

# **THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH**

## **Domie R. Jacob**

### **FOREWORD**

I am enticed to write an article about this Church, Roman Catholic Church, because I believe that most of the members of this church don't know its beginning, and much more they are ignorant of the doctrines which they are faithfully adhering to. When they became members, maybe they were still in their childhood or during their infancy. In other words, they blindly became Catholics, and so they are just doing the doctrines which they did not fully understand.

I, too, want to educate the young Gospel preachers about it, so that they will know what to teach and how to refute when they encounter these members, or even the laymen or priests of this church.

I want to make it clear that I am not dealing with the personal character of any individual Catholic member, but purely dealing with the Catholic Church and its doctrines. Is this Church Scriptural? Are its doctrines Scriptural or Biblical? These are to be dealt with. Don't hesitate to read it, read it and you will surely be enlightened. If you have your Bible, consult it, as it will surely fully enlighten you. Rev. 1: 3 says, "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of the prophecy, and keep the things that are written therein for the time is at hand."

The lessons of the article I am to discuss are quoted mostly from the preaching of Brother Frank Van Dyke in his Gospel meeting held in Greenville, Texas in 1952. His subject was Catholicism, and it was purely HISTORICAL, as he traced the development of the Roman Catholic Church. Brother H. Osby Weaver who was in that Gospel meeting suggested to him to use this subject "ERRORS AND DANGERS OF ROMAN CATHOLICISM." After transcribing from tape recordings which were made at that time, he asked the permission of brother Van Dyke to have it printed in the form of a booklet. Now, reading this booklet, I found out that most of the lessons brother Van Dyke preached were quoted from the book entitled "Novelties of Romanism," by Colette. Thus I am quoting several important lessons which he delivered and which were written by brother Weaver in his booklet "ERRORS..." in order to fully document my article about this Church. Therefore, most of the documents in writing this article are copied exactly from this booklet, some are paraphrased, and others from different references. I urge you to continue reading because it is so very interesting, exciting and enlightening because you will find out the gradual development of the Roman Catholic Church and why world leaders recognize the temporal power of the Pope.

### **I. THE GRADUAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC HIERARCHY**

#### **I. THE ELDERSHIP**

The Apostle Paul prophesied, " But the spirit saith expressly, that in later times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of demons, through the hypocrisy of men that speak lies, branded in their own conscience as with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God

created to be received with thanksgiving by them that believe and know the truth,” ( I Tim. 4: 1-3). This prophecy came to a reality. Van Dyke said, “History bears out the fact that the first step of departure did actually begin in the eldership. But even before the days of the Apostles were over, there was evidence of departure from that arrangement. Paul said the mystery of iniquity was already working and warned the Ephesians elders that ‘from among them themselves men would arise, speaking perverse things to draw away the disciples after them.’ This departure occurred in the SECOND CENTURY,”(Weaver, Errors and Danger of Roman Catholicism, Emphasis mine DAJ)

Their problem was about the Office of the Elders and Office of the Bishops. They were bothered, as they could not ascertain nor identify the office of the elders and the office of the bishops. But reading the New Testament, you will find out the organization of the New Testament Church that ELDERS and BISHOPS are the SAME office. NO distinction. ALL the elders in a congregation are bishops. But in this period, according to Van Dyke, “ONE elder became more influential than the others. Maybe he was more aggressive with a little ability as a leader, therefore, he was given a position of authority or higher honor than the other elders. They simply said, ‘We will distinguish him from other elders by calling him bishop of the congregation, whereas the others are just elders.’ Right there was the first step away from the order of the organization of the New Testament Church,” ( ibid).

