem

Ignorant of Peter's Infallibility

Again, a question had arisen regarding Gentile equality. There was a demand for immediate and authoritative settlement. Here, if anywhere, was a question of "faith and morals." Now, if ever, was the time for the supreme and infallible head of the Church—if there were such a person on earth—to come forward and give his sure and final judgment. Did Peter give such judgment? Not at all. Peter did nothing on his own authority. The record reads, "The Apostles and Elders came together for to consider of this matter," *Acts 15:6*.

But what reason was there for all these men "considering" the matter? If the Papal theory is the correct one,

there was one among them who knew infallibly what ought to be done. Furthermore, according to this theory he was under solemn obligation as "the Vicar of Christ" to impose his supreme decision upon the whole Church.

If Peter were supreme and infallible, then this Biblical first council of the Christian Church was utterly useless—and worse than useless—for if it taught anything it pointed to the fact that the Lord Jesus Christ had not appointed anyone supreme ruler of His Church.

But who presided over this council? Peter was present, but not in the chair. He spoke, but Barnabas and Paul also spoke. The expression of his opinion did not bring the council to a close. After due discussion and deliberation, James gave his judgment on the matters discussed. The letters that were then framed were sent not in the name of Peter, but in the name of the apostles and elders and the whole church. Manifestly, there was no supremacy of Peter here. No primacy, not even precedence. It is to be noted further that the "letters" which the council sent were not written by Peter, nor were they written in terms which he dictated. Nor were they sent in his name. He was simply one among the rest, one among equals. These facts are totally inconsistent and irreconcilable with the tenet of Papal supremacy.

The expression, "obedience to the faith," occurs several times as descriptive of the results of the apostolic ministry, *Acts 6:7*. But there is never a word about "obedience" to Peter, as "Vicar of Christ" on earth.

The Holy Scriptures assuredly do not give Peter the importance conferred today upon the Sovereign Pontiff. Regarding the matter of infallibility, it should be noted that on the occasion of the Lord's transfiguration, Peter was decidedly lacking in faith. The proposition he advanced clearly proves this, namely, "Let us make here three tabernacles, one for thee and one for Moses and one for Elias." *Matthew 17:4*. Mark observes, "he wist not what to say."

Mark 9:6. Luke remarks, that he uttered it, "not knowing what he said." *Luke 9:33.*

Paul Ignorant of Peter's Jurisdiction

Paul, in writing to the Corinthians, says of himself: "I suppose that I was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles," *2 Corinthians 11:5.* He makes no exception, and states no limitations to the meanings of his words. Surely, if Paul had known any point in which Peter had any primacy or supremacy over him, or the rest of the apostles, he would never have used these words.

Then, again, in his *Epistle to the Galatians* Paul says that when he went up to Jerusalem to confer with the apostles who were in the ministry before him, and had been appointed by Christ during His earthly ministry, they in conference added nothing to him, "but, contrariwise, when they saw that the gospel of the *uncircumcision* was committed to me, as the gospel of the *circumcision* was unto Peter, and when James, and Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that we should go unto the heathen and they unto the circumcision." *Galatians 2:7-9.*

Bill of Particulars

Paul had been preaching successfully before he had seen Peter. When he did meet him he added nothing to him either in knowledge of the truths of the gospel, nor yet in authority to preach. He states emphatically, "But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." *Galatians 1:11,12.*

The concurrence in accepting Paul's distinctive ministry to the Gentiles was a joint affair between the three, James, Peter and John, with no hint of a superiority on the part of Peter.

In the *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, Paul, in speaking of his labors and sufferings in the cause of Christ, says: "Besides those things that are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the churches." *2 Corinthians 11:28*. He mentions nothing about Peter. He speaks of the care of "all the churches." Paul was the apostle to the Gentiles, the Church of Rome most certainly was included. There is no recognition of any subordination to Peter.

There is the striking passage in Paul's *Epistle to the Galatians*. Here Paul disapproves of the practice which was being pursued by Peter and severely reprimands him for his shameful vacillation and dishonesty. The discussion involved the question whether men were justified by faith in Christ or by the works of the law. Paul says, "I withstood him to the face." *Galatians 2:11*. In administering this sharp rebuke Paul did so, "before them all." *Galatians 2:14*. Furthermore, he says: "to whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour," *Galatians 2:15*. Paul never could have used such language to Peter, or with regard to him, if he had understood at that time that any primacy or supremacy over the whole Church, or over the other apostles, such as the present Pontiff now claims, had been given to Peter.⁽¹⁷⁾ Here is the same Peter, — twenty-five years after the ascension of Christ, exhibiting the same identical weakness. Is this then the "rock" upon which Christ built His Church?

It is inconceivable that Paul would have ventured to "withstand" one whom he knew to be "the Vicar of Christ on earth," one secured from all possibility of error in matters of "faith and morals" by the divine gift of infallibility. Anything more unlike the dealings of a supreme pontiff with those under his absolute rule it would be difficult to imagine. This becomes the more noteworthy if we consider Paul's great care and jealousy about intruding into any other man's field of labor, — "episcopal jurisdiction," we

(17) The charge was a most serious one, that of dissembling. The word "dissemble" is thus defined by Webster. "To conceal the real fact, motives, intention, or sentiment, to act the hypocrite." The Primate of the One, True, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church a dissembler!

should call it these days. Thus he says: "I have striven so to preach the gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation." *Romans 15:20*. It is evident that Peter had laid no foundation at Rome, nor had he, in the opinion of Paul, any exclusive right or prerogative there, otherwise he never could have said these things had he known of, or acknowledged any primacy, or jurisdiction over the churches to which he refers.

