

Learning to Speak

Roman Catholic

So a Bible Believer Can Speak

About the Errors of Rome ...

So a Catholic Can Speak

About the Bible truth

# Learning to Speak Roman Catholic

So a Bible Believer Can Speak  
About the Errors of Rome ...  
So a Catholic Can Speak  
About the Christian truth

By Pastor E.G. Rice

John Wycliffe (1320-1384) wrote, “The Church is the totality of those who are predestined to blessedness. It includes the Church triumphant in heaven... and the Church militant for men on earth. No one who is eternally lost has part in it. There is one universal Church, and outside of it there is no salvation. Its head is Christ. No pope may say that he is the head, for he can not say that he is elect or even a member of the Church.”

DayStarPublishing  
PO Box 464 Miamitown, Ohio 45041

Copy Right 2007  
Edward G. Rice, Pastor

ISBN 1-XXXXXX1-0X-X

Library of Congress No.

206XXXXXXXX

## *Books by this Author*

- \* Learning to Speak Reformed Augustinian
- \* Learning to Speak Roman Catholic
- \* Learning to Speak Secular Humanism
- \* What The Bible Says - in 52 Penny Pulpits
- \* Essays in Science - A Christian Perspective
- \* A 357 Magnum Shoots Holes In Modernist Bibles

## ***Dedication***

## ***Contents***

**Article 1 A Grand Divisor of Truth and False Religions  
(The Blood)**

**Article 2 On Biblical Authority (The Book)**

**On Biblical Authority What the Bible says**

**Article 3 One Church, But Not Roman (The Body)**

**Article 4 Origin of Roman Catholic Church**

**Chronological Tabled List of Heresies**

**Article 5 Peter not the Rock on which the Church was  
Built**

**Article 6 Three Roman Errors Concerning Mariology**

**The Error in the words of their Catechism**

**Article 7 The Ancient Witness of Baptist Existence**

**Appendix 1 The Bible and the Good Friday Error**

**The Greatest Decision You Could Ever Make**

**Appendix 2 Help From Dr. Steven A. Hite**

**Appendix 3 Vatican II Liturgical Press ... concerning  
indulgences**

**Appendix 4 The Contrast Between Faith by Grace, and  
Faith by Works**

## ***Preface***

### **Roman Catholic Voice is Not the Voice of Christianity**

In the secular pluralistic society that engulfs us in this 21st century Roman Catholicism is considered the voice and definition of Christianity. That is unfortunate. A Bible believing Christian finds this Roman voice speaking of a mother Church and a Holy Father Pope very foreign to the Bible which brought them their faith. A Protestant believer regularly bumps into a church doctrine which springs from their distant mother in Rome and dashes in the face of direct Bible teachings. A Roman Catholic matures into a thinking rational inquiring mind which knows that the Pope is not really infallible nor Mary divine.

The tentacles of Roman Catholic error are still reaching deep into the lives and the beliefs of Americans. As a Baptist Preacher I regularly find it necessary to address three major tentacles of errors that spring from mother Rome. As a Baptist one can see these tentacles more clearly because Roman Catholicism is not our mother. As a second generation Baptist I know the entanglements of these tentacles that staunchly gripped my Italian mother until she was converted from Catholicism and became a born again Christian, and joined a Baptist Church.

The three most far reaching tentacles that need to be cut off at the root are: 1) The error that salvation of the soul, and eternal life, can somehow be attained by some work or deed which one can accomplish here on earth. The Bible will show in contrast that one can never work or sacrament enough to achieve heaven and eternal life. 2) The error that the Roman Catholic Church is the mother of all faith and is married to the Holy Pope who is an inerrant vicar of Christ. This whole twisted tentacle comes from the first Roman pope with the audacity to call himself the Holy Father, Pope

Gregory I in 605 AD And 3) the error that the Roman Catholic church gave us our Bible. It did not, in fact we got an accurate inerrant Bible despite the continual efforts of the Catholic Church (Roman's Catholic and England's Catholic) to burn it.

Roman Catholicism is considered the Christian voice and definition by the secular pluralistic American culture, but not by Bible believing Christians. This treatise addresses three blatant fallacies in this blaring voice and defective definition. The three mark the foundation stones of this false religion. The Bible refutes these three Catholic doctrines with clear doctrine about the Blood, the Body and the Book. The catholic foundation stones must be removed from the sand before a catholic soul can be built on the Rock, Christ Jesus. Jesus rebuking the religious order of his day said *“Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves.”* It shall take a greater power than this evidence to convert a Catholic loved one, neighbor or friend from Romanist to Christ. It takes God to shake the three stones mentioned above. You need to know what stones should be kicked at but only God can convert a soul. If you are a converted catholic or a curious one, the evidence in this treatise is meant to strengthen your faith to stand on the Bible and debunk the errors of Catholicism which entwined you.



*One Question, a Grand Divisor of Truth*

**Article 1** TOC

**One Question, a Grand Divisor of Truth  
and False Religions** 10/18/03

In all human studies of theology there is no one greater question than the one I shall address here. In all the divisions of religions, especially "Christian religions," there is not a more clear divisor which separates teachers, denominations, faiths and churches into two distinct piles or groupings of "true religion" and "false religion."

The question was asked of Jesus himself while he walked here on this earth. This question, answered wrongly, has formed many a mother church which gives birth to innumerable daughter churches which are tainted by the falsehood of false teachings on this one question. All of mankind is responsible for asking and pursuing a truthful answer to this one question, and we should let its answer divide Baptists and Catholics into two distinct piles and call one false and one true.

The question:

**"What shall a man do to attain eternal life?"**

The question looms before every religion. If the Bible is true, and I devoutly believe that it is, then there is but one right answer to this question. Again, how a teacher, denomination, religion or church answers this one question determines weather they are a true religion or a false religion.

Let me state first how a Baptist categorically, across the board answers this question. Then we shall examine the side stepping answers I have gathered from those taught in the Roman Catholic Papal Doctrine. Whereupon we shall have the tools to decide which religion is the false teacher, Baptist Bible Doctrine, or Catholic Papal Doctrine.

### *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

The Baptist believe the clear Bible teaching that there is no works a sinner can do in this life to procure eternal life. It is absolutely a free gift made available to all men through Jesus Christ. Not through his church, not through any good work, not through any physical deed or bead, penance or substance, baptism of infant or baptism of adult, or conformation class. Nothing but faith in Jesus Christ and his promise of GRACE can bring about eternal life to fallen man. And when Jesus Christ gives you this eternal life he does not leave you sitting around wondering if you got it. You are literally born again as he said, born spiritually wherein you are 1) **Converted** via repentance and faith in Christ, 2) you are **Justified** before God through Christ, 3) you are **Regenerated or Quickened**, made alive where once you were dead in trespasses and sin, 4) you are **Baptized** into the body of Christ, (no water here) and 5) you are **Indwelt**, permanently, by the Holy Spirit of God. These all happen in an instant and are all permanent and everlasting.

Thus Christ did not misspeak when he said in John 3:16 "Has, (present perfect tense) everlasting life." Now when these five events occur simultaneously in ones life, there is little doubt that some thing has happened to the individual and one can tell you when they got saved, when they were born again, who showed them the scriptures and how great it is to be saved and know it. We call that giving a testimony of when God saved you, mine is written on my web page, every member of a Baptist Church has a salvation testimony, they state it before being baptized in believers baptism, and they are baptized by immersion before they can be a member of a Baptist Church.

Now lets look at a few verifying scriptures. Eph 2:8 "*For*

*One Question, a Grand Divisor of Truth*

*by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: 9 Not of works, lest any man should boast."* You may not get a full understanding of what it means to get saved from this sentence but it is a cinch that you won't get there with any works that you do. Notice Rom 11:6 *And if by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work.* Clearly no works at all are in ones salvation experience.

Rom 4:1 *What shall we say then that Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found? 2 For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God. 3 For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. 4 Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. 5 But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. 6 Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, 7 Saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. 8 Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin.*

These passages are clear about salvation of man's soul being by grace and no work of any sort being involved. It is a free gift, and must be accepted as such as so eloquently described in the whole dissertation of Romans. Further these excerpts are completely in context, so much so that we recommend that the whole book of Ephesians and the whole book of Romans be read to more fully understand the freedom of this gift, and the reality of an event called

### *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

salvation that includes the five above mentioned simultaneous events. Note especially that it is an event, like a birth is an event. It is not a process that occurs over time but an event that occurs in a moment of time.

Now an argument often brought up to confuse this issue is the statement of James the brother of Jesus who states "James 2:14 ¶ What *doth it* profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? can faith save him? ... 17 Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone. ... 24 Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only."

Note here that a dictionary easily solves this confusion. Paul's statements are concerning the attaining of "Justification" whereby the justification is the judicial statement of God that my sin's are forgiven, via Webster's def #1. James' statements are concerning the observance of fact or circumstance that 'justifies' ones faith, i.e. tests it to see if it is alive or dead, tests it to see if it is real or pretend, and has nothing to do with the attaining of this declaration of justification. Thus James is using Webster's def #2 in his rebuke to "the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad" shewing respect of persons concerning the faith of the Lord Jesus Christ. The rebuke is justified. The use of these scriptures to pretend that God's act of justifying for salvation is attained by works is not. Notice the two definitions in use by the two authors of scripture and be careful not to interchange them as Catholic doctrine does:

**just·i·fi·ca·tion** (j<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>s<sup>2</sup>t...-f<sup>1</sup>-k<sup>3</sup>sh...n) *n.* **1.a.** The act of justifying. **b.** The condition or fact of being justified. **2.** Something, such as a fact or circumstance, that justifies: *considered misgovernment to be a justification for revolution.* (The American Heritage Dictionary 3rd Edition @1994)

That is Baptist Doctrine of salvation. It is straight from the

*One Question, a Grand Divisor of Truth*

Bible and concludes that man can have eternal life, and know that he has it, by being 'born again.' Further the Bible says 1John5:11 *And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. 12 He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life. 13 These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God.*

Any religion that would add some work to this free gift is a false religion. And any church that would offer eternal life up for sale to highest bidders is especially vile. So now I'll bid you do your homework, and tell me what does the Roman Papal Doctrine say concerning eternal life? I have asked Catholic priests what one must do to know for certain that you have eternal life and recorded their answers. What is the Roman church teaching this week that one must do to attain eternal life, it changes periodically. I know what they taught in the past 1600 years, since they started baptizing infants and broke off from the Independent, Autonomous, Bible Believing, Believer Baptizing, Churches and joined hands with the government of Rome. Clearly they have been a false church, a false religion on this regard of salvation by grace. They teach salvation by works. They call themselves the mother of all faith, but their faith is not Bible Faith. They claim they wrote the Bible, that they are the sole protectors of the Bible and that they are the sole interpreters of the Bible. In the pages which follow we will expose all three of these lies of Catholicism. Faith is not of works, but of grace. Catholicism is not the mother of faith, but the antithesis of it. Catholics did not write, preserve or accurately interpret

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

the Bible, instead they burned them and the English translators who printed them.

What have we then learned in answer to this questions “What must I do to be saved?”

Salvation is thus obtained by listening to the Scriptures, not by listening to the Roman Catechism:

*Perseverance in faith*

Catechism Pt 1, Sect 1, Chap 3, #162 Faith is an entirely free gift that God makes to man. We can lose this priceless gift, as St. Paul indicated to St. Timothy: "Wage the good warfare, holding faith and a good conscience. By rejecting conscience, certain persons have made shipwreck of their faith." To live, grow, and persevere in the faith until the end we must nourish it with the word of God; we must beg the Lord to increase our faith, it must be "working through charity," abounding in hope, and rooted in the faith of the Church.

Understand from the precedeing Scriptures that ones salvation is not secured nor maintained by begging the Lord to increase our faith nor by works of any sort. Catechism #162 misrepresentes the new birth and salvation of a soul which is attained by calling on the name of the Lord Jesus Christ (Rom 10:13) not by working through the sacramental system of any Church.

**What Must I Do To Be Saved –  
The Catholic's Wrong Answer**

We have shown in a previous article that one question that can act as a grand divisor of truth and false teachings is the question asked of Jesus on several occasions: “What shall a man do to attain eternal life?” The Catholic answer to that question will involve two major contentions, first that their baptism is what washes away sin. We have called that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. And secondly that one must work out ones salvation with fear and trembling and then maybe, if they do enough penance and work, they might make it to heaven, it is their hope. In this article we shall use a systematic presentation of Bible truths to refute their doctrine of baptismal regeneration five fold. For every verse they attempt to twist into their doctrine I will use five Bible truths which refute their doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. I shall use the most common Bible arguments I have heard from staunch catholics that are defenders of this doctrine of baptismal regeneration. Largely they will use the words of the early church fathers to develop this error in their teachings because they hold their teachings above the clear teaching of the scriptures. A catholic will find it difficult to concede that most of their unbiblical doctrines have been propagated through such a line fathers for 1500 years. Here we shall begin at the beginning, as Baptists do, using the Holy Scriptures alone to refute fivefold this misleading doctrine.

**There is no Baptismal Regeneration in John 3!**

First they attempt to read baptismal regeneration into John 3:5 “Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” But the whole contrast that Jesus is laying out here is between a physical

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

birth, here on earth, and a spiritual birth, a birth from above. So a first refuting is in the context of the very argument. They take the whole discussion out of context in order to leverage in their teaching about water baptism. I once argued to a Catholic antagonist that there is more natural birthing amniotic fluid in verse 5 than there was catholic holy water. San Diego Bishop Robert Brom soon published an article saying Baptists “attempt to explain away this verse (John 3:5) saying the water is amniotic fluid.” He calls such a discourse absurd. So would I. What I actually said is that the water in verse 5 would sooner be amniotic fluid than Catholic holy water. And I still contend so. I know of no Baptist who has argued what the Bishop contends but I could easier defend such an interpretation than to fit baptismal water into John 3:5, such is not even the subject matter! Look at the previous verse. Nicodemus was not in need of clarification about baptism but about the kingdom of God, (the spiritual) being different from the physical world (the water). In verse 4 Nicodemus asks “How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mothers womb, and be born?” Verse 5 contains Jesus' answer to that question contrasting the physical with the spiritual and has nothing whatsoever to do with catholic baptism. Verse 6 further separates the contrasting natural births and spiritual births, thereby separating the water (baptism?) from the spiritual even more. Even differentiating so much as to make the water (baptism?) refer to the fleshly, completely separate from the spiritual birth. A second refuting of the catholic misrepresentation of John 3:5 is Jesus' second clarifying illustration using the wind. Verse 8 says “The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound



*One Question, a Grand Divisor of Truth*

thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit.”

Remember that Jesus is addressing what a religious man must do to inherit eternal life. In this dissertation he is completely separating the spiritual birth from the physical, and in this illustration of its invisible effects there is absolutely no baptism because that would be physical and visible. There is no holy water here and another level of separation between the natural and spiritual. Now look at the third illustration found in verse 14.

Of all the water filled Old Testament illustrations Jesus could have used, he used he used a dry one. No baptismal regeneration is found in John 3. He used one that seeded the Evangelical Christian song “Look and Live, My Brother Live” because that is all that was required for the people in Numbers chapter 21 to obtain salvation, and that is all that is required for New Testament Christianity. There is no scriptural basis for a song “Be Baptized and Live” none for “Be Sprinkled and Live”, none for “Get Some Holy Water and Live” ... no Jesus' illustrations on obtaining eternal life never contain baptismal water. If baptismal water were necessary for salvation Jesus' communication here represents gross negligence on his part, to clarify their essential baptismal water to Nicodemus here in John 3.

Thirdly, Jesus actually clarifies clearly that water baptism is not part of his explanation. In verse 15 and again in verse 16 it says 'Look and Live'... “That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life.” If water baptism were necessary, Jesus, here, would be deliberately misleading Nicodemus. And if water baptism were just the entry gate that starts your forgiveness whereby you might,

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

in time, after much works obtain eternal life, then the present-perfect possessive tense of "have eternal life" is a gross verbal error in our Bible or a misleading communication from Jesus himself. Baptists hold emphatically that the Bible is verbally inspired, inerrant and infallible.. Holding that this sentence of Jesus is worded in the right present perfect tense possessive 'have' and that Jesus was not leading St. Nick into any error (the Scriptures are inerrant), and thirdly, that this promise concerning eternal life can never fail (the Scriptures are infallible.) This is made even more pungent when you examine his next sentence for any presence of holy water. John 3:16 known, loved, and memorized by Baptists around the world says "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

A forth refuting of the Catholic misrepresentation of John 3:5 is this Chapter's dealing with the "*question between some of John's disciples and the Jews about purifying.*" If baptismal water could wash away a single sin or do any purifying at all these 9 sentences from the apostle John must capture such a possibility. Catholic Bishop Brom<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Brom published an article titled "Are Catholics Born Again" trying to refute Evangelicals proselytizing Roman Catholics, and thus is an easy target for quoting what Catholics supposedly believe on the subject. The article was approved for catholic doctrine by Bernadeane Carr, STL, Censor Librorum, Aug 10, 2004, and published with permission attributed to Robert H. Brom, Bishop of San Diego, in accord with 1983 CIC 827. The Catholic apologetics found in that series of such published articles

*One Question, a Grand Divisor of Truth*

may quote Justin Martyr (151 A.D.) and Irenaeus (190 AD), Cyprian the bishop of Carthage (252 AD) or St. Augustine (408 AD) but concerning baptismal he cannot quote the Apostle John or the Lord Jesus Christ in this very passage dealing with forgiveness of sin, eternal life and purifying water. Why not? The purifying by water, so prominently emphasized by the Jews could, if true, be tied to salvation in this clarification but it is instead divorced from the availability of salvation. Salvation available solely by faith, solely by belief in the Lord Jesus Christ. It says in John 3:30 that “He (the Lord Jesus Christ) must increase, and I (the baptizer with water) must decrease. If there is no baptismal regeneration itemized in these verses of John chapter 3, where the questions about John the baptizer and about purifying water are dealt with directly, then expect none in the rest of the Bible. They may be rampant in St. Augustine's doctrine, but none will be found in the Holy Scriptures.

In the fifth of the five-fold refuting of this catholic error I need to simply quote John's closing sentence to the chapter on being 'born again' or 'born from above.' With the danger of being over repetitive notice that there is no water, no baptism, and no physical connections or words to be found in the closing sentence. Notice too, the present perfect tense of the possession and the clarity of its presentation. The Apostles John's words in John 3:36 clarify the issue: “ *He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.*“

There is absolutely no baptismal regeneration found in

---

are herein attributed to Bishop Brom.

John chapter 3.

**There is no Baptismal Regeneration in Acts 2**

A second scripture the catholics continually use to prop up a bad doctrine of baptismal regeneration, wherein baptism gives one forgiveness of sin, is Acts 2:38. Here Peter is preaching to those who crucified the Christ and says to them in his closing message: “*37 Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and Brethern what shall be do? 38 Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. 39 For the promise is unto you, and to tour children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call, 40 and with manyu other words did he testify and exhort, saying Save yourselves from this untoward generation. 41 Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls.*”

Now if 38 stood alone in explaining how one attains salvation I would not slight the catholics for putting all their emphasis on baptism for regeneration (although even there infant baptism is not a feasible doctrine) But the Bible contains many other words of exhortation on the salvation of the soul of man. Words that clarify and prioritize the two ingredients of verse 38, “*repent and be baptized.*” So the first of the fivefold refutings of this out of context application is the understanding of what the verse actually contains.

Acts 2:38 is the close to Peter's message to the very Jews that cried “crucify him” fifty days earlier. His preaching to this crowd was for them to first repent, then be baptized.

*One Question, a Grand Divisor of Truth*

Baptists hold that the former is the means of salvation repentance of sin with faith in Christ is called conversion in the Bible and Jesus said “except ye be converted ... ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.” The Catholics, with Jeromes 385 AD Latin Vulgate Bible have mistranslated the word 'to repent' into 'do penance.' Their doctrine puts all its emphasis on the baptism and completely eliminates repentance. It substitutes instead their doctrine of penance, which is by definition “the suffering, labor or pain to which a person voluntarily subjects himself, or which is imposed on him by authority as a punishment for his faults, such as fastings, flagellations, wearing of chains etc. (Penance is one of the seven sacraments of the Romish Church)” (The American Heritage Dictionary 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition)

Again, let me reiterate that 'penance' is found nowhere in the Scriptures, only by mistranslation in the Catholic's Latin Vulgate of 385 AD. It is nowhere found in the Greek New Testament, nor in the teachings of Christ. It is a Catholic addition to the faith propagated by Jerome's mistranslation of the Greek word repent 52 times out of it's 58 uses. Thus 'penance' joins a list of words added to their doctrine and disseminated by Jerome's faulty translation from the Greek whereby they devised 'penance' (Latin mistranslation) instead of 'repentance' (Greek Bible Word), 'sacrament' (Latin mistranslation) instead of 'mysteries' (Greek Bible Word), 'New Testament priests' (Latin mistranslation) instead of 'presbyters' (Greek Bible Word).

Baptists make every effort to systematically capture every thing the Bible says in this doctrine about how to attain eteranl life while Catholics have allowed tradition and errant Church Fathers to dictate their doctrine. Now that

### *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

the Bible is out of their monestaries and available to the common man (i.e. After 1611) they must force and leverage the Bible to match their misguided doctrine of baptism, penance, sacraments and priests, and they try to get all the leverage they can out of Acts 2:8. But in Acts 2:8 Peter is giving the generalities of what one must do to be saved. The specifics that emphasize repentance over baptism are described in much more detail elsewhere. So this first refuting of their use of this verse is that the Catholics try to force fit this verse into their traditionally developed doctrine of baptismal regeneration by rejecting and mistranslating its real emphasis on repentance.

A second refuting is found again in Jesus' teaching about salvation. In John 6:26 the people seeking Jesus asked *“What shall we do, that we might work the words of God?”* This simple and blunt question was in response to Jesus' profound statement *“Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which enforeth unto everalsting life, which the son of man shall give unto you: for him hath God the Father sealed.”* In answer to this question, if baptismal regeneration were true Jesus would need to mention purifying water, or the work of baptism, or sacrament of penance or such, but he mentions only that they *'believe'* (as he consistently said in John 3 which we just examined.) Verse 29 here says *“Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.”* Clearly this explanation of salvation by garce (a free gift without works) and is at odds with the Catholic doctrine of the sacramental works of penance and the sacramental works of baptismal regeneration.

A third refuting can be found in the book of Romans

*One Question, a Grand Divisor of Truth*

where the apostle Paul is developing a systematic presentation of the gospel of Jesus Christ. An excellent rule for understanding the Bible is “The Bible is the best interpretor of the Bible.” To implement this rule one must consider the teaching of all Scriptures as they bear upon any one doctrine. Here, upon the doctrine of how one obtains eternal life, a paramount principle doctrine of the faith, we must consider Romans 10:9-10. Paul has corrected the error that the law might provide righteousness (even as we here are correcting the error that water baptism might provide righteousness.) Thus Paul states “*For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that **believeth.***” Again notice the emphasis in on what one believes not on one being baptized. Paul then explains this dependence on belief thus “*That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.*” The process of receiving eternal life is here described in the simplest most concise manner anywhere in the N.T. and it follows the Baptist's systematic method of faith alone with no water baptism included. Although Catholics have gone through a great effort to develop their errant doctrine of baptismal regeneration it cannot be supported systematically with the Bible.