What is the CORRECT order of the organization of the New Testament Church regarding eldership? In the First Century congregations were organized with each one having a plurality of elders with deacons serving under and with them. In Acts 14: 23, when Paul was returning from his first missionary journey, we can read this “he ordained elders in every church.” Then in Phil. 1: 1, Paul addressed himself, “To the church at Philippi with the bishops and deacons.” Then the Apostle Paul instructed Titus, “For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that were wanting, and appoint elders in every city, as I gave the charge; if any man is blameless the husband of one wife, having children that believe, who are not accused of riot or unruly. For the bishops must be blameless, as God’s steward; not self-willed, not soon angry, no brawler, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but given to hospitality, a lover of good, sober-minded, just, holy, self-controlled; holding to the faithful word which is according to the teaching, that he may be able both to exhort in the sound doctrine, and to convict the gainsayers,” (Titus 1: 5- 9). He further emphasized the real roles and qualifications of elders or bishops, and deacons, he said, “Faithful is the saying, if a man seeketh the office of the bishop, he desireth a good work. The bishop therefore must be without reproach, the husband of one wife, temperate, a sober – minded, orderly, given to hospitality, apt to teach; no brawler, no striker; but gentle, not contentious, no lover of money; one that ruleth well with his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity....Deacons in like manner must be grave, no double- tongued, not given to much wine, no greedy of filthy lucre... Let deacons be husband of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well. For they that have served well as deacons gain to themselves a good standing, and great boldness in the faith which is Christ Jesus,” ( I Tim. 3: 1 – 13).

It is plainly and clearly understood that the office of elders or bishops are the same. It is understood that each congregation has a plurality of elders, NOT only one elder or bishop. It is also understood that elder or bishop should be a married man and has

children that believed. It is understood further that every congregation is autonomous, self governing or independent. It is a unit within itself with elders or bishops, as overseers or shepherds of the flock, subject only and always to Christ as HEAD of the whole church. Thus, the CHURCH OF CHRIST- the New Testament Church IS NOT A CENTRALIZED religious entity, NOT like man –made religions or churches, like THIS church I am to discuss.

It is sad to note that men are sometimes not satisfied with the simple organization of the church which God Himself decreed, and much more they don't like the Church which Christ built and they built their own churches, and so many different churches rose. The Apostle Paul said, "For they exchanged the truth for a lie, and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever,"(Romans 1: 25). Like in the days of Noah, God gave to Noah the exact size of the ark which he was going to make: the length, the width, the height, the rooms, the kind of tree he was to use which was gopher. Surely men during those times ignored the preaching of Noah. Perhaps several men also heeded to the preaching, but may be they were not satisfied with the kind of ark which God ordered men to make, thus made a much, much bigger and more beautiful ark than the ark which Noah made, and so ONLY eight were saved, only the family of Noah because they were the ones who complied faithfully with the EXACT order of God regarding the kind of ark He wanted them to make in order to be saved from the water (flood),"(Gen. 6: 13 – 22; I Peter 3: 20, 21). Evidently the church leaders in the second century wanted a much more pleasing organization of the church, so the "Plurality of Elders in each congregation was changed to only ONE elder and now called Bishop. Later a bishop of a city congregation was considered more important than the bishop of a country congregation. Then this office gradually evolved until the bishops of the capitols of the world became the presiding bishops called patriarchs,"( McDaniel, A Brief History of the Church of Christ).

"There were FIVE patriarchs of the capitols of the world: Rome; Antioch of Syria; Jerusalem; Alexandria, Egypt; and Constantinople, Greece," ( McDaniel; John Cox, Church History; Jimmy Thomas, The Papacy; Catholic Encyclopedia, p. 403; Weaver).

Van Dyke said, "Now I want you to notice friends, how far the development has gone. A great departure from the New Testament order. We are away along now in the FOURTH and FIFTH centuries, yet not one of those bishops was looked upon as the supreme head of the church, and not one of those bishopric was considered as having all authority over the entire church," (Weaver, Capitalization mine DAJ).

## 2. GENERAL COUNCILS WERE CALLED.

These COUNCILS' role was TO MAKE DECISIONS and DOCTRINES of the church. The FIRST council was done in the later part of the second century, then councils after councils were called and ended in the seventeenth century. These councils contributed much for the gradual and full development of the Roman Catholic Church. So far, I have listed TWENTY TWO councils; however, if there are more, and you know them , add them. The first Council was dated 325 A. D. and the last Council was dated 1870 A. D. Except the Council of Laodicea , as it was a provincial council (Synod) ALL were general councils.