Paul writes at least eight epistles to the churches he had founded, and gives instructions to Timothy and Titus with regard to the administration of others. Therein is no reference or allusion to Peter, and with as much freedom, and in tone of as much authority, as if there had been no personage as Peter within the range of his knowledge. Peter also writes two epistles to those who were of Jewish descent, scattered abroad throughout Pontus, Gallatia, Capadocia, Asia and Bithynia, that is, throughout Asia Minor. He writes, however, not as a Pope, but as "an elder" to fellow elders. *I Peter 5:1*. Notice also, his directions in regard to Church authority, "Neither as being lords over God's heritage." *I Peter 5:3*.

In his *Second Letter* Peter speaks of "our beloved Paul." In all this he recognizes Paul as equal both in regard to authority as a teacher and his jurisdiction as an apostle. This, surely, is both unaccountable and unintelligible, if the writers of the Sacred Scriptures had any such idea of Peter for which the modern Catholic controversialist contends.

Another remarkable passage from Paul's writings might be cited. In his *First Epistle to the Corinthians* there is a statement most damaging to the claims of Petrine supremacy. He says, "For though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers: for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel. Wherefore I beseech you, **be ye followers of me.**" *I Corinthians 4:15,26*. These words were written to the Church at Corinth because of the spirit of division that was creeping into the assembly. Some were claiming to be followers of Peter, others of Apollos.

Paul rebukes them sharply. Mark his words, "Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ." *I Corinthians 11:1*. No Petrine Pope here!

Now in regard to Paul's own power and authority, we read, "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you *are the commandments of the Lord.*" *I Corinthians 14:37*. Furthermore, he writes, "According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise masterbuilder, **I have laid the foundation**, and another buildeth thereon." *I Corinthians 3:10*. He declares that he had received from the heavenly glory numerous "visions and revelations of the Lord." *2 Corinthians 12:1*. Only Stephen and John besides Paul were favored with post-ascension epiphanies of the Lord.

In an even bolder affirmation of his distinctive ministry, Paul shuts out Peter. He does not say that he was called a *minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles*. What he states is radically different. He affirms that he is *the minister*. If this statement does not exclude Peter, then we have yet to learn wherein perfect clearness of expression consists. Rome's anti-Pauline hostility is historic. Protestants would do well to examine the ground on which the divine authority of Paul's writings is based, for one of old said, "If the foundations be destroyed, what shall the righteous do?" *Psalms 11:3*.

The Scriptures, as we have seen,⁽¹⁸⁾ do not even so much as say that Peter was ever at Rome. On the contrary, they create strong presumption that he was never there. In speaking of his being at Babylon when he wrote his first epistle is strong proof of this. Rome contends that this "Babylon" was not in Asia, near the Persian gulf, but Rome itself. There is nothing however mystical or symbolic in Peter's *Letters*. We find in John's *Apocalypse* highly symbolic figures of speech, but Peter's writings are simply pastoral. It were well to bear in mind that when Paul wrote his several letters from Rome he was under the imme-

(18) "Was Peter Ever in Rome?" *Questions and Answers*, February, 1943.

diate eye of the Roman authorities. He does not call Rome Babylon, but always Rome. Finally, the Scriptures are almost completely silent about Peter after the council of Jerusalem. Outside the Catholic necessity of Peter's Roman residence there is really no point to his ever having been at Rome.

Feed My Sheep

The Roman Church has made much of the passage in John, where the Lord commissions Peter to feed His sheep. Let us look at the circumstances. Peter, heedless of the divine call to "catch men," had induced several of the apostles to resume their former occupation of fishing. Three and one half years before, by the same lake, Peter and the others had been called to preach the gospel of the kingdom. At that time the Lord promised to supply all their need. On the occasion, however, to which we refer they had set forth on their own initiative, but had met with no success. Jesus appeared unto them and repeated the miracle which at first had heartened them to follow Him. By this second miraculous draught of fishes he gently rebuked their want of faith. He who had supplied all their need from the beginning thus indicates that He would continue so to do. He addresses Peter, reminding him of his failure. "So when they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these?" *John 21:15*. The ingenious Catholic controversialist sees in this query the superiority of Peter's devotion to the Lord, beyond that of the other apostles. But the meaning is apparent. The Lord was referring to the nets — the means of the fisherman's livelihood, to things and not to persons.

Such, then, is the setting of the scene. Peter is questioned three times in regard to his love for Christ. On Peter's answer, repeated three times in the affirmative, the Lord gives the charge, "Feed my sheep, tend my sheep, feed my little sheep." *John 21:15-17*. Peter had been in disgrace and apostasy from the time he had thrice denied the Lord on the evening of His trial. Are we to suppose that when Peter

speaks of Judas as having fallen through transgression, that he himself was exempt from condemnation?

