

858936

Terminiello, A.W.  
The 40 questions most  
ADX 0242

The

# 40 Questions

Most Frequently Asked

About The

## Catholic Church

By

Non - Catholics



By REV. A. W. TERMINIELLO



?

*The 40 Questions*

Most Frequently Asked  
About The  
Catholic Church

By

Non - Catholics

+

By REV. A. W. TERMINIELLO

**NIHIL OBSTAT: Rt. Rev. William J. Cusick, D.D., P.A.,  
Censor Librorum.**

**IMPRIMATUR: ✠ Most Rev. T. J. Toolen, D.D., LL.D.,  
Archbishop-Bishop of Mobile-Birmingham.  
ham.**

**Copyright 1956**

**by**

**Arthur W. Terminiello**

**Deacidified**

# Foreword

At the insistent urging of many of my confreres who are familiar with the work of the PASTOR'S FIRESIDE Radio and TV programs during the past eight years, I have decided to publish the forty questions most asked during these question and answer programs. These questions represent, likewise, the mostly frequently asked questions during eight additional years of street preaching.

It is hoped that this pamphlet will be helpful to the clergy in understanding the problems of non-Catholics; and that those who are interested in the Catholic Church will receive from them the necessary impetus to signify their interest to some priest of their choice. In this regard I can speak for all my brothers in the priesthood. Any one of us would feel it a God-given privilege to consult with you, advise you and instruct you if you so desire.

**REV. A. W. TERMINIELLO**



## **Chained Bibles?**

*Is it not true that the Church chained Bibles in the Middle Ages?*

**The Church DID chain Bibles in the Middle Ages; and for the same reason that the Telephone Company chains its directories to the booth—to prevent people from STEALING them.**

**We must remember that each Bible had to be copied by hand and that it took the lifetime of a monk to do this. According to standards today, each one of these Bibles would probably be worth \$10,000. Records have been compiled which show that there were 5,000 chained books in 11 Protestant and 2 Catholic libraries. The Reformers, likewise, chained their Bibles in their churches for at least 300 years. Therefore, Catholics were not alone in chaining Bibles.**

## Oldest Bibles?

*Which is older, the Catholic or non-Catholic version of the Bible?*

The Catholic version is more than 1000 years older than any non-Catholic version.

- (a) The source of the Catholic version (which contains the seven missing books) is called the “Septuagint Version,” and dates to 280 B.C., and was the one used by Christ and the Apostles. The source of the non-Catholic version (the Massoretic Text) did not come into existence until about 1000 years later.
- (b) The canon, or official list of books, was established by the Council of Carthage in 397. It was more than a thousand years later (1534) that the first non-Catholic Bible, the Lutheran, came into existence as a complete Old and New Testament.



# Bible Differences?

*What are some of the differences between the Catholic and the Protestant versions of the Bible?*

The chief difference is in the omission of seven complete books and parts of two others from the Old Testament in the Protestant versions. The books omitted are:

Tobias	I Macabees
Judith	II Macabees
Wisdom	Esther (part)
Ecclesiasticus	Daniel (part)
Baruch	

These omissions should certainly be a matter of concern and investigation. The entire Christian world accepted them as the inspired Word of God until the Reformation. If they did not belong there, then God had permitted the entire Christian world to be led astray for more than a thousand years. On the other hand, if they DO belong there, then Protestants are being deprived of a good portion of revelation and the inspired Word. No one would presume to say that anything inspired by God is unimportant.

## **Bible Alone?**

*Why is the Bible alone not sufficient as our rule of faith or guide to the teaching of Christ?*

**The Bible alone is not sufficient as a guide to Christ's teaching, because:**

**(a) It was not CHRIST'S way.**

**Only two of the Apostles wrote Gospels; and only five wrote Epistles. All would have done so if it were Christ's intention to spread the Gospel by the circulation of books. On the contrary, the Apostles were commissioned to teach and preach in His name.**

**(b) The Bible alone is not a SAFE guide.**

**There are many millions who cannot read. And there are many passages which are difficult to understand. St. Peter admits this in speaking of the Epistles of St. Paul.**

**"In these epistles there are certain things difficult to understand, which the unlearned and the unstable distort, just as they do the rest of the Scriptures also, to their own destruction."**

**2 Peter 3:16**

**(c) The Bible alone is not COMPLETE.**

**“There are, however, many other things that Jesus did; but if every one of these should be written, not even the world itself, I think, could hold the books that would have to be written. Amen.”**

**St. John 21:25**

**(d) The Bible alone is not CLEAR. Read Acts 18:26-31.**

**Likewise we see the hundreds of denominations, all of which claim to get their religion from the same Bible, believe contrary doctrines.**

## Traditions of Men?

*By what right does the Catholic Church teach doctrines which are not found in the Bible? Is this not what St. Mark calls "Making the word of God of no effect through your traditions?" or what St. Matthew calls "Teaching for doctrines, the commandments of men"?*

This certainly would present a problem for the sincere seeker after truth who believes that all revelation is found in the Bible and the Bible ALONE.

By tradition we mean the official interpretation of the teaching Church, clarifying the written teachings of the Apostles. It also includes the UNWRITTEN teaching of the Apostles and the Church, handed down through the Fathers, the councils, the decisions of the Popes and the liturgy of the Church

Scripture is certainly the basis for this tradition. Christ sent His Apostles to teach:

"All power in heaven and in earth has been given to me. Go, therefore, etc."

St. Matt. 28:18-19

They were to teach with His authority and to teach all things He taught. They were to go and **PREACH:**

“Go into the whole world and preach the gospel to **EVERY** creature.”

St. Mark 16:15-16

They were to be **WITNESSES:**

“In Jerusalem in all Judea and Samaria, and even to the utmost parts of the earth.”

Acts 1:8

Nowhere is there a command to **WRITE** anything. And so the Church has the duty and the commission to teach all things that Christ taught whether or not those things have been committed specifically to Holy Scripture.

Tradition itself is mentioned by St. Paul:

“Hold to the form of sound teaching which thou hast heard from me.”

II Tim. 1:13

Not only was His written word to be obeyed; but also the doctrine committed to them by speech.

“The things which thou hast heard from me through many witnesses, commend to trustworthy men, who shall be competent in turn to teach others.”

II Tim. 2:2

In other words, the teaching of Paul was to be handed down through teachers who were to follow him. In Romans he says:

“How then are they to call upon Him whom they have not believed? But how are they to believe Him whom they have not heard? . . . And how are men to preach unless they be sent?”

Romans 10:14-15

We must remember that before the last Apostle, St. John, died, there had already been a succession of four Popes—St. Peter (33-67), Linus (67-79), Cletus (79-91), Clement (91-100).

These men who were accepted by the whole Christian Church as the supreme authorities in matters of faith and morals, were teaching before the New Testament was completed. All the Apostles, moreover, except John, were dead **BEFORE** the entire New Testament was written.

So Catholics do not believe that they are teaching doctrines of **MEN**, or the traditions of men, or commandments of men. They are teaching **DIVINE** tradition.

In the texts mentioned in the question, Matthew 15:9 and Mark 7:13, Christ is speaking of the Pharisees and their **UNREASONABLE** commandments.

## Luther Discover Bible?

*Was it not Luther who discovered the Bible, and was he not the first to translate it into the language of the people?*

Of course, this is a falsehood. Luther, himself, in his Table Talks said, "When I was young I acquainted myself with the Bible — read the same often, so that I knew where any reference was contained and could be found when anyone spoke about it." Luther's translation of the New Testament was not published until 1522, and his version of the Old Testament was not published until 1534.