1. Council of Nice -325 A. D. (2.) First Council of Constantinople- 381 A. D. (3.) Council of Hippo- 390 A. D. (4.) First Council of Carthage(?). (5.) Second

**Council of Carthage- (?) (6.) Third Council of Carthage -397 A. D. (7.) Council of Ephesus- 431 A. D. (8.) Council of Laodicea (?) (8.) Council of Chalcedon – 451 A. D. (10.) Second Council of Constantinople- 553 A. D. (11.) Third Council of Constantinople- 680 A. D. (12.) Second Council of Nice –787 A. D. (13.) Fourth Council of Constantinople- 869 A. D. (14.) Council of Ravenna -1311 A. D. (15.) Council of Basel- 1439 A. D. (16.) Council of Florence- 1439 A. D. (17.) Council of Avignon- 1457 A. D. (18.) First Council of Trent –1543 A. D. (19.) Second Council of Trent -1545 A. D. (20.) Third Council of Trent -1546 A. D. (21.) Fourth Council of Trent- 1565 A. D. (22.) Vatican Council -1869- 70 A. D., (McDaniel, Hailey, Thomas, Weaver, James M. Tolle).**

### **3. WORKS OF THESE COUNCILS.**

**1. Council of Nice -325 A. D.** This council was considered the Mother of ALL councils. “Constantine, the Emperor of the Roman Empire during this period called the bishops to solve the controversy between Arius and Athanasius. The controversy was about the nature of Christ. Arius taught that Christ was not eternal while Athanasius taught that Christ was eternal and divine. This council was held in the City of Nice in Bythenia in June, 325 A. D. and ended about the middle of August. Constantine, being the head of the church, as he proclaimed himself the head of the church in 320 A. D., presided over the council. In this council the church leaders decided that Christ was eternal and divine with the Father. Two more very important events that were decided by this council were the making of a creed, called the Nicene Creed, and the making of Christianity, as the State religion of the Roman Empire,” (McDaniel, Cox).

Van Dyke said, “They passed a decree that all the bishops would be on an equal level; that each one would have the right to conduct his own affairs without any interference or without any subjection whatsoever to any other bishop,” (Weaver, Errors...)

**2. Council of Hippo -390-A. D.** Van Dyke said, “Let me give you the claim in the words of the magazine article of recent date( 1952 A. D.), put out by the Knights of Columbus as part of their propaganda program, ‘For the first three hundred years of Christianity the Bible existed but not as we have it today. During those early times, parts of the Bible were scattered among the various churches, no one of which had the complete Bible, as we have it now. Then in 390 A. D., at the Council of Hippo, the Catholic Church gathered together various books which were claimed to be scriptures, passed on the claims and merits of each, and this council decided which were inspired and which were not. The Catholic church, therefore, gave the people in the world the Bible as we have it today,’”(ibid).

Van Dyke refuted this claim of the Knights of Columbus. He said, “But we need not be confused about that. It seems that this was undertaken in the council of Hippo in 390 A. D., and then the Council of Carthage in 397 A. D., just seven years later continued the work of the previous council. But the important question is, Did the Catholic Church then and there decide what books would make up the holy canon? There are some significant facts involved, and I am going to mention a few of them.

In the year 383 or 384, Pope Damascus designated Jerome to make a revision of the then existing Latin copies of the Bible. Now notice, this is six or seven years before the Council of Hippo, yet the Knights of Columbus said that it was not until the Council of Hippo that it was decided what should constitute the Bible. How was it possible then

for the Pope, as they designated, six or seven years before that time to commission Jerome and give him the work of revising the Bible which work of revision actually resulted in the Latin Vulgate Version, if it were not known what books composed the Bible? Jerome started that work of revision and said in effect, 'I will just go back and make an outright translation of the Bible into the Latin language.' I think that is sufficient evidence to show you that at least that much earlier than the statement from the Knights of Columbus claims, the Bible already existed. Not only this, but the oldest manuscripts that we have – the Senaitic, the Vatican, and the Alexandrian were dated back as early as 325 A. D., to 331 A. D. These old Greek manuscripts contain the Bible substantially as we have it now. Those old copies of the Bible were made away back as early as 325 A. D., that is some 60 or 65 years earlier than the time that the Catholic Church decided what should make up the Bible, so a very clear discrepancy!