The declaration of the Lord did, doubtless, restore Peter to his former position and repute among the apostles. But we must take into consideration the fact that these words revert to those other "three" in which Peter thrice denied that he knew the Lord,—the second and third time, he curses and swears, adding blasphemy to falsehood. Had not Peter protested vehemently, "If I should die with thee, I will not deny thee?" The Lord's charge merely reinstated Peter to the place he had forfeited by his cowardice. As Judas fell from the apostleship by transgression, Peter fell from it by denying the Lord with an oath. Peter, here, stood before the Master as a culprit, reproached, but spared; not, certainly, as the Prince of Apostles. The commission, "Feed my sheep," restored to Peter his apostleship, and to his share in pastoral labors, *but nothing more*.

Again, the very last words of Christ which He addressed to Peter, convey unmistakably the Lord's reproof. Peter evidently was jealous of the disciple whom Jesus loved. For of John he asks the Lord, "And what shall this man do?" *John 21:21*. Note the Lord's answer, "What is that to thee? follow thou me." The passage will not admit of any other interpretation.

A Brief Summary

Holy Scripture is silent about Peter's supposed primacy and jurisdiction. Peter assuredly was not elevated to the high office while the Lord was on earth. In the case of the appointment of Matthias as successor of Judas, the eleven make the choice. On the day of Pentecost, Peter does not stand forth in solitary Papal arrogance, but is joined by "the eleven." In the appointment of Stephen there is no hint of Peter's primacy. The apostles never allude to Peter's primacy or recognize it. There is not a word from Peter intimating that he thought of it. James is seen to

exercise an authority superior to that of Peter. Paul claims and exercises an authority wholly independent of Peter.

Not to Peter but to Paul was given the doctrines of the Church. Not to Peter but to Paul was it given to lay down with authority the rules for Christian living and Church government. Not to Peter but to Paul was given the revelation of the great secret. Not to Peter but to Paul it was given to "make all men see what is the *dispensation* of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God." *Ephesians* 3:9. Not to Peter but to Paul was given the exalted privilege to "complete the word of God." *Colossians* 1:25. Little wonder, then, that Augustine writes, "When 'Apostle' is said, if it be not expressed what apostle, none is understood save Paul." Little wonder that Chrysostom declares, "When we say, 'Apostle,' we think of Paul, just as when we say 'Baptist' we think of John."

From a full survey of the *Acts* and the *Epistles* it is clear that there is not the slightest evidence for Peter's superior authority. There is positively no proof there, or elsewhere in Holy Scriptures, that Peter had any thought of any such official pre-eminence. Nor, except for refuting the fantastic notions of Rome, is there any reason for minimizing the real importance of Peter's ministry. In a subsequent article we purpose dealing with the future ministry of the apostle, under title, "**Peter and the Restoration of Israel.**"

To sum up: The traveller standing beneath the mighty dome of St. Peter's, resting upon its supporting piers in such serene tranquillity, is filled with astonishment and admiration. Its sublimity is beyond all other architectural creations. There is no work of man's hands that is similar or second to it. Little wonder that Madame de Stael described it as *musique fixee* (frozen music). The Latin inscription on the frieze of St. Peter's dome is anything but a happy symbolism. The hoary shibboleth hung up high in the air where it never could be kept aloft for an instant but for the masses of masonry erected by human hands, has no foundation in fact. Long since we have ceased to regard the

papacy as a divine institution. History and personal experience confirm us in the belief that it is but a long extended human experiment bolstered up by carnal ingenuity.

A Blueprint of the Future

Pope Pius XII, in a radio address to the world on the occasion of his Episcopal Jubilee, May 13, 1942, saw fit in these official words to reiterate the ancient claims of the Church of Rome:

When we think back to the early Church, only and spotless mother of all churches, where better, we ask, might the prayer "that they may be one," re-echo in more ringing tones than from this rock beside the Tiber on which heaven's favor has shone more brightly and generously, once Providence had selected it to be the Episcopal See of the first Peter and the spiritual bastion of Christianity — on that river bank whose annals, the glorious martyrdom of the Prince of the Apostles and the high privilege of having given to his mortal remains their last resting place.

* * * *

Where does our soul strengthen and stabilize? At the Tomb of Peter, First Bishop of Rome. When we kneel before that tomb and fix our thoughts on the beginning of the Church, we seem to see the first Pope, destined by Christ Himself to be the cornerstone of the church.

* * * *

The divine mission of the Church, established on the Rock of Peter, has no limits of space on earth, and has no limits in its activity, but the limits of mankind; but, like every age that passes, the present moment presents to her new enterprises.

* * * *

As the pillar and ground of the truth and guardian by the will of God of the mandate of Christ, and the

natural and supernatural order, the Church cannot renounce its rights.⁽¹⁹⁾

Pope Pius XII is widely regarded as a man of large political experience, versed in the intricacies of Vatican diplomacy. No one knows better than this highly cultured Italian ecclesiastic how needful it is to couch Papal aspirations in general language calculated to avert the suspicions of liberal-minded peoples. Faced with a delicate international situation, the present Pontiff has shown the adroitness of a Machiavellian strategist, and he can skate over thinnest ideological ice with dexterity.

What Does the Pontiff Mean?

It is our conviction that the full meaning of this very recent Papal utterance is not understood by the average reader. In fact, the expressions used cannot properly be weighed in the balance unless they are traced to their origin. Only as we turn to the decrees of the former Popes, and to the abundant writings of highly placed ecclesiastics of the Roman Catholic Church, are we able to comprehend their full significance. What does Pope Pius mean when he says that the Church has "no limits on earth"; "no limits to activity"; that it is the guardian by "the will of God of the mandate of Christ?" In effect, the Pope, as we would say in America, "wants to boss the universe," if his words mean anything.