Catholics, between the years 1466 and 1522, had already published fourteen complete editions of the Bible in high German and five in low German. During this same period of time, that is, from 1450 to 1520, Catholics had also published 156 Latin, 6 Hebrew editions of the Bible, besides 11 complete editions in Italian, 10 in French, 2 in Bohemian, 1 in Flemish, and 1 in Russian.

The objection to Luther's translation is summed up by a non-Catholic as follows:

"He has in many places confused, stultified and perverted the old trustworthy text to its great disadvantage, and also

poisoned it with heretical glosses and prefaces — he almost everywhere forces the Scriptures on the question of faith and works, even when neither faith nor works are thought of.” (Janssen, History of the German People, XIV, 425).

The same author points out 1,400 inaccuracies. Bunsen, another Protestant, mentions 3,000 inaccuracies.

We know that he ridiculed the Book of Ecclesiastes, that he rejected the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse as not being Apostolic, and that he called the Epistle of St. James, “An Epistle of straw.” He changed the meaning in Romans 3:20 and Romans 4:15 by adding the word “only.” Likewise, he added the word “alone” in Romans 3:28. When this was pointed out to him, he made this comment:

“If your new papist makes much ado about the word ‘alone’ just say straight out to him: ‘Dr. Luther will have it so, and says, papist and donkey are one and the same things; thus I will and am Determined to have it; my will is the reason’.”



## Search the Scriptures?

*Are we not told in John 5:39 that the Bible is the only source of faith: "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life and they are they which testify of me." (K. J.) . . . . So, too, in II Timothy, 3:16-17, where we are told that all Scripture "is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, etc."?*

**These texts do not prove that Scripture alone is the guide or rule of faith. In the first text (John 5:39), Christ is not telling the Jews to read the NEW TESTAMENT to find His gospel because the New Testament did not exist. He is rather insisting upon the fact that they gain no profit from their own reading of the OLD TESTAMENT because they fail to recognize Him as the Messiah. The word "search" is in the indicative and not the imperative mood.**

Christ is talking here to the Bereans who read the Scriptures to see whether He had correctly cited the Old Testament and whether His interpretation was true.

The text of II Timothy likewise proves nothing in this regard because St. Paul is speaking to Timothy at a time when a good portion of the New Testament had not yet been completed. This is evident from the preceding verse which is seldom quoted along with verses 16 and 17. Verse 15 reads as follows in the King James version:

“And that from a child thou hast known the sacred Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.”

Certainly St. Paul is not talking of the NEW Testament, but rather of the OLD. From the Old Testament, of course, Timothy could get a knowledge that would lead him to accept Christ and His teachings as he did.

## **Christ's Church — Corrupt?**

*Is it not true that the Catholic Church became so corrupt before the 16th Century that it was no longer the Church of Christ?*

So-called “reformers” have chosen different points of history at which the Church of Christ was supposed to have become corrupt. No matter what point is chosen, it must then be admitted that UNTIL that particular time, the Catholic Church (the only one then in existence) was the true Church of Christ. To admit CORRUPTION OR APOSTASY, is to say that Christ failed in establishing a church—either because He COULD not, or He WOULD not keep His promise.

Three texts of Scripture prove that Christ made the promise that His church would go on until the end of time:

- (1) Matthew 28:18-20. Christ promised that He himself would remain with the Church until consummation of the world.

- (2) **Matthew 16:18.** His promise to Peter that He would build His church upon him as a rock and that the gates of hell would not prevail against it.
- (3) **John 14:16.** Christ promised to send the Holy Ghost to abide with the Church forever.

**These promises were made by the Son of God; and therefore, He INTENDED to keep them, and WAS ABLE to keep them.**

**Although individuals, large groups of men, and even entire nations, have apostatized from the God, we can never say that the Church itself apostatized; for this would mean that Christ had not kept His promises.**

## Undemocratic?

*Does your Church not deprive Catholics of the democratic freedom of thought which is enjoyed by Protestants?*

The Church does not claim to be a democracy; and no Catholic resents the fact that he is not allowed to carry freedom to the extent of license. No sane person would want the privilege of denying absolute truth.

Furthermore, it is not for the individual to choose the type of government he would like in the church. The type of government was chosen by the Christ Himself and was a government based upon authority in teaching and discipline.

Christ Himself taught with authority, changing even the Mosaic Law. Matthew 5:20-23).

He conferred this same authority on His Apostles:

“And whatever thou shalt bind upon earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever thou shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven.”

St. Matthew 16:19

The Apostles exercised this authority as we read throughout the Acts of the Apostles.

Likewise St. Paul wrote to the Galatians:

“But even if we or an angel from heaven should preach a gospel to you other than that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema.”

Galatians 1:8

St. John, in his second Epistle, wrote:

“If anyone comes to you and does not bring THIS doctrine, do not receive Him.”

II John 1:10

Furthermore, the Apostles were commissioned to go and teach in the NAME of Christ and with the AUTHORITY of Christ. If there are teachers, there must be students, and the students must accept the authority of the teacher.

Catholics, of course, do enjoy freedom of thought. This freedom is limited only by absolute truth. No one is free to say that the sum of two plus two equals five.

So, too, in the government of the Church the Church was founded upon Peter as the rock as we shall see in another question.

## Peter - or - Christ — the Rock?

*Christ made Himself the rock foundation in Matthew 16:18. . . . Does the Church not usurp the power of Christ by claiming that Peter was the rock foundation and the Popes his successors?*

A careful reading of Matthew 16:18 in the light of St. John 1:41 should show us that Christ, in speaking of the rock, was referring to Peter and NOT of Himself. Of course we all admit that Christ is the founder of His Church. But St. Peter was the one chosen to be the temporal ruler of this church. St. John tells the story of the meeting of St. Peter and our Lord in St. John 1:42 when Christ said to him:

“Thou art Simon, the son of John; thou shalt be called Cephas” (which interpreted is Peter).

The word “Peter” in Aramaic which Christ was speaking meant “a rock.” Christ was following the practice among Orientals of changing the name of a person to signify a new function which he was to perform. Two years later, Christ was

actually to change the name of Simon and to promise to build His Church upon PETER.

“Thou art Peter (i.e., a rock), and upon this rock I will build my church.”

St. Matt. 16:18

A reading of this chapter from 13 to 20 will show that PETER was the one who was to be the rock. The LORD first asked for a sign of faith from Peter. Peter said, “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.” He then rewarded him, “Blessed art thou Simon Bar-Jona—because flesh and blood has not revealed this to thee but my Father in heaven.” And then He changed his name.

“And I say to thee, thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church and the gates of hell will not prevail against it.”

St. Matt. 16:18-20

Certainly Christ would not CONFOUND GRAMMATICAL CONSTRUCTION by saying, “I say to thee (speaking to PETER), thou art Peter (and then changing in the same sentence), upon this rock (that is, upon Me), I will build my church.”

In the very next verse he then goes back TO PETER, “And I will give to THEE the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shall



bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever THOU shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.”

He FULFILLED this promise after His resurrection when He commanded Peter to feed His lambs and also His sheep. St. John 21:15, 17.

Peter EXERCISED this jurisdiction:

- (a) His name was always first on the lists of Apostles.
- (b) He proposed the election of an Apostle to succeed Judas. Acts 1:21-26.
- (c) He preached the first sermon on Pentecost Sunday. Acts 2.
- (d) He worked the first miracle. Acts 3:6-8.
- (e) At the council of Jerusalem, all the Apostles submitted to his authority. Acts 15:7-12.