But again, the oldest translation of the Bible dated back even older than that. A manuscript is a copy in the same language in which the scriptures were written, but a version is a translation into another language. We have the versions of the Bible older than the manuscripts which we have. Sometimes that is a little confusing to people. They say, 'If a manuscript is a copy of the original and a version is a translation from the original into another language, how can a version be older than the original?' Right in the last expression is where confusion comes in. It is not that versions are older than the original, but are older than the copies which we have that were made from the original. That is why we have versions such as the old Latin, the Coptic versions, and particularly the Peshito Syriac Version which simply means the 'simple Syriac Version' dated back far beyond the time in 390 or 397 A. D. , when the Catholic claimed they decided what books should make up the Bible.

The Catholics have preserved that version made by Jerome which was completed near the beginning of the 5<sup>th</sup> century- the **Latin Vulgate**. To Catholics, that version is until this date the OFFICIAL scripture. They have the English version- the **Douay Version**, but they have preserved with an attitude of reverence to the old Latin Vulgate. **Now, they** have added to the Latin Vulgate the **APOCRYPHAL books**. The Latin Vulgate with the Apocryphal books added is the Bible which Catholics have preserved for us. What is the **Apocrypha**? Van Dyke said, 'The Apocrypha is simply that group of additional books that Catholics have in their Bible that we do not have in our Bible today. Those books were never in the original Hebrew Bible. They did creep into the Septuagint version that was made during that interval between the close of the Old Testament and the beginning of the New Testament. In the Council of Trent in 1546 the Catholic finally accepted those books as CANONICAL. That council decreed that the Apocrypha was to be accepted along with the books of the Old Testament as part of the inspired scriptures,'" (Ibid, Emphasis, mine DAJ).

James M. Tolle said, "The Old Testament canon which we accept as genuine is the same as the one held by the Roman Catholic Church. In addition to the books which hold as canonical, Catholics accept as divinely inspired the following writings, as decreed by the fourth session of the Council of Trent, held April 8, 1546 A. D., Tobias, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Barruck, and the two books of Maccabees, with addition to the two books of Esther and Daniel. These books we designate as APOCRYPHAL, meaning 'hidden' or 'secret,' because the date, origin, and authorship of them are doubtful. What evidence do we have that these books are not inspired and that our

rejection of them is valid, thus proving that the Roman Catholic Church belies its claim of giving the Bible to the world when it presents books as divinely inspired which do not come from God?

The first evidence we present against the canonicity of the apocryphal books is that they were never recognized as canonical by the Jews, to whom the Old Testament was given. We, then, who reject the Apocryphal hold to the same canon of the Old Testament as the Jews. Flavius Josephus, a Jewish historian of the first century A. D., described the canon of the Old Testament as held by the Jews, which we hold today. He did not name the books of the Old Testament, but he numbered them, and described them that there was hardly room for any mistake,” (Tolle, *Is the Bible a Catholic Book?*, Tract, p.8, emphasis mine DAJ).

**3. Council of Laodicea-** (No Exact Date). Van Dyke said, “Jerome, who translated the Latin Vulgate, specifically repudiated the Books of the Apocrypha. Not only did Jerome repudiate those books, but also the Council of Laodicea which was but a provincial council, but finally the Council of Chalcedon in 451 A. D., which was a general council, confirmed the decree of the Council of Laodicea, rejecting these Apocrypha books,” (Weaver).

Tolle said, “The Council of Laodicea, which was the first synod that determined the number of canonical books... The ancient Christians have followed the Jewish canon in the books of the Old Testament. The first catalogues of the canonical books made by the ecclesiastical Greek and Latin authors comprehend no more,” ( *Is the Bible a Catholic Book?*, p. 12). Thus, this further proved that the Council of Laodicea and the Council of Chalcedon really rejected the Apocryphal books!