Out of a whole host of testimony we shall call as our first witness, Pope Boniface VIII, (1235-1303), to whose life and labors *The Catholic Encyclopedia* devotes nine pages. In a Bull entitled, *The Holy See*, meaning, "the Church," Boniface declared:

Thus the Pope hath all power on earth, purgatory, hell and Heaven, to bind, loose, command, permit, confirm, depose, do and undo. Therefore, it is con-

(19) *Pius XII and Peace*, 1939-1943. National Catholic Welfare Conference. (Washington, D.C., 1943) pp. 53-56.

cluded, declared and pronounced, to be of necessity to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff.⁽²⁰⁾

These all embracing claims are in turn interpreted in the *Annals* of Cardinal Baronius, (1538-1607). *The Catholic Encyclopedia* gives three pages to an account of this scholar's activities. Baronius says:

The civil principality is subject to the sacerdotal, and, God hath made the political government subject to the dominion of the spiritual church.⁽²¹⁾

Another eminent annotator is Cardinal Bellarmine, (1542-1621), a distinguished Jesuit theologian, to whom *The Catholic Encyclopedia* allots three pages. Ballarmine affirms:

That by reason of the spiritual power, the Pope has indirect power in temporal matters.

The temporal authority must be subject to the spiritual power, whence, if the earthly power should go astray, it must be judged by the spiritual.⁽²²⁾

Are These Antiquated Doctrines?

When, however, these and similar tenets are reprobated by non-Romanists, the reply comes readily enough. It is said, "No one denies that such teachings were in vogue in the past, but the Catholic Church no longer countenances them." But, with an array of evidence before us, it is impossible to accept this statement. The Papal apologist would have us brush aside these dogmas as mere specimens

(20) *Unam Sanctam Boniface VIII. Lib. Sext. Decret. C. Felicitis Corp. jur. can. Extravag. Comm. v. VII. I, ed Friedberg, 1245.*—Joseph F. Damberger, Roman Catholic historian, raised objections to the authenticity of the Bull, *Unam Sanctam*, but the *Catholic Encyclopedia* states: "The genuineness of the Bull is absolutely established by the official register of the Papal Briefs, and its incorporation in the canon law." Vol. XV. p. 126.

(21) Baronius, Cesare, *Ann LVII:23.*

(22) Bellarmine, Robert, *Tractatus de polestate Summi Pontificis in rebus temporalis*, Opera Omnia Lib. II. c.1. 1610.

of "grotesque mediaevalism," wrought in an academic milieu far removed from twentieth century realities. But these tenets have never been officially repudiated; actually they are the approved teaching of the Roman Catholic Church today. To suggest, as has been so often done, that they are the antiquated but discarded doctrines of the Middle Ages is to contradict evidence at hand. These theories are found in approved text books in use in Roman Catholic theological seminaries. The works of several contemporary writers might be mentioned here. For instance, the manual by the Jesuit, Joseph Rickaby, entitled, *Commentary on the Moral Teachings of St. Thomas Aquinas*;⁽²³⁾ the two volume treatise by the Jesuit, Marianus de Luca, under title, *Institutes of Public Ecclesiastical Law*,⁽²⁴⁾ and a book by the Archbishop, Alexius Lepicier, on *The Permanence and Development of Dogma*.⁽²⁵⁾

It should be recalled that the vast claims made by Pope Boniface were, in large measure, based on the teachings of Thomas Aquinas,—one of the first to affirm that it was necessary to be subject to the Roman Pontiff in order to obtain Salvation, and that the Pope is invested with temporal as well as spiritual authority over all mankind, or, in the words of the present Pontiff, "the natural and supernatural order." By decree of Pope Leo XIII, August 4, 1880,⁽²⁶⁾ the works of Aquinas were made the basis of present instruction in all Roman Catholic universities, academies, colleges and schools. Pope Pius X, in an encyclical letter, dated September 1, 1910, warned all teachers in Roman Catholic seminaries that, "to deviate from St. Thomas is to run considerable risk." And, later, on June 29, 1923, Pope Piux XI repeated this solemn warning.

(23) Rickaby, Joseph, *Aquinas Ethicus*. (London, 1911)

(24) Luca, Marianus de, *Institutiones Juris Ecclesiastici Publici*. (Roma, 1901)

(25) Lepicier, Alexius M. *De Stabilitate et Progressu Dogmatis*. (Roma, 1910)

(26) *Aeterni Patris*

The Right to Dominate Society

Returning, for a moment, to the utterances of the present Pontiff, we would inquire what Pius XII had specifically in mind, when he states: "The Church cannot renounce its rights?" The answer to our question is supplied by the encyclical letter of Pope Leo XIII, dated January, 1890,⁽²⁷⁾ wherein it is declared that the laws of the State are not binding if they conflict with the interest of the Papacy. Similar sentiments are to be found in two of his previous Briefs, under date, February 4, 1880, and June, 1888.

Then, too, we find that the "rights of the Church" are expressly laid down in *The New Code of Canon Law*, the compilation of which was begun and finished under the direction of the two recent Popes, Pius X, and Benedict XV. Canon Law affirms that:

The Church has a native and proper right, independent of any human authority.⁽²⁸⁾

Independence from any human authority means, if it means anything at all, a power which claims a right to dominate society, politically or otherwise. It is because we are witnessing a new plan of "Catholic Action" on the part of the Roman Church in its effort to dominate society that we feel amply justified in calling our readers' attention to certain facts relating to the all-embracing jurisdictional claims of the Papacy.