History proves that from that time on, both in the East and the West, the successor of Peter was acknowledged to be the supreme head of the Church. Since that day there have been 265 successors to St. Peter. That this was Christ's plan is found in the same chapter where He said that the Church founded upon THIS rock foundation was to endure until the end of time and that the gates of hell would NOT prevail against it. The Church was to have the same foundation, for if the Church was to go on there must be successors who would carry on the work of Peter, the rock.

# You Invite Me — I Can't Invite You . . . Why?

*Why is it that Catholics invite us to their Churches and will not go to ours when we invite them?*

When we as Catholics invite you to our Church we are not asking you to commit sin. We are not asking you to do anything which would violate your conscience. As a logical Protestant you must admit that one church is as good as another. This is based on private judgment, the fundamental doctrine of Protestantism. Every Protestant **MUST ADMIT** that every other person is just as correct as he is, and has the same right to worship God in any way he chooses. This would mean that the Catholic Church, too, is as good as any other Church; and there would be no guilt attached to attendance at a Catholic Church.

On the other hand Catholics believe that Christ decided what form of worship He wanted. He was God and had the right to say that He would be worshipped in this way or that way. We believe

that He established only ONE form of worship, and intended us to participate in THAT FORM.

We are not free to say we would rather do it OUR way. Therefore for a Catholic to participate in any other form of worship would be a violation of his conscience; and this means sin. Therefore, when you invite us (in all good faith) to worship with you, you are in effect asking us to commit sin. We, of course, know this is not your intention.

Catholics are, however, permitted to participate with non-Catholics in services such as marriages, funerals, etc.

## Only “Accept” Jesus?

*Is it not sufficient to “Accept Jesus” in order to be saved through the merits of Jesus Christ?*

Christ could not have made mere “acceptance” of Himself sufficient for salvation since the observance of some of the commandments is required by natural law. His plan included not only hope or “acceptance” but also the observance of the commandments, faith, baptism, etc.

“Not everyone who says to me ‘Lord, Lord’ shall enter the kingdom of heaven; but he who does the will of my Father in heaven shall enter the kingdom of heaven.”

St. Matt. 7:21

# What Difference Which Church?

*Is it not true that all Churches are good, and that it makes no difference what we believe as long as we live right?*

No, this is not true for:

- (a) This would mean that truth and falsehood were equally pleasing to God.
- (b) That the unity for which Christ prayed would be an impossibility.
- (c) It **DOES** make a difference what we believe as well as what we do.

**“He who believes and is baptized shall be saved, but he who does not believe shall be condemned.”**

**St. Matt. 16:16**

**“He who hears you, hears me; and he who rejects you, rejects me; and he who rejects me, rejects Him who sent me.”**

**St. Luke 10:16**

**“But if he refuse to hear even the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican.”**

**St. Matt. 18:17**

## Faith vs. Good Works?

*How do you explain the Catholic position with regard to good works when St. Paul teaches that a man is justified by faith: "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law." (Romans 3:28).*

Outside the Catholic Church the average person has an entirely erroneous idea of the Catholic Church's position on the question of good works. No Catholic has ever taught that a person can be **SAVED** by good works. Certainly he can be **JUSTIFIED** by faith, but not by faith alone.

**"We are justified by a faith that worketh by charity.**

**Gal. 5:6**

We believe that the human race was redeemed by the death of Christ on the cross, but that more than the acceptance of this is necessary. It is necessary for each individual to personalize this atonement of our Lord by his own co-operation, i.e., by faith, baptism, the keeping of the commandments and observing all things that Christ has taught.

Furthermore, good works are necessary in order to help a person persevere in the state of grace or friendship with God. He has told us this when He said that he who gives a glass of water in His name, gives it to Him; that we must love our neighbors as we love ourselves; that we must do good to those who hate us and persecute us; that we must feed the hungry and clothe the naked; and perform all the other corporal and spiritual works of mercy.

For God to ignore these good works, and not attach merit to them, would be unjust. He Himself says this through St. Paul.

“For God is not unjust that He should forget your works.”

Hebrews 6:10

Those who are doubtful about the place of good works in the plan of Redemption should read the Epistle of St. James, Chapter 2:

- (14) “What will it profit, my brethren, if a man says he has faith, but does not have works? Can the faith save him?”
- (17) “So faith too, unless it has works, is dead in itself.”
- (18) “But someone will say, ‘Thou hast faith, and I have works. Show me thy faith without works, and I, from my works, will show thee my faith’.”

- (20) "But dost thou want to know, O senseless man, that faith without works is useless?"
- (24) "You see that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only."
- (26) "For just as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith also without works is dead."

Likewise, in I Corinthians 13:2.

"And if I have prophecy and know all mysteries and all knowledge, and if I have faith, so as to remove mountains, yet do not have charity, I am nothing."

Therefore, although a man is not **SAVED** by works, yet works are pleasing in the sight of God, and **HAVE VALUE** since they are done for Him. They thus help the individual to preserve in the state of grace or friendship with God.



# Salvation for Protestants?

*Can Protestants be saved?*

Protestants who sincerely believe that they are in the right church **CAN** be saved provided they die without **UNREPENTED** mortal sin.

If these persons are not baptized, it is possible for them to have baptism of desire, that is, if these persons do all they know God expects of them, we say they have baptism of desire. This means they **WOULD** desire baptism if they knew its importance since they do all else that God has required as far as they know. These persons belong to what is called "the Soul of the Church."

# Assurance of Salvation?

*Why is it that Catholics do not believe in "Assurance of Salvation" here and now?*

Because we believe that man remains free to serve or offend God throughout his entire life, and that we are saved only when our life is completed by death. We likewise believe that as long as there is life, there is the possibility of offending God and losing our souls.

To have a positive here-and-now assurance of salvation is contrary to experience and Scripture. It would presume:

(1) That there is no possibility of future sin, either;

(a) Because the assured CANNOT SIN. Scripture tells us, however, that even the JUST man shall fall seven times seven.

Proverbs 24:16

**We are likewise told that if we imagine that we can remain sinless we are deceiving ourselves.**

**“If we say we have NO SIN we deceive ourselves.”**

**I John 1:8**

- (b) Or because sin will not be IMPUTED to us.**
- (c) Or because we WILL repent before it is too late. This would mean that the “acceptance of Jesus” had taken away our free will, as would, indeed, happen in either of the above assumptions.**

**Scripture proves that this is not the teaching of the Apostles. St. Paul, who certainly had “accepted Jesus,” was not thereby SURE of his salvation.**

**“But I chastize my body and bring it into subjection, less perhaps after preaching to others, I myself should be rejected.”**

**I Corinthians 9:27**

**“Therefore let him who thinks he stands, take heed lest he fall.”**

**I Corinthians 10:12**

Catholics do have MORAL certainty from the words of Scripture in many places, for example:

**“He that eateth this flesh shall live forever.”**

**St. John 6:52**

**“Is any man sick among you? Let him call in the priests of the church who will anoint him with oil in the name of the Lord, etc.”**

**James 5:14**

**“Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them; whose sins you shall retain they are retained.”**

**St. John 20:22, 23**

This moral certainly is based upon the fact that we are doing all that we can, with the help of God, to save our souls.

## East or West?

*Is the Orthodox Greek Church the same as the Roman Catholic Church?*

The Catholic Church is divided geographically into two great divisions, the East and the West. In the East there is a further division of churches into those which are in communion with the Pope and those which are not. Those which are connected with Rome are called "UNIATE," or more correctly, "Eastern CATHOLIC Churches." Those which are not connected with Rome are called Orthodox Churches.

The Greek Church is one of these Eastern Churches, and in Greece, this Church is divided into those who are united with Rome and those who are not. That is, the Catholic Greek Church and the Orthodox Greek Church.