A forth refuting of their use of Acts 2:38 to try and support water derived righteousness can be found in the order of events when one gets saved. Always, in the Bible, conversion, i.e. repentance from sin and faith in Christ, precedes the water baptism by immersion, so much so that the baptism is but a public display of ones conversion and

### *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

not the causative agent for regeneration. Acts 2:38 and 41 already indicate that order of saving faith followed by water baptism. Lets look at 3 more of the several of examples. In Acts 8 there are two. In verse 13 a man called Simon, who previously used sorcery (verse 9) *“believed also and was baptized.”* Notice the order, he first believed and then he was baptized. (This follows the order of Baptist's “believer baptism, and confounds the Roman infant baptismal regeneration) Baptists differentiate here contending that his faith and trust in Christ is what would give him eternal life by imparting to him the righteousness of Christ. His baptism washed away no sins, if sins were to be forgiven it must be by the blood of Christ not by the baptismal water. *For without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins.*(Heb 9:22) Simon was baptized because he made a profession of believing in Christ. But in verse 2 Peter says to Simon *“Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter: for thy heart is not right in the sight of God.”* Peter here discerned that Simon may have confessed with his mouth, the Lord Jesus but he did not believe in his heart. Peter emphasizes the need of repentance which was lacking in Simon. The order is again emphasized here that repentance and faith in Christ, which make up conversion, must occur before baptism. Baptism, here, had not part in the conversion or regeneration. Baptism is to follow conversion as a command of Christ and a public testimony of ones conversion to Christ but with no baptismal regeneration. In Simon's case there was no regeneration at all because of Simon's unbelief, there is never regeneration because of water baptism.

The same chapter, Acts 8, and verse 37 and 38 we see the testimony of an Ethiopian eunuch concerning his baptism



*One Question, a Grand Divisor of Truth*

and again baptism was only to follow an authentic conversion testimony. Eternal life is conveyed in the repentance and faith in Christ as Jesus taught in John 3:15-18 and as Paul so robustly preached it in Romans 10:9-10 and 13. Here Philip affirms it for the eunuch. *“If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest (be baptized) And (the eunuch) answered and said I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.”*

(Now verse 37 is not in the modernist ecumenical bibles. To find it in English you need to use the King James Bible, and to find it in the original Greek you must use the Byzantine manuscripts because the Alexandrian copies from Egypt, used for all modernist bibles, and the Western Empire copies used by the Romans with their Latin Vulgate translation, leave off this whole verse. The Egyptian copies came from Alexandria where tainted by the false teachings Tertullian(145-220 AD) passed on to Cyprian and to St Augustine(AD 354-430) Here are some lines from Tertullian himself on this fallacy of holy water washing away sin:

HAPPY is our sacrament of water, in that, by washing away the sins of our early blindness, we are set free and admitted into eternal life! ...Mindful of this declaration as of a conclusive prescript, we nevertheless proceed to treat the question, "How foolish and impossible it is to be formed anew by water. In what respect, pray, has this material substance merited an office of so high dignity?" The authority, I suppose, of the liquid element has to be examined. This however, is found in abundance, and that from the very beginning. For water is one of those things which, before all the furnishing of the world, were quiescent with God in a yet unshapen state. ... Water was the first to produce that which had life, that it might be no wonder in baptism if waters know how to give life ...I fear I may seem to have collected rather the praises of water than the reasons of baptism; although I should thereby teach all the more fully, that it is not to be doubted

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

that God has made the material substance which He has disposed throughout all His products and works, obey Him also in His own peculiar sacraments; that the material substance which governs terrestrial life acts as agent likewise in the celestial. ...

All waters, therefore, in virtue of the pristine privilege of their origin, do, after invocation of God, attain the sacramental power of sanctification; for the Spirit immediately supervenes from the heavens, and rests over the waters, sanctifying them from Himself; and being thus sanctified, they imbibe at the same time the power of sanctifying. Albeit the similitude may be admitted to be suitable to the simple act; that, since we are defiled by sins, as it were by dirt, we should be washed from those stains in waters. But as sins do not 'show themselves in our flesh (inasmuch as no one carries on his skin the spot of idolatry, or fornication, or fraud), so persons of that kind are foul in the spirit, which is the author of the sin; for the spirit is lord, the flesh servant. Yet they each mutually share the guilt: the spirit, on the ground of command; the flesh, of subservience. Therefore, after the waters have been in a manner endued with medicinal virtue through the intervention of the angel, the spirit is corporeally washed in the waters, and the flesh is in the same spiritually cleansed. TERTULLIAN, ON BAPTISM. [TRANSLATED BY THE REV. S. THELWALL.]

Tertullian is not much quoted by Catholics because in his later years he departed from this error and held more closely to the Scriptures as ascribed by the Montanists, but he was a founder of this error on the spiritual power of Catholic holy water, and this error was propagated by his disciples from Africa right into Roman Catholicism. Note the explanation of Roberts-Donaldson's Introduction on Tertullian:

It seems to be the fashion to treat of Tertullian as a Montanist, and only incidentally to celebrate his services to the Catholic Orthodoxy of Western Christendom. Were I his biographer I should reverse this course, as a mere act of justice, to say nothing of gratitude to a man of splendid intellect, to whom the filial spirit of Cyprian accorded the loving tribute of a disciple, and

*One Question, a Grand Divisor of Truth*

whose genius stamped itself upon the very words of Latin theology, and prepared the language for the labours of a Jerome. In creating the Vulgate, and so lifting the Western Churches into a position of intellectual equality with the East, the latter as well as St. Augustine himself were debtors to Tertullian in a degree not to be estimated by any other than the Providential Mind that inspired his brilliant career as a Christian.

Thus the Alexandrian error is present in all the Western Theology and in all the modernist ecumenical bibles which rely predominately on the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, manuscripts from Alexandria which omit Acts 8:37 altogether. H.G. Wells writes about the 'scholars of Alexandria: "Wisdom passed away from Alexandria ... For the use of books was substituted the worship of books. Very speedily the learned became a specialized ... class with unpleasant characteristics of it's own... a new type of human being; shy, eccentric, unpractical, incapable of essentials, strangely fierce upon trivialities of literary detail, as bitterly jealous of colleague within as the unlearned without – The Scholarly Man -- he was sort of by-product of the intellectual process of mankind." From H.G. Wells, *The Outline of History*, p. 305, quoted in *Did the Catholic Church Give Us The Bible*, by David W. Daniels So what kind of Doctrine would we expect to come out of Alexandria Egypt? The roots for the doctrine of baptismal regeneration are as poison as the bibles that these humanistic scholars produced. )

But, I digress. Thirdly, lets look at the command of Christ whereby he told us to baptize. It is found most clearly in Matt 28:19 "*Go ye therefore, (because all power is given unto Christ in heaven and in earth from verse 18) and teach all nations*" Herein the disciples were to teach people to believe in Christ, to "see with their eyes and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart and be converted, and (Jesus) should heal them" Matt(13:15,

### *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

notice “be converted” not “be baptized”) In the commission of Christ here, teaching them to believe in Christ precedes baptism, again conversion precedes baptism. The commission continues, “*baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: ...*” This does not secure righteousness, this does not produce the regeneration, this does not produce the quickening, that is only produced in conversion. The commission continues “*teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.*” ... Here, believers are trained in the faith, taught the commands of Christ, not to attain eternal life, but because they have eternal life, eternal life they gained by conversion to Christ, with repentance to sin and faith (trust, belief) in the Lord Jesus Christ. This is a consistent systematic Biblical accounting for how one receives eternal life, how one is born again, how one is saved. There is no dependence on baptism for this conversion.

A fifth and final refuting for the catholic attempt to read baptismal regeneration into Acts 2:38 can be found in Acts 16:31.

**There is no baptismal regeneration in 1 Pet 3:20-21 nor in Col 2:11-13** TOC

#### **Catholic Forgiveness of our Mortal Sin**

Catechism Article 4 The Sacrament of Penance and Reconciliation (1422-1484) called the Sacrament of conversion, Penance, confession, forgiveness, Reconciliation, is the Catholic means of alleviating a mortal sin and it includes broadly 3 items Contrition, Confession, and Satisfaction.(1480 Like all the sacraments,

*One Question, a Grand Divisor of Truth*

Penance is a liturgical action. The elements of the celebration are ordinarily these: a greeting and blessing from the priest, reading the word of God to illuminate the conscience and elicit contrition, and an exhortation to repentance; the confession, which acknowledges sins and makes them known to the priest; the imposition and acceptance of a penance; the priest's absolution; a prayer of thanksgiving and praise and dismissal with the blessing of the priest.)

**1486** The forgiveness of sins committed after Baptism is conferred by a particular sacrament called the sacrament of conversion, confession, penance, or reconciliation.

The movement of return to God, called conversion and repentance, entails sorrow for and abhorrence of sins committed, and the firm purpose of sinning no more in the future. Conversion touches the past and the future and is nourished by hope in God's mercy.

**1491** The sacrament of Penance is a whole consisting in three actions of the penitent and the priest's absolution. The penitent's acts are repentance, confession or disclosure of sins to the priest, and the intention to make reparation and do works of reparation.

**1492** Repentance (also called contrition) must be inspired by motives that arise from faith. If repentance arises from love of charity for God, it is called "perfect" contrition; if it is founded on other motives, it is called "imperfect."

**1493** One who desires to obtain reconciliation with God and with the Church, must confess to a priest all the unconfessed grave sins he remembers after having carefully examined his conscience. The confession of venial faults, without being necessary in itself, is nevertheless strongly recommended by the Church.

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

**1494** The confessor proposes the performance of certain acts of "satisfaction" or "penance" to be performed by the penitent in order to repair the harm caused by sin and to re-establish habits befitting a disciple of Christ.

**1495** Only priests who have received the faculty of absolving from the authority of the Church can forgive sins in the name of Christ.

**1496** The spiritual effects of the sacrament of Penance are:

- reconciliation with God by which the penitent recovers grace;
- reconciliation with the Church;
- remission of the eternal punishment incurred by mortal sins;
- remission, at least in part, of temporal punishments resulting from sin;
- peace and serenity of conscience, and spiritual consolation;
- an increase of spiritual strength for the Christian battle.

**1497** Individual and integral confession of grave sins followed by absolution remains the only ordinary means of reconciliation with God and with the Church.

**1498** Through indulgences the faithful can obtain the remission of temporal punishment resulting from sin for themselves and also for the souls in Purgatory.

These more specifically involve **Interior Penance**, (1431) Interior repentance is a radical reorientation of our whole life, a return, a conversion to God with all our heart, an end of sin, a turning away from evil, with repugnance toward the evil actions we have committed. At the same time it

*One Question, a Grand Divisor of Truth*

entails the desire and resolution to change one's life, with hope in God's mercy and trust in the help of his grace. This conversion of heart is accompanied by a salutary pain and sadness which the Fathers called *animi cruciatus* (affliction of spirit) and *compunctio cordis* (repentance of heart).)

**Reconciliation with the Church** (1456 Confession to a priest is an essential part of the sacrament of Penance.),

**Penance** (1460 *The penance* the confessor imposes must take into account the penitent's personal situation and must seek his spiritual good. It must correspond as far as possible with the gravity and nature of the sins committed. It can consist of prayer, an offering, works of mercy, service of neighbor, voluntary self-denial, sacrifices, and above all the patient acceptance of the cross we must bear. Such penances help configure us to Christ, who alone expiated our sins once for all. They allow us to become co-heirs with the risen Christ, "provided we suffer with him.)

**Indulgences**, (1471 The doctrine and practice of indulgences in the Church are closely linked to the effects of the sacrament of Penance. *What is an indulgence?* "An indulgence is a remission before God of the temporal punishment due to sins whose guilt has already been forgiven, which the faithful Christian who is duly disposed gains under certain prescribed conditions through the action of the Church which, as the minister of redemption, dispenses and applies with authority the treasury of the satisfactions of Christ and the saints." "An indulgence is partial or plenary according as it removes either part or all of the temporal punishment due to sin." The faithful can gain indulgences for themselves or apply them to the dead

**1478** An indulgence is obtained through the Church who, by virtue of the power of binding and loosing granted her by Christ Jesus, intervenes in favor of individual Christians and opens for them the treasury of the merits of Christ and the saints to obtain from the Father of mercies the remission of the temporal punishments due for their sins. Thus the Church does not want simply to come to the aid of these

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

Christians, but also to spur them to works of devotion, penance, and charity)



*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

**Article 2** TOC

**On Biblical Authority**

Baptist Doctrine and Roman Catholic Doctrine spring from two very diverse authorities. A Baptist's sole authority is the holy inspired word of God. Its availability, and its verbal accuracy are of vital importance to Baptists. The Roman Imperial Church errantly asserts that it constructed, authored, and preserved our Holy Bible and gave birth to the completed canonized script in 397 AD. They errantly assert that the Bible did not even exist prior to 397 AD. It is then errantly presumed that early church fathers wrote, not that the apostles wrote, that 3rd century theologians wrote, and not that God wrote. Thus modernist scholars contend that it is an error riddled Bible and that it is O.K. for them take their pen knife and snip out any portion that they are displeased with. This error of origin must be dealt with. God wrote the Bible. They are God's words which "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you" (Pet 1:21-2:1) Baptists conclude that every word of every one of the 66 books is verbally inspired and penned by holy men of God. The 27 books of the new testament are inspired, penned and 1st copied only by the apostles and eyewitnesses. In the case of Mark and Dr. Luke, God's agents under direct supervision of these apostles and eyewitnesses. Apostles were not theologians with an agenda to communicate, they were eyewitnesses with the Truth to communicate. Only the eyewitnesses ordained and authorized by God are inspired to pen the truths communicated by God, and every word they wrote, whether noun or pronoun, verb or adverb; every word they wrote, whether letter or dissertation, gospel or exhortation;

### *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

every word was a word of God's choosing and communication. Such is called the verbal plenary inspiration of scripture.

A well versed Roman Catholic recently wrote to me saying: "You know and I know that the Bible didn't exist until 397 AD, when the canon was complete! Constantine died in 337, 60 years earlier. How could there ever have existed a Church "by open Bible and by open conscience" before the Bible even was finished! And even after 397, there could only exist as many Bibles as there were monks who would hand copy them, since there was no printing press. Good grief. The man made "doctrine" of "Bible alone" is so riddled with error! The Bible didn't plop down from the sky. The Catholic Church picked which Scriptures belonged in the Bible. And if the Catholic Church could error on infant Baptism, communion, et al, then why do you accept your Bible!? The Bible indeed is the written Word of God. But this fact isn't because the Bible says it, it is because the Catholic Church said it in 397 AD, when she finalized the canon."

It should be pointed out that Catholics and too often Protestants, error by referring to the Churches in the singular as if there is but one and Romanism is 'It'. The Bible continually instructs "For ye brethren, became followers of the Churches of God which in Judea are in Christ Jesus." The continual reference to "The Church" in the abstract is nowhere practiced by the apostles and is thus an unbiblical practice. Nowhere does the Bible call Mary the Mother of God. Nowhere does the Bible lend credence or authority to a singular Church.

Catholics rest on papal authority. We Baptists on Biblical authority. They try an end run around our authority by saying the Bible did not exist prior to their papal authority. They say, consequently that no church could have ever existed basing all its faith and practice on what the Bible said. Their doctrine insists that they are the One Church and the Mother of all faith. This is not a new argument for

## Article 2 - On Biblical Authority

Catholics, they have repeatedly tried to contain and control all written word, and thus contain and control all Christendom. Catholicism errantly holds popular opinion that at one time they were the one and only Church in existence. Baptists know this is not true. Baptist also know that the Roman Imperial Church did not construct, author nor preserve our Bible. The facts tell us, in actuality, that Roman Catholicism was a leading hindrance to the distribution of God's word and the doctrine of verbal preservation.

Let's examine these facts from three different aspects. First, what does the Bible say about its formation, distribution and preservation and authority. Second, what does history tell us about the availability of scripture before 397 AD. And lastly, what does the Roman Catholic Church itself say about those churches which were using scriptures as authority outside of its Roman purview

### **On Biblical Authority What the Bible says** TOC

An excellent rule for understanding the Bible is that "The Bible is the best interpreter of the Bible." To implement this rule one must consider the teaching of all scriptures as they bear upon any one doctrine. What then does scripture say about its New Testament authors? Were they actually apostles, i.e. Eyewitnesses of the Christ, his life, death, burial and resurrection?

The Apostle John sure claims that rite:

*I John 1: 1 ¶ That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life; 2 (For the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was*

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

*manifested unto us;) 3 That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us: and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ. 4 And these things write we unto you, that your joy may be full.*

*5 ¶ This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all. 6 If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth: 7 But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.*

Clearly this was penned by the Apostle John, the wording exactly reflects his manner in his Gospel (Note particularly John 1:1-28<sup>2</sup> the exceptional prologue of the Gospel he

---

<sup>2</sup> 1 ¶ In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. 2 The same was in the beginning with God. 3 All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. 4 In him was life; and the life was the light of men.

1 5 And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not. 6 There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. 7 The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the Light, that all men through him might believe. 8 He was not that Light, but was sent to bear witness of that Light. 9 That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. 10 He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not. 11 He came unto his own, and his own received him not. 12 But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: 13 Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. 14 And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.

2 15 John bare witness of him, and cried, saying, This was he of whom I spake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me: for he was

*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

wrote with the same authority.) The same holds true for the Revelation of Jesus Christ, signed by the Apostle John's own hand, written copied and then distributed to the 7 Churches of Asia Minor. To say that John did less than this is to say that the Apostle John was disobedient to the Lord Jesus Christ. Jesus commanded John to write these things in a book. Jesus commanded John to get the letters to the 7 Churches. It is embarrassingly clear that all this was done in the apostles life time. It is embarrassingly clear that it was 300 years before the Counsel at Hippo (393AD) and Carthage (397AD). To say that the Bible did not exist prior to these counsels of the apostate Catholic Church is to be embarrassingly ignorant of the Bible itself. Yet the Roman Catholics must insist that Papal Doctrine carries more

---

before me. 16 And of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace. 17 For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. 18 No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.

3 19 And this is the record of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, Who art thou? 20 And he confessed, and denied not; but confessed, I am not the Christ. 21 And they asked him, What then? Art thou Elias? And he saith, I am not. Art thou that prophet? And he answered, No. 22 Then said they unto him, Who art thou? that we may give an answer to them that sent us. What sayest thou of thyself? 23 He said, I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Esaias. 24 And they which were sent were of the Pharisees. 25 And they asked him, and said unto him, Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet? 26 John answered them, saying, I baptize with water: but there standeth one among you, whom ye know not; 27 He it is, who coming after me is preferred before me, whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose. 28 These things were done in Bethabara beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing.

### *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

authority than Bible Doctrine. To do less would erode their authority to establish such ludicrous doctrines as baptismal regeneration, priests magically turning wafers into God's flesh, confessionals; deification of Mary, celibacy of nuns and priests, or praying to dead saints. Notice how their authority must precede Bible authority, their papal infallibility, must precede Bible infallibility.

My antagonistic Catholic writes:

Where did the Baptist's get the Bible from, in order to have a "Bible Doctrine". I pose to you that before "Bible Doctrine" even existed there needed to be Papal Doctrine, otherwise Scripture might not have been infallibly picked for the Bible. In any case. Catholic's "Papal Doctrine" should coincide with "Bible Doctrine", as it was "Papal Doctrine" which defined the Bible.

Again notice Catholic insistence that papal authority is infallible, and that they alone could define the Bible. Notice again their necessity to have papal authority override even the authority of the apostles. Lets look for a moment at the gospel of Luke, especially it's marvelous introduction.

*Luke 1:1 ¶ Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, 2 Even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eyewitnesses, and ministers of the word; 3 It seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, 4 That thou mightest know the certainty of those things, wherein thou hast been instructed.*

In each of the writings of the apostles we find tremendous authority to establish and contend for the doctrines of the faith. Although not one of the 12, Luke was a co-minister of the Gospel with the 12 Apostles, and wrote with the

*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

authority of an apostle as they indeed authorized his written works. Luke wrote his gospel and the history of the early Church recorded in the Acts of the Apostles. Here Luke wrote with authority to establish and confirm doctrine, with no help from catholic papal authority. Biblical authority and Biblical Doctrine did indeed precede any Roman Catholic or Catholic Papal authority. By the apostles own dictates, any departures from or additions to their doctrines is to be rejected <sup>3</sup>. Papal Authority is replete with departures from and additions to Bible Doctrine. And trying to contend that papal authority carries the same weight as Apostolic authority and Inspired Scripture's Authority is a cardinal error which will not be swallowed by a Bible Believing Baptist. What Bibles were around before 397 AD? The ones that the Apostles wrote, copied and distributed. Did the Church at Corinth have a copy of Paul's letters? Did the independent, local, autonomous, apostle believing, believer baptizing Church at Philipi have a copy of Paul's writings prior to the Counsel at Hippo (393AD) and Carthage (397AD)? Obviously Yes.

The Churches had the scriptures from the apostles long before the Roman Catholics figured out what was what in 397 and well before the once thought infallible, Roman

---

<sup>3</sup>Galations 1:8-9 But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. 9 As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.

<sup>4</sup>2Thes 2:1-2 Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, 2 That ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand.

<sup>5</sup>1John

### *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

Pope Innocent I confirmed the existence of a Bible in 405 A.D. Innocent I was one of the last guys to figure out what a Holy Bible is and now they teach he was the first. Go figure.

The Catholics persist in this type of rhetoric because they have intermingled papal authority with apostolic authority. Their Roman contention is that the Apostles had nothing over what their father pope has thus their thinking that the Bible was authored, constructed and preserved by this papal authority, and not by apostolic authority. The roots of this papal authority will be explored in another chapter. Notice here that it is very different from apostolic authority. An apostle must be an eyewitness and ordained by Jesus Christ himself.

Baptists hold to Biblical authority of Scriptures. The apostles alone were the eyewitnesses which passed on the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. They did not pass on any of this authority, they passed on the truth. They wrote all that God wanted written, and what God wanted written was copied, passed on and preserved by God's almighty hand, not man's futile hand

Examine some more scriptures. Paul states in the closing of his letter to the Colossians: "Luke, the beloved physician, and Demas, greet you. Salute the brethren which are in Laodicea, and Nymphas, and the church which is in his house. And when this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye likewise read the *epistle* from Laodicea. And say to Archippus, Take heed to the ministry which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfill it. The salutation by the hand of me Paul. Remember my bonds. Grace *be* with you. Amen."



*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

Notice in this context that Paul did not expect his letter to be read once then laid aside. His expectation was that it be copied and distributed to other churches where it was to be read in their assemblies. It was. Notice his reference to a letter of his, to be received and then read in this assembly, from the Church of the Laodiceans. Paul wrote no letter addressed to the Laodiceans/ Notice from the table which shows the approximate times and settings of each of Paul's writings that letters of Colossians, Ephesians, and Philemon were written and distributed in this same year.

<i><b>Pauls Letter</b></i>	<i><b>Approx Date</b></i>	<i><b>Wrote From</b></i>	<i><b>Ref</b></i>
Galations	49-50	Antioch	Acts 15:1-35
1,2 Thes	51	Athens / Corinth	1Thes 3:1
1 Cor	56	Epesus	Acts 18:23-21:26
2 Cor	57	Masadonia	
Romans	58	Corinth	
Colossains	61	Rome	
Ephesians	61	Rome	
Philemon	61	Rome	
1 Timothy	63	Macedonia	
Titus	63	Nicopolisar-Macedonia	
2 Timothy	66	Rome	

The letter that was coming from Laodicea to be read at Colosse was most likely the letter to the Ephesians, Phileman being a more private letter that gained circulation later on. Some who hold little regard for verbal plenary inspiration of Scriptures contend that individual Churches took pen in hand and changed the addressee in Paul's letters, thus they errantly say the letter we have as Ephesians was first labeled Laodicea. Such unsupported conjecture is balderdash. Paul clearly wrote to the church

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

he addresses and provides enough specific information about them and to them that such conjecture is blasphemous to the doctrine of verbal plenary inspiration of Paul's writings.

However it is plain that Paul did intend that his letter to Ephesus, although specifically addressing his concerns for the new believers at Ephesus, be read in other Churches( I could say here "all Churches.")