Importance of Issue Underestimated

Now, it so happens that whenever these matters are called to the eye of the average intelligent man or woman, they are received with a tolerant smile. "The Papacy," so we are informed, "has long since been shorn of the power and authority it once enjoyed and exercised in bygone centuries. Frankly, there is really nothing we need now fear from that quarter." Unfortunately, the harboring of

(27) *Sapientiae christianae*

(28) *Codex Juris Canonici*. Canon 2214.

any such illusion is clear evidence that we present-day Americans are forgetful and lacking in historic perspective. Speaking generally, we as a people in this respect "know only what we read in today's newspapers." But our far-seeing revolutionary statesmen were of a different mind. Patrick Henry, it may be recalled, once strikingly said, "I know of no way of judging the future but by the past."

That the vision of Hildebrand and Aquinas still inspires the Papacy may be gleaned from another of the statements made by the present Pontiff in the recent address to which we have already called attention:

The Church remains, always the same, she does not change in her dogma or in her strength. She is impregnable. She is immovable, changeless, . . . yet she moves, she takes new forms with the age in which she goes forward, on her way progressing, yes, but not changeless in her nature.

* * * *

This is the rock of truth and salvation whose lofty and vast aspirations no one understood more thoroughly or described with greater eloquence than Leo the Great, Pope and Doctor of the Church in those memorable words, "Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostolic order, it assigned to the stronghold of the Roman Empire, so that the light of truth which was revealed for the salvation of all men might course more efficaciously from the head itself through the whole body of the world"

Let it be remembered that, now as in the past, the Papacy has but one rule of action inspiring its ambitious course. The goal is ever before it, namely, a world kingdom under its own benevolent ecclesiastical dominion. The Papacy never compromises that ruling ideal. It thinks nothing of temporary failure or defeat. For centuries its continuous proud boast has been, *Roma semper eadem*, "Rome always the same."

The Papacy Cannot Retreat From Its Position

By decree of the Vatican Council, 1870, it is declared that when the Pope speaks *ex-cathedra*, (i.e., literally, from the chair of St. Peter), on "faith and morals" his official utterances are infallible. His decrees are binding on the conscience of every Christian and in a manner that allows of no reservation, which includes all civil rights.⁽²⁹⁾

The Roman Pontiffs, in centuries past and in our own time, definitely and at all points regard their decrees as superior to the law of the State. In laying obligations on the faithful, Pope Leo XIII, in an outspoken utterance, affirmed:

If the laws of the State are manifestly at variance with the divine law, continuing exactment hurtful to the Church (the Papacy), or conveying injunctions adverse to the duties imposed by (the Roman Catholic) religion, or if they violate in the person of the supreme Pontiff the authority of Jesus Christ, then truly to resist becomes a positive duty, to obey a crime.⁽³⁰⁾

Pope Pius X maintained dogmatically that:

There is no boundary fixed to the domain in which the Church's head can, and ought to, exercise his will . . .

(29) The Roman Catholic Church maintains dogmatically that politics and religion cannot be divorced, since politics is the application of morals to public affairs and morals are definitely in the realm of religion. This is clearly brought out by Cardinal Manning, who said: "Now I may be asked, why should the Holy Father (the Pope) touch on any matter of politics at all? For this plain reason: because politics are a part of morals. Politics are nothing more than the morals of society — the collective morality of Christian men united together under social law. Politics are morals on the widest scale." *Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects* — Henry Edward, Cardinal Manning, Archbishop of Westminster (New York, 1873) Vol. II, p. 83.

(30) *The Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII.* (Bensiger Brothers, New York, 1903) p. 185.

It is indeed an utterly false and pernicious doctrine that the interests of the State should be separated from the interests of the Church⁽³¹⁾

Thus, we witness the Pontiffs voicing the claims of their predecessors in the See of Rome to have power and authority over the whole Church and mankind, spiritual and temporal. But is that sufficient? One who bears witness to himself is not necessarily true. Solemn responsibility is laid upon the claimant of Supremacy, Jurisdiction and Infallibility to give evidence of the validity of his claims. Equal responsibility rests upon the inquirer to examine the evidence which the Roman Catholic Church professes to supply.

The Papacy cannot retreat from its historical position. It cannot consent to the least compromise without destroying the basis not only of its polity but of its spiritual authority.

The Papal position follows with strict logic from the primary dogma of divine appointment. This has been made irreformable by the decree of Infallibility, and to vary it at any point would be to admit that Papal Supremacy and Jurisdiction were not of divine origin, and thus to undermine the whole colossal structure.

Temporal Government of Papacy Re-established

By the Lateran Concordat of February 11, 1929 between the Kingdom of Italy and the Vatican City State, a government was re-established, based upon the theory that the Pope is, by appointment of Almighty God, His sole representative on earth, infallible in matters of faith, supreme in matters of morals and conduct, independent of all human authority and subject to no human laws. The Treaty reasserted the temporal and political power of the

(31) *Vehementer* Nos. 1906.

Pope through the creation of the Vatican City State. All this was recognized by the Italian government as the Pope's right and not conceded as a favor. Pontifical religio-political sovereignty gives the Pope the right to interfere in the affairs of all States.