The Orthodox Eastern Churches are divided into many branches and acknowledge the supremacy of five Patriarchs — Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Cyprus.

**In essential matters, the Orthodox Churches believe as the Western Church for the most part. However, they do not accept the authority of the Pope. Their priests are validly ordained and their bishops validly consecrated. Priests are allowed to be married men, provided they marry before they become deacons.**

**Their liturgy is similar to the Catholic Eastern liturgy, but different from the Western liturgy except in essential parts such as the consecration.**

## Unmarried Priests?

*Why is that Catholics priests do not marry?*

The Church has always considered marriage as a Sacrament and something sacred. The fact that priests do not marry is not a condemnation of marriage. The reason is that priests **VOLUNTARILY** give up the married state in order that they may give themselves entirely to the service of God and the care of His people. This is a disciplinary law of the Church; and the Church, for good reason, may dispense from the law.

St. Paul gives this as the reason in his Epistle to the Corinthians:

“I would have you free from care. He who is unmarried is concerned about the things of the Lord, how he may please God. Whereas, he who is married is concerned about the things of the world, how he may please his wife; and he is divided.”

I Cor. 7:32, 33

In the Eastern Churches connected with Rome, priests are permitted to be married men provided they marry before they become deacons.

# Infallible Humans?

*How can Catholics claim that a mere human being can be infallible?*

It is strange to hear such an argument from individuals who believe that every human being, learned and unlearned alike, is infallible through the principle of private judgment i.e., that one man's judgment is as good as another, and that everybody's judgment is correct.

Infallibility means that God guarantees that in matters of faith and morals the Pope cannot make a mistake.

Infallibility **DOES NOT** mean that the Pope cannot sin; nor does it mean that he cannot make a mistake in other matters such as history, politics, science and the like. Only when he declares a certain truth to be a matter of revelation is he infallible.

There are four conditions which are necessary in order that the Pope be infallible:

- (1) He must speak as the chief pastor and teacher of the Church. The words he uses must make it clear to all that he is speaking as the head of the Church in a matter of faith or morals.



- (2) He must be speaking to the universal Church, that is, to Christians everywhere in the world.
- (3) He must speak “ex cathedra,” that is, officially, with supreme apostolic authority.
- (4) It must be on a matter of faith or morals, and not on any other subject. Proof for this is found in St. Paul’s first Epistle to Timothy where he speaks of the Church of Christ as “the pillar and mainstay of truth.” Likewise, in St. John’s Gospel, “I will ask the Father and He will give you another advocate, to dwell with you forever.”

Likewise, we know from Scripture that Christ promised that the gates of hell would not prevail against the Church and that He promised to be with the Church until the end of time. If these promises mean anything, they mean that Christ would protect the Church in its TEACHING of the truth because He established this Church primarily as a teaching Church.

This does not limit discussion or debate among its members, because the Church uses this protection of the Holy Ghost only in extreme cases where it is necessary to settle the truth of a question; and this, always on fundamental truths.

## Dipping or Pouring?

*Why doesn't the Church baptize by immersion as do all other Churches?*

The Church recognizes either of the three forms of Baptism as valid:

- (1) Immersion—or dipping.
- (2) Infusion—or pouring.
- (3) Aspersion—or sprinkling.

In any form it is necessary that the minister have the proper intention, i.e., to remove original sin.

The Church uses pouring for practical reasons since it would be impossible to dip a baby, a person in prison or a person in a hospital.

Although it is true that until the 13th Century, the Church usually baptized by dipping, we do find authority for **POURING** in one of the oldest books of Christianity, the Didache, or the "Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles," which dates back to the year 98. In this book we read:

"Baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost in running water, but if thou hast no running water, baptize in other water, and if thou canst not in cold, then in warm. But if thou hast neither, pour water three times on the head in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

# Baptism of Infants?

*Why does your Church baptize infants?  
They cannot acknowledge Christ.*

In instituting the Sacrament of Baptism, Christ made no exceptions. His command was:

“Teach ye all nations, baptizing them, etc.”

St. Mark (16:15) likewise makes no exceptions:

“Go into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature. He who believes and is baptized shall be saved, but he who does not shall be condemned.”

In this passage Christ speaks plainly and says that UNBELIEF is sufficient to incur damnation but that FAITH does NOT insure salvation unless it is accompanied by baptism. His command in John 3:5 includes all, “Unless a man be born again of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.”

In addition to those examples, there are the “household” passages where entire families were baptized and where we PRESUME there must have been children in some of them.

These household Scripture texts, however, are relatively weak. But the tradition of the Church is so conclusive that some Protestants lay aside the "Bible alone" principle and baptize infants on the strength of Catholic tradition.

Recent discoveries in the Roman catacombs prove that infant baptism was common in the primitive Church. Thus a certain Murtius Verinus placed on the tomb of his children the inscription: "Verina received (baptism) at the age of ten months, Florina at the age of twelve months."

Above another tomb we read: "Here rests Archillia, a newly-baptized (infant); she was one year and five months old, died February 23rd."

# Why Not Confess to God Instead of to a Mere Man?

*Why is it Catholics go to confession to a mere man in order to confess their sins? Is it not easier to go directly to God?*

Yes, it is easier to go to God, and probably this is why Christ did not chose this method.

We confess to a man, not because he himself has the power to forgive sins, but because he acts as an agent, or a judge, in the name of God, and forgives sins in His name.

The words of institution prove that Christ intended specific confession of sins:

**“He, therefore, said to them again, ‘Peace be to you! As the Father has sent me, I also send you.’ When He had said this, He breathed upon them and said to them, ‘Receive the Holy Spirit; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them, whose sins you shall retain, they are retained’.”**

**St. John 20:21, 22**

By these words Christ gave to His Apostles the power EITHER to forgive OR to retain. In order to exercise this judicial power it is necessary for the sinner to accuse himself specifically of his sins. Most sins are committed in secret and the priest-judge would have no other way of knowing these sins, except by specific confession.

Furthermore, the priest as a judge must give a penance or work of satisfaction which is proportionate to the sins and helpful to the sinner. This he can do only if he knows what sins have been committed.

The fact that the priest is a sinner, as are all men, does not affect the power which he exercises. The power comes to him from his office. The same is true with a President or with a judge in our civil courts. The private lives of these individuals does not affect the authority which they have under the Constitution.

## Unpardonable Sin?

*Are there sins that God cannot pardon?  
Does not Christ speak of this sin against  
the Holy Ghost in Matthew 12:31-32?*

There is no sin which God cannot and will not pardon. This is evident from the text in I Timothy where we read:

“This is good and agreeable in the sight of God our Saviour, who wishes all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth.”

I Tim. 2:3, 4

St. Matthew, in Chapter 12, is speaking of the Pharisees who attributed the miracle of the curing of the blind and dumb to the devil. We read this in verse 24 of the same chapter:

“But the Pharisees, hearing this, said, ‘This man does not cast out devils except by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils’.”

The unpardonable sin, then, for the Pharisees and for all people is the wilful rejection of the grace of God. Wilful rejection means that the sinner refuses to repent despite all the graces God bestows upon him. He will not receive God’s pardon because he will not ask for it, and will not do what is necessary to obtain it. As long as he remains in this condition, of course, he cannot be pardoned.

## Real Body — Real Blood?

*Do Catholics really believe they are receiving the Body and Blood of Christ in Communion?*

Christ instituted the Holy Eucharist on the night before He died, i.e., on the first Holy Thursday, when He changed bread and wine into His Body and Blood; and then commanded His Apostles to do what He had done in commemoration of Him.