If we have the time line of Paul's writings accurate the epistle to be received from Laodicea may have been his tremendous dissertation on "the righteousness of God providing salvation by faith" Which he called the epistle to the Romans. It would have been written two years earlier than this letter to Colosse. It may have been one of the earlier letters written to Corinth or Thesolonica or to the Churches of Galatia, but there was a letter of Paul's present at Laodocia. Paul has no letter addressed specifically to them. They were copying and distributing it to Colosse and Paul wanted his letter to Colosse copied and sent to the Church of the Laodoceans. There it was to be read in their assemblies. Clearly and irrevocably the Scriptures (Paul's letters were Scriptures, to be read in Churches as were the OT Scriptures. Were being copied and distributed amongst Churches in 61 AD, under the watchful eyes of the apostle himself, the eyewitness of the resurrected Christ.

We have mentioned several times in this treatise that apostolic authority included a requirement of being eyewitness to the resurrected Christ. Since there never was a pope with this required trait we should see what the scripture itself says of this requirement for authority. Begin such examination with the replacement for Judas made by the eleven apostles in Acts chapter 1.

*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

Peters justification for choosing a replacement witness for “Judas, which was guide to them that took Jesus” is recorded in Acts 1:21-22. “Wherefore of these men which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, Beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day that he was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection.” They then choose by lots Matthias “to take part of the ministry and apostleship.” The stern requirement understood for an apostle of the truth was that they be an eyewitness of the Lord Jesus' resurrection. No pope has been such. Baptist authority for truth remains solely affixed to these apostles. There is no continuing appointment or ordination for the office of apostles. There is no passing of the torch of their authority. Christ gave “And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ:” This giving of apostles stops at 12 each. The requirements for an apostle, that they be eyewitness of the resurrected Christ, is such that this is not a perpetual office in the Churches.

Revelation 21:14 says “And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb.” There are but 12 here. We will know which 12 when we get to heaven, but it is certain now that Joseph Smith is not one, nor is Pope John. In Revelation 2 Jesus commends the Church at Ephesus because “thou hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars:” We should do the same. Any institution which ordains apostles is deviant from Scriptures. When the Roman Catholic Church claims

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

273 popes holding apostolic authority they are apostate, not apostolic. Catholicism is not a part of the foundation nor authority of a Bible believing Christian. We are not built on the Roman Catholic foundation but by the witness of god's Word. We are built on the foundation of the 12 apostles alone.

When we get to heaven and check the names on the foundation I expect we will find there the Apostle Paul's name on one. Myself, I don't expect to see Mattheas' name there. There will only be 12 names and I believe Mattheas was mans ordained replacement while the Apostle Paul was God's ordained replacement. Whatever names are written on these foundation there are but 12 of them and they are called foundation stones on purpose. Paul speaks of these apostle named foundation and says to the saints at Ephesus and to the faithful in Christ Jesus (we Baptist are here included) "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone. In whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit." There may be 273 popes who pretended to be vicars of Christ, but there are only 12 apostles which form the foundation of what true Christians believe.

We conclude here that the Scriptures were written copied and distributed to the Churches by apostolic authority. This authority to discern and record the true doctrine of Jesus Christ was not passed on to another. The foundation stones are found in these 12 apostles not in traditions passed on with private interpretation.

*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

*“It shall greatly help ye to understand Scripture,  
If thou mark, Not only what is spoken or written,  
But of whom, And to whom,  
With what words, At what time  
Where, To what intent,  
With what circumstances,  
Considering what goeth before And what followeth.”  
John Wycliffe*

**Article 3** TOC

**One Church, But Not Roman**

The Roman Catholic Church contends that it is the sole mother of all faith in Christ. This contention that there must be only one Church of Christ, and the Romans are it, is pitted in their twisted interpretation of Matthew 16.

Nowhere in the NT scriptures is there an implication that one Church is to lord over another with any ecclesiastical control. Each Church was to be independent, and each Church is to be autonomous. Understand the meaning of autonomous here as Catholics often make it synonymous with anarchy. Autonomous here means a Church body is not under human control but under the control of Jesus Christ. A local Church has a human pastor (shepherd, more particularly an under shepherd) in the office of bishop (overseer) who is an ordained elder (presbyter.) This ordination (or choosing) is by God, . but bear this point carefully in mind. When Jesus Christ said *“And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall prevail against it.”* There are some things that the Roman Catholic Church read entirely wrong. First, they think that the rock was referring to Peter rather than the truth that Peter had just uttered, secondly they teach and consider that the church here is some singular, only one can be right, and we are “IT” kind of monstrosity that excommunicates and burns heretics. Clearly, the church referred to here is the abstract institution not the singular held to by mislead Roman Catholics and carried over by confused Protestants. Dr. Carroll, provides the best illustration of this abstract language with example:

An English statesman, referring to the right of each

*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

individual citizen to be tried by his peers, should say: ‘ On this rock England will build her jury, and all the power of tyranny shall not prevail against her.’ He uses the term jury in an abstract sense, i.e., in the sense of an institution. But when this institution finds concrete expression or becomes operative, it is always a particular jury of twelve men and never an aggregation of all juries into one big jury.” Bravo Dr. Carol.

Please see, that the Roman Catholic Church misrepresents the scripture on this point and contends that the Roman Catholic Imperial Church is the aggregation of all churches into one big jury. Not true, thus, to a Bible believer, the Roman Catholic Imperial Church is anything but a “pillar and ground of truth” It is a web of self serving deception and deceit. But it does have a very long history of very effective half truth deceptions. As you read through the following answers to Max’s list of unanswerable questions, keep in mind that this web of deceit is sometimes subtle, but clearly comes from the father of deceivers, and not from the Word of God.

**Article 4** TOC

**Origin of Roman Catholic Church**

I'll contend that your misjudgment that Roman Catholicism was around before Independent, Autonomous, Bible Believing, Believer Immersing Churches came about when you errantly believed that the Bible did not exist prior to the fifth century. That myth is a stronghold of Roman Catholicism. The Bible existed and was copiously copied from the day the apostles penned and distributed each book/letter. Until you get this truth framed in your head you will continue to follow the deceptive Roman Catholic line of reasoning.

The Roman Catholic Church is the result of gradual perversion and corruption and "lest thou shouldest ponder the path of life, her ways are moveable, that thou canst not know them. (Prov 5:6)" From the days of Constantine, when soldiers without regeneration were baptized into the church by the thousands, and compromise was made with paganism, conditions waxed worse and worse, finally bringing about a state that made the Catholic Church possible. The actual establishment of the Roman Papacy was accomplished by Gregory the Great in the year A.D. 590. (This according to Dr. S.E. Tull "Demoniationalism Put to the Test") Dr. Tull corroborates his statement by the following quotation from Ridpath (Vol. 4 P. 41):

"This epoch in history should not be passed over without reference to the rapid growth of the papal church, in the close of the sixth century and the beginning of the seventh. Most of all by Gregory the Great; whose pontificate extended from 590 to 604, was the supremacy of the apostolic See attested and maintained. Under the triple title of Bishop of Rome, Prelate of Italy, and Apostle of the



*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

West, he gradually by gentle insinuations or bold assertions as best suited the circumstances, elevated the Episcopacy of Rome into a genuine papacy of the church. He succeeded in bringing the Arians of Italy and Spain into the Catholic fold, and thus secured the solidarity of the Western Ecclesia."

Thus the development of any absolute Roman papacy, the corruption of the word catholic, and the complete abandoning of the Word of God (the Bible, the writings of the Apostles that were copied the day they were penned) as the absolute authority had its crescendo under Gregory in 590-604 A.D. The Roman Catholic Church did not originate in a day or year, but gradually subverted the apostles' teaching, and in centuries inaugurated full-grown popery. There is not a trace of a pope or Universal Father in the first three centuries of the Christian era.

We thus trace Independent, Autonomous, Bible Believing, Believer Immersing Churches all the way back to the Apostles who wrote the scriptures. Don't get hung up on the history of John Smyth here, nor on the name Baptist. These IABBBI Churches were called Baptists, Baptizers, Ana-Baptists Montanists, Donatists, Paulicians, Waldenses, etc. Since the American, Regular and Southern Baptist have compromised with the modernists we call the little remnant that remains true to His Word, Independent, Fundamental, KJV Baptists. Names will change. The fact that a Baptist holds to the Holy Scriptures as its sole source of all faith and practice won't change. It has not changed for 1970 years now, ever sense the apostle Peter (who didn't found any papacy or any Roman Church despite what fallible Pope Gregory I said) preached at pentecost.

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

	List of Heresies And HUMAN INVENTIONS ADOPTED and PERPETUATED by the ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE COURSE OF 1600 YEARS. (Compiled by Rev. Stephen L. Testa). Revised by A.A. Davis	
Item	These dates are in many cases approximate. Many of these heresies had been current in the Church years before, but only when they were officially adopted by a Church council and proclaimed by the pope as dogma of faith, did they become binding on Catholics. At the Reformation in the 16th Century these heresies were repudiated as having no part in the Religion of Jesus as taught in the New Testament.	Contrived in A.D.
1	Of all the human inventions taught and practices by the Roman Catholic Church, which are contrary to the Bible, the most ancient are the prayers for the dead and the sign of the Cross. Both began 300 years after Christ.	310
2	Wax candles introduced in church about 320 and also tampering with Law of God (Exodus 20:3-17) in 321	320
3	Veneration of angels and dead saints about 375	375
4	The Mass, as a daily celebration, adopted 394	394
5	The worship of Mary. The mother of Jesus, and the use of the term "Mother of God", as applied to her, originated in the Council of Ephesus in 431	431
6	Priests began to dress differently from the laity in 500	
7	The doctrine of Purgatory was first established by Gregory the Great about the year 593	593
8	The Latin language, as the language of the prayer and worship in churches, was also imposed by Pope Gregory I. 600 years after Christ.	600
9	The Bible teaches that we pray to God alone. In the primitive church never were prayers directed to Mary, or to dead saints. This practice began in the Roman Church about 600	600

*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

10	<p>The papacy is of pagan origin. The title of pope or universal bishop, was first given to the bishop of Rome by the wicked emperor Phocas, in the year 610. This he did to spite Bishop Ciriacus of Constantinople, who had justly excommunicated him for having caused the assassination of his predecessor emperor, Mauritius. Gregory I, the bishop of Rome, refused the title, but his successor, Boniface III, first assumed title “pope”.</p> <p>Jesus did not appoint Peter to the head ship of apostles and forbade any such notion. (Luke 22:24-26; Ephesians 1:22-23; Colossians 1:18; I Cor.. 3:11)</p> <p>Note: Nor is there any mention in Scripture, nor in history, that Peter ever was in Rome, much less that he was pope there for 25 years; Clement 3rd Bishop of Rome, remarks that “there is no real 1st century evidence that Peter ever was in Rome.”</p>	610
11	<p>The kissing of the Pope’s feet began in 709. It has been a pagan custom to kiss the feet of emperors. The Word of God forbids such practices. (Read Acts 10:25-26; Rev. 19:10;22:9)</p>	709
12	<p>The Temporal power of the Popes began in 750. When Pepin, the usurper of the throne of France, descended into Italy, called by Pope Stephen II, to war against the Italian Lombards, he defeated them and gave the city of Rome and surrounding territory to the pope. Jesus expressly forbade such a thing, and He himself refused worldly kingship. (Read Matt. 4:9; 20:25-26; John 18:36)</p>	750
13	<p>Worship of the cross, of images and relics was authorized in 788. This was by order of Dowager Irene of Constantinople who first caused to pluck the eyes of her own son, Constantine VI, and then called a church council at the request of Harrian I, pope of Rome at that time. Such practices is called simply IDOLATRY in the Bible, and is severely condemned. (Read Exodus 20:4; Deut 27:15; Psalm 115)</p>	788
14	<p>Holy Water, mixed with a pinch of salt and blessed by the priest, was authorized in 850.</p>	850
15	<p>The veneration of St. Joseph began in 890.</p>	890
16	<p>The baptism of bells was instituted by Pope John XIV in the year 965</p>	965
17	<p>Canonization of dead saints, first by Pope John XV in 995. Every believer and follower of Christ is called saint in the Bible.(Read Rom. 1:7; I Cor.. 1:2)</p>	995
18	<p>Fasting on Fridays and during Lent were imposed in the year 998. By popes who said to be interested in the commerce of fish. (Bull, or permit to eat meat), some authorities say, began in the year 700. This is against the plain teaching of the Gospel. (Read Matt. 15:10; I Cor.. 10:25; I Tim. 4:1-3).</p>	998

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

19	The Mass was developed gradually as a sacrifice; attendance made obligatory in the 11th century. The Gospel teaches that the sacrifice of Christ was offered once and for all, and is not to be repeated, but only commemorated in the Lord's Supper. (Read Heb. 7:27; 9:26-28; 10:10-14).	1000?
20	The celibacy of the priesthood was decreed by Pope Hildebrand, Boniface II, in the year 1079. Jesus imposed no such rule, nor did any of the apostles. On the contrary St. Peter was a married man, and St. Paul says that bishops were to have wife and children. (Read I Tim. 3:12 & 25; Matt 8:14-15)	1,079
21	The Rosary, or prayer beads was introduced by Peter, the Hermit, in the year 1090. Copied from Hindus and Mohammedans. The counting of prayers is a pagan practice and is expressly condemned by Christ. (Matt. 6:5-13)	1,090
22	The inquisition of heretics was instituted by the Council of Verona in the year 1184. Jesus never taught the use of force to spread His religion.	1,184
23	The sale of indulgences, commonly regarded as a purchase of forgiveness and a permit to indulge in sin, began in the year 1190. Christianity, as taught in the Gospel, condemns such a traffic, and it was the protest against this traffic that brought on the Protestant Reformation in the 16th century.	1,190
24	The dogma of Transubstantiation was decreed by Pope Innocent III in 1215. By this doctrine the priest pretends to perform a daily miracle by changing the wafer into the body of Christ, and then he pretends to eat Him alive in the presence of his people during the Mass. The Gospel condemns such absurdities; for the Lord's Supper is simply a memorial of the sacrifice of Christ. (Read Luke 22:19-20; John 6:35; I Cor.. 11:26).	1,215
25	Confession of sins to the priest at least once per year was instituted by Pope Innocent III, in the Lateran Council, in the year 1215. The Gospel commands us to confess our sins direct to God. (Read Psalm 51:10; Luke 7:48; 15:21; I John 1:8-9).	1,215
26	The adoration of the wafer (Host), was decreed by Pope Honorius in the year 1220. So the Roman Church worships a god made by human hands. This is plain idolatry and absolutely contrary to the spirit of the Gospel. (Read John 4:24)	1,220
27	The scapular was invented by Simon Stock, an English monk, in the year 1287. It is a piece of brown cloth, with the picture of the Virgin and supposed to contain supernatural virtue to protect from all dangers those who wear it on naked skin. This is fetishism.	1,287
28	The Roman Church forbade the cup to the laity, by instituting the communion of one kind in the Council of Constance in the year 1414. The Gospel commands us to observe the Lord's Supper with bread and wine. (Read Matt. 26:27; I Cor.. 11:26-27.)	1,414

*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

29	The doctrine of Purgatory was proclaimed as a dogma of faith by Council of Florence in 1439. There is not one word in the Bible that would teach the purgatory of priests. The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sins. (Read I John 1:7-9; 2:1-2; John 5:24; Rom. 8:1)	1,439
30	The doctrine of 7 Sacraments affirmed in the year 1439. The Gospel says that Christ instituted only two ordinances, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. (Read Matt. 28:19-20; 26:26-28)	1,439
31	The Ave Maria, part of the last half in the year 1508. It was completed 50 years afterward and finally approved by Pope Sixtus V, at the end of the 16th century.	1,508
32	The Council of Trent, held in the year 1545, declared that Tradition is of equal authority with the Bible. By Tradition is meant human teachings. The Pharisees believed the same way, and Jesus bitterly condemned them, for by human tradition, they nullified the commandments of God. (Read Mark 7:7-13; Col.. 2:8; Rev. 22:18).	1,545
33	The apocryphal books were added to the Bible also by the Council of Trent in 1546. These books were not recognized as canonical by the Jewish Church. (See Rev 22:8-9)	1,546
34	The Creed of Pope Pius IV was imposed as the official creed 1560 years after Christ and the apostles, in the year 1560.	1,560
35	The Immaculate Conception of Virgin Mary was proclaimed by Pope Pius IX in the year 1854. The Gospel states that all men, with the sole exception of Christ, are sinners. Mary herself had need of a Savior. (Read Rom. 3:23; 5:12; Psalm 51:5; Luke 1:30; 46-47.)	1,854
36	In the year 1870 after Christ, Pope Pius IX proclaimed that dogma of Papal infallibility. This is a blasphemy and the sign of the apostasy and of the anti-christ predicted by St. Paul (Read II Thess. 2:2-12; Rev. 17:1-9; 13:5-8,18)	1,870
37	Pope Pius X, in the year 1907, condemned together with "Modernism", all the discoveries of modern science which are not approved by the Church. Pius had done the same thing in the Syllabus of 1864.	1,907
38	In the year 1930 Pius XI condemned the Public Schools..	1,930
39	In the year 1931 the same pope, Pius XI, reaffirmed the doctrine that Mary is the Mother of God. This doctrine was first invented by the Council of Ephesus in the year 431. This is a heresy contrary by Mary's own words. (Red Luke 1:46-49; John 2:1-5).	1,931
40	In the year 1950 the last dogma was proclaimed by Pope Pius XII, the Assumption of the Virgin Mary.	1,950

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

Concl

What will be the next invention? The Roman Church says it never changes; yet, it has done nothing else but invent new doctrines which are contrary to the Bible, and has practiced rites and ceremonies taken bodily from paganism. Some scholar has found 75% of the rites and ceremonies of the Roman Church are of pagan origin. Note: Cardinal Newman, in his book, "The Development of the Christian Religion," admits that . . . "Temples, incense, oil lamps, votive offerings, holy water, holidays and season of devotions, processions, blessing of field, sacerdotal testaments, and tonsure (of priests and monks and nuns), images . . . Are all of pagan origin . . ." (Pg. 359)

The above chronological list of human inventions disproves the claim of the priests of the Roman Church that their religion was taught by Christ, and that the popes have been the faithful custodians of this religion.

**BROTHERS!** The Word of God commands us to get out of Babylon, saying : "Come out of her, my people, that you may not take part in her sins, nor receive a share in her plagues . . ." (Rev. 18:4). All true Christians will remain faithful to the religion of Christ as taught in the Bible, and heed the warning of the Apostle Paul, who said : "But, though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." (Gal. 1:8)

From "The Baptist Story Sermons on The Trail of Blood" by A.A. Davis @1999, Appendix XIV pg. 207

*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

**Article 5** TOC

**Peter was not the Rock on which the Church was Built**

The contention between Rome and Baptist has always been centered on authority. Rome claims papal authority handed down through Peter to itself. Thus the Roman Catholic Church, they contend, is the only true and singular Church. Baptists claim Biblical authority accepting all faith and practice from only the eyewitness authors of scripture and denying all apostolic session. Thus a true Church (a called out body of believers) with doctrinal purity and Biblical organization could spring up from any group of regenerated believers who band together and grasp only a Bible, the word, and a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, the WORD. Their battle cry “Christ built His Church upon Peter, He did not build ‘churches’ upon Christ.” Our battle cry, “Christ built and is still building local, autonomous, independent, Bible believing, believer Baptizing Churches, who will not pledge allegiance to Rome.” There have always been such Churches in existence. Rome denies it but Baptists follow the trail of blood all the way back to the 1st called out body of believers, the 1st ecclesia, the 1st Church of Jesus Christ. They, the Roman imperial monarchical church, claim history to be on their side. We, in the independent Bible believing, believer baptizing churches currently called Baptists, claim truth to be on ours.

Let’s examine the scriptures carefully on this point. Matthew 16:18 particularly.

*When Jesus came into the coasts of Caesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I the Son of man am? And they said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist: some, Elias;*

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

*and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets. He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. **And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.** And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ.*

Roman interpretation of this scripture is that Jesus would build his Church upon Peter. Baptist rendering follows the text more carefully to understand the contrast between “Petros”, a proper noun of masculine gender, and “this rock”, a demonstrative pronoun of feminine gender. The truth (a feminine noun) that Peter stated is clearly the rock (petra, a feminine noun) which Christ would build upon. In Greek the pronoun must always agree in gender with its object. “This”, the demonstrative pronoun used here, could have been in the masculine and with some obscure use could have been used to point to Peter, i.e. This(m) Petros(m), will be the rock(m) to build my ecclesia(f). But that would not be the words of Christ. His words reflect a contrast between the name Petros (m) and the truth(f) that he stated. This truth(f) which Christ labeled this(f) rock (petra)(f) was what he would build his Church upon. Christ’s Church is built upon the truth of who he is, as in



## *Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

Baptist Doctrine. It is not built on a human or upon a succession of humans, as in Roman Catholic Doctrine.

The keys of the kingdom of heaven are also misrepresented in Roman Catholic thinking. They clearly represent the gospel of Jesus Christ, more decisively the preaching of that gospel. Peter was first to use those keys in Acts chapter 2. At that 1st preaching of the gospel there were thousands loosed from bondage of sin. Christ's Church is built by the preaching of the gospel to every creature and his marvelous work of salvation, i.e. the regeneration of believers. That follows Baptist Doctrine. Christ's Church is not built by Peter handing down the keys to a human papacy made infallible, now with authority to lock or unlock the kingdom at it's will and whim. That is Roman Catholic Doctrine, and the Roman Catholic Papacy has been full of will and whim, departure from the Bible and additions to the faith.

Lets follow Roman Papal lineage more closely. To propagate that this Roman papal authority is holding Peter's keys to the kingdom they had to get Peter to be a pope in Rome. That was a formidable task which they pursued by twisting history and rewriting it where necessary. They even exploited secret code word fictions like "Babylon" being Peter's supposed secret code word for Rome. Peter wrote from Babylon, not Rome. The arguments against Peter's residence in Rome have been quantified by Michael Grant in his historical biography "Saint Peter" (Grant was a nonbeliever, neither Roman Catholic nor a Baptized Bible Believing Baptist) as follows:

- 1) Paul's Letter to the Galatians indicates that Peter's activities took place at Jerusalem. There is also a mention of a visit to Antioch, with Gentile

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

Christians, and even induced Paul's companion Barnabas to adopt a similar procedure. But nothing is said here about Rome.

2) Paul's Letter to the Romans is addressed to the Christians at Rome. In the whole of this address, however, there is no mention of Peter at all, which seems strange if he was indeed in Rome, *and even stranger if he was indeed a Pope at Rome.*

3) As we have already seen, one of the principal purposes of Acts is to institute a comparison between Peter and Paul: whereas Galatians shows them in conflict and confrontation, Acts deliberately displays unanimity. Since the book terminates with Paul preaching in Rome, it is surely to be expected that its author would mention that Peter had preceded him there, or was his companion there, if any such tradition existed. But there is no mention of any such thing.

4) The Epistle *I Clement* (96 AD), which purports to have been written by Clement of Rome, on behalf of the church of that city, to the church of Corinth, records Peter's noble past, but has nothing whatever to say about his having been at Rome. Moreover, the aim of the entire passage is to compare him with Paul, and draw a parallel between them. In these circumstances, it is possible to deduce that no tradition of Peter's residence or martyrdom at Rome was known to the writer of the Letter.

5) When writing of later date do make reference to the martyrdom of Peter, they fail to indicate where this took place. If it had taken place at Rome, one would expect this to be specified.

*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

6) In support of the opposite argument it has been supposed that when Ignatius, who died in about 110 AD, said to the Romans, 'I did not request you, as Peter and Paul did', he was implying that Peter as well as Paul, had preached to their community in the city. However, Justin Martyr, when he was writing in about the middle of the second century, does not make any mention of Peter having been there. About the activities of Simon Magus in the city he has a good deal to say. But on Simon's supposed confrontation with Peter in Rome, which is the theme of so many later stories, Justin remains entirely silent.