The renewed assertion of such sovereignty proves that the historic claims of the Papacy have not been abated; that they are not merely held as idealistic philosophy, but they are considered as immediate and Divine Right, to be enforced whenever and wherever practicable. All of which demonstrates that the Popes are not content with spiritual leadership, but are resolute in their determination to get down to the business of the world and wield political and economic power.

The absolutism of the Papacy is based on this claim of Divine Right, and this claim is maintained to be universal, eternally unchangeable by any act of man, and to demand the same loyalty as is given to God Himself.

Shape of Things to Come

One must be blind indeed if he cannot see that the Vatican is putting forth herculean efforts to gain further power and prestige. This extension of authority cannot but be apparent to those who read the articles now appearing in the newspapers and magazines on both sides of the Atlantic.

Pressure is being brought to bear upon the American State Department and the British Foreign Office, (indirectly, of course, but no less effectively), to produce collaboration with the Vatican in the solution of the problems confronting post-war international reconstruction.

We have already referred to the present Pontiff as a man of great intelligence, of large culture and political acumen. Generally regarded as one of the ablest statesmen of the age, the experience of his thirty-eight years spent in the diplomatic service of the Vatican, as Nuncio and Secre-

tary of State, is now of inestimable advantage in the attempts being made to seat a Papal representative at the Peace Conference.

Subjugate and Subdue

The Papacy has its well-laid plans to balance the loss of its power and prestige in Europe and other parts of the world by capturing the English speaking peoples. That this statement is not the rantings of some wild-eyed bigoted Ku Klux Klansman may be seen from the declaration of Cardinal Manning, which is the view of the present British Catholic hierarchy. Addressing the Third Provincial Council of the Archdiocese of Westminster, the Cardinal in bold, unpatriotic utterance thus expressed himself:

This nineteenth century will make a great epoch in the history of the Church. It is good for us to be here in England. It is yours, right Reverend Fathers, to subjugate and subdue, to bend and break the will of an Imperial race; the will which, as the will of Rome of old, rules over nations and people, invincible and inflexible. You have a great commission to fulfill, and great is the prize for which you strive. Surely a soldier's eye and soldier's heart would choose by intuition this field of England for the welfare of the faith. It is the head of Protestantism; the centre of its movements, and the stronghold of its powers. Weakened in England it is paralyzed everywhere; conquered in England it is conquered throughout the world. Once overthrow here, all is but a war of detail. All the roads of the world meet in one point, and, this point reached, the whole world is open to the Church's will. England is the key of the whole position of modern error.⁽³²⁾

(32) Manning, Henry Edward, *Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects*, (Dublin, 1863-73) Vol. I, pp. 166-167; printed also in *The Tablet*, London, August 6, 1859. On another occasion this same prelate spoke of the Pope as "the supreme judge on earth, and director of the consciences of men — of the peasant that tills the field and the prince that sits on the throne; of the household that lives in the shade of privacy, and the legislature that makes laws for the kingdom. The supreme judge on earth of what is right and wrong." *Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects*, Vol. III, p. 97.

That these sentiments are not merely the expressions of a singular Ecclesiastic may be gathered from similar utterance voiced in these United States. Dr. John Ireland, Archbishop of St. Paul, Minnesota, speaking before the Roman Catholic Congress in Baltimore, declared:

Our work is to make America Catholic. Our cry shall be, "God wills it!" and our hearts shall leap with crusader enthusiasm.

Dr. Orestes A. Bronson, one of this country's ablest writers, said in his *Quarterly Review*:

Undoubtedly it is the intention of the Pope to possess this country.

During the First World War, Pope Benedict XV chose the present Pontiff, then known as Monsignor Pacelli, for the delicate mission of Apostolic Nuncio. He employed every scheme known to Vatican diplomacy in an effort to have the Pope represented at the Peace Conference, but nothing came of this. The shrewd statesmen of Europe, foreseeing disastrous consequences, took energetic measures against the Vatican's subterranean intrigue and backstairs plotting.

But the Papacy through all its strange vicissitudes knows nothing of ultimate defeat. It is again making obvious attempts to gauge prevalent opinion and is straining every nerve and sinew through its propaganda agencies to induce the United States and Great Britain to consent to a Papal delegate at the projected Peace Conference, so that in this way the "one voice of Christendom that speaks with justice and absolute impartiality" may be heard. Upon the acceptance of the Pope's council the peace, forsooth, the peace and happiness of the world for many generations will depend!⁽³³⁾

(33) The Rt. Rev. Fulton J. Sheen, D.D., in a radio address sponsored by the "Catholic Hour," stated, "There is no doubt that the Church is returning from exile, and that a great number of thinking people recognize that the Holy See is the only spiritual hope of world peace." *Peace*, published by the National Council of Catholic Men. (Washington, D.C. 1943) p. 70.

In a discourse to the College of Cardinals, on June 2, 1942, Pope Pius XII permitted himself to become rhetorical:

In this tempestuous sea, amid the waves of hate, the waves of love that transport and turn the faithful to the Rock which is Peter's See become the oil that calms the troubled waves and prevents shipwrecks and upheavals. These are the promising signs of victory over the tempest, of the dawn of salvation and of the returning murmur of that placid zephyr, to whose appealing voice no ear can remain closed.⁽³⁴⁾

In all fairness be it said the present Pope is not an arrogant man. Ambitious he is; but his is not the ambition of a self-seeking prelate. Like Hildebrand he is ambitious for his office, not for himself. He by no means impresses the thoughtful reader as being an adventurer making a case out for himself; rather he appears to be a man conscientious and sincere to a fault, but who, nevertheless, to our way of thinking, is a fearfully deluded man.