“And while they were at supper, Jesus took bread, and blessed and broke, and gave it to His disciples, and said, ‘Take and eat; this is my body.’ . . . And taking a cup, He gave thanks and gave it to them, saying, ‘All of you drink of this; for this is my blood of the new covenant’.”

St. Matt. 26:26, 28

Our Lord meant literally to change the bread and wine into His body and blood instead of leaving us a mere symbol or memorial of His passion.



We know this from the words of His promise to do this in St. John's gospel, Chapter 6. The important words of this chapter are:

- (a) John 6:52, "The bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world."
- (b) John 6:52, "... unless you eat of the flesh of the Son of man, ye shall not have life in you."
- (c) John 6:56, "For my flesh is food indeed and my blood is drink indeed."

These and other texts must be taken literally because the entire context demands it; and because any other interpretation would involve us in absurd consequences. The words, "Eat my flesh and drink my blood" in a figurative interpretation would mean to "persecute or hate bitterly." In this sense, it would mean that our Lord would promise those who hate Him, eternal life and glorious resurrection.

The grammatical construction of the phrases, "This is My Body," and "This is My Blood," does not admit of a figurative or symbolic meaning. When the verb "to be" is used, the antecedent must always be identical with the consequent, i.e., "This" must be identical with "My Body." Therefore, there must have been a change of substance.

**The Apostles understood Christ to speak literally.**

**“The cup of benediction which we bless, is it not the sharing of the blood of Christ, And the bread that we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord?”**

**I Cor. 10:16**

**“Therefore, whoever eats this bread or drinks the cup of blessing which we bless, unworthily, will be guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord.”**

**I Cor. 10:27**

**This has been the continuous belief of Christianity until the time of the Reformation.**

# Why Latin?

*Why is the Mass celebrated in Latin?*

- (a) Because Latin is the official language of the Church. It was adopted as such because it was at one time the official language of a large part of the civilized world.
- (b) Latin is a dead language and therefore the meaning of words remains constant.
- (c) To preserve the uniformity of the Mass in different countries and at different times. Latin makes it possible for a person to be able to follow the Mass as easily in China as in America.

## Communion — One Form?

*Why do you deny the people the right to receive Communion under the form of wine as well as bread?*

Protestants argue the necessity for receiving under both forms from three passages of Scripture:

(1) St. John 6:55:

“He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood, has life everlasting.”

(2) St. John 6:57:

“He who eats my flesh, and drinks my blood, abides in me and I in him.”

For each one of these passages where eating AND drinking are mentioned together, there is another passage which mentions eating alone. For example:

(1) St. John 6:59:

“He who eats this BREAD shall live forever.”

(2) St. John 6:52:

“This BREAD that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world.”

The third text used as an argument against the Catholic practice is:

**“Therefore, whoever eats this bread OR DRINKS the cup of the Lord unworthily, will be guilty of the body AND the blood of the Lord.”**

**I Cor. 11:27**

The King James Version changed the reading “OR drink” to “AND drink.” However, the reading “OR drink” has such overwhelming evidence that the King James Revised and the Standard Revised Versions have gone back to this Catholic reading. The Catholic reading **COULD BE PARAPHRASED** as follows, if we break it down into its grammatical parts:

**“Whoever shall eat this BREAD UNWORTHILY, shall be guilty of the body AND the blood of the Lord.”**

**Likewise:**

**“Whosoever shall drink the CHALICE of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the body AND the blood of the Lord.”**

This is so because Christ is present entirely under **EITHER** form.

However, the important thing is not the mode of reception, for just as in Baptism, our Lord left the form to **BE DETERMINED** by the Apostles and their successors. The important thing in the reception of Holy Communion is that we receive the Body and Blood of Christ really and actually. This fundamental fact is ignored in a discussion of the manner of reception.

The truth of the real presence is brought out very clearly in this passage which is so often quoted by Protestants, I Corinthians 11:27, where we read that a person who **RECEIVES CHRIST** unworthily is **GUILTY** of the Body and the Blood of Christ. Without the real presence this passage would be meaningless. There could be no guilt attached to the reception of a mere memorial.

## One Mediator—?

*Does not Scripture in I Tim. 2:5 tell us that there is only one mediator? Why, then, do Catholics pray to the Saints and to Mary?*

Again, this is an example of taking a text out of its context. As a matter of fact Protestants as well as Catholics do use prayers of **SECONDARY** mediators. Do you not ask your minister to pray for you? Do you not ask your friends to pray for you? If no **SECONDARY** mediator is necessary, then why ask them to pray for you? Why not go directly to God?

As with all Christians we believe that all graces come to us through Christ as the **PRI-MARY** mediator. This does not mean, however, that we should not go to God the Father or to the Holy Ghost directly. The logical inference from the literal translation of I Tim. 2:5 is that we must **ALWAYS** go to Christ first. On the contrary, we have the words of Christ Himself telling us that when we pray we should say, "Our Father who art in heaven, etc."

That the text of I Tim. 2:5 is NOT to be taken literally is evident from other sources of St. Paul.

“I beseech you, therefore, brethren, through our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the charity of the Holy Ghost, that you help me in your prayers for me to God.”

Rom. 15:30

Likewise in the Apocalypse (or Revelations) we read:

“And when He had opened the scroll, the four living creatures and the twenty-four ancients fell down before the Lamb, having each of them a harp, and golden bowls full of incense, WHICH ARE THE PRAYERS OF THE SAINTS.”

Apoc. 5:8

Also in this same inspired Book:

“And the smoke of the incense of the prayers of the Saints ascended up before God, from the hand of the angel.”

The Catholic belief is based upon the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ, i.e., that all baptized Christians are members of the Mystical Body of Christ and that all are working for the same objectives, the glory of God and the salvation of souls. The very act of going to an intermediary and asking him to go to Christ is an



acknowledgment that we believe all graces and blessings can come only from Christ. Furthermore, it does not seem logical that we be permitted to ask living human beings to intercede for us, and yet be forbidden to ask the saints of God to pray for us.

We pray to Mary because her influence with her Son is greater than that of any other saint.

On earth the power of this intercession was proved at the marriage feast of Cana where Christ performed His first miracle before the time set by Divine Providence, because Mary had asked Him to do so. (St. John 2:1-11).

The power of this intercession still exists in heaven since the mother-Son relationship still exists and because we have so much evidence of this intercession here on earth, i.e., the apparitions at Lourdes, Fatima, etc.

# Mary - Worship?

*Where do you find Scripture for your worship of Mary?*

Catholics do not “worship” Mary in the sense that we worship God. We do not make her equal to God, nor a substitute for God, nor a sort of a “goddess.” We consider her a creature of God—but the purest of creatures, and the one whom God must love above all creatures because of her purity and her function as the mother of the Redeemer. Instead of worshipping Mary, we venerate or honor her.

We honor Mary:

- (1) Because she is the mother of Jesus, the Son of God. Certainly this fact alone makes her unique among all the millions of creatures of all times. We honor men and women of the world for less dignity and less important work.
- (2) Because Mary was honored by God the Father, Who chose her as the mother of His Divine Son, and sent His angel to announce this choice to her.

**“Now in the sixth month, the angel Gabriel was sent from God to a town of Galilee, called Nazareth, to a virgin betrothed to a man named Joseph, of the House of David, and the virgin’s name was Mary.”**

**St. Luke 1:26, 27**

**(3) Because the Son loved her as His own mother.**

**“But when the fullness of time came, God sent His Son, born of a woman, born under law.”**

**Galatians 4:4**

The following texts of Scripture demonstrate the honor paid to Mary. The sincere seeker will want to read the entire texts.