7) The earliest evidence for Peter's alleged residence in Rome that can be dated with any degree of accuracy comes from Dionysius of Corinth. It was during the bishopric of Soter (166-74 AD) that Dionysius wrote to the church of Rome, expressing gratitude to its members for their financial assistance. Part of the Letter has been reproduced by Eusebius. In this, Dionysius observes that it is right and proper that the churches of Rome and Corinth should operate in unison, since they had both been founded jointly by Peter and Paul (and this, in the case of Rome, was echoed by Irenaeus.) However, this mention of the role of Peter does not readily invite acceptance. For one thing, what Dionysius stated about Corinth was not true. That is to say, he had seriously distorted the history of his own church. And, since he had been so inaccurate about the church he knew so well, there is no reason to believe what he said about Rome either. Moreover, there are positive reasons for disbelieving what he wrote on the subject. For one thing, his

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

ascription to Paul of a joint role in the foundation of the Roman Church does not seem to be correct. On the contrary, Paul observed in *Romans* that he had never met the Christians in Rome, in the foundation of whose Church, therefore, he cannot have played a part. So why believe the statement about Peter either, which goes far beyond anything said by Ignatius or Justin?

8) Later on, it became customary to report, without any justification, that Peter had resided at Rome for twenty-five years, and to declare that he had been not merely the joint founder but the sole founder of its Church, so that the alleged participation of Paul in its establishment was gradually expunged from the record.

In order to propagate its single episcopal, monarchical personage doctrine and to build and hold onto a forged papal authority the Roman Church needed to twist, contort and add to history. It had to expunge the true founder of the Church at Rome, the Lord Jesus Christ, and fabricate a continuous succession of authority, attached to Peter. They misread Scripture to fashion Peter as the human founder of the Church, they misread history to propagate their error.

Baptist Doctrine follows verbatim Biblical Doctrine. That individual Churches, (i.e. bodies of believers, called out baptized believers,) were organized into local Churches where only regenerated baptized believers were admitted into membership. These local Churches, whose founder was the Lord Jesus Christ, had but one human overseer in an office called bishop (Grk. Bishop = Overseer), who was an ordained elder (Grk. Presbyter = elder, mature one), who was to do the task of a shepherd (Grk. Pastor.) A Roman

*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

Catholic will be kept from this explanation and guarded in the teaching that Peter founded the Church of Rome and passed on an apostolic authority wherein the Popes all retained infallible connection to God, even if they initiate mariology or indulgences, baptismal regeneration or immaculate conception.

The contention between Rome and Baptist has always been centered on authority. Roman Imperial Monarchical Church always wielded the sword of Government, (until 1776 Praise the Lord.) The Baptist (not always called by that name but always separatist) wielded only the two edged sword of the Word of God. We are still only armed with that powerful sword and reliant only on the Spirit of God that indwells all regenerated believers today. What a marvelous contest Bible believers vs. mystery Babylon. Sword of the Lord vs. Sword of Monarchical Governments. I have read the final chapter, and will be staying away from any mark of the Roman Imperial Monarchical Church. You should do likewise.

**Article 6** TOC

**Three Roman Errors Concerning Mariology**

One of the most striking systematic errors found in Catholicism is what we shall call Mariology. Although a Bible believer finds it striking and staunchly un-Biblical, one who has been brought up in Catholicism and shielded from the scriptures will often take the humanizing of Mary with swift insult. In the Bible John the Baptist said of the Christ, "He must increase, but I must decrease." To get a staunch Catholic to say the same, to say that "Christ must increase, but Mary must decrease", is necessary for their conversion to Christ, but it can be very challenging.

Catholicism has deified Mary. They say she was the Mother of God, she was not. They say "Pray to Mary", instead of to God as Jesus commanded us, they ought not. They say she remained virgin and gave her only begotten son, she did not. These three extra Biblical assertions were developed by Catholic theologians and sanctioned by supposed infallible popes. An adversary of Christ would find them an excellent tangent which would lead attention away from the theme of the Bible, away from the redeeming act of the Lord Jesus Christ. They have been a very effective tangent. One will not be converted to Christ unless they are taken off all the tangents.

The three arguments to be presented in this treatise are again that Mary was not the mother of God, that Mary was not a perpetual virgin, that Mary's womb bore other children named in the Bible, conceived and bore by natural childbirth, and that a Christian ought not to pray to Mary or to other dead saints, but pray to God the Father as Christ taught us. The scripture are solid and hard hitting on all three arguments but none so solidly as the second. Let's

*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

examine it first.

ARGUMENT: Mary did not give her only begotten son, God did. Mary gave birth to Jesus, the only begotten son of God. After the birth of Jesus, Joseph 'knew' Mary and she conceived and bare James the brother of Jesus. If the apostle Matthew writes the truth, she conceived again and bear Joses. If Mark, the companion preacher to the apostle Peter and author of the second gospel in our New Testament, told the truth she conceived again and bear Judas, then Simon. These are the Biblically listed brothers of Jesus. If Matthew and Mark wrote the God inspired truth then Jesus had sisters as well. If Luke, the co-minster of the apostle Paul, wrote the verbally inspired truth in his gospel account then the Mother of Jesus, Mary, and his brothers James, Joses, Juda and Simon came to Jesus to get him away from a controversial crowd while he taught in his hometown of Nazareth. Examine the Scriptures on these points:

*Matt 13:54 And when he was come into his own country, he taught them in their synagogue, insomuch that they were astonished, and said, Whence hath this man this wisdom, and these mighty works? 55 Is not this the carpenter's son? is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren, James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas? 56 And his sisters, are they not all with us? Whence then hath this man all these things? 57 And they were offended in him. But Jesus said unto them, A prophet is not without honour, save in his own country, and in his own house. 58 And he did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief.*

Mark 6:1 And he went out from thence, and came

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

into his own country; and his disciples follow him. 2 And when the *sabbath day* was come, he began to teach in the synagogue: and many hearing him were astonished, saying, *From whence hath this man these things? and what wisdom is this which is given unto him, that even such mighty works are wrought by his hands?* 3 *Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary, the brother of James, and Joses, and of Juda, and Simon? and are not his sisters here with us? And they were offended at him.* 4 *But Jesus said unto them, A prophet is not without honour, but in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house.* 5 *And he could there do no mighty work, save that he laid his hands upon a few sick folk, and healed them.* 6 *And he marvelled because of their unbelief. And he went round about the villages, teaching.*

Matt 12:46 While he yet talked to the people, behold, his mother and his brethren stood without, desiring to speak with him. 47 Then one said unto him, *Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with thee.* 48 *But he answered and said unto him that told him, Who is my mother? and who are my brethren?* 49 *And he stretched forth his hand toward his disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren!* 50 *For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.*

Mark 3:31 There came then his brethren and his mother, and, standing without, sent unto him, calling him. 32 And the multitude sat about him, and they said unto him, *Behold, thy mother and thy brethren*



*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

*without seek for thee. 33 And he answered them, saying, Who is my mother, or my brethren? 34 And he looked round about on them which sat about him, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! 35 For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and my sister, and mother.*

Luke 8:19 Then came to him his mother and his brethren, and could not come at him for the press. 20 And it was told him by certain which said, *Thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to see thee. 21 And he answered and said unto them, My mother and my brethren are these which hear the word of God, and do it.*

Mary was a precious chosen vessel. A chosen vessel who bore our Lord, and her Lord, our Saviour, and her Saviour, Jesus the Christ, the Son of God. With that blessed task complete she went on with her married life to Joseph and is dropped from the subject matter of the Bible. She must decrease and He, our Lord Jesus Christ alone, must increase. But this is not so in Roman Catholicism.

Roman Catholics contend against these plain and clear scriptures by saying that in the Greek brother does not mean brother and sister does not mean sister, it means some other kin. Or, perhaps, they say, it means fellow believer like we call a fellow believer a brother in Christ and they call a nun a sister. Examine this argument in their catechism:

**Catechism Pt 1, Sect 2, Chap 2, Article 3, #500** Against this doctrine the objection is sometimes raised that the Bible mentions brothers and sisters of Jesus. The Church has always understood these passages as not referring to other children of the Virgin Mary. In fact James and

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

Joseph, "brothers of Jesus," are the sons of another Mary, a disciple of Christ, whom St. Matthew significantly calls "the other Mary." They are close relations of Jesus, according to an Old Testament expression.

Clearly in any loose exposition of these scriptures it is clear that the Roman "Church has always understood these passages" very incorrectly. Such a desperation argument quickly disintegrates when we examine the context of these passages and particularly the presence of Mary, the Mother of Jesus, with Jesus' brethren. Lets start with the understanding that none of the 12 apostles, the eye witnesses who knew and spoke to Mary, the ones ordained by Christ himself to communicate the whole truth of the gospel, not one of these twelve called Mary "Mother of God" nor condoned praying to Mary. Such practice is not found in any of the 27 books of our New Testament. Mary having other children was not a "sacred persona" to any of them. Mary is a "sacred persona" to Roman Catholicism which strives to add to the ordained truths presented by the 12 ordained apostles.

Now in both these instances of Scripture Jesus is teaching in his home town of Nazareth. He is teaching people who grew up with him and his family. In Mark 6:1-6 unbelievers were offended at him because they knew him as a carpenter the son of Mary and brother of his 4 listed brothers. Would they be offended at Jesus claim to be the Son of God if Jesus had just cousins in town? No. Would they have brought it up if these were not believed by them to be blood brothers to Jesus? No. Would they have brought it up if Mary had remained a virgin and Jesus was her only begotten son? No. In Marks account they call him

*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

a carpenter in Matthew's account the carpenter's son. Obviously they said a lot of things about why they would not believe he was the miracle working son of God, but the whole gist of their argument is that they knew Joseph the carpenter, his supposed father. They knew Mary his mother and they knew Joseph and Mary's other children, Jesus' blood brothers (we know them to be half brothers.) Mary was their mother and Joseph their father. They knew Jesus' blood sisters (we know them to be half sisters). Mary was their mother and Joseph their father.

Despite what Roman Catholics strive to teach about Mary's perpetual virginity, here stands a town full of eye witnesses who knew the children that Joseph and Mary had by natural child birth. Note here that if the perpetual virginity of Mary was true and important to Christ and his apostles he could have Mark and Matthew here clarify that these were "as was supposed" brothers just like he had Luke record that Joseph was "as was supposed" the father of Jesus. (cf Luke 3:23). No apostles perpetuated any hint that Mary was a perpetual virgin. On the contrary they tested his blood brothers and mention his blood sisters without even a regard to such a possibility. Such a cardinal teaching of the Roman Catholic catechism is not Biblical and more dramatically is in contract to Bible teaching.

Let's examine the second reference to Jesus' blood brothers where they accompany Mary in an attempt to rescue Jesus from a pending riot recorded in Matthew 12, Mark 3 and Luke 8. At this point in his ministry Jesus was dealing with the rejection his "kinsmen according to the flesh." The Jews, and with offering of his kingdom to all who would believe in him. With this backdrop, and in growing hostility from the Jews, "his mother and his

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

brethren” come to get him away from the hostility. Jesus here makes a powerful illustration about spiritual brethren being more important than physical brethren. Catholicism makes a terrible dichotomy in Jesus' perfect lesson when they try to affirm that these were not really Jesus' brothers but cousins or something else, actually anything else will suit them as long as you don't believe what the Bible says. Such a dichotomy is not necessary unless you are trying to add to the Bible something that it does not contain, a glorification of Jesus' mother in the flesh. These texts, contrary to Roman Catholicism displace the reverence of Mary to the exaltation of faith in Christ.

She must decrease, and He must increase.

Mariology Argument #2 Mary was not the Mother of God. The Roman Catholic Catechism states:

**Catechism Pt 1, Sect 2, Chap 2, Article 3, # 469...** "O only-begotten Son and Word of God, immortal being, you who deigned for our salvation to become incarnate of the holy **Mother of God and ever-virgin Mary, ...**

In their zeal to exalt Mary to a position of “sacred persona” Catholicism with no Biblical precedence, have given her the distinguishing title, “Mother of God.” Such a title is subtly and purposefully misleading at the least, and such an assertion is a bold lie about deity at its highlight. Clearly in Linguistics, in Bible doctrine and in Bible exegesis the title “God” or in Hebrew “Elohim” or in Greek “Theos” is reserved for the official title of the Godhead. This is used solely for the whole Godhead composed of God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit. Mary was not the Mother of God; she was, as the Bible says, Mother of the Lord; she was, as the Bible says the mother of Jesus; but never in the Bible is she the Mother of

*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

God. It is deception.

The inherent danger in Catholicism is that their theologians think themselves above the words of the Bible, they think themselves as carrying an infallibility as did Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, they think themselves as diviners of new truth they even think themselves as the Mothers of Faith and gospel truth. Armed with their dangerous reasoning they feel they can reason that Mary's womb was the Ark of God and this womb, as the Ark of God couldn't be defiled with another birth, so they reason, the word "brother", as used by Matthew, Mark, and Luke cannot mean Jesus' brother, because it does not fit what they believe. They continue in their faulty faith that if Mary is the Mother of God, we should ask mother to intercede for us and they proceed down a false path to ask people to pray to Mary instead of praying to the Father. Such froward theology was not contrived in one setting. Indeed the original purposes were noble defenses of the deity of the Lord Jesus Christ. But they constructed a horrible tangent and became a journey down the tangent with no ability to turn back to Bible truth. Their conception that they were infallible and their use of Roman Law to force their rule made it very costly to descent from their erroneous adoration of Mary. Their house of cards is still standing. You may need to move out of the house before it collapses. Move into the house built on the foundation of Jesus Christ and constructed with the truths of His Word.

Roman Catholic Catechism Excerpts on Mariology.

Catechism Pt 1, Sect 1, Chap 3, #165 It is then we **must turn** to the *witnesses of faith*: ... **to the Virgin Mary**, who, in "her pilgrimage of faith," walked into the "night of faith" in sharing the darkness of her son's suffering

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

and death;

**Catechism Pt 1, Sect 2, Chap 1, Article 1, # 273** ... The Virgin Mary is the supreme model of this faith, ...

**Catechism Pt 1, Sect 2, Chap 2, Article 3, #469**... "O only-begotten Son and Word of God, immortal being, you who deigned for our salvation to become incarnate of the holy **Mother of God** and **ever-virgin Mary**, ...

**Catechism Pt 1, Sect 2, Chap 2, Article 3, #487** What the Catholic faith believes about Mary is based on what it believes about Christ, and what it teaches about Mary illumines in turn its faith in Christ.

**Catechism Pt 1, Sect 2, Chap 2, Article 3, #491** Through the centuries the Church has become ever more aware that Mary, "full of grace" through God, was redeemed from the moment of her conception. That is what the dogma of the Immaculate Conception confesses, as Pope Pius IX proclaimed in 1854:

The most Blessed Virgin Mary was, from the first moment of her conception, by a singular grace and privilege of almighty God and by virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, Savior of the human race, preserved immune from all stain of original sin.

**Catechism Pt 1, Sect 2, Chap 2, Article 3, #493** The Fathers of the Eastern tradition call the Mother of God "the All-Holy" ( *Panagia*) and celebrate her as "free from any stain of sin, as though fashioned by the Holy Spirit and formed as a new creature." By the grace of God Mary remained free of every personal sin her whole life long.

**Catechism Pt 1, Sect 2, Chap 2, Article 3, #495** Called in the Gospels "the mother of Jesus," Mary is acclaimed by Elizabeth, at the prompting of the Spirit and even before the birth of her son, as "the mother of my Lord." In fact,

*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

the One whom she conceived as man by the Holy Spirit, who truly became her Son according to the flesh, was none other than the Father's eternal Son, the second person of the Holy Trinity. Hence the Church confesses that Mary is truly "Mother of God" (*Theotokos*).

*Mary—"ever-virgin"*

**Catechism Pt 1, Sect 2, Chap 2, Article 3, #499** The deepening of faith in the virginal motherhood led the Church to confess Mary's real and perpetual virginity even in the act of giving birth to the Son of God made man. In fact, Christ's birth "did not diminish his mother's virginal integrity but sanctified it." And so the liturgy of the Church celebrates Mary as *Aeiparthenos*, the "Ever-virgin."

**Catechism Pt 1, Sect 2, Chap 2, Article 3, #500** Against this doctrine the objection is sometimes raised that the Bible mentions brothers and sisters of Jesus. The Church has always understood these passages as not referring to other children of the Virgin Mary. In fact James and Joseph, "brothers of Jesus," are the sons of another Mary, a disciple of Christ, whom St. Matthew significantly calls "the other Mary." They are close relations of Jesus, according to an Old Testament expression.

**Catechism Pt 1, Sect 2, Chap 2, Article 3, #501** Jesus is Mary's only son, but her spiritual motherhood extends to all men whom indeed he came to save: "The Son whom she brought forth is he whom God placed as the first-born among many brethren, that is, the faithful in whose generation and formulation she cooperates with a mother's love."

**IN BRIEF**

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

Catechism Pt 1, Sect 2, Chap 2, Article 3, #508 From among the descendants of Eve, God chose the Virgin Mary to be the mother of his Son. "Full of grace," Mary is "the most excellent fruit of redemption" (SC 103): from the first instant of her conception, she was totally preserved from the stain of original sin and she remained pure from all personal sin throughout her life.

**Catechism Pt 1, Sect 2, Chap 2, Article 3, # 509** Mary is truly "Mother of God" since she is the mother of the eternal Son of God made man, who is God himself.

**Catechism Pt 1, Sect 2, Chap 2, Article 3, # 510** Mary "remained a virgin in conceiving her Son, a virgin in giving birth to him, a virgin in carrying him, a virgin in nursing him at her breast, always a virgin" (St. Augustine, *Serm.* 186, 1: PL 38, 999): with her whole being she is "the handmaid of the Lord" (*Lk* 1:38).

**Catechism Pt 1, Sect 2, Chap 2, Article 3, # 511** The Virgin Mary "cooperated through free faith and obedience in human salvation" (*LG* 56). She uttered her yes "in the name of all human nature" (St. Thomas Aquinas, *STh* III, 30, 1). By her obedience she became the new Eve, mother of the living.

These statements of Roman Catholic Doctrine are from their own catechism and are very dangerous divergence from the marvelous and simple truth of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

**Did Pope John Paul Refocus Catholic's to Christ... NO.**

It has been said by TV Evangelist Jack Van Impe that "Pope John Paul has refocused all of Catholicism's faith onto the Lord Jesus Christ." But the March 20th 2005 Associated Press sure presents a different tone.

Presenting an Aug. 2004 picture of Pope John Paul II



*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

praying to Mary at the grotto of Lourdes, a shrine to the Virgin in France, the press states:

“VATICAN CITY - After being shot in St. Peter’s Square in 1981, Pope John Paul II was said to beseech the Virgin Mary for strength and later credited her for “guiding” the bullet from making a fatal strike.

“And, after his recent throat surgery to ease breathing problems, the pontiff wrote a message that ended with his Latin motto dedicated to Mary, “totus tuus,” or I am completely in your hands.”

“The two moments of suffering - from the vibrant early years of John Paul’s papacy to what could be its twilight - frame one of the most sweeping theological messages of his Vatican leadership: the pope’s devotion to the Virgin.

“For Catholics, the pope’s writings and addresses on Mary broaden approaches to prayer and spiritual meditations (to Mary.) But his focus on Mary also has served to drive wedges into Christian unity. Many evangelicals groups consider it a deviation from Scripture....

“The 84-year-old pope has dedicated his 26-year papacy in the Virgin’s name and his personal crest contains the letter M for the Madonna. “He feels always accompanied by the Madonna,” said Vatican Cardinal Julian Herranz of Spain.

“ For John Paul, it began as a seminary student in Poland when he took interest in a 17th century French pastor, Louis Marie Grignon de Montfort, who saw Mary as a central figure of Christian devotion. Montfort was elevated to sainthood in 1947.

### *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

“John Paul’s personal devotions often overlapped with attempts to revive declining interest in traditions such as the rosary - a cycle of prayers, many dedicated to the Virgin Mary, often said with the help of beads.

“In October 2002, the pope proclaimed the Year of Rosary. He said the rosary held particular significance for its peaceful message and as an “effective spiritual weapon against the evils afflicting society.” (The Associated Press 3/20/2005)

#### **The Error in the words of their Catechism**

The Roman Catholic Catechism tries to document Catholic Doctrines and use their traditions as their authority with precious little Bible use. They have developed a whole entourage of doctrines about Mariology and here are just two that provoke un-Biblical prayer to their god:

**Catechism Pt 4, Sect 1, Chap 2, Article 2, #2679** States “Mary is the perfect *Orans* (pray-er), a figure of the Church. When we pray to her, we are adhering with her to the plan of the Father, who sends his Son to save all men. Like the beloved disciple we welcome Jesus' mother into our homes, for she has become the mother of all the living. We can pray with and to her. The prayer of the Church is sustained by the prayer of Mary and united with it in hope.”

Catechism Pt 4, Sect 1, Chap 2, Article 2, #2682 “Because of Mary's singular cooperation with the action of the Holy Spirit, the Church loves to pray in communion with the Virgin Mary, to magnify with her the great things the Lord has done for her, and to entrust supplications and praises to her.”

The Bible clearly admonishes us to pray to none but God. Jesus particularly directing us to pray to God the Father.

*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

Praying to any member of the trinity is paramount to praying to God, but praying to Mary is a travesty that is outside the faith and false. The un-Biblical Roman Catholic tradition of praying to Mary is directly contradictory to the words of the Lord Jesus Christ. Realizing this is essential before one can dig through the sand of Roman religion and build upon the Rock Christ Jesus.

**Article 7** [TOC](#)

**The Ancient Witness of Baptist Existence**

Excerpts of Dr. Jewell Smith's Lecture, 1999 Baptist Bible Conference, Penfield NY.

Mosheim said "concerning the primitive Christian " ... "Before the rise of Luther and Calvin, there lay secreted in almost all the countries of Europe persons who adhered tenaciously to the principles of modern Dutch Baptists." ("Trail of Blood" Introduction pg 3) Mosheim, the great Lutheran historian says the original Christians were Baptists.

The Presbyterian historian says "It must have already occurred to our readers that the Baptists are the same sect of Christians that were formerly described as Ana-Baptists. Indeed this seems to have been their leading principle from the time of Tertullian to the present time." (Edinburg Cyclopedia) Tertullian was born just 50 years after the death of John the Apostle.

John Clark Ridpath, Methodist historian said "I should not readily admit that there were Baptist Churches as far back as AD 100, although without doubt there were Baptists then, as all Christians were originally Baptists."

Catholic Cardinal Hosius (1524), presiding at the Counsel of Trent in 1554, during the time when the Protestant Reformation was raging, and every effort was being sought to end it, said "Were it not for the fact that the Baptists have been grievously tormented and cut off with the knife during the past twelve hundred years, they would swarm in greater number than all the Reformers." (Hosius, *Letters, Apud Opera*, pp. 112,

*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

113.) The "twelve hundred years" were the years preceding the Reformation in which Rome persecuted Baptists with the most cruel persecution thinkable. The Cardinal goes on "If the truth of religion were to be judged by the readiness and boldness of which a man or any sect shows in suffering, then the opinions and persuasions of no sect can be truer and surer than those of the Anabaptist, since there have been none for the 1200 years past that have been more generally punished or that have been more cheerfully and steadfastly undergone, and have offered themselves to the most cruel sort of punishment than these people."