What Price Post-War Reconstruction?

Dr. John A. Ryan, one of the outstanding figures in the Roman Catholic Church in America, in a recent address stated: "The majority of Catholics have abandoned nationalism and become internationalists."⁽³⁵⁾ That statement is significant, for up to the time when Pope Pius XI reached an agreement with Mussolini in the creation of the Vatican City State, the activities of the Papacy were largely confined to propaganda. Hitherto the Pope's immediate predecessors were wont to echo the lamentations of Pope Leo XIII, who never ceased to bewail the fact that in "being stripped of the temporal sovereignty the Supreme Pontiff is unable to accomplish his universal and divine mission."⁽³⁶⁾

(34) *Victory and Peace*, National Catholic Welfare Conference, (Washington D.C. 1942) p. 15.

(35) Ryan, John A. (Rt. Rev.), *International Post-War Reconstruction*. (National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D.C.) 1943.

(36) *Apostolic Letter*, March 19, 1902.

Since the establishment of the Vatican City State, Catholic propaganda agencies throughout the world have proclaimed the international position and policy of the Papacy, and loudly affirm that the Pope can aid and attain Peace. The Papacy, in voicing its claims to universality, stresses its impartiality as between nations. It harks back to the times of the Holy Roman Empire, when the Papal Church was in fact supreme throughout Western Europe. At that time, acting as the political heir of Imperial Rome, she delegated to temporal rulers that share which concerns purely civil affairs, while reserving the right to intervene, — *as she often did*. The Popes have always claimed the right to control temporal rulers, — to be Caesar as well as Pope. The *Ossevatore Romano*, the Pope's official organ, hailed the creation of Vatican City State as the prelude to the Pope's becoming a supreme judge in international affairs. It said:

The Catholic Church is not a national church, but a universal society and to the head of that society men and all nationalities owe allegiance.⁽³⁷⁾

The Papacy claims that it is acting as an international breakwater against the surging tide of anarchism. It stands for authority. But for authority to be valid it must be properly constituted on a reasonable basis: it must be of a quality that commends men's reverence.

For more than a decade the Roman Catholic Church in America has been waging relentless warfare on "Atheistic Communism." Proletarianism is the Big Bad Wolf in the eyes of the Vatican. Long since we have come to regard its propaganda against Bolshevism as a carefully laid smoke screen behind which it seeks to cover up its own international activities. Comparatively speaking, the emissaries of the Red Internationale are far less dangerous than the Jesuits.

(37) *Ossevatore Romano*, March 1, 1929.

In progressive countries like those of England and the United States, for prudential reasons, the Roman Catholic Church is on her best behavior. But let it be said at once, there is not an abominable atrocity which she has committed throughout her long criminal past that she is not prepared to repeat, when and where the circumstances appear to favor her age-long pursuit of world domination. Let there be no mistake about that.

When in 1939, Eugenio Pacelli became Pope he chose for his coat of arms and motto, a dove with an olive branch in its beak and the words, "Peace in Justice." It was not, therefore, unexpected that in addressing an audience of 20,000 Italian workmen on Sunday, June 13, 1943, he availed himself of the occasion to denounce the enemies of the Vatican as "maliciously trying to throw on the Papacy the responsibility for all the blood that has flowed in the battles on land, in the air and in the sea, and in the ruins of cities."⁽³⁸⁾

Hold, not so fast! One moment, please! Was it not Cardinal Manning, the esteemed friend of "the prisoner of the Vatican," who, with the utmost complacency, declared that the surest means of restoring the Pope to his rightful place in the world, was by a "great world-conflagration"? Did not this self-same prelate predict a "terrible scourge of a Continental war," and that "a deluge of blood" would in all likelihood precede the solution of the "Roman Question"?

These sentiments are not the rabid invention of some narrow-minded, bigoted Protestant. We would suggest that the reader obtain a copy of William Ewart Gladstone's *Vatican Decrees*, wherein the Prime Minister of Great Britain deals with Cardinal Manning's bloody prophecy.⁽³⁹⁾

(38) *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, June 14, 1943.

(39) Gladstone, William E. *The Vatican Decrees, Bearing on Civil Allegiance*, (London, 1874) p.x.

In an article entitled, "Is Killing Murder" published thirty years ago,⁽⁴⁰⁾ we called attention to the following pronouncement by the Third Council of the Lateran, and which was repeated by Pope Urban II:

We do not esteem them to be homicides who, burning with zeal for their mother, the Catholic Church, against excommunicated persons, shall slay some of them.⁽⁴¹⁾

We were accused at once of resurrecting an old bogey, and of stirring the smouldering embers of religious strife. We felt obliged to point out that as the nineteenth century merged into the twentieth, a Jesuit theologian issued a work in two volumes entitled, *The Institutes of Public Ecclesiastical Law*. Not only did it receive the official sanction of the author's Jesuit superiors, but it bore a letter of approval on the paper covers of each volume from no less a personage than Pope Leo XIII. In this present-day Roman Catholic textbook it is affirmed that:

Coercive power belongs to the Church. . . . In this age the right to inflict the severest penalties, even death, belongs to the Church, which possesses the right to adopt any means needful to promote its end. . . . There is no graver offense than heresy . . . and therefore it must be rooted out with fire and sword. . . . It is a Catholic tenet which must be faithfully held, and that the extreme penalty not only may, but must, be inflicted on obstinate heretics . . . that in the case of heretics, death is the one efficient means to the security of society; the only remedy is to send them soon to their place.⁽⁴²⁾

(40) Morgan, Harold Patrick, *The Liberator*, Ottawa, Canada, 1913.