Tolle further discussed these Apocryphal books, “ The first catalogue of the books of the Old Testament to which were added the Apocrypha was that of the third Council of Carthage ( A. D. 397), comprised of bishops of Africa. ...This Council deviated in its catalogue from both Jewish canon and the canon generally held by claimant Christians during the first four centuries of our era... It finally remained for the Council of Trent, held 1545, to give the official recognition of the Roman Catholic Church to the Apocrypha.

The principal argument made by the Catholic authorities in favor of the divine inspiration of the Apocrypha is that these books were contained in the Septuagint version, a Greek translation of the Old Testament scriptures, and that since this version was generally quoted by Christ and the apostles, it is obvious that they recognized the Apocrypha as belonging to the Old Testament canon. ‘Is it not strange that if the Septuagint version enumerated books not belonging to the canon, Christ and His apostles should have continually cited it? For some 300 out of the 350 quotations of the Old Testament found in the New Testament are taken from the Greek of this version, which contained all the books of the Catholic Bible of today.’

In answering the argument, we first notice that there IS NO PROOF that the Apocrypha were included in the Septuagint version as originally translated from the Hebrew in Alexandria, from 250 to 150 B. C., and as used by Jesus and the apostles,” (Ibid , emphasis mine DAJ).

**4. Council of Chalcedon- 451 A. D.** Van Dyke said, “ This Council that met in the year 451 A. D. passed a decree to the effect that Constantinople should be given equal rank of glory and honor with Rome... Now, we need to understand what we are

talking about. Constantinople was considered the center of the Eastern part of the Roman Empire. Rome, of course, remained the heart of the Western part of the Roman Empire,”

(Weaver).

“ Away back in the early part of the FOURTH century when old Constantine had come to the throne, he recognized the Christian religion, but because the Roman Aristocracy persisted in adhering to their Pagan religion, moved the capital of the Roman Empire to Byzantine, renamed it to Constantinople which was given that name in honor of Constantine, called the ‘New Rome,’” (Halley’s Bible Hand Book).

“The Council of Chalcedon in 451 A. D., the great ‘divine’ the church said, ‘Now the Capital of the Roman Empire has been moved to the East and certainly the city that is now the capital of the empire should share honors that has heretofore been bestowed to Rome.’ In the 28<sup>th</sup> canon of that council, it was decreed that equal precedency should be given to Constantinople with Rome, since the seat of the government had been transferred from Rome to Constantinople. They said the fathers of old had given Rome a sentiment of superiority and precedency to Rome because it was the seat of the empire. Don’t you see that they were acknowledging that whatever honor, whatever precedency, whatever superiority that had been attached to Rome up until this time was purely a matter of sentiment because it was the seat of the empire, and they did not look upon Rome as having superiority by divine right. It was purely because Rome was the seat of the government and since the capital had been moved to another city, they said that city ought to have the honor. That is away down in the middle part of the 5<sup>th</sup> century, and they did not then look upon Rome as being the supreme bishopric and the bishop of Rome as being the supreme head of the church by divine right.”( Weaver).

**5. Fourth Council of Constantinople- 869 A. D.** Van Dyke said, “This Council made the statement: ‘In the Apostolic See ( that is, in the Roman See) the Catholic religion has always been preserved immaculate, and holy doctrine has been proclaimed.’ That is what the Council of Constantinople said about the Roman Bishopric. The word ‘See’ as we have been using here means a ‘bishopric’ or ‘diocese.’ This Council, then, went record as saying that in the Apostolic See in the Roman Bishopric, which was the seat of the government of the Catholic Church, and still is, ‘Catholic religion has been preserved immaculate and holy doctrine has always been proclaimed,’” (Ibid).