The Swiss Reformer Zwingli, a Presbyterian Collaborer with John Calvin, said "the institution of the Anabaptists is no novelty but for 1300 years have caused great troubles to the (Roman) Church." Now Swinley was no friend of Baptists. Protestant persecuted and kill Baptists like the Roman Catholics did. Swinley ordered 20 Baptists lowered into a castle tower and fed bread and water till they were dead. Men, women and children were thus left in their own wastes and their own carcasses till all were dead. Baptists are no Protestants.

*Johann Lorenz Von Mosheim (c. 1694-1755). German Lutheran divine and Church historian, was born at Lubeck on the 9th of October. 1694 or 1695. After studying at the gymnasium of his native place. he entered the university of Kiel (1716), where he took his master's degree in 1718. In 1719 he became assessor in the philosophical faculty at Kiel .. His first appearance in the field of literature was in a polemical tract against John Toland, Vindiciae antiquae christienorum. disciplinae (1720), which was soon followed by a volume of Observationes sacrae (1721). These works, along with the reputation he had acquired as a lecturer and preacher, secured for him a call to Helmstädt as*

## Learning To Speak Roman Catholic

*professor ordinarius in 1723. The Institutionum historiae ecclesiasticae libri IV. appeared in 1726. and in the same year he was appointed by the duke of Brunswick abbot of Marienthal. to which dignity and emolument the abbacy of Michaelstein was added in the following year. Mosheim was much consulted by the authorities when the new university of Gottingen was being formed; especially in the framing of the statutes of the theological faculty. and the provisions for making the theologians independent of the ecclesiastical courts. In 1747 he was made chancellor of the university. He died at Gottingen on the 9th of September. Among his other works were De rebus christianorum: ante Constantinum: commentarii (1753), Keizer-Geschichte (2nd ed. 1748). and Sittenlehre der heiligen Schrift (1735-53). His exegetical writings. characterized by learning and good sense, include Cogitationes in N. T. loc. select. (1726). and expositions of I Cor. (1741) and the two Epistles to Timothy (1755). In his sermons (Heilige Reden) considerable eloquence is shown. and a mastery of style which justifies the position he held as president of the German Society. (Ref 1910 Encyclopedia Britannica the 11th edition.)*

*There are two English versions of the Institutes, that of Archibald Maclaine, published in 1764. and that of James Murdock (1832), which is the more correct. Burdock's translation was revised and re-edited by James Seaton Reid in 1848. and by H. L. Hastings in 1892 ( Boston ). An English translation of the De rebus christianorum was published by Murdock in 1851.(Ref Dr. Steven A. Hite, Dean Indianapolis Bible College)*

*Stanislaus Hosius, (1504-1579) Polish cardinal, was born in Cracow on the 5th of May 1504 .. He studied law at Padua and Bologna, and entering the church became in 1540 bishop of Kulm, in 1551 bishop of Ermland, and in 1561 cardinal. Hosius had Jesuit sympathies and actively opposed the Protestant reformation, going so far as to desire a repetition of the St. Bartholomew massacre in Poland .. Apart from its being "the property of the Roman Church," he regarded the Bible as having no more worth than the fables of Aesop. Hosius was not distinguished as a theologian, though he drew up the Confessio fidei Christiana catholica adapted by the synod of Piotrkow in 1557. He was however, supreme as a diplomatist and administrator. Besides carrying through many difficult negotiations, he founded the lyceum of*

## Article 2 - On Biblical Authority

*Braunsberg, which became the center of the Roman Catholic mission among Protestants. He died at Capranica near Rome on the 5th of August 1579 (Ref 1910 Encyclopedia Britannica the 11th edition.)*

When inducted in the military as a Christian I was asked are you Catholic, Protestant or a Baptist. Their Chaplains know that a Baptist is no Protestant. You should know that too. My military dogtags still call me a Baptist. I am no Protestant. We have never been connected to Roman Catholicism, except when we were chained to their stakes as they gathered their faggots of wood. Sir Isaac Newton said it well "The Baptists are the only body of known Christians that have never symbolized with Rome." (Trail of Blood Introduction pg 3)

As was stated by these historians Baptists predate the Imperial Roman Catholic Church. The first Church at Jerusalem, which added 5,000 to its membership in Acts chapter 2 was Baptist in doctrine, baptizing it's new believers into membership by immersion.

B.Myron Cedarhilm, D.D., President of Maranatha Baptist Bible College puts this Baptist History very aptly by saying

Historians testify that local churches; which hold the doctrines, beliefs, and practices of today's Bible-believing, separatist Baptists; have had continuous existence since the days of Christ. This cannot be said on any other church, churches, or religious organization. Here are a few statements by historians and religious leaders (only one of them Baptist) regarding the history of Baptists:

Sir Isaac Newton said, "The Baptists are the only body of known Christians that have never symbolized with Rome."

**Since the Apostles:** Ypeij and Dermout, eminent historians of the Dutch Reformed Church said, "The

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

Baptist may be considered as the only Christian community that has stood since the days of the apostles, and as a Christian society has preserved pure the doctrine of the Gospel through all the ages.” Alexander Campbell, founder of the Campbellites (Christian Church or Disciples of Christ) who rigorously opposed Baptists during the 19th century, wrote, “The sentiments of Baptists and their practice of baptism from the apostolic age to the present, have had a continued chain of advocates, and public monuments of their existence in every century can be produced.”

Robert Barclay, a Quaker historian, says of Baptists, “We shall afterward show that the rise of the Anabaptists took place prior to the Reformation of the Church of England, and there are also reasons for believing that on the continent of Europe, small hidden Christian societies, who have held many of the opinions of the Anabaptists, have existed from the times of the apostles. In the sense of the direct transmission of divine truth, and the true nature of spiritual religion, it seem probable that these churches have a lineage or succession more ancient than that of the Roman Church.”

**All Christians Were Then Baptists:** John Clark Ridpath, doubtlessly the greatest historian the world has ever produced and a Methodist by denomination, said, “I should not readily admit that there was a Baptist church as far back as 100 AD, although without doubt there were Baptist churches then, as all Christians were then Baptists.” ....(Dr. Cedarholm, here quotes Mosheim, Zwingli and Cardinal Hosius



*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

as quoted previous in this article)

**Not Reformers** “Crossing the Centuries” edited by William C. King, says, “Of the Baptists it may be said that they are not reformers. These people, comprising bodies of Christian believers known under various names in different countries, are entirely distinct and independent of the Roman and Greek churches, and have an unbroken continuity of existence from apostolic days down through the centuries. Throughout this long period they were bitterly persecuted fro heresy, driven from country to country, disfranchised, deprived of their property, imprisoned, tortured and slain by the thousands; and yet they swerved not from their New Testament faith, doctrine, and adherence.”

Now I could close this article with no greater thought than that expressed by the prince of Baptist Preachers Charles H. Spurgeon. There is an Ancient Witness to Baptist Existence. There is cause that no true Baptist will align with Romanism, Denominationalism nor Governments of this world. This Ancient Witness was written in a “Trail of Blood” as Dr. Carol has documented in his book by that title. This Ancient Witness was not directly written by the historian as Spurgeon notes below in his sermon at Newington:

“History has hitherto been written by our enemies, who never would have kept a single fact about us upon the record if they could have helped it, and yet it leaks out every now and then that certain poor people called Anabaptists (Anabaptist was the name given to Baptists before the 16th century. “Ana” means “again” but the entire name, Anabaptist, was applied

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

to those who believed and practiced what Bible-believing, separatist Baptists do today) were brought up for condemnation, From the days of Henry II to those of Elizabeth, we hear of certain unhappy heretics who were hated of all men for the truth's sake that was in them. We read of poor men and women, with their garments cut short, turned out into the fields to perish in the cold, and anon of others who were burnt at Newington for the crime of Anabaptism. Long before your Protestants were known of, those horrible Anabaptists, as they were unjustly called, were protesting for the 'one Lord, one faith, and one baptism.' No sooner did the visible church begin to depart from the Gospel than these men arose to keep fast by the good old way. The priests and monks wished for peace and slumber, but there was always a Baptist or a Lollard tickling men's ears with Holy Scriptures, and calling their attention to the errors of the times. They were a poor persecuted tribe. The halter was thought to be too good for them. At times, ill-written history would have us think that they died out, so well had the wolf done his work on the sheep. Yet here we are, blessed and multiplied; and Newington sees other scenes from Sunday to Sunday. As I think of the multitudes of your numbers and efforts, I can only say in wonder, 'What a growth!' As I think of the multitudes of our brethren in America, I can only say, 'What hath God wrought!' Our history forbids discouragements."

Appendix 1 [toc](#)

# The Bible And Good Friday Good Samaritan Baptist Church

Independent Fundamental Bible Believing KJV BAPTIST  
54 Main Street Box 99, Dresden NY 14441

Pastor Ed Rice

(315) 536-0878 Home (607) 292-6639

[www.linkny.com/edrice4](http://www.linkny.com/edrice4)

## **Good Friday May Not Have Been Good Nor Friday**

In Leviticus chapter 23 Moses is commanded to speak the words of Jehovah concerning his feasts, his holy convocations, his Sabbaths where no servile work is to be done. God states there that for the children of Israel the 15th day of the first month starts the 7 day feast of unleavened bread, and is to be a *"holy convocation: ye shall do no servile work therein."* I shall contend in this article that this 15th day of Abib was on what we now call Good Friday, that Jesus the Christ of God was tried, crucified and laid in a borrowed tomb on the 14th, the Passover, a Thursday, that he spent three days, Friday, Saturday, and some of Sunday, entombed and that he rose,

### *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

as prophesied by his own words, on the third day, Sunday, the first day of the week.

Traditionally, it has been held that Jesus was tried and crucified on a Friday. The Friday was considered to be the "*day of the preparation, that is the day before the Sabbath*" (Mark 15:42.) It was considered that He was entombed on Friday, and the referenced Sabbath was on Saturday, the seventh day of the week when no servile work was to be done. One would only break from this traditional and straight forward reading of these four passages (Matthew 27:62, Mark 15:42, Luke 23:54-56, and John 19:31,42) with a cause. My cause is to find better fulfillment of the prophecy that Christ would be "*three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.*" (Matt 12:40) Contend with me that Jesus' body was laid in the tomb late on a Thursday; but not too late to call it daytime #1; the evening bringing nighttime #1; Friday daybreak daytime #2; Friday evening nighttime #2; Saturday daybreak daytime #3; Saturday evening nighttime #3; and Sunday daybreak he was found to be raised on the third day. (Remember that the Hebrews called the evening and the morning a day, and used no midnight hour to divide their days.) It is quite impossible to contain Christ in the tomb for three days and three nights otherwise, so let's briefly examine this more likely possibility.

First, let's examine some things we know about the date of the crucifixion. It occurred on the 14th of the month Abib, which is the day of Passover. It is of no small significance that this is true. During the very hour when the Jews Passover Lamb was slain, our Passover Lamb, "*the lamb that taketh away the sin of the world,*" was slain. This day was called the preparation and was the day Jesus was tried,

*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

crucified and placed in the borrowed tomb. The next day, the 15th was more than a Sabbath, "*for that Sabbath day was an high day*" (John 19:31) it was the first day of the feast of unleavened bread (Exod 12 and Leviticus 23.) This first day of the feast was called an holy convocation, a day when no servile work was to be done and was commonly called a Sabbath day, (a day of rest). Also consider it was customary that Galilaeen Jews would observe their Passover meal a day before the Jewish observance. Thus Jesus and his disciples had their "last supper," Passover meal a day earlier on the 13th (which would be called their 14th after the setting of the sun) , then on the evening of the 14th the traditional Passover supper was observed and the feast of unleavened bread began with a Sabbath day of rest. Given this calendar of events we must now, simply fit the calendar days into the days of the week on which they occur. Let's begin with John 12:1 "six days before the Passover," being the 8th of the month, and in all likely hood a Friday. If it were a Saturday, Jesus would be violating a Sabbath day with his travel, Mary and Lazarus with their serving of the feast. On the 9th, the Saturday Sabbath they rested "But the Chief Priests consulted that they might put Lazarus also to death; "(John 12:10) :On the next day," the 10th , a Sunday we call Palm Sunday, the triumphal entry into Jerusalem parallels the choosing of the Passover Lamb on the 10th day of the month. "*Speak ye unto all the congregation of Israel, saying, In the tenth day of this month they shall take to them every man a lamb, according to the house of their fathers, a lamb for an house. . . . And ye shall keep it up until the fourteenth day of the same month: and the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it in the evening .*" (Exodus 12:3,4) On the

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

tenth, the congregation chose a Passover lamb, and Jesus the Christ was ushered into Jerusalem, Palm Sunday. Now the week unfolds as we know it from scripture. On the 13th, a Wednesday Jesus has the significant last supper with his disciples. For the crush of people in Jerusalem the Galilaean Jews observe their meal the evening before Passover. On the preparation day, the 14th a Thursday, the "wicked hands" of man take the Christ, our Passover Lamb, and in the evening he gives up the ghost and dies to take away the sins of the world.

Now, swiftly, "because of the Jews' preparation day" (John 19:31,42) Joseph and Nicodemus place the crucified body of Jesus in the sepulcher, on the 14th, the preparation day, a Thursday, rather than the traditionally held Friday. Now Jesus' dead body spends part of Thursday, the 14th (albeit a small part it may be) all of Friday, the holy convocation Sabbath day, all of Saturday, the 7th day Sabbath day, and a portion of Sunday, the third day the day he arose from the tomb triumphant over death. For three days and three nights he was in the burrowed tomb. The women "prepared spices and ointments" and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment." A drawback of this whole contention is what is missing from this verse. If it had them resting for the Sabbath 'days', both the first day of the unleavened bread feast day and the 7th day Sabbath day of rest, this contention would be clearly in view.

As it is stated in scripture the idea that Jesus died on Thursday not the traditional interpretation of a Friday crucifixion is a contention to tradition. But it is a contention that has significance because it puts the feast with Lazarus on a Friday instead of a Sabbath day; it puts Palm Sunday on the 10th, the day of the Passover Lamb selection and it

## Article 2 - On Biblical Authority

allows Jesus' body to be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth, just as he said. These three reason override the consideration that a double Sabbath occurrence is not clearly illiterate in the Scripture. Although not clearly illiterate, two consecutive holy days is clearly possible. The likely hood is that Jesus was entombed on Thursday evening and did spend the complete 3 days in the heart of the earth. One holds to a Good Friday interpretation only because of what the scriptures don't clearly delineate with a quick reading of the calendar events that are described. A short study determines that it was actually a Thursday or a Wednesday that Jesus died on the cross for your sins and for mine. Pastor Ed Rice

### **You Can be Born Again** [TOC](#)

You, today, can be saved and be assured of eternal life, if you ...

**Know...** God said *"For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God."* Rom 3:23 *"All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; Isaiah 53:8*

**Realize...** The Bible says *"For the wages of sin is death; Romans 6:23 "And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire" Rev 20:15 "He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life. 1John 5:12*

**Believe...** Jesus Died for YOU! *"But God commendeth his love toward us in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Rom 5:8 All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." Isa 53:8*

**Accept Jesus...** *That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus and shalt believe in thine heart that God*

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

*hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. Rom 10:9-10*  
Jesus Christ Told us: *He that Cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out!*



Article 2 - On Biblical Authority

Appendix 2 [TOC](#)

Help From Dr. Steven A. Hite

Pastor Rice,

>>>>>I can't find any record of any Cardinal Hashish at the Council of Trent .. Can you help me out with his full name and the citation for his quote? <<<<<<

*Is the Cardinal Hashish possibly Cardinal Hosius who said that the Bible has no more worth than the fables of Aesop? Stanislaus Hosius, (1504-1579) Polish cardinal, was born in Cracow on the 5th of May 1504 .. He studied law at Padua and Bologna, and entering the church became in 1540 bishop of Kulm, in 1551 bishop of Ermland, and in 1561 cardinal. Hosius had Jesuit sympathies and actively opposed the Protestant reformation, going so far as to desire a repetition of the St. Bartholomew massacre in Poland .. Apart from its being "the property of the Roman Church," he regarded the Bible as having no more worth than the fables of Aesop. Hosius was not distinguished as a theologian, though he drew up the Confessio fidei Christiana catholica adapted by the synod of Piotrkow in 1557. He was however, supreme as a diplomatist and administrator. Besides carrying through many difficult negotiations, he founded the lyceum of Braunsberg, which became the center of the Roman Catholic mission among Protestants. He died at Capranica near Rome on the 5th of August 1579*

*This and the other biography on Mosheim were from the 1910 Encyclopedia Britannica the 11th edition. A must have for any Christian scholar. If you need a set I may be able to find you one. It was the last encyclopedia written from a Christian perspective and is a who's who for the fundamentals of faith*

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

Appendix 3 TOC

Vatican II Liturgical Press Collegeville, Indiana 56321  
ISBN 0-8146-1533-3 second printing 1992 page 71  
concerning indulgences "...should be kept in the Church;  
and it condemns with anathema those who say that  
indulgences are useless or that the Church does not have  
the power to grant them."

New American Catholic Edition Douay OT, Confraternity  
Edition NT, Benziger Brothers, Inc. NY 1950

INDULGENCES

a) The faithful who spend at least, a quarter of an hour  
in reading Holy Scripture with the reverence, due to the  
Word of God and after the manner of spiritual reading, may  
gain:

An indulgence of 3 years.

b) Those, however, who read at least a few verses of  
the Gospel and further kiss the book of the Gospels.  
devoutly reciting one of the following invocations: Through  
the Gospel's words may our sins be blotted out .. - -May the  
reading of the Gospel be our health and protection May  
Christ, the Son of God, teach us the words of the Holy  
Gospel, are granted:

An indulgence of 500 days;

A plenary indulgence on the usual conditions, if they  
perform this act daily for an entire month, as given above;

A plenary indulgence at the hour of death, if they  
frequently performed this devout exercise during their lives.  
provided that they have made their confession and received  
holy Communion or are at least contrite, and invoke  
devoutly the most holy Name of Jesus with their lips, if  
possible, otherwise in their hearts and accept death  
patiently from the hand of God as the just penalty for sin

*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

(S. C. Ind., Dec, 13, 1898; S. P. Ap., Mar. 22, 1932 and Apr. 24, 1915).

## *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

### Appendix 4 TOC

The Contrast Between Faith by Grace, and Faith by Works  
Abraham is used as the key illustration for the Apostle Paul's charge to Gentiles that Saving Faith is only by Grace and not by law (Galatians 3:6-9,16, Romans 4:1-25) and Pastor James' charge to the Jews that Faith without works is dead (James 2:14-26).

The main point of each illustration is found in Gen 15:6  
"And he believed in the LORD; and he counted it to him for righteousness."

What had happened to Abraham up to Gen 15:6

1) He was told to leave country, kindred, fathers house and go to a land. (Gen 12:1) He followed dad to Haran till dad died then went on without his fathers house, but took his brothers son. (Acts 7:2-6, Gen 11:31-32) When Abram had put works to his belief and "*they went forth to go into the land of Canaan; and into the land of Canaan they came*" that is when "*the LORD appeared unto Abram.*"

2) He went off into Egypt, not trusting God in the land during a famine, nor in Egypt because of his attractive wife, and came back with great riches. (Gen 12:10-20) He calls upon God on his return but does not here from Him until Abram does some 'work' of obedience in separating from Lot (Gen 13:14)

3) Spontaneously Abram rises against 4 confederate kings and rescues his brothers son Lot in Gen 14, and says "*I have lift up mine had unto the LORD, the most high God, the possessor of heaven and earth,*" Now, in fear of what those kings will do on their next encounter "*The word of the LORD came unto Abram in a vision, saying, Fear not, Abram: I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward.*"

*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

Now after these three failed faiths, after these three maturing faiths, Abram believes God's word about a son and "*he counted it to him for righteousness.*" Abram will continue to have 'faith failures' but each will be a 'faith growth.' He will continue to believe God and act out his belief with obedience, thus he is the rich illustration for Paul to the Gentiles, and for James to the Jews. The Gentiles were to not try for salvation nor sanctification through the works of the law. The Jews were not to set down the law and do nothing. There are no contradictions in this contrast, any more than Proverbs 26:4 contradicts Proverbs 26:5. The truth applied just depends on the type of error made by the one being answered.

## *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

### Appendix 5 Answered contentions of Max, The argumentative Catholic

Max,

I am breaking my responses into two parts, one will address the prelude of statements you make about Catholicism, the second will answer your 36 “unanswerable” questions. Read, Learn and be Converted to Christ by the Power of His written Word. My prayer is that you will have your eyes opened, see the Catholic Church for the Babylon that she is and Get out of Babylon before it is eternally to late.

*Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city,  
because she made all nations drink of the wine  
of the wrath of her fornication.* (Rev 16:18)

By way of introduction you ask:

Where does the bible say I must read it alone? At the bottom are some questions that no protestant church or beliefs can answer... Perhaps no Protestant Church can answer your questions, but here is a Baptist Preacher, not Protestant, who can and will. Baptists were around long before Catholics. In fact one of the first catholic acts was to annex or kill Bible Believing Baptists who would not unite with them to form their first Imperial State Church.

Where does the bible say I must read it alone?

I am in agreement with you on this point. David Koresh, of Waco Texas, (x7DayAdventist) is a good example of one who took off with his own interpretations and became a cult leader. In good hermeneutics one must consider at least three safeguards. 1) What the Bible says in context. In context of the passage and in context with the whole book, comparing scripture with scripture. 2) What has always been believed and taught about the doctrine. “If its new its not true”, makes a good rule of thumb here. (the rule works

## *Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

well for Bible versions as well) This middle safeguard delves into the history of orthodox Christianity; one should be careful stepping outside what God revealed (from His word) in times past. 3) What is commonly believed and taught by Bible believers and scholars in ones own era. This is an important sanity check in relating Bible truths and Bible principles to the predicaments of our modern society. These three safeguards are employed to keep one from "reading the Bible alone."

However, I know your implication, and I do not believe that "The Catholic Church" should ever be the one who provides this interpretation of Scripture. "The Catholic Church" from it's conception as an Imperial State Church in 330 AD, has been such an instrument of hell that John Wycliffe and I don't consider it as "The Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth." (1 Tim 3:15b) Who then is this CHURCH that you so recklessly consider the "Pope run Catholic Church" every time you see it in Scripture? Baptists (not Protestant), ever since Polycarp received his copy of the closing Revelation of Jesus Christ from the apostle John, pursuant to the death of this last apostle, have held with the apostles that it is the independent, autonomous, local churches. You, Max, must watch for the occurrence of Church, [Greek -ecclesia] in the PLURAL in your Bible, and recognize why it is there. Each of these independent , autonomous, local churches must watch for its own doctrine, its own stand, and its own ordained elder that fills the office of Bishop- Pastor/Teacher, being one man in one office in one local Church with no hierarchy. It is the Holy Spirit of God that indwells believers and leads them into all truth. Each individual Church and particularly its Bishop- Pastor/Teacher, must give answer for its accurate following of the "head of the Church." That head is the Lord Jesus Christ not some hierarchical structure and certainly not a pope. Independent Autonomous Local Churches, ... This concept

### *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

is very foreign to your Roman dictate that one universal Church be in charge of holding all doctrine and authority so pay particular attention to its development in 1) scripture and 2) in history and even 3) in this error in ecclesiastical control which was passed to Protestant Churches and is currently leading even Catholics into bigger error with its homosexual priesthood problems. This independent, autonomous local church concept is foreign to most Protestant Churches that carried gross ecclesiastical error from their mother church when they protested. Luther, Calvin and puritans did not protest far enough to go all the way back to what the Bible says and become Independent Fundamental Baptists, holding to the Bible as their only source of faith and practice. Their protest got them out of Catholic error concerning Salvation, it being of Faith and Faith ALONE, no indulgences, no Catholic Sacraments, no last rights, no purgatory, no candles for the dead. However, they (Protestants) did not follow the leading of the Holy Spirit sufficiently to structure their ecclesiastical practices after the direction of first and second Timothy and Titus, written *"That thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God."* They did ,however, depart from the grossest of Catholic error, concerning individual soul salvation by faith, and concerning the power of the Word of God which was not to be a Latin book locked away in a Catholic Monastery as your Popes had dictated. Never forgetting that they killed thousands of Bible believing born again believers who desired to read the Bible in the English language because of those Catholic dictates. Recall *"in 1425 an angry mob, led by the local Roman priests and bishops, entered into a cemetery in the little town of Lutterworth, England, and proceeded to desecrate the grave of a man who had been dead forty one years. His remains were exhumed and burned along with his writings, and his ashes scattered into the River Swift. He had been declared a notorious heretic, posthumously, excommunicated, posthumously, his*



## *Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

*memory condemned, and the vile act of destroying his earthly remain had been ordered. . . . The man was John Wycliff, and his only crime was translating the Bible into the English language.*"[From "Purified Seven Times, the history of the English Bible" by Evangelist Bill Bradley, pp. 5]

Now you ask me to trust this Church as the sole interpreter of Scripture? Please understand how dumfounded I am to even discourse with an educated man who exhibits such trust. I appreciate the opportunity to answer your questions, but I question whether one who cannot see the error of Catholicism, is born from above. The Holy Spirit of God, who does not speak of himself (John 16:13) but speaks from what we hear from the Bible, can guide you from this false trust in Catholicism, if your eyes have been opened by the light of Jesus Christ through "born again" (John 3)," converted to Christ" (Matt 18), salvation. If you have not been born again you cannot see the kingdom of heaven, nor the Catholic error. If you have not been converted from Catholicism to Christ, you cannot enter the kingdom of God, nor can you enter into this enlightenment on Catholic error. You will fight it all the way.