**Gen. 3:15—The “WOMAN” who would crush the head of the serpent. Can any other woman But Mary be suggested?**

**Isa. 7:14—Prophecy of the virgin birth.**

**Luke 1:26-28—The Annunciation by the angel.**

**Luke 1:39-56—The Visitation: “Blessed art thou among women. . . .”**

**Matt. 2:11—Visit of the Magi.**

**Matt. 2:14-21—Flight into Egypt.**

**Luke 2:41-50 — Loss of the child Jesus in the temple.**

**Luke 2:51, 52—The Child went down to Nazareth and was subject to them.**

**John 2:1-11—Marriage feast at Cana.**

**John 2:12—She went to Carphanaum with Jesus.**

**John 19:25-25—Foot of cross.**

**Mark 16:1-10—At tomb.**

**Acts 1:15—Pentecost.**

**Apocalypse (Revelations) 12:1-17 — The “WOMAN” clothed with the sun. What other woman can be suggested but Mary?**

## Idol - Worship?

*Is it not true that Catholics worship images contrary to Exodus 20:3-5?*

The first commandment forbids the making of graven images **“TO ADORE THEM.”** This is found in the Book of Exodus, where we read:

**“Thou shalt not have strange gods before me. Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing, nor the likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, nor of those things that are in the waters under the earth. Thou shalt not adore them, nor serve them.”**

By this we are forbidden to make images to take the place of God, or to adore them, or serve them. This is the sin of idolatry.

That it was **NOT** the intention of God to forbid the use of images is evident from the fact that the same inspired writer, in Exodus 25, commands the Jews to make two golden cherubims for the ark of the covenant in the temple. Likewise, in the Book of Numbers, God commanded Moses to make a brazen serpent, so that the Jews might look upon it and be saved from the attack of the fiery serpent.

Therefore, images are forbidden **ONLY** if we attribute to them a power that belongs to God alone, or if we worship them as gods.

**“Thou shalt make also two cherubims of beaten gold, on the two sides of the oracle.”**

**Ex. 25:18**

**“And the Lord said to him: Make a brazen serpent, and set it up for a sign; whosoever being struck shall look on it, shall live.”**

**Num. 21:8**

**Why do we use pictures and images?**

**We use pictures and images:**

- (a) To remind us of the virtues of the particular saint, or of the Blessed Mother;**
- (b) To remind us that we should imitate their virtues;**
- (c) To help us concentrate on our prayers;**
- (d) To honor that particular saint, or the Blessed Mother, who are God’s heroes.**

## Brothers of Christ?

*After the birth of Christ, Mary was just like any other married woman. Scripture tells us that she was virgin until after the birth of Christ and that Christ was her first-born son and that Christ had other brothers?*

Most Protestants will put Mary on the pedestal of virginity at least until Christ was born. This would be difficult to deny in view of the prophecy of Isias in Chapter 7 that a virgin would conceive and bear a son; and in virtue of the appearance of the angel to the virgin who was espoused to Joseph.

But then they would take her from the pedestal as a unique creature of God and say that she lived a normal married life after the birth. They base this on three particular passages of Scripture which are badly misunderstood by most people.

A. The "BROTHERS" OF CHRIST. Matthew 13:55, 56:

**"Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not His mother called Mary, and His brethren James and Joseph and Simon and Jude? And His sisters are they not all with us?"**

We must not forget the answer, the rebuke of our Lord in verse 57:

“Jesus said to them, ‘A prophet is not without honor except in his own country, and in his own house.’ And because of their unbelief He did not work many miracles there.”

Matthew 13:57, 58

Catholic and non-Catholic students of Scripture are not agreed as to who were the parents of James and Joseph and Simon and Jude. Most Catholic scholars believe that they are the cousins of the Lord, their mother being Mary, the wife of Cleophas (Clopas). They come to this conclusion by comparison with other texts, i.e., John 19:25.

We also know that in the Old Testament the word “brother” or “brethren” was not reserved for blood brothers but for other relatives also. It was used:

## 1. FOR ALL RELATIVES.

Genesis 29:15:

“And Laban said unto Jacob, ‘Because thou art my brother, should thou, therefore, serve me for naught’.”

We know that Jacob was the nephew of Laban.



## 2. KINSMEN.

Genesis 13:8:

“Abram therefore said to Lot . . . ‘Let therefore there be no quarreling between my herdsmen and thy herdsmen for we are all brethren’.”

## 3. ALSO FOR NIECES.

Genesis 12:13.

So also in everyday use today we call our preacher brother and the preacher calls us brother. But we are not brothers. In our union halls we salute each other by the title “brother.” In our lodges the same is true.

In this particular text if Simon and Jude and James and Joseph were cousins, as they probably were, they could not be CALLED “cousin” for there was no word in Aramaic for cousin. If we suppose that these were blood brothers we will have to admit they were born AFTER Christ—since no one today questions the virginity of Mary PRIOR to the birth of Christ.

But in John 7:3, 4 and also in Mark 3:21 we see these “brothers” rebuking our Lord. Now it was unthinkable among Jews for a younger brother to take such a role. Still further, in the story of the crucifixion in John 19, we read that the dying Lord gave His mother into the keeping of St. John. This would not be done if He had

other living brothers. Lightfoot, who was a non-Catholic scholar, said:

“It is inconceivable that our Lord would thus have snapped asunder the most sacred ties of natural friendship.”

The most important argument, however, is found in the fact that nowhere in the New Testament is anyone else EXCEPT Jesus called the “SON” of Mary. He is always pointed out as HER Son. Nor is SHE ever called the MOTHER of anyone else. She is always referred to as the mother of JESUS.

**B. FIRST-BORN.** Matthew 1:25. The next argument by the objectors to the virginity of Mary is found in this text where Christ is called the first-born. From this, the presumption is drawn that there were other children. However, this is not the usual meaning of the word “first-born.” A family may only have one child and that child is the first-born. In the Old Testament we find examples of this in:

(a) Num. 18:15: The first-born son was to be given to God. This son was to be given BEFORE any other sons were born and even if NO OTHER sons were born.

(b) Exodus 3:2: “Sanctify every first-born that openeth the womb among the children of Israel.” This was to be done BEFORE others were born and even if NO others were born.

**C. THE WORD "UNTIL" in the same chapter of the same text (Matthew 1:25) where we read "and he knew her not until she brought forth her first-born son." This work, however, does not mean that he DID know her AFTERWARDS. It refers to what has already been done and not to the future.**

For example: In Genesis 8:6, 7, we read that Noah sent forth a raven which did not return UNTIL the waters dried up. As a matter of fact the raven NEVER returned, even after the waters dried up. So, too, in Psalm 109: "Sit thou at my right hand UNTIL I make thy enemies my footstool." Now, of course, Christ will continue to sit at the right hand even after enemies are made the footstool of God.

As Catholics we believe in the perpetual virginity of Mary before, during, and after the birth of Christ. After the birth of Christ she lived in the home with her Son whom she knew by revelation to be "the Son of God." There was no place for selfish personal feelings when she was so absorbed in the love for her Son. It is like looking directly into the sun; we see nothing except the sun. So in heaven we will know God, see God and there will be no reason for turning our attention to the creatures of the world or of thinking of ourselves. This was true, likewise, of Mary, living, as she was, with the Son of God.

## Never Divorce?

*Your Church makes no exceptions when it comes to divorce. How then do you explain the exception Christ Himself permitted in the case of adultery in St. Matthew 19:9?*

The text St. Matthew 19:9 reads as follows:

**“But I say to you, ‘That whosoever shall put away his wife, except for immorality, and marries another commits adultery’.”**

**St. Matt. 19:9 (cf. St. Matt. 5:32)**

Jewish law at the time of our Lord did not permit absolute divorce. It did, however, permit separation for the cause of adultery. However, another school of teachers among the Rabbis taught that even this was not cause for separation, or “limited divorce.”