**6. Council of Ravenna- 1311 A. D.** Van Dyke said, “At the Council of Ravenna in 1311 A. D. , they accepted sprinkling and pouring as baptism. Since that time this practice has been the OFFICIAL doctrine of faith of the Catholic Church. They cannot afford to say that they are wrong about it, for such admission would be the ‘death blow to her claim of infallibility.’ In spite of the fact that the Bible teaches that baptism is a ‘burial and resurrection’- Romans 6: 3, 4, and that when men were baptized , they ‘went down into the water’- Acts 8: 38, the Catholics cannot afford to admit that they are wrong. They are saddled with a FALSE doctrine of faith which they must hold to the end of time, or else RENDER ‘a death blow to the doctrine of infallibility,’ ( Ibid, emphasis, mine DAJ).

**7. Council of Basel- 1439 A. D.** Van Dyke said, “ Then years passed on. The Dominicans among the Catholics opposed this idea of the immaculate conception of Mary and the Franciscans, another monastic order, championed the cause; hence, they

were at each other's throats. From time to time on different councils, the idea of the immaculate conception did creep in. It was expressed in the Council of Basel in the year 1439, and again in the Council of Avignon in 1457. Then, in 1483, Pope Sixtus IV issued a PAPAL BULL and said that neither the Dominicans nor the Franciscans could charge each other with being heretical. The reason he gave: 'Because this doctrine has not yet been decided by the Roman Church and the Apostolic See.'"(Ibid, emph., mine DAJ.

**8. Council of Florence- 1439 A. D.** Van Dyke quoted, 'Also we decree that the Holy Apostolical See and the ROMAN PONTIFF himself is the SUCCESSOR of Saint Peter, the prince of the Apostles and the true vicar of Christ and the head of the whole church and father and teacher of all Christians; and that to him in the person of the blessed Peter, our Lord Jesus Christ has committed full power to feed, rule, and govern the universal church according as it is contained in the acts of general councils and the holy canons.' That was the claim of superiority and supremacy of the Roman bishopric and the supremacy of the Roman bishop himself as the successor, so called, of Peter, who, according to them, was the first pope of the church and that the Roman Pontiff even until this day enjoys that superiority. It is significant to note that the general councils and the holy canons referred to in this decree are simply not on record. That is, general councils and the holy canons through the centuries before that date had not given to the Roman See this superiority," (Weaver, Emphasis, mine DAJ.).

**9. Council of Trent- 1543 A.D.** " This Council formulated the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church into one body, called the 'Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent,'" ( Homer Hailey, Attitudes and Consequences, Book, p. 21).

Van Dyke said, " Another claim of the Catholic church that I want to mention is their doctrine of oral tradition is of equal authority with the written scriptures. That decree was passed in the **Council of Trent in 1546 A. D.**...The last claim that I want you to notice is their claim that the 'CLERGY HAS THE RIGHT TO FORGIVE SINS.' This supposed blessing is given through the channel of the sacrament of penance. The sacrament of penance consist of three distinct steps or parts. There is what we would ordinarily call the repenting, though technically, it is attrition instead of outright contrition. They say that it is imperfect repentance; that it is a degree of penitence; and they call it 'attrition.' After one has come into that condition of heart and soul, he goes to the priest and makes his confession- auricular confession -confessing in the ear. As a result of that confession, there is a satisfaction or some physical punishment which the priest may and does impose as the satisfaction for that wrong. Now then, the catechism of the Council of Trent, speaking of that sacrament of penance says, ' There is no sin so grievous, and no crime so enormous, and regardless of how frequently repeated, but the sacrament of penance will remove the guilt.' Furthermore, that same catechism says that the sacrament of penance has connected with it in such a special manner the absolution of the guilt of sin, that without its intervention, we cannot obtain or expect absolution. It is stipulated that in the sacrament of penance, after attrition and the confession, the priest is to say, 'I ABSOLVE THEE,'" (Emphasis mine DAJ).

Van Dyke refuted this doctrine. He said, "Such a doctrine places a man called a 'priest' between an individual Christian and his Lord in the act of obtaining forgiveness. One cannot approach the throne of grace and find mercy and grace in every hour of need without going through the medium of human ecclesiastical system, according to Catholic

teaching from the Council of Trent. One of the first things which the doctrine overlooks is that each Christian is a priest within his own right ( Revelation 1: 6), hence, he does not need another to serve him in this capacity. Furthermore, “ There is but, ‘ONE mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus,” ( I Tim.. 2: 5). This eliminates the priest and his act of forgiving the sinner, and saying, ‘I absolve thee.’” (Weaver).