As I apply my studies to the word I will answer your unanswerable questions in turn. Consider some of the above concepts as foundational steps to freedom from the Catholic error you are entangled in. You conceptualize that the WORD, the TRUTH, and all CHRISTIAN FAITH is entrusted to a single organization with infallible teachings, the Roman Catholic Church. I am still amazed to find an educated individual who could believe such, knowing the history of this church. The concept you despise, but will find repeatedly through this treatise, is that the WORD, the TRUTH, and all CHRISTIAN FAITH is entrusted to a single book, written by the apostles (obviously written prior to their death) and handed down as the written word of God (or 2 gospels written under strict scrutiny of the apostles, in the case of John Mark, who wrote Mark, and Dr. Luke, who

## *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

wrote Luke). Thus if one is to continue in the doctrine of the apostles, it will involve the BOOK they left us. It can not involve the traditions of the murderous, barbaric Catholics who hate the exposure of the BOOK that the apostles wrote and left us. That is the heart of the difference between a Church believer and a Bible believer. You are a Church believer. I a Bible believer.

In my next correspondence I will begin my address of the 36 questions you present.

God Bless your Studies of Him and His Word,.... not "them" and their interpretations  
Pastor Ed Rice

I You State:  
Here is what the bible says....

*Acts 8:30-35 - And Philip running thither, heard him reading the prophet Isaias. And he said: Thinkest thou that thou understandest what thou readest? 31Who said: And how can I, unless some man shew me? And he desired Philip that he would come up and sit with him. 32And the place of the scripture which he was reading was this: He was led as a sheep to the slaughter; and like a lamb without voice before his shearer, so openeth he not his mouth. 33In humility his judgment was taken away. His generation who shall declare, for his life shall be taken from the earth? 34And the eunuch answering Philip, said: I beseech thee, of whom doth the prophet speak this? of himself, or of some other man? 35Then Philip, opening his mouth, and beginning at this scripture, preached unto him Jesus.*

*2 Peter 1:20 - Understanding this first, that no prophecy of scripture is made by private interpretation.*

*2 Peter 3:16 - As also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are certain things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, to their own destruction.*

*John 14:16 And I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Advocate 8 to be with you always, 17 the Spirit of truth, 9 which the world cannot accept, because it neither sees nor knows it. But you*

## *Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

*know it, because it remains with you, and will be in you. 18 I will not leave you orphans; I will come to you. 10*

Jesus promised that the Church would be guided by the Holy Spirit, in Truth. The Church cannot be wrong about faith and morals, because Jesus said so.

This promise was made to the believers not to an Imperial State Church. To say that a Roman Universal Church cannot be wrong about faith and morals is to be blind and ignorant of Roman Catholic history, not to mention current events. Was it impossible for Cardinal Law to be morally wrong about child molestation because he was the Roman Church? That is ludicrous. Was it possible that the Roman Catholic Church's sale of indulgences was inerantly God's command about faith and practice. Unbelievable. Clearly here, this guidance into Truth by the Holy Spirit is not applicable to baby baptizing, Baptist killing, Church & State Empire building Roman Catholics. Who then? First, and foremost this was to his apostles, who's faith and practice was recorded in written word. Secondly, it applies to all believers. (Believers in this context will always refer to "Born Again" (John 3) "Converted to Christ" (Matt 18) "Justified" (Romans 3:21- 26 In One Sentence) "Regenerated" (Eph 2) "Indwelt" (Rom 8) and "InChrist" (1 Cor. 12) individuals.) The Holy Spirit does not lead some Imperial State Church or some Imperial Universal (Catholic) Church, it leads individual believers.

You could study the Baptist doctrine of "Individual Soul Liberty" to better understand this concept. This doctrine is well documented in even Protestant Systematic Theology texts and their is no reason for a studious Catholic to be ignorant of such works and state that no Protestant can answer my 36 questions. It seems pretty incompetently arrogant for one to say such and yet be ignorant of Agustus Hopkins Stong's three volumes of "Systematic Theology" of copyright 1907! Most of the Protestant Reformation involved the concept of individual soul liberty, and the

## *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

defrocking of an Imperial Catholic Church.

II You State:

*1 Tim 3:15 But if I should be delayed, you should know how to behave in the household of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and foundation of truth.*

The Church is the Pillar and Foundation of truth. To be the Pillar and Foundation of Truth, then the Church must have the authority to teach the Word of God, to teach it infallibly. Infallibly because it is guided by God.

Allow me to boldly point out two blunders in this short statement. First you have violated copyright law. If you check your version you will find two things. First you must give credit to its authors whenever you quote the thing. I do not know who wrote the version you are quoting. And secondly you will find it is a paraphrase not a translation of the Greek manuscripts. In my rebuttals I will be using a King James Bible, the only non copyright English translation of the Bible, so you may want to brush up on the differences between Thee or Thou and You or You-all and some other uses of the King's English. A more exact translation of this verse is as follows:

***1 Tim 3:15 But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.***

Notice here that the subject is not the Church. You quickly jump to infer that this verse is about the Imperial Roman Catholic Church, when in fact it gives a tremendous insight to what the "church of the living God" actually is. Your copyright version errantly uses the word "household of God" in the direct object, where the "house of God" is correct. The Greek word 'oikos' accurately means the dwelling place. Where is the dwelling place of God? You contend that it is the Imperial Roman Catholic Church. I contend that it is the individual soul of the believer, thus the clarification that the dwelling place of God is the ecclesia (a

## *Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

called out body of believers.) In this context Paul had just given Timothy the requirements for the only two offices for a local body of believers, that of Bishop and Deacon. Now if Paul does not get to Timothy personally, he states in this verse that he is giving him instruction on how to conduct ecclesiastical affairs. Don't error here and think he is sending Timothy off to an Imperial Roman Church, no he is sending him to individual local Churches, like the local ones Paul and Silas confirmed in *Acts 15: 40-41 And Paul chose Silas, and departed, being recommended by the brethren unto the grace of God. And he went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches.* Churches, plural! Not Imperial Church of Rome singular.

III You State:

St Matt 18:17 (Jesus said) If he refuses to listen to them, tell the church. 14 If he refuses to listen even to the church, then treat him as you would a Gentile or a tax collector.

St. Matt 28:18 11 Then Jesus approached and said to them, "All power in heaven and on earth has been given to me.

19 Go, therefore, 12 and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Spirit, 20 teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you. 13 And behold, I am with you always, until the end of the age."

Which Church has been making disciples of all nations since the Apostles for 2000 years? Which Church could possibly have Jesus Himself guiding the Church? ....answer to both.... The Catholic Church

You are doubtless tired of hearing about the independent autonomous non catholic baptizing local Churches that existed since Christ so let me use the resources of a Catholic historian here. Cardinal Hasheesh, President of the Council of Trent, 1554 says, "Were it not that the Baptist had been rigorously tormented and cut off with the knife of persecution for the past 1200 years they would swarm greater numbers than all the reformers."

### *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

Moshime, the Lutheran Historian said concerning the primitive Christians, "before the rise of Luther and Calvin there lay secretive in almost all the countries of Europe persons who adhered tenaciously to the principles of the Baptists."

The Presbyterian Historian writes "It must have already occurred to readers that the Baptists are the same sect of Christians that were formerly described as Anabaptist. Indeed this seems to have been their leading principle from the times of Tertullian to the present."

John Clark Redpath, noted historian writes "I shall not readily admit that there were Baptist Churches as far back as AD 11, although without doubt there were Baptist then, as all Christians were originally Baptists."

Swiss Reformer Swinley states "The institution of the Anabaptists is no novelty but for 1300 years have caused great trouble to the (Roman Catholic) Church" Now Swinley was no friend of Baptists. When he said this, indeed he had ordered 20 Baptists, men, women and children, locked in a tower and fed bread and water till their death, no outlet, no removal of the dead. Protestants killed Baptists too, not nearly as many as Catholics but just as viscously.

Which Church has been making disciples of all nations since the Apostles? Which Church has the Lord Jesus Christ himself as its head, redeemer and guide? Answer to both is the independent autonomous non-Catholic local Bible believing, believer baptizing, sola Scriptura Baptist Churches.

IV You State:

Luke 10:16 "He who hears you hears me, and he who rejects you rejects me, and he who rejects me rejects him who sent me"

This is another verse that shows there will be One Church to lead, One Church to preach the truth....

This verse shows no such thing. In fact, if one weren't hobnobbing with modernist and their bibles, one would

## Article 2 - On Biblical Authority

know the difference between “you” and “thee”. The English translation of this verse is “**He that heareth you heareth me; and he that despiseth you despiseth me; and he that despiseth me despiseth him that sent me.**” In the Kings English, “thee” is singular, and “you” is plural. Modernists disposed of all first person singulars and made everything first person plural, for small minds. With that key, notice that this verse says “**He that heareth YOU-ALL heareth me.**” He is in no way showing a singular Church, but a plurality of disciples, plurality of apostles, and a plurality of Independent Autonomous Bible Believing Called out Body of Believers

V You State:

2 Timothy 3:14 But you, remain faithful to what you have learned and believed, because you know from whom you learned it, 15 and that from infancy you have known (the) sacred scriptures, which are capable of giving you wisdom for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus. 16 3 4 All scripture is inspired by God and is useful for teaching, for refutation, for correction, and for training in righteousness,

This shows that someone taught it...The scripture spoken of here is the Septuagint... The New Testament was not around until 400 AD.

You repeat two very incriminating falsehoods here. Your Church has taught you that they only had the Septuagint as their scripture. Balderdash. The Masoretic text of the Hebrews was never set aside for the use of the clumsy Greek translation of the Septuagint. God said he would not allow His word to come from Egypt, coming from Egypt is a picture of coming from the world. The pure word of God, does not come from the Septuagint or from the Alexandrian copies that modernists use to make versions from today.

Secondly, your loyalty to a lying Roman Church is evidenced by your repetition of their lie that “The New Testament was not around until 400 AD.” Their are 35,000 quotes taken from the New Testament and recorded by 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th century Church fathers. Most of these are

### *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

prior to the formation of the Roman Church. The Roman Church likes to perpetuate that they formed the Bible in the 4th Century, the same way they perpetuate the lie of Peter being in Rome, it gives them a sense of authority to wield over the uneducated serfs. We are not such today. Their lies have been exposed. Writings of Polycarp, 156 AD, have been read, and he quoted the writings of the apostles from his Bible. Writings of Shepherd of Hermas, pre 150 AD, have been read, and he quoted the writings of the apostles from his New Testament Bible. Writings of Ignatius, 110 AD, have been read, and he quoted the gospels and the letters of the apostles from his Bible. Melito, pre 190 AD, wrote and quoted from his New Testament Bible. Even Clement of Rome, 96 AD, had a New Testament Bible to quote from! We can read these letters and quotes and know that the Roman Catholic lied about the Bible in order to perpetuate their Imperial State Church and the authority that it wanted to wield. See the Truth. Jesus Said "I am the way, the TRUTH, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me."

VI You State:

2 Thess 2:15 Therefore, brothers, stand firm and hold fast to the traditions that you were taught, either by an oral statement or by a letter of ours. 8

2 Tim 2:2 And what you heard from me through many witnesses entrust to faithful people who will have the ability to teach others as well.

These faithful people...who could they be??? Which Church has been around since the Time of Christ & His Apostles? .... The Catholic Church, fulfilling the commands of Jesus.

I know how much Catholics love oral statements to the disregard of the written word so let me make sure we start out with an accurate rendition of the verses, the Bible says:

*II Thes 2:15 Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the*



## *Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

*traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle.*

*II Tim 2:2 And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also.*

In this scripture the Thessalonians here were told to hold fast to what they had been taught . They had been taught the teachings of the apostles, and warned about departing from those teachings. Paul, the author of Thesalonians, and founder of the Church at Rome before Catholicism got there, warns continually to watch out for those who pervert or add to their teachings. What unfaithful people would these be???? Which church has been twisting the apostolic teachings since its conception when it united Church and state, the Roman Catholic Church, perverting the Commands of Jesus Christ. It is interesting that you also use the scripture in Timothy to pretend that the Imperial Roman Catholic Church are the faithful men that Timothy committed truth to. Actually, a short study of Paul's letters to Timothy reveals that Paul repeatedly warns him about the perversions that would be coming out of the Imperial Roman Church. Paul challenges him to charge others that no other doctrine be taught. No doctrines about praying to Mary, no doctrines about holy water or holy wafers, I need not go on. Notice his charge in 1 Tim 4:1 ***Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; 2 Speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; 3 Forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth.*** This gives a good description of Catholicism. Forbidding to marry, heard of that? Ask your priest about it, he knows the group who promote this false teaching. Speaking lies in hypocrisy, Mary's immaculate conception qualifies as lies, in hypocrisy ! It is fabricated doctrine form the Roman

## *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

Catholic Church. Abstain from meats, remember when it was a mortal sin to eat meat on Fridays? Still got the Friday fish fries from that lie. Kind of embarrassing to rationalize that one away. These scriptures speak of the Catholic Church all right, but you'll be hard pressed to get them into a positive light on Catholicism.

VII You State:

Romans 10:17

Thus faith comes from what is heard, and what is heard comes through the word of Christ.

We could settle here if I could expound on this truth, that the word of Christ comes to us through the writings of those who were eye witnesses of him alone. That these men are called apostles, and apostleship and eyewitnessship is not inherited, nor decreed to another, especially if that one call himself a pope, and pretend that he be the head of all Christendom. I understand your grasping to oral tradition rather than the written word but that grasp doesn't matter to a Bible believer, all faith and practice springs from the written word of the apostles which gives us the word of Christ. You cannot show from the Bible alone that any bishop (to use the Bible term) carries any weight outside of his own bishopric. Apostles do, yes because they were the eyewitnesses of Christ. Bishops do not carry the authority of God outside their own calling. The pope is a fictitious office based on mislead egos, lies and kingdom building of some Roman bishops. They were never eyewitnesses and inherited no apostleshipness. Such is the core of our ongoing disagreement 1600 years after they invented your papal tendencies.

VIII You State:

1 Peter 1:25 'But the word of the Lord abides for ever.' That word is the good news which was preached to you

Ephesians 3:5 which was not made known to human beings in other generations as it has now been revealed to his holy apostles and

## *Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

prophets by the Spirit,

Ephesians 2:20 built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, with Christ Jesus himself as the capstone. 10

1 Corin 11:2 I I praise you because you remember me in everything and hold fast to the traditions, just as I handed them on to you.

These traditions spoken of are what the Catholic Church hands on...

I understand your strong belief in such a scheme. Bible believers will forever set out to demonstrate to you that the Roman Catholic Church passed on lies and deceit. They embellished their traditions to build their kingdom, deceive the ignorant, control the learned, and pervert the gospel of Jesus Christ. They did all the above extremely well but not by the power of God; obviously not by the decree of the Book. As you believe that they are acting in place of the apostles you ought to accept study that shows where they directly contradict, pervert, and twist the teachings of the apostles found in the Word of God, that is the written Word of God, not the oral traditions that are subjective, deceitful, inconclusive and strayed from truth (the Book says thy (written) Word is Truth.)

IX You State:

1 Corin 15:3 For I handed on to you as of first importance what I also received: that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures;

1 Corin 15:11 Therefore, whether it be I or they, so we preach and so you believed.

Acts 2:42 8 They devoted themselves to the teaching of the apostles and to the communal life, to the breaking of the bread and to the prayers.

They devoted themselves to the "teaching" of the Apostles, not scripture.

In John chapter 4, the scripture says that Jesus taught a two day scripture seminar to the Samaritans. Oh that I

### *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

could have sat in that seminar. I can't. In the texts you misquote here, folks got to hear and sit under the teachings of the apostles themselves. Oh that I could have sat under the tutelage of the apostle Peter or been at Corinth in the 60's to here the Apostle Paul preach the gospel in person or like Polycarp have set under the teachings of John the Elder and been handed one of the copies of the Revelation of Jesus Christ by John in person. I can't. I can only read it in the written inspired record of the apostles. Now don't you tell me I should substitute the oral teachings of some guy in a dress who thinks he is a priest and is ignorant of the writings of the apostle John, who can't marry because he subjects himself to the rules of Bishop, so called, who wears a white dress and answers to a cardinal who wears a red dress who answers to a pope who calls himself a vicar of Christ. Should I ignore the writings of the apostles and follow your chain of tradition up that chain of command. I think not! Bible believers, reject your chain of tradition and go back to the original link, the writings of the apostles. You should do the same.

X You State:

Acts 8:27 So he got up and set out. Now there was an Ethiopian eunuch, a court official of the Candace, 8 that is, the queen of the Ethiopians, in charge of her entire treasury, who had come to Jerusalem to worship, 28 and was returning home. Seated in his chariot, he was reading the prophet Isaiah.

29 The Spirit said to Philip, "Go and join up with that chariot."

30 9 Philip ran up and heard him reading Isaiah the prophet and said, "Do you understand what you are reading?"

31 He replied, "How can I, unless someone instructs me?" So he invited Philip to get in and sit with him.

The Catholic Church is a gift from Christ sent to instruct us. Christ promised that the gates of hell would not prevail against the Church (Matt. 16:18) and the New Testament itself declares the Church to be "the pillar and foundation of the truth" (1 Tim. 3:15).

## *Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

Nowhere in the NT scriptures is there an implication that one Church is to lord over another with any ecclesiastical control. Each Church was to be independent, and each Church is to be autonomous. You have already expressed your ignorance about the meaning of autonomous, you making it synonymous with anarchy, but bear this point carefully in mind. When Jesus Christ said ***“And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall prevail against it.”*** There are some things that the Roman Catholic Church read entirely wrong. First, they think that the rock was referring to Peter rather than the truth that Peter had just uttered, secondly they teach and consider that the church here is some singular, only one can be right, and we are “IT” kind of monstrosity that excommunicates and burns heretics. Clearly, the church referred to here is the abstract institution not the singular held to by mislead Roman Catholics and carried over by confused Protestants. Dr. Carroll, provides the best illustration of this abstract language with example:

An English statesman, referring to the right of each individual citizen to be tried by his peers, should say: ‘On this rock England will build her jury, and all the power of tyranny shall not prevail against her.’ He uses the term jury in an abstract sense, i.e., in the sense of an institution. But when this institution finds concrete expression or becomes operative, it is always a particular jury of twelve men and never an aggregation of all juries into one big jury.” Bravo Dr. Carol.

Please see, that the Roman Catholic Church misrepresents the scripture on this point and contends that the Roman Catholic Imperial Church is the aggregation of all churches into one big jury. Not true, thus, to a Bible believer, the Roman Catholic Imperial Church is anything but a “pillar and ground of truth” It is a web of self serving deception

## *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

and deceit. But it does have a very long history of very effective half truth deceptions. As you read through the following answers to Max's list of unanswerable questions, keep in mind that this web of deceit is sometimes subtle, but clearly comes from the father of deceivers, and not from the Word of God.

XI Your 36 Questions:

1) Where did Jesus give instructions that the Christian faith should be based exclusively on a book?

Explicitly this is clearly stated by the Apostle John who often repeats his purpose in writing. Notice particularly in the writings of his gospel, *John 20:30 And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: 31 But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name. These are written that ye might believe, and have life through his name.* Pretty certain he expected to be read by the audience of upcoming believers, who are "*them also which shall believe on me through their word;* (John 17:20)" Your contention that you will not use the written word of the Apostles to expose and correct godless traditions and practices of the Imperial Roman Catholic Church seems pretty baseless here.

Since some trivialist require that one only believe the words in red letter, since that is the only place that Jesus gives instruction, here is verse in red: John 17:13 "*And now come I to thee; and these things I speak in the world, that they might have my joy fulfilled in themselves. 14 I have given them thy word; and the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world.*" Notice, that the only record of the what Jesus spake in the world comes from this written record. A record of those who were eyewitnesses. In 1 John the apostle again begs that you read and believe his written record and in chapter 1 he states "*3 That which we have seen and heard declare we unto*

## Article 2 - On Biblical Authority

*you, that ye also may have fellowship with us: and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ. 4 And these things write we unto you, that your joy may be full. 5 ¶ This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, . . . .”* That should make you want to read the rest of John’s writings, because he wrote, by the dictates of Jesus Christ that we might completely know the “Christian Faith.”

### 2) Where did Jesus tell His apostles to write anything down?

In the Revelation of Jesus Christ, written down by our Apostle of keen interest, the Apostle John, we find that clearly recorded. *Rev 1:10 I was in the Spirit on the Lord’s day, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet, 11 Saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and, What thou seest, write in a book, and send it unto the seven churches which are in Asia; unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamos, and unto Thyatira, and unto Sardis, and unto Philadelphia, and unto Laodicea.* Isn’t it queer that he included distribution to seven autonomous independent local churches with individual bishops, and not a single Imperial Roman Universal Church or a Pope?

God Bless your Studies of Him and His Word,.... not “them” and their interpretations  
Pastor Ed Rice

### 3) Where in the New Testament do the apostles tell future generations that the Christian faith will be based on a book?

The implication here again is that we are to discard the written word, and go with the oral word even as the oral word transitions through the controls of Imperial Roman Government and it’s edicts. Introduced in this transition are such unbiblical practices as confessionals, implemented to detect and kill Roman discontents, Purgatory, implemented to coerce money from mourners, and sale of indulgences, also implemented to finance the Imperial Roman Catholic

## *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

Church. Evangelists preach the gospel of the saving power of Jesus Christ without works, this oral tradition you esteem sells tickets to heaven to the highest bidder or hardest worker. Introduced in this transition are such unbiblical doctrines as Deification of Mary, taking the book of Psalms, removing every reference to God and substituting Holy Mary Mother of God!, (Don't pretend that the Imperial Roman Catholic Church didn't do that; It is worse than embarrassing isn't it, it gives new meaning to perverting the Word Of God, especially the Word of God that the Lord Jesus Christ, our example, quoted and used.), Praying to Saints, when the Bible clearly teaches we have one priest, one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus (1Tim 2:5), the Mortal Sin of Presumption, when the Bible says "*These things have I WRITTEN unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may KNOW that ye have eternal life,*" (1 John 13, emphasis mine) or the Mortal Sin of Despair, when the Written Word of God says, "*And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.*" (1John 5:11-12)

But you asked where it is written that we should follow the written Word of God from the Apostles, over the written edicts of the Imperial Roman Catholic Church, which you call oral traditions. The above discourse, pretty plainly explains why I would us the writings of the original Apostles rather than knee jerk dictates of a State Run Church, but lets look at the Holy Bible, for more concrete reasons.