Christ is settling this dispute by permitting separation for the cause of adultery, but does not allow remarriage in such a case. The text would read as follows:

**“But I say to you, ‘That whosoever shall put away his wife—and this separation**

is not permitted except for the cause of fornication—makes her to commit adultery’.”

The Law of God expressed by Christ is clear and definite in the New Testament, and since it is the word of God, neither the Church nor anyone else is at liberty to change this law. What is the law?

“And He said to them, ‘Whosoever puts away his wife and marries another, commits adultery against her, and if the wife puts away her husband and marries another, she commits adultery.’”

St. Mark 10:11, 12

Sometimes separation is permitted for a good reason. In such cases the Bishop may permit divorce also if this is necessary to secure legal protection for the innocent party and the children. However, this is always with the understanding that no second marriage can be considered valid after this separation.

“But to those who are married, not I, but the Lord, commands that the wife is not to depart from her husband, and if she departs, that she is to remain unmarried or be reconciled to her husband. And let not a husband put away his wife.”

I Cor. 7:10, 11

## Vain Repetition?

*When you say the Rosary, is this not vain repetition condemned by Matt. 6:7?*

The Rosary is indeed a repetition of prayers . . . but NOT vain repetition . . . or useless repetition.

In this passage of St. Matthew, our Lord is condemning the Pharisees who “loved to stand in the corners of the streets that they might be seen by men.” They talked to God only to be seen by men.

Our Lord never condemned repetition in prayer. He Himself repeated the self-same prayer three times in the Garden of Gethsemani. (Matt. 26:39, 42, 44). The blind man repeated his prayer and was cured by Christ. (Matt. 20:31). We are told that the angels of God in heaven never cease repeating, night and day, the canticle: “Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty.” Apoc. 4:8.

Repeated prayers are not necessarily mechanical or unnecessary. The girl who is in love does not rebuke her boy friend for repeating the statement that he loves her.

In the Rosary, Catholics repeat the Scriptural prayers: the Lord’s Prayer (Matt. 6) and the Angelic Salutation, or “Hail Mary,” found in Luke 1:28.

# Why Purgatory?

*Where do you find purgatory and praying for the dead in the Bible?*

Purgatory is a place and state where those go for a time, who die with no unrepented mortal sins on their souls, but who still have either venial sins, or who still have temporal punishment due either for venial sins or repented mortal sins.

We can prove the existence of purgatory from Holy Scripture and from reason.

1. OLD TESTAMENT . . . in II Macabees we read:

“And making a gathering, he sent twelve thousand drachms of silver to Jerusalem for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead. . . . It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead that they may be loosed from sin.”

Among non-Catholics this book is generally not accepted as the word of God. However, no one denies that it IS a reliable book of history. As such, it proves that the Jews believed in the existence of a place in the next world where sins COULD be forgiven. We know this cannot be hell from which there is no escape; nor can it be

heaven, for nothing unclean can enter there. We know also that Christ did not correct this belief as He would have done if it were not true.

## 2. NEW TESTAMENT . . .

(a) In the Apocalypse (XXI, 27, we are told:

“And there shall not enter into it anything defiled. . . .”

If there were no purgatory, this would mean that God would have to send a person who died with only the slightest venial sin on his soul to hell with all those who have committed horrible crimes.

(b) In St. Matthew's Gospel (V, 26) St. Matthew is here speaking of hell. But by inference we are told that there IS a place we can LEAVE in the next world:

“Amen, I say to thee, thou wilt not come out from it til thou has paid the last farthing.”

From this text we conclude that there must be a purgatory, or third place, where some atonement CAN be made after death. This cannot be hell, for we know there is no escape from hell. Nor can it be heaven, for nothing unclean can



enter heaven. There must, then, be a third place. And this place we call "purgatory."

(c) Again we read in St. Matthew (XII, 32) that the sin against the Holy Ghost cannot be forgiven EITHER in this world OR in the world to come. We conclude from this that there ARE sins which can be forgiven in the next world. But they cannot be forgiven in hell, and could not exist in heaven. Therefore, there must be a third place where they CAN be forgiven. This place we call "purgatory."

3. REASON ALSO PROVES the existence of purgatory. Most people are not such great sinners when they die as to deserve hell; nor are most people prepared to go immediately to heaven. God's goodness and mercy demands a place of purifying for the slight sins of those who have tried to live according to His law.

# The Lord's Prayer — Why Not the Same?

*Why is it that Catholics do not say the Lord's Prayer as it is found in Scripture, with the ending, "For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever"?*

Catholics do say the Lord's Prayer as it is found in Scripture; and even as it is found in YOUR version of Scripture.

We do not condemn the Doxology, "for thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever." It is a beautiful prayer. However, it is not Scriptural.

The Doxology is found in the King James Version, it is true. The King James Revised Version, however, omits it and makes a marginal note that some manuscripts have this but that the better ones did not. So, too, the Revised Standard Version says in the footnote under Matt. 5:15:

“Other authorities, some ancient, add in some form ‘for thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory, forever, Amen’.” Therefore, we might say that NON-CATHOLICS are not using the text of the Lord’s Prayer found in the latest versions of their own Bible.

Why is there a difference? Most probably this Doxology was due to a marginal note made by some copiest of the Bible back in the early church. Later it crept into the text of some of the ancient manuscripts.

## Cain's Wife?

*Who was Cain's wife? From Genesis 4:17 it is evident that he had to marry a pre-Adamite woman.*

In the first place Catholics do not believe in the existence of pre-Adamite people, but rather believe in the unity of the human race descended from Adam and Eve who were the first parents.

It was not the intention of the inspired writer to name all the children of Adam and Eve. As a matter of fact they did not. The Bible names three sons, Cain, Able and Seth, and then it goes on to say that Adam "begat sons and daughters." (Gen. 5:4).

Therefore, Cain married one of his sisters. This marriage of blood relatives was, of course, necessary in order that the human race might be begun.

# The Drink Problem?

*How can the Catholic Church tolerate drinking?*

The Church does not tolerate **EXCESSIVE** drinking anymore than it permits excess in any other thing. Human actions are divided into three categories—good, bad, and indifferent. Indifferent actions are those which can become good or bad depending upon the use or abuse made of them. For instance, eating is an indifferent act. It becomes good when it is done for the purpose of maintaining health and strength. It becomes sinful, of gluttony, when it is done to excess. So too with gambling, smoking, dancing, and many other indifferent actions.

Drinking can be good if done for reasons of health or innocent recreation. Its abuse, or drunkenness, is always evil and sinful.

Scripture does not condemn drinking as such. In the Bible it has been calculated that there are 117 references to drinking as something good. We have an example of this in St. Paul who **RECOMMENDED** drinking. Writing to Timothy he says:

**“Do not still drink water but use a little wine for thy stomach’s sake, and for thy frequent infirmities.” (I Tim. 5:23).**

**Our Lord Himself was accused by the Pharisees of being a man who was “a glutton and a wine-drinker.” (Matt. 11:19). Also our Lord Himself at the marriage feast of Cana changed water into wine. He performed a miracle in order that those there might drink wine. Certainly we cannot accuse our Lord of doing anything which would be sinful. Therefore the drinking of alcoholic beverages is an indifferent act; it becomes evil by abuse and by excess.**

## Why Hats in Church?

*Why is that in the Catholic Church women must wear hats?*

The practical reason is so that the woman's hair, which is her pride and glory, will not be a distraction to others. Likewise, it has always been a custom of etiquette in Old and New Testament times for a woman to cover her hair as a sign of her subservience to men. St. Paul uses this reason:

**“Judge for yourselves; does it become a woman to pray to God uncovered?”**

**I Cor. 11:13**

**“Every man praying or prophesying with his head covered, disgraces his head. But every woman praying or prophesying with her head uncovered disgraces her head, for it is the same as if she were shaven.”**

**I Cor. 11:4, 5**

St. Paul is here insisting on the natural subordinate position of women, particularly in church affairs. He is settling a dispute which had arisen among the Corinthians where certain women here, as in other Greek cities, enjoyed a great deal of liberty. At meetings many had presumed to at-

tend without veil and even to speak. And St. Paul condemns this practice as improper and contrary to custom.