(41) *Decret Grat. Pars. ii, caus xxxiii., qu. 5. ch 47.*

(42) De Luca, Marianus, *Institutiones Juris Ecclesiastici Publici*, Libreria Pontifica, Roma, 1901) Vol. II, p. 142, et seq.

Then, too, in further evidence we printed excerpts from another contemporary Roman Catholic theologian. In the year 1908 a book entitled, *The Stability and Progress of Dogma*, was published at Rome by Alexius H. M. Lepicer, a Canadian by birth, who up to several years ago was professor of Sacred Theology in the Pontifical College De Propaganda Fide. Dr. Lepicer is now the Archbishop of Tarsus. The book is prefaced by a letter from the Pope's secretary, saying that "the Supreme Pontiff was immensely pleased with the work." In reply to the question, "Should heretics be tolerated?", Dr. Lepicer answers:

No one can doubt that they not only deserve to be severed from the Church by excommunication but they ought to be taken away from the midst of the living by death. . . . Wherefore, as soon as anyone makes a public profession of heresy and endeavors to pervert others by words or example not only should he suffer the greater excommunication, but also he should be justly put to death, lest he should destroy very many by his pestilential contagion.⁽⁴³⁾

There is much more to the same purpose in these books, but enough has been given to show that the Church of Rome is indeed as the present Pontiff proudly boasts, "changeless," that it is, in fact, the same in the twentieth century as it was in the thirteenth and fourteenth.

Under the foregoing circumstances, it seemed necessary that we present sound Scriptural reasons why we decline to acknowledge the Supremacy, Jurisdiction and Infallibility of the Roman Pontiffs, and declare ourselves forthrightly in regard to that power of which Macaulay in one of his essays says, that "among the contrivances which have been devised for deceiving and oppressing mankind, it occupies the highest place."

(43) Lepicer, Alexius H. M., *De Stabilitate et Progressu Dogmatis*, Typographia Editeia, Romana, 1908, pp. 173-178.

A final word. In summing up the case against political Romanism, the great German scholar, Dr. Adolf Harnack, formerly Rector of the University of Berlin, says:

As an outward and visible church and a State founded on law and force, Roman Catholicism has nothing to do with the Gospel, nay, it is in fundamental contradiction with it. That this State has borrowed a Divine lustre from the Gospel, and finds this lustre extraordinarily advantageous, cannot avail to upset the verdict. To mix the Divine with the secular, and what is innermost in man with a political element, is to work the greatest mischiefs, because the conscience is thereby enslaved and religion robbed of its solemn character. It is inevitable that this character would be lost when every possible measure which serves to maintain the earthly empire of the church — for example, the sovereignty of the Pope — is proclaimed as the Divine Will. . . .

NO ONE WHO LOOKS AT THE PRESENT POLITICAL SITUATION CAN HAVE ANY GROUND FOR ASSERTING THAT THE POWER OF THE ROMAN CHURCH IS ON THE WANE.⁽⁴⁴⁾

(44) Harnack, Adolf von, *Das Wesen des Christentums*, (Berlin, 1900) pp. 283-5.

Questions and Answers

Pamphlet Series

No. 1. Is the Supreme Deity of Christ a Theological Error?

No. 2. Christ, the Imperative Need of the Hour.

To be published:

No. 4. The Church Not the Subject of Prophecy.

No. 5. Was the Appointment of Matthias Premature and Unwarranted?

No. 6. Did Paul Write the Epistle to the Hebrews?

To be well informed, Know your Bible
Your Problems Solved

For that Bible question that has puzzled you,
there is an answer

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(Impartial Constructive Authentic)

A Periodical Devoted to the Exposition of the Sacred Scriptures which Recognizes the Truth as its Sole Monitor

Edited by Harold P. Morgan

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS is written throughout by those who have earned the right to speak with authority. Our aim is to disseminate biblical information of general interest to earnest readers of the Sacred Scriptures. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS is conducted by Dr. Morgan and a group of experts in the fields of biblical research.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS, while conforming in every particular to the exacting rules of sound biblical scholarship, is, nevertheless, edited and written throughout in simple, direct style, so plain that the average Christian man and woman is able readily to grasp its meaning at a single glance.

One of our chief functions as a nonpartisan, nonprofit institution is to interpret conditions, which at a given moment are of critical concern to the general welfare of the Church.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

**is issued by the Committee on Publications for the
Biblical Information Bureau, Bloomington, Illinois.**

Special Introductory Offer of **Ten Copies for One Dollar.** Address all correspondence regarding subscriptions to Dr. Harold P. Morgan, P. O. Box 185, Bloomington, Illinois, U.S.A. Gifts intended for the Sustentation Fund should be mailed to Mr. M. F. McLaughlin, Chairman of the Committee on Publications, 1912 N. 26th, Kansas City 2, Kansas, U.S.A.