**1) Directly by His Example:** The Lord Jesus Christ is to be our example so lets look first at the example he sets and see that we are to rely on the Written Word Directly by His Example. You are familiar with the temptation of Jesus Christ recorded in Matthew 4. How did Jesus answer the first temptation of Satan "*If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread.*"? His answer "*It is written...*" How did Jesus answer the



## Article 2 - On Biblical Authority

second temptation of Satan, the opposer of God, when he uses the very Word of God in his temptation? His answer "*It is written . . .*"! How did Jesus answer the third temptation of Satan, when Satan bribed him for his worship? His answer "*It is written . . .*" Now do you suppose the future generations of believers who are to be opposed and tempted by Satan, should answer differently? Should we say "Well the pope said in 1112 AD that . . . ." I think I will go with what is written by the Apostles over what the 237 popes said or devised in order to build an Imperial Roman Catholic Church.

**2) By Direct Command of the OT:** To presume that the written word is set aside for the new testament traditions of men is to violate the Direct Commands of the Old Testament. Although we are replete with examples here I will limit myself to four. Psalms 119 is written in octets as an acrostic of the Hebrew Alphabet, (that is a WRITTEN alphabet incidentally, which is used to record WORDs that man uses to communicate with.) In this acrostic are 176 verses (22 letters x 8 verses per letter) which refer to the Written Word of God in eight ways.

1. The Law of the Lord
2. His Testimonies
3. His Ways
4. His Precepts
5. His Statutes
6. His Commandments
7. His Judgments
8. His Word

An 176 verse dissertation on the practicality, purpose and purity of His written word as the foundation of all faith. Should we throw out the medium of the written word because we are under a new covenant? No, Although God used the preaching and the words of prophets to do his bidding, he had them recorded in a book for all future generations. He then commanded that we read the book

## *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

he had sent by His inspiration, preserved by His infallible providence and sharpened by His indisputable authority. New Testament and Old Testament alike, God does not change.

Psalm 19: 7 *“The law of the LORD is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the LORD is sure, making wise the simple. 8 The statutes of the LORD are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the LORD is pure, enlightening the eyes. 9 The fear of the LORD is clean, enduring for ever: the judgments of the LORD are true and righteous altogether. 10 More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold: sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb. 11 Moreover by them is thy servant warned: and in keeping of them there is great reward. 12 Who can understand his errors? cleanse thou me from secret faults. 13 Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins; let them not have dominion over me: then shall I be upright, and I shall be innocent from the great transgression.”*

All Faith and Practice is based on the written word because “The law of the LORD is perfect, converting the soul:” while the law of your popes is imperfect, building sacrament.

All Faith and Practice is based on the written word because “testimony of the LORD is sure, making wise the simple” while the testimonies of your popes is uncertain, selling chances to heaven to the simple like bingo number.

All Faith and Practice is based on the written word because “The statutes of the LORD are right, rejoicing the heart” while the statutes of your popes is wrong, burning believers at the stake.

All Faith and Practice is based on the written word because “The commandment of the LORD is pure, enlightening the eyes.” while the commandment of your popes is vile, closing eyes from the written word killing those who would publish it.

All Faith and Practice is based on the written word because “The fear of the LORD is clean, enduring forever” while the fear of your popes is dirty, brandishing death, but praise the Lord it was temporary and a door was opened in

## *Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

Philadelphia that no man can shut (Rev 3:7)

All Faith and Practice is based on the written word because "The judgments of the LORD are true and righteous altogether." while the judgments of your popes is embezzlement, the selling indulgences.

I think I will go with what is written by the Apostles over what the 237 popes said or devised in order to build an Imperial Roman Catholic Church.

3) Implicitly by His Apostles. The Apostles, of which there are only twelve ordained by God, who did not bequeath authority of any sort, wrote with a clear authority as the eyewitnesses of Christ. They wrote as saints to the saints. (Pope John Paul II waived the mandatory waiting period of five years after death to begin the process of sainthood for Mother Teresa. It is one of the first times such an exception has been made by the Vatican. (USA TODAY 3/1/99) "Sword of the Lord" Editor's Comments, I can't outdo Dr. Shelton Smith who said of this "Sainthood, according to the Bible (Rom. 1:7, 1Cor 1:2; Eph 2:19; 3:8), is a privilege bestowed upon every person who is saved. But when the Bible (the Word of God) is not the authoritative standard, the rules keep changing. Roman Catholicism is built upon a false system of theology of which their "sainthood" business is only one indicator!") The written word of the Apostles was to them clearly as authoritative as OT scripture. Did they command that we future generations read what they wrote? Clearly so.

*1Th 5:27 I charge you by the Lord that this epistle be read unto all the holy brethren.*

*Col 4:16 And when this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea.*

*Eph 3:4 Whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ)*

*2Co 1:13 For we write none other things unto you, than what ye read or acknowledge; and I trust ye shall acknowledge even to the end;*

### *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

I think I will go with what is written by the Apostles over what the 237 popes said or devised in order to build an Imperial Roman Catholic Church.

4) Protestants claim that Jesus categorically condemned all oral tradition (Matt 15:3, 6; Mark 7:8-13). If so, why does He bind His listeners to oral tradition by telling them that to obey the scribes and Pharisees when they "sit on Moses' seat" (Matt 23:2)?

I did not know that they categorically did but I will humor you on this one. To claim that Matthew 23:2 gives precedence to any oral tradition over the written law is to be ignorant of what a Pharisee was, ignorant of the 1st rule of hermeneutics is (given previously, dealing with keeping scripture in context, read the whole chapter, know what Jesus was telling his disciples about Phariseeism before you claim throw your catholic heritage into bed with the Pharisees) and ignorant of the game of pass-it-on, where each one whispers a story, (or tradition) to the person next to them and you reveal what story comes out at the end of the circle. Everyone is amazed at how unwritten passed on stories get perverted when retold by only 6 or 7 folks, especially a catholic who has been taught that oral tradition has more authority than the written word of an Apostle. This question is quite full of smoke and mirror and balderdash. I think I will go with what is written by the Apostles over what the 237 popes said or devised in order to build an Imperial Roman Catholic Church.

To those Baptist receiving a BCC, (blind courtesy copy) of these answers to Catholics, this will be your last update unless you request to be included. These and the remaining 30 answers will be compiled in a final manuscript which will be published on our web site. I will notify you of its completion this spring. God Bless and thanks for your prayer. Any assistance would be appreciated, especially those who have additional quotes from Polycarp, Tertullian and Tellestian, or copies of "Neanders Church History",

## Article 2 - On Biblical Authority

"Antiquity of Cyrus", "Armitage Vol I & II" or other early works possibly missed by A.A. Davis. (Doubtful but possible) God Bless.

God Bless your Studies of Him and His Word,.... not "them" and their interpretations  
Pastor Ed Rice

5) Protestants claim that St. Paul categorically condemned all oral tradition (Col 2:8). If so, why does he tell the Thessalonians to "stand firm and hold to the traditions which you were taught, whether by word of mouth or by letter" (2 Thes 2:15) and praises the Corinthians because they "hold firmly to the traditions" (1 Cor. 11:2)?

I expect that you exaggerated the Protestants claim to suit your purpose here, I am certain that the educated Protestant would only categorically condemn all Catholic oral tradition. As would any educated Baptist. Let me say "Shame on you" first for making these verses of private interpretation as you take your excerpts so completely out of context to defend heretical traditions. Let's examine the scripture here and see why we categorically condemn Catholic oral tradition.

***Col. 2:8 Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.***

***II Thes. 2:15 Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle.***

***I Cor. 11:1 ¶ Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ. 2 Now I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances, as I delivered them to you. 3 But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God.***

In these three Scriptures the Apostle Paul is instructing three independent autonomous Bible believing Churches to

### *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

pay attention to his teachings, his written epistles and his traditions which he delivered unto them. Notice the past tense of all of this. What you have already been taught and what has been delivered as to you as the truth, is the subject here, and you can even see the stern warning not to accept the philosophy, vain deceit and traditions of men that would soon be outpouring from the Catholic Church, as the future traditions one should “beware of”. What are these traditions of the Catholic Church? I’ll provide you this list:

	List of Heresies And HUMAN INVENTIONS ADOPTED and PERPETUATED by the ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE COURSE OF 1600 YEARS. (Compiled by Rev. Stephen L. Testa). Revised by A.A. Davis	
Item	These dates are in many cases approximate. Many of these heresies had been current in the Church years before, but only when they were officially adopted by a Church council and proclaimed by the pope as dogma of faith, did they become binding on Catholics. At the Reformation in the 16th Century these heresies were repudiated as having no part in the Religion of Jesus as taught in the New Testament.	Contrived in A.D.
1	Of all the human inventions taught and practices by the Roman Catholic Church, which are contrary to the Bible, the most ancient are the prayers for the dead and the sign of the Cross. Both began 300 years after Christ.	310
2	Wax candles introduced in church about 320 and also tampering with Law of God (Exodus 20:3-17) in 321	320
3	Veneration of angels and dead saints about 375	375
4	The Mass, as a daily celebration , adopted 394	394

*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

5	The worship of Mary. The mother of Jesus, and the use of the term “Mother of God”, as applied to her, originated in the Council of Ephesus in 431	431
6	Priests began to dress differently from the laity in 500	
7	The doctrine of Purgatory was first established by Gregory the Great about the year 593	593
8	The Latin language, as the language of the prayer and worship in churches, was also imposed by Pope Gregory I. 600 years after Christ.	600
9	The Bible teaches that we pray to God alone. In the primitive church never were prayers directed to Mary, or to dead saints. This practice began in the Roman Church about 600	600
10	The papacy is of pagan origin. The title of pope or universal bishop, was first given to the bishop of Rome by the wicked emperor Phocas, in the year 610. This he did to spite Bishop Ciriacus of Constantinople, who had justly excommunicated him for his having caused the assassination of his predecessor emperor, Mauritius. Gregory I, the bishop of Rome, refused the title, but his successor, Boniface III, first assumed title “pope”. Jesus did not appoint Peter to the head ship of apostles and forbade any such notion. (Luke 22:24-26; Ephesians 1:22-23; Colossians 1:18; I Cor.. 3:11) Note: Nor is there any mention in Scripture, nor in history, that Peter ever was in Rome, much less that he was pope there for 25 years; Clement 3rd Bishop of Rome, remarks that “there is no real 1st century evidence that Peter ever was in Rome.”	610
11	The kissing of the Pope’s feet began in 709. It has been a pagan custom to kiss the feet of emperors. The Word of God forbids such practices. (Read Acts 10:25-26; Rev. 19:10;22:9)	709

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

12	The Temporal power of the Popes began in 750. When Pepin, the usurper of the throne of France, descended into Italy, called by Pope Stephen II, to war against the Italian Lombards, he defeated them and gave the city of Rome and surrounding territory to the pope. Jesus expressly forbade such a thing, and He himself refused worldly kingship. (Read Matt. 4:9; 20:25-26; John 18:36)	750
13	Worship of the cross, of images and relics was authorized in 788. This was by order of Dowager Irene of Constantinople who first caused to pluck the eyes of her own son, Constantine VI, and then called a church council at the request of Harrian I, pope of Rome at that time. Such practices is called simply IDOLATRY in the Bible, and is severely condemned. (Read Exodus 20:4; Deut 27:15; Psalm 115)	788
14	Holy Water, mixed with a pinch of salt and blessed by the priest, was authorized in 850.	850
15	The veneration of St. Joseph began in 890.	890
16	The baptism of bells was instituted by Pope John XIV in the year 965	965
17	Canonization of dead saints, first by Pope John XV in 995. Every believer and follower of Christ is called saint in the Bible.(Read Rom. 1:7; I Cor.. 1:2)	995
18	Fasting on Fridays and during Lent were imposed in the year 998. By popes who said to be interested in the commerce of fish. (Bull, or permit to eat meat), some authorities say, began in the year 700. This is against the plain teaching of the Gospel. (Read Matt. 15:10; I Cor.. 10:25; I Tim. 4:1-3).	998
19	The Mass was developed gradually as a sacrifice; attendance made obligatory in the 11th century. The Gospel teaches that the sacrifice of Christ was offered once and for all, and is not to be repeated, but only commemorated in the Lord's Supper. (Read Heb. 7:27; 9:26-28; 10:10-14).	1000?



*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

20	The celibacy of the priesthood was decreed by Pope Hildebrand, Boniface II, in the year 1079. Jesus imposed no such rule, nor did any of the apostles. On the contrary St. Peter was a married man, and St. Paul says that bishops were to have wife and children. (Read I Tim. 3:12 & 25; Matt 8:14-15)	1,079
21	The Rosary, or prayer beads was introduced by Peter, the Hermit, in the year 1090. Copied from Hindus and Mohammedans. The counting of prayers is a pagan practice and is expressly condemned by Christ. (Matt. 6:5-13)	1,090
22	The inquisition of heretics was instituted by the Council of Verona in the year 1184. Jesus never taught the use of force to spread His religion.	1,184
23	The sale of indulgences, commonly regarded as a purchase of forgiveness and a permit to indulge in sin, began in the year 1190. Christianity, as taught in the Gospel, condemns such a traffic, and it was the protest against this traffic that brought on the Protestant Reformation in the 16th century.	1,190
24	The dogma of Transubstantiation was decreed by Pope Innocent III in 1215. By this doctrine the priest pretends to perform a daily miracle by changing the wafer into the body of Christ, and then he pretends to eat Him alive in the presence of his people during the Mass. The Gospel condemns such absurdities; for the Lord's Supper is simply a memorial of the sacrifice of Christ. (Read Luke 22:19-20; John 6:35; I Cor.. 11:26).	1,215
25	Confession of sins to the priest at least once per year was instituted by Pope Innocent III, in the Lateran Council, in the year 1215. The Gospel commands us to confess our sins direct to God. (Read Psalm 51:10; Luke 7:48; 15:21; I John 1:8-9).	1,215

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

26	The adoration of the wafer (Host), was decreed by Pope Honorius in the year 1220. So the Roman Church worships a god made by human hands. This is plain idolatry and absolutely contrary to the spirit of the Gospel. (Read John 4:24)	1,220
27	The scapular was invented by Simon Stock, an English monk, in the year 1287. It is a piece of brown cloth, with the picture of the Virgin and supposed to contain supernatural virtue to protect from all dangers those who wear it on naked skin. This is fetishism.	1,287
28	The Roman Church forbade the cup to the laity, by instituting the communion of one kind in the Council of Constance in the year 1414. The Gospel commands us to observe the Lord's Supper with bread and wine. (Read Matt. 26:27; I Cor.. 11:26-27.)	1,414
29	The doctrine of Purgatory was proclaimed as a dogma of faith by Council of Florence in 1439. There is not one word in the Bible that would teach the purgatory of priests. The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sins. (Read I John 1:7-9; 2:1-2; John 5:24; Rom. 8:1)	1,439
30	The doctrine of 7 Sacraments affirmed in the year 1439. The Gospel says that Christ instituted only two ordinances, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. (Read Matt. 28:19-20; 26:26-28)	1,439
31	The Ave Maria, part of the last half in the year 1508. It was completed 50 years afterward and finally approved by Pope Sixtus V, at the end of the 16th century.	1,508
32	The Council of Trent, held in the year 1545, declared that Tradition is of equal authority with the Bible. By Tradition is meant human teachings. The Pharisees believed the same way, and Jesus bitterly condemned them, for by human tradition, they nullified the commandments of God. (Read Mark 7:7-13; Col.. 2:8; Rev. 22:18).	1,545

*Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

33	The apocryphal books were added to the Bible also by the Council of Trent in 1546. These books were not recognized as canonical by the Jewish Church. (See Rev 22:8-9)	1,546
34	The Creed of Pope Pius IV was imposed as the official creed 1560 years after Christ and the apostles, in the year 1560.	1,560
35	The Immaculate Conception of Virgin Mary was proclaimed by Pope Pius IX in the year 1854. The Gospel states that all men, with the sole exception of Christ, are sinners. Mary herself had need of a Savior. (Read Rom. 3:23; 5:12; Psalm 51:5; Luke 1:30; 46-47.)	1,854
36	In the year 1870 after Christ, Pope Pius IX proclaimed that dogma of Papal infallibility. This is a blasphemy and the sign of the apostasy and of the anti-christ predicted by St. Paul (Read II Thess. 2:2-12; Rev. 17:1-9; 13:5-8,18)	1,870
37	Pope Pius X, in the year 1907, condemned together with "Modernism", all the discoveries of modern science which are not approved by the Church. Pius had done the same thing in the Syllabus of 1864.	1,907
38	In the year 1930 Pius XI condemned the Public Schools..	1,930
39	In the year 1931 the same pope, Pius XI, reaffirmed the doctrine that Mary is the Mother of God. This doctrine was first invented by the Council of Ephesus in the year 431. This is a heresy contrary by Mary's own words. (Red Luke 1:46-49; John 2:1-5).	1,931
40	In the year 1950 the last dogma was proclaimed by Pope Pius XII, the Assumption of the Virgin Mary.	1,950

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

Conc 1	<p>What will be the next invention? The Roman Church says it never changes; yet, it has done nothing else but invent new doctrines which are contrary to the Bible, and has practiced rites and ceremonies taken bodily form paganism. Some scholar has found 75% of the rites and ceremonies of the Roman Church are of pagan origin. Note: Cardinal Newman, in his book, “The Development of the Christian Religion,” admits that . . . “Temples, incense, oil lamps, votive offerings, holy water, holidays and season of devotions, processions, blessing of field, sacerdototal testaments, and tonsure (of priests and monks and nuns), images . . . Are all of pagan origin . . .” (Pg. 359)</p> <p>The above chronological list of human inventions disproves the claim of the priests of the Roman Church that their religion was taught by Christ, and that the popes have been the faithful custodians of this religion.</p> <p><b>BROTHERS!</b> The Word of God commands us to get out of Babylon, saying : “Come out of her, my people, that you may not take part in her sins, nor receive a share in her plagues . . .” (Rev. 18:4). All true Christians will remain faithful to the religion of Christ as taught in the Bible, and heed the warning of the Apostle Paul, who said : “But, though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.” (Gal. 1:8)</p> <p>From “The Baptist Story Sermons on The Trail of Blood” by A.A. Davis @1999, Appendix XIV pg. 207</p>
-----------	--

6) If the authors of the New Testament believed in sola Scriptura, why did they sometimes draw on oral Tradition as authoritative and as God's Word (Matt 2:23; 23:2; 1 Cor. 10:4; 1 Pet 3:19; Jude 9, 14 15)?

Your question here captures a strand that reaches the

## Article 2 - On Biblical Authority

heart of the matter. We believers have learned, by faith, to accept the Scriptures as pure truth. When Jesus Christ says that the prophets spoke something, we believe without hesitation that the prophets spoke it. Even if we cannot find an exact quote in the written Hebrew scriptures, we will believe that God incarnate knew what he was quoting. Notice of course the many times when Jesus quoted what was written. We have already considered that his prophets were speakers/preachers first, writer second. It should not surprise anyone at this point however, that when Jesus passes on an what the prophets spoke, we hold that quite differently than when Pope Pius XI speaks to reaffirm a fiction that Mary is the Mother of God. When God's Apostle Paul tells us that Moses and the Israelites "***drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ.***" We hold that differently than when Pope Hildebrand, Boniface II talks about celibacy. When the Apostle Peter writes it down for our learning that "***For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison;***", Peter, an eye witness, disciple and apostle of Jesus Christ is regarded differently than is Pope John XV who writes stuff down about the canonization of dead saints. When Jude writes, with a seeming first hand knowledge, about the body of Moses, or the preaching of Enoch, we take note that he was with Jesus the Light of the world and the living Word of God and we believe him. However when Pope Honorius decrees that we should worship a Catholic wafer, or Pope Pius IX decides that Mary had Immaculate Conception, you must understand that this is quite a different matter, this is quite a different kind of "oral tradition." We strongly, and justifiably believe in "sola Scriptura." Baptists, which are not Protestants, always have. We strongly, and justifiably condemn the oral traditions of the Catholic Church. Baptists, who predate Protestants and Catholics, have

### *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

condemned Roman Church traditions ever since they united with the Roman Empire in the 3rd century, and 300 years later, when they began to call themselves Catholic, the Baptist were still there, opposing their heretical oral traditions. Recheck your sources.

God Bless your Studies of Him and His Word,... not "them" and their interpretations  
Pastor Ed Rice

7) Where in the Bible is God's Word restricted only to what is written down?

This question was clearly answered via Question #1,2 & 3 answers above.

8) How do we know who wrote the books that we call Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Acts, Hebrews, and 1, 2, and 3 John?

The Greek words "kata Matqiaion" appear on the first page of his Gospel. Translated to English, that is "According to Matthew." You see when Matthew wrote by inspiration, his perspective of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, before handing copies around to the other apostles and bishops that he had been preaching with for 10 years, he put this title to the work. Mark, who also dipped his pen into God's ink bowl of inspiration did the same, as did Luke, and John. They did not write these inspired accounts to bury them in a tomb in Alexandria Egypt so 19th century heretics could dig them up. They distributed them to the saints. We have been so permeated with the false doctrine of evolution that we imagine these folks were cave men barely able to read or write a newly invented language. The dark ages resulted from Satan locking up most, not all, of these writings in a vault of the Roman Imperial Church, but that did not happen until after 300 years of rampant copying and distribution of God's Written Word, which flowed from the pens of the known Apostles. The early Church didn't wonder who wrote what, they just looked at the title. They didn't

## *Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

need it canonized by any 'universal' Church in Babylon, (where, incidentally, Peter wrote his Epistle from (I Peter 5:13) in the historic record, Peter was never in Rome, let alone a Bishop of such.). The 1st century believers had a written copy of all that the Apostles wrote, with their titles which indicated their human author. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, disciple of Apostle John, proved that by quoting his copy repeatedly in his writings and teachings.

How do we know who wrote the book of Acts? Look at Acts 1:1. It's author is someone who wrote a Gospel, and wrote it to a fellow named Theophilus. Now just look at a couple Gospels, there are only 4, until you see a record being written to Theophilus, look up the page to the title above the book and you will discover that Luke wrote the book that he called "Praxeiz twn Apostolwn" or "The Acts of the Apostles." Book titles are not just a modern invention, you see, the Apostles used them. Who wrote the verbally inspired inerrant book of Hebrews? I don't know, and neither do you. I believe it was a team of Apostles, they compiled it while Paul was giving guided tours of the Jerusalem temple before his imprisonment and martyrdom in Rome. We do know that it was received by the believers in the early Churches (non universal plural.) It was added to their collections of Inspired Scriptures from the Apostles, and they left the title without acknowledging the author. God chose to leave the Letter to the Hebrews anonymous, but He sure left it authoritative as His inspired Word is always authoritative.

God Bless your Studies of Him and His Word,.... not "them" and their interpretations

Pastor Ed Rice

9) On what authority, or on what principle, would we accept as Scripture books that we know were not written by one of the twelve apostles?

We, as the 1st century saints did, accept only the

### *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

Scriptures that were handed on by the Apostles themselves. John Mark was not one of the apostles and penned the "Gospel according to Mark". He was preaching companion to the Apostle Peter. His writings contain the authority of God and the blessings of Peter. Dr. Luke penned the "Gospel according to Luke". Luke was not an Apostle but he was the preaching companion of the Apostle Paul, some believe he was his personal physician. His writings containing the authority of God and the blessings of the Apostle Paul. Luke also wrote the "Acts of the Apostles." These three books did not come from the hand of an apostle, but we accept them as Scripture books because they were written during the time of the apostles and preserved as Scripture by the apostles and their disciples. Thus, all New Testament Scriptures are received on the authority of the apostles, the eyewitnesses of the Lord Jesus Christ. Incidentally, eyewitnessship isn't handed down to successors.