Catholic women, then, keep their heads covered out of respect for the house of God and for the real presence of our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament which is on the altar.

---

## Shaved Heads of Nuns?

*Is it true that nuns shave their heads and why do they do this?*

Most religious orders of women do crop their hair or cut it short.

They do this as symbolic of the life they are leading which is a life of self sacrifice for God and a renouncing the things of the world. A woman's hair is considered her crowning glory and is often a source of vanity. In order to avoid this vanity the nun covers her head and cuts her hair short.



## “Call No Man Father”?

*Why do Catholics call their priests “Father” when the Bible says . . . “Call no one on earth your father; for one is your Father, who is in Heaven.” (Matt. XXIII, 9).*

**Catholics call their priest “Father”:**

**I. Because he IS a Spiritual Father to them.**

- (a) In infancy he baptized them and, therefore, was the instrument . . . the agency . . . of their spiritual REBIRTH just as the physical fathers of Catholics are responsible for their PHYSICAL birth.**
- (b) He gives them spiritual FOOD for their souls whenever they receive the Body and Blood of Christ in Holy Communion. “For my flesh is food indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.” (Jn. VI, 57). PROVIDING NOURISHMENT IS ANOTHER OBLIGATION OF A FATHER.**
- (c) In confession, the priest not only forgives sin in the name of Christ, but also ADVISES them as to the best way to over-**

come their difficulties . . . spiritual and material. **THIS, TOO, IS THE DUTY OF A FATHER.**

- (d) Like a father, the priest is always at the death-bed of a Catholic to console and assist him. No Catholic would **WANT** to die without a priest — **HIS SPIRITUAL FATHER**—beside him.

Therefore, a priest does not **DEMAND** this title. Catholics call him “Father” as a sign of the affection he shares with their natural parents, and because he shares with them the duties and obligations of a parent.

II. Because the Bible does not mean that **NO** man should be called “Father.”

1. Cruden’s Concordance (which is a non-Catholic concordance) at the beginning of the citation under the word “father” says:

“In addition to its common use, this word is also used in the sense of seniors . . . of ancestors . . . founders of trades or professions . . . head of the inhabitants of a town, etc.”

The word “Father” is found almost a 1000 times and only about half of these refer to God. The others refer to **HUMAN BEINGS** who are called “Father.”

2. It was not the intention of Christ that **NO** man should be called "Father."

(a) In Matthew XIII, 1-3 . . . He is admonishing the people to follow the teachings of the Pharisees . . . but not their example:

"But do not act according to their works."

According to these verses, no master is to be followed who would lead us away from Christ.

(b) Christ Himself permitted and used the word **FOR OTHERS** than God.

(a) In John 4:12, He did not correct the Samaritan woman who said: "Art thou greater than our father Jacob who gave us the well? . . ."

(b) In John 8:56, He Himself used the term for Abraham: "Abraham your father rejoiced that he was to see my day . . ."

3. Saint Paul, following the example of Christ, did not take these words in their literal sense.

(a) He calls the Corinthians his spiritual children: "For although you have ten thousand tutors in Christ, yet you have not many fathers. For in Christ Jesus, through the gospel, did I beget you."

(I Cor. 4:15)

(b) He calls Timothy his “beloved SON in the faith.”

(I Tim. 1:2)

(c) He speaks of the Corinthians as his CHILDREN: “. . . but I admonish you as my dearest children.”

(I Cor. 4:14)

(d) He tells the Philippians that the proof of Timothy’s loyalty is to be found in the fact that he had served Paul in the Gospel as “a Son with the FATHER.”

(Phil. 2:22)

(e) See also: I Thes. 2:11.

III. If we adhere to the literal interpretation:

1. All honorary titles would be forbidden. Judges, mayors, etc., could not be called “Your Honor.” Presidents, ambassadors, etc., could not be called “Your Excellency.”
2. Physicians could not be called “Doctor” and ministers could not be called “Reverend.”

3. We could not call our own male parent "Father" for there would be no exceptions under the literal interpretation.
4. Likewise we could no longer call Washington the "Father of the Country."
5. We could not use the expression "Mister" for this is equivalent to "Master" and the same text says, "Neither be ye called masters. . . ."
6. Nor could we use the term "Sir" for this is a contraction of "Sire" which means "Lord" or "Master."

**THEREFORE**, this text of St. Matthew is not to be taken literally or as a general law. Catholic priests do not **DEMAND** this title. It is for them a source of **HUMILITY** rather than of **PRIDE**, for it reminds the priest of his **OBLIGATIONS** as a spiritual **FATHER** to his flock.

## Why Fish on Friday?

*Why is it that Catholics have to eat fish on Fridays?*

In the first place, Catholics do not **HAVE** to eat **FISH** on Fridays. They may eat anything they like **EXCEPT MEAT**.

Friday is a day of abstinence from meat for Catholics in order that this little sacrifice will be a work of satisfaction for the sins they have committed. The Church **COMMANDS IT** just as a mother will insist on her child making restitution for something the child may have stolen; or will insist on eating nourishing food. The Church is a mother and knows that unless we are constantly reminded we will not make satisfaction for our sins.

Meat is not considered as something **BAD** by Catholics. If so, the Church would certainly not permit it on every day **EXCEPT** one. It would be bad **EVERY** day.

Friday is chosen because this is the day on which our Lord died to atone for our sins and to remind us that we should offer our sacrifices in union with His sacrifice on the cross.









# Index

	Page
Chained Bibles? .....	1
Oldest Bible? .....	2
Bible Differences? .....	3
Bible Alone? .....	4
Traditions of Men? .....	6
Luther Discover Bible? .....	9
Search the Scripture? .....	11
Christ's Church — Corrupt? .....	13
Undemocratic? .....	15
Peter or Christ — The Rock? .....	17
I Can't Invite You — Why? .....	20
Only "Accept" Jesus? .....	22
What Difference Which Church? .....	23
Faith vs. Good Works? .....	24
Salvation for Protestants? .....	27
Assurance of Salvation? .....	28
East or West? .....	31
Unmarried Priests? .....	33
Infallible Humans? .....	34
Dipping or Pouring? .....	36
Baptism of Infants? .....	37
Why Not Confess to God? .....	39
Unpardonable Sins? .....	41
Real Body — Real Blood? .....	42
Why Latin? .....	45
Communion — One Form? .....	46
One Mediator? .....	49
Mary-Worship? .....	52
Idol-Worship? .....	55
Brothers of Christ? .....	57
Never Divorce? .....	62
Vain Repetition? .....	64
Why Purgatory? .....	65
The Lord's Prayer — Why Not the Same? .....	68
Cain's Wife? .....	70
The Drink Problem? .....	71
Why Hats in Church? .....	73
Shaved Heads of Nuns? .....	74
Call No Man "Father"? .....	75
Why Fish on Friday? .....	80