10) Where in the Bible do we find an inspired and infallible list of books that should belong in the Bible?

The writings of the apostles were carefully copied and handed on by the apostles themselves. They were distributed to the Churches and copied (with their titles intact by the way) by instruction of the apostles. Paul specifically stated that his letters should be read in the Churches. There is no reason to pretend that the Apostles didn't have access to the 4 gospels that had been written. As the apostles were crucified, beheaded, and slaughtered, it should be obvious that they stopped writing. When the Apostle John wrote his closing book, the "Revelation of Jesus Christ", with stern warnings from Christ himself that this was the end of the writings, the writings were complete. All that, before the turn of the century. God, canonized the scriptures. There was no need of an Imperial Roman Church to pretend that they did. The early saints armed with the indwelling of the Holy Spirit of God, and the



## *Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

writings of the Apostles, knew the pretenders from the real thing. Your question is trite, so too is my answer. Go to page 1, there you find a list of the Books that should be in your Bible. If you are missing some books, or if some catholic church tried to insert some extra apocryphal books, go get a King James Bible.

11) How do we know, from the Bible alone, that the individual books of the New Testament are inspired, even when they make no claim to be inspired?

But they do. This is probably a hingpin of difference between one who has faith in the Bible and one who has faith in a Church, so I will develop it more carefully.

Consider first, What does inspiration mean? Paul uses it in II Tim 3:16. “ **16 All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: 17 That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.** Inspiration here, literally means breathed by God. How did God accomplish this? Let’s look at inspiration of the OT (Old Testament). We will see in a moment that Paul held his writings on equal level with OT inspired writings, but one will certainly concede that the “all scriptures” mentioned in this text includes the known and accepted 39 books of the Hebrew OT. (Christians call it OT, Hebrews do not.) How did God inspire writings of Scripture?

The phrase “The word of the LORD came to me saying, . . .” is replete in the OT. (e.g. Jer. 18:1; Ezek. 12:1, 8, 17, 21, 26; Hos. 1:1; Joel 1:1; Amos 3:1 etc.). The prophets had a consciousness that their message was from God. It was not their own creation. Some obvious things about this inspiration of God’s word should be stated. First, the word of God to man is mediated. Meaning, there is a mediator. God’s word always comes in a human language, whether it be Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek. Thus God speaks to man via a mediator who writes down the message in a human language. That’s how we got the scriptures of the OT, and

## *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

that's how we got the scriptures of the NT.

Secondly, the process of this Divine Speech should be stated. In the inspiration of Scripture one may find 1) an audible speaking of God, 2) a silent inward hearing of God's message, it may take the form of 3) a dream, it may be from 4) a vision, or it may be 5) the author wrote, and God placed within his mind the thoughts that God wished communicated. Notice that this last instance, which we normally think of in regards to NT inspiration, can include both the Holy Spirit's bringing matters which were previously witnessed or taught to ones remembrance, or the Holy Spirit's directing the writer into new thoughts and principles which God wanted communicated; this would accurately be called revelation from God. Given this understanding of God using a mediator to communicate his new testament in Christ via these 5 modes of inspiration, we can state emphatically that the New Testament Scriptures are given by the inspiration of God.

Is there written evidence that the authors of the NT were consciously writing the communications from God? Absolutely. Examples are 1) audible voice in Matt 3:17, Mark 1:11, Luke 3:22, John 12:28, Acts 9:4-6, 11:9, II Pet 1:18; 2) a silent inward hearing of God's message in Matt 16:17, I Cor 2:10; 3) a dream Acts 11:5; 4) in a vision in Acts 16:9, Revelation 1; 5) written by inspiration case 1. John 14:25-26, case 2 2Pet 1:14-15, ICor 7:10,12 & 25. This list is not inclusive. I have already given you a ton of such scriptures, which state why the authors wrote, and that they were writing the communication from God, so let's briefly look at the last three in this list, 3 of my favorites.

John 14:25-26 states ***“25 ¶ These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you. 26 But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.”*** Notice how clearly this statement of Christ applies only to the apostles,

## *Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

and not to the believers, which are to be his Church, which are to follow. We did not hear him speak these things, they did. A direct indication that they, the eyewitnesses, would be inspired authors recording his words and deeds. Jesus did not write but in the sand. He meditated a new covenant, and left the mediating of God's Word to his disciples. (Not to just any believer that happened along 300 years later, but specifically to his eyewitnesses.) That is how Paul repeatedly defends his apostle ship, he was an eyewitness of Christ. Pope XXXX is not such, nor is any 3rd -23rd century prophet. Inspiration ceased when the last apostle, the beloved apostle John died. And he closes his writings with a curse from God on any that would add to or take away from this inspired writing that we call the 27 books of the New Testament..

II Pet. 1:14 "Knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath shewed me. 15 Moreover I will endeavour that ye may be able after my decease to have these things always in remembrance." Need one ask why Peter wrote this? Need one ask how long we should remember it and use it as God's communication to us? Could one refuse of this epistle that "Holy men of God 'wrote' as they were moved by the Holy Ghost? No. No. No.

ICor 7:10 "***And unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from her husband: . . . . 12 But to the rest speak I, not the Lord: If any brother hath a wife. . . . 25 Now concerning virgins I have no commandment of the Lord: yet I give my judgment, as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful.***" Examine this marvelous passage carefully and you will notice that Paul, under conscious inspiration, gives the command of the Lord, stating emphatically that it is of the Lord. He then, steps out of the "command of the Lord" mode in verse 12; not setting aside the conscious inspiration that he has he gives the inspired "mind of the Lord." Then in verse 25, again,

### *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

conscious that he is giving instruction which is from God, but not specifically commanded of Christ, he gives his judgment, as one having the authority of God via inspiration. A marvelous illustration of three distinct forms of inspiration of scripture consciously delineated by the Apostle Paul himself.

Now do the authors of the New Testament make claim of writing inspired Scripture?. A fool would require that there be a verse penned by an Apostle that states implicitly "The following is a recital of holy inspired thoughts of God." A wise student of Scripture, born again and indwelt by the Spirit of God, would study what inspiration is, and realize that the authors of the 27 book left to us were consciously writing the mind of God in a book that was to be read, heeded, and unaltered until the Lord Jesus Christ returned, and that even then their words, being the word of God would endure FOREVER. (*Psalms 119:89 "For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven."*)

12) How do we know, from the Bible alone, that the letters of St. Paul, who wrote to first-century congregations and individuals, are meant to be read by us 2000 years later as Scripture?

I know that modernists hate the writings of Paul because it is so embarrassing to their ideas of modern society with queer and woman bishops. They call Paul "a woman hater" and "out of touch with what our society has 'evolved' into over these 2000 years." I am not sure what your Catholic leaders fear about the writings of Paul. Let's say for a moment that Paul did not have a clue that he was writing truths that would apply to future Churches. (Of course he did know that he was, and he did ask all the Churches to read and share his letters back then. Just the same his writings of NT scripture had his teachings and doctrines captured very nicely, they were documents of truth then and Paul knew their value enough to tell Christians never to depart from his teachings. Truth does not change or evolve, it is eternal. Paul's instruction was to never depart from the

## *Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

truths that he taught. Never? So when was it all right to depart from Paul's teachings? in 500 AD when the Imperial Roman Church started exiling believers who did not agree with its new renditions of truth? Or later when they started killing their opposition? Or just in the past 150 years when we crossed some threshold of evolutionary development and knowledge increased. I will contend that whether Paul meant for me to use his apostolic teachings to solve problems in 2003, or had no clue, I would far rather use his word's of truth than any Catholic pope's froward words.

13) Where does the Bible claim to be the sole authority for Christians in matters of faith and morals?

In Psalms 119:89 the Bible says "*For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven.*" It is remarkably interesting that this was penned as the word of God and was settled in heaven the same day. Or, I could give you Jesus prayer in John 17:17 "*Sanctify them through thy word: thy word is truth.*" Doubtless, however, by the tone of this question, you would not like the myriad of references that we could give that makes God's written word authoritative and the final authority for our faith and practice, so let me delve a little here into the depth of your problem with the Bible. It is obvious by the rhetoric that you despise those who would use the written word of God to over ride the teachings of your Roman Catholic Church. Your implications of 'sole authority' and the hedging of your questions with the phrase 'from the Bible alone' make it clear that you want to set the Bible aside and rely primarily on the 'oral traditions' or the Catholic Dogma. Let me point out again, the two major differences between a Roman Catholic and a Bible Believer. One is the totally different views of the authority and completeness of the Bible, and the second is the completely divergent understandings of what is the church, particularly what Jesus meant when he said "*Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not*

## *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

*prevail against it.”* Your questions, up to this point have addressed your tepid view of Biblical authority. We will wade into the other area momentarily, I bring it up now so you can recognize that what you are wrestling with is “Where do I find the authority of God?” I, a Bible Believing Christian find it in the Word of God, you, a Roman Catholic find it solely in the Catholic Church.

Allow me to diverge slightly here based on your last response. We both may provoke easily and call each other bigots at the drop of a clause. That's because our individual 'gods' are being attacked by the other. A difference in the use of the name, 'bigot' hinges on the definitions use of the word 'intolerant.' So let me say once more that Baptists who are Bible Believing Christians, were burned at the stake by intolerant Protestants and intolerant Catholics and have never burned anyone. We persuade men with the Word of God, not the swing of the sword, thus the term 'bigot' leveled onto a Baptist is usually overstated. We are sure bolted on to the truth of God's word, meeting the first half of the definition because we will not be moved off of that truth; but we are for the most part very tolerant people, even when in the jails, towers, stocks or flames of Catholics, Lutherans or Presbyters, who might better fit the definition of intolerant bigots. I am careful to avoid name calling and personal smearing in this article and would appreciate the same courtesy, in your responses.

At this venture it may surprise you that we Baptists (who are not Protestants) do not hold staunchly to your pet peeve 'sola scriptura' and never have. I said in the outset of this article that there are some rules of hermeneutics that are held dear to Bible Believers. Your question about sole authority prompts me to remind one that, although we use only the Bible as the authority of all faith and practice, our rendering of the principles found in the Book includes detailed and open study of what orthodox Christianity has always taught. Any introductory systematic theology study

## *Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

starts with the provision that it's sources are 1) Revelation, (the inspired Word of God) 2) Reason (don't leave your brain at the church door) 3) Historical Theology (what you prioritize and what Catholics want to delve solely to a Roman Catholic Church but I won't) 4) Present Theological Context (addressed more completely in your next question) and 5) Experience (here is the highest priority of the Pentecostals and modern charismatics, who have been unaffectionately called the feelers and squealers.) Take the time to be familiar with this list. Each of the various and numerous 'denominations' that shake your faith in God's written word have prioritized this list in a different order. A Baptist and most Bible Believers use the priority of source and authority as listed here and also include all 5 in their theological development. A bead counting Catholic uses #3 and that alone. A Catholic theologian might use a very minute mixture of #4, especially if he is in Boston this year. If a Catholic uses very much of #1 in their studies, however, they will turn into a Bible Believing Baptist. Thus the Catholic tradition has been to ban the book, lock it up and get nervous if someone starts reading it as truth without their direct supervision.

Again, let me point out in the answering of this question and all these questions, that there is a significant difference between a Bible believer and a catholic, and that this difference is hingpin on this list of sources that one uses for their belief system. The continual attacks on the authority of the Bible, found in the tone of your questions up to this point, point directly at this difference. With this major difference defined let me state boldly that someone is right in the prioritizing of these sources of theology, and someone is wrong. This is not a question of lying, so please don't just right me off and call me a liar. It is not that someone is telling the truth and someone is lying. It is that someone has properly prioritize the sources of theological truth and the other has not. I believe with all my heart and with all

### *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

my Bible that Baptists have properly prioritized the sources of theological truth, and have a good handle on that truth. That does not make me a bigot. I am very tolerant of your right to prioritize all your sources of theological truth into the Roman Catholic Church. I am just very amazed that a rational, studious and thinking individual would so staunchly do so. Don't perceive my frustration in communicating this life changing truth as bigotry. It is not. Please don't turn off your brain at the door of your church. Study this list of sources of theological truth, consider that your Church has blinded you to the needful priority of scriptures as the prime source. Understand that the Protestants in their reformation did not get the list prioritized right either, they just protested the catholic church as the sole source. Bible Believing Christians, from Jesus Christ to the present, have used these 5 prioritized sources to effectively build Christ's church, often from jails.

14) Most of the books of the New Testament were written to address very specific problems in the early Church, and none of them are a systematic presentation of Christian faith and theology. On what biblical basis do Protestants think that everything that the apostles taught is captured in the New Testament writings?

Notice the frustration of the apostles as they wrote the inspired word in *John 21:25 And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written. Amen.* There is therefore NO basis whatsoever to think that everything that the apostles taught is captured in the New Testament writings. It is not. However, what is captured is complete and sufficient for our needs. God said so. If one has convinced you that the Bible is not sufficient, exactly what has that one added to or taken away from the written word of God? And why should you trust them over the written word of God?

It is a marvelous truth that the Bible is nowhere a systematic presentation of the Christian faith and theology.



## *Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

Consider, for a moment that if God had desired, John, the beloved disciple, would have penned something similar to the Apostles Creed. We Baptists know that if he had there would be no line about the holy catholic church in it, it is in none of their other writings. But God did not have the apostles or Isaiah or Jeremiah or Moses pen an 5 volume set of systematic theology. God gave his principles and prophecy in narrative and illustration from Genesis to Revelation, without any portion of written systematic theology or creed. Consider that in Luke 10 Jesus could have given the questioning Lawyer a Webster definition of 'neighbor'. Instead, Jesus gave him a parable of the Good Samaritan. Consider that Paul, in the foreknowledge of God could have know that smoking Tobacco would be hazardous and he could have written to Corinth "Thou shalt not burn and inhale any smoking plants." He did not, however he did write ***"What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's."*** Consider that God could have given a "Thus Saith the LORD" to any of his OT prophets and had them pen in one short chapter the sequence of events concerning the first and second coming of His only begotten son, his death burial and resurrection, his return for the saints and the 1000 year reign on earth before a new heaven and new earth were introduced. He did not. Instead you have to read all 66 books cover to cover 6 or seven times before you can put that much information into one sentence. Who am I to criticize the communication techniques of God. It seems he was pretty good at progressive revelation because every day I love his book more and more and have less and less use of your apostolic creed. Every day I find more and more reason to curse the catholic additions to his book and believe His closing lines ***"For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall***

### *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

*add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book. He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus."*

You may not like his book right now, but it is all we have to determine faith and practice. We use it to develop our creeds and our systematic theology. As mentioned in the previous article it is far better to use it as our prime source than to use some pope who had some secular interest in the price of fish on Fridays.

15) If the books of the New Testament are "self-authenticating" through the ministry of the Holy Spirit to each individual then why was there confusion in the early Church over which books were inspired, with some books being rejected by the majority?

It is true. There was much confusion in the early Church over who wrote what and who should be speaking for the truth. It was therefore justly decreed that only the writings of the actual apostles should be accepted as truth. Several verses attest to this problem. Examine II Thes 2:1 Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, 2 That ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand.

See also II Thes 3: 17 The salutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is the token in every epistle: so I write. If the Bible is true, and I believe it is, there is an opposer to God at work in the affairs of man. This opposer has legions of helpers so

Gal 1:6 ¶ I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him

## *Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel:  
7 Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you,  
and would pervert the gospel of Christ. ... 20 Now the  
things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not.

Jesus himself warned of deceivers Lu 21:8 And he said,  
Take heed that ye be not deceived: for many shall come in  
my name, saying, I am Christ; and the time draweth near:  
go ye not therefore after them.

16) If the meaning of the Bible is so clear, so easily interpreted, and if the Holy Spirit leads every Christian to interpret it rightly, then why are there over 23,000 Protestant denominations, and millions of individual Protestants, all interpreting the Bible differently?

"Among Protestants, 44% say they are born-again. And 13% of Roman Catholics and 20% of Mormons so identify themselves in Gallup surveys. "

"Now 57 million strong, the church is adding 2 million members each year... Perhaps as many as one in five Roman Catholics call themselves charismatic, or Pentecostal, and somewhere between 13 and 21% say they are born-again Christians. "

17) Who may authoritatively arbitrate between Christians who claim to be led by the Holy Spirit into mutually contradictory interpretations of the Bible?

18) Since each Protestant must admit that his or her interpretation is fallible, how can any Protestant in good conscience call anything heresy or bind another Christian to a particular belief?

19) Protestants usually claim that they all agree "on the important things." Who is able to decide authoritatively what is important in the

### *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

Christian faith and what is not?

20) How did the early Church evangelize and overthrow the Roman Empire, survive and prosper almost 350 years, without knowing for sure which books belong in the canon of Scripture?

21) Who in the Church had the authority to determine which books belonged in the New Testament canon and to make this decision binding on all Christians? If nobody has this authority, then can I remove or add books to the canon on my own authority?

22) Why do Protestant scholars recognize the early Church councils at Hippo and Carthage as the first instances in which the New Testament canon was officially ratified, but ignore the fact that those same councils ratified the Old Testament canon used by the Catholic Church today but abandoned by Protestants at the Reformation?

23) Why do Protestants follow post-apostolic Jewish decisions on the boundaries of the Old Testament canon, rather than the decision of the Church founded by Jesus Christ?

24) How were the bishops at Hippo and Carthage able to determine the correct canon of Scripture, in spite of the fact that they believed all the distinctively Catholic doctrines such as the apostolic succession of bishops, the sacrifice of the Mass, Christ's Real Presence in the Eucharist, baptismal regeneration, etc?

25) If Christianity is a "book religion," how did it flourish during the first 1500 years of Church history when the vast majority of people were illiterate?

26) How could the Apostle Thomas establish the church in India that survives to this day (and is now in communion with the Catholic Church) without leaving them with one word of New Testament Scripture?

27) If sola Scriptura is so solid and biblically based, why has there never been a full treatise written in its defense since the phrase was coined in the Reformation?

## *Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

28) If Jesus intended for Christianity to be exclusively a "religion of the book," why did He wait 1400 years before showing somebody how to build a printing press?

29) If the early Church believed in sola Scriptura, why do the creeds of the early Church always say "we believe in the Holy Catholic Church," and not "we believe in Holy Scripture"?

30) If the Bible is as clear as Martin Luther claimed, why was he the first one to interpret it the way he did and why was he frustrated at the end of his life that "there are now as many doctrines as there are heads"?

31) The time interval between the Resurrection and the establishment of the New Testament canon in AD 382 is roughly the same as the interval between the arrival of the Mayflower in America and the present day. Therefore, since the early Christians had no defined New Testament for almost four hundred years, how did they practice sola Scriptura?

32) If the Bible is the only foundation and basis of Christian truth, why does the Bible itself say that the Church is the pillar and foundation of truth (1 Tim. 3:15)?

33) Jesus said that the unity of Christians would be objective evidence to the world that He had been sent by God (John 17:20-23). How can the world see an invisible "unity" that exists only in the hearts of believers?

34) If the unity of Christians was meant to convince the world that Jesus was sent by God, what does the ever-increasing fragmentation of Protestantism say to the world?

35) Hebrews 13:17 says, "Obey your leaders and submit to their authority. They keep watch over you as men who must give an account. Obey them so that their work will be a joy, not a burden, for that would be of no advantage to you." What is the expiration date of this verse? When did it become okay not only to disobey the Church's leaders, but

*Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

to rebel against them and set up rival churches?

36) The Koran explicitly claims divine inspiration, but the New Testament books do not. How do you know that the New Testament books are nevertheless inspired, but the Koran is not?

God Bless,  
Max

God Bless your Studies of Him and His Word,.... not "them"  
and their interpretations  
Pastor Ed Rice

## Article 2 - On Biblical Authority

### Appendix

Listen Ed,

The Church was before the bible, my faith is in God, not a book. God left us a Church, as the bible says.

All of your replies have had numerous errors.

Answer this one question.... Why do ALL anti-Catholics lie about Catholic Teachings?

The liars: Ian Paisley, Jack Chick, Tom Ferrall, Rick Jones, etc....

They all lie about Catholic teachings.

God Bless... seek the truth, learn and pray... Only the Holy Spirit can convert you.

Max

You keep asking me to interrupt the answer of your 36 unanswerable questions to answer just one more question. I shall.

First let me address your impudent response concerning your refusal to believe the Bible because you believe in God and in your Catholic Church instead. Both have insisted that you put your faith in the Book! Since you'll likely add me to your liar list if I show you from the Bible ALONE where you are to put your faith in the written law of God, let me give you some teachings of your Church that you seem to be willingly ignorant of.

"There is no doubt that the medieval church also understood the Bible to be the Word(s) of God. God is the Author of Scripture and therefore Scripture must be understood as truth. Divine authorship was seen to be the principle cause of Scripture, but human authorship was the instrumental cause." . . . Thomas Aquinas stressed the Literal sense of Scripture as being the word of God. In general, scholastic theologians saw the Bible as the Written Word of a God "who inspires human writers, illuminating their minds to conceive clearly and correctly what He wishes them to write, moving their wills faithfully to write down the divine message which He gives them . . ." (C.J. Callen, "The Bible in the Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 9 (1947):34)

Your Roman Catholic Church has always regarded the Bible, the NT and OT, as true, accurate, the Word of God, authoritative, infallible and inspired. Your blatant departure from such a stand now is belligerent and likely a cardinal sin

### *Learning To Speak Roman Catholic*

in your own Church. I won't turn your comments over to your Church, however, because, if they were to excommunicate you your arguments would be baseless and your web page homeless.

For your second impudent question "Why do ALL anti-Catholics lie about Catholic Teachings?" Let me respond in three ways.

1) The individuals you mention are not anti-Catholic, they are Pro-Truth. It is easy for you to confuse these categories of individuals because most Preachers of Truth end up having to kick the Catholic teachings in the head along several avenues that they frequent.

2) These men only lie in your opinion. And that happens because you remain willfully ignorant of what is going on in Catholic Teachings. I can say that Catholic Teaching incorporates that "Mary the 'Mother of God' resurrected from the tomb before Christ did, and then helped Christ out of the tomb!" You would say "Liar, Liar, pants on fire." But take a trip to Lemma Peru and find what Catholics have been taught about the resurrection of Christ and you will owe me an apology for your quick answer and name calling shenanigans. That is a teaching of the Catholic Church even if you can't find it written in your shallow archive of Catholic teachings. Do they also teach the Worship of Mary? YES they do. Do they also teach the worship of Statues? Absolutely. Worship of wafers? Yes! Now you can run around and call these learned men liars all you please. Those of us who have been exposed to real Catholicism just wince at your name calling and feel bad for another 'poor blinded catholic.'" "Let he that hath ears to hear, hear."

3) Ian Paisley and Jack Chick have more knowledge of Catholic teaching contained in their little finger than you or I have in our whole 50 years of existence here on this earth. It would behoove you to get off your high horse, open your Bible and study the truth of what they teach.



## *Article 2 - On Biblical Authority*

They more than anybody alive know where Catholic teaching errors from Bible truth, and they got enough backbone to stand up, rare back and preach the Glorious Gospel of Jesus Christ, no matter what idiot points at them and calls them liar. My advice to you is don't be the idiot for a Bible Preacher with as much Power of God on his life as Ian Paisley. ***“And now I say unto you, Refrain from these men, and let them alone: for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought: But if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God.”*** Acts 5:38-39  
God Bless your Studies of Him and His Word,.... not “them” and their interpretations  
Pastor Ed Rice