In addition to what Van Dyke reasoned out, the Apostle Paul said, “ Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father,”( Phil. 2: 9- 11). Jesus said, “And whatever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask anything in my name, that will I do,” (John 14: 13 -14). Apostle Paul also said, “And whatsoever ye do, in word and in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, giving thanks to God the Father, through him,”( Col. 3; 17). These three quoted verses of the Bible are enough evidences that we don’t need the intercession of the priest in order that our sins be forgiven by God. The priest is NOT God! He is ONLY assuming the role what is NOT his, but of God, or SOLELY for God! He is a mere human being like us! How can he forgive our sins, if he himself is a sinner? ( Rom. 3: 23; I John 1: 8-10). Don’t be deceived, friends! Think! Don’t close your minds and hearts! Be open-minded!

**10. Vatican Council- 1869-70 A. D.** “In 1870, the Vatican Council, through the leadership of Pope Pius IX, made the decree of Papal Infallibility, which they taught the decree made by the Pope is infallible or free from error,”( McDaniel).

“‘Catholics are taught that the Pope is supreme judge in all matters of faith and morals, and his pronouncements on these matters have the guarantee of infallibility. The test that shows a person to be a member of the true church is union with the pope. He is the head of the church and if we are not in union with him, we are outside the true fold.’ Submission unto the pope is essential to salvation. ‘Now, we therefore, declare, say and determine and pronounce that to every creature it is necessary for salvation to be subject to the authority of the Roman pontiff,’” (The Papacy, Catholic Encyclopedia Vol. XV, p. 126).

Van Dyke related and commented the decree of the Vatican Council, “While exercising this supposed right through the centuries, they have had some difficulty in deciding just where this ‘infallibility’ lies in the church. Just who is the voice of the church to speak infallibly? That was finally settled in the year 1870 A. D., when they declared the infallibility of the Pope. That was done in the Vatican Council, the last general council that they have had held. Up until that time, they could not decide just who was to speak ‘infallibly,’ whether the Pope or the Bishops of the general councils. It was generally looked upon as being infallible if it came from other source. But since 1870, there has been no further need for a council because since that time, they had already the doctrine of infallibility of the Pope. If he is the one to speak infallibly, the council could do would be simply ask the Pope what he wanted them to say, and they would have to say it. To do otherwise, would be for them to refuse that which is infallible, according to them. You can see why they have not had a general council since 1870,” (Weaver).

#### 4. THE MAKING OF THE PAPACY

Van Dyke said, “Now, I have to stop to relate facts about the Council of Nice and Council of Chalcedon to emphasize the fact that through these second to the fifth centuries they did not look upon Rome as the supreme bishopric nor the bishop of Rome as the universal head of the church. Those are facts of history taken from the decrees and actions of their own church councils. Using them then as witnesses and of course giving credit for knowing the conditions of the times and the attitudes and sentiments of the age, we must come to the conclusion that Rome at that time had not come to be looked upon as supreme head.

Now time went on and the struggle between Rome and Constantinople continued. It became rather keen and sometimes even bitter until 588 A. D., John the Faster who was at that time Bishop of Constantinople assumed the title of universal head of the church. The Bishop of Rome at that time was Pelagius II, and he was astonished of the boldness of old John the Faster and spoke out vigorously against him. Pelagius said, ‘Regard not the name of universality which John has unlawfully usurped to himself, for let none of the patriarchs ever use this profane appellation. You may well estimate what mischief maybe expected rapidly to follow whenever among priests such perverted beginnings break forth, for he is near respecting whom it is written, ‘he himself is king over all sons of pride.’ That was the strong, pointed language that was used by Pelagius II toward a fellow bishop in Constantinople.

“After a few years, Gregory the Great succeeded Pelagius as bishop of Rome, and also spoke out bitter denunciation against the actions of John over in Constantinople. He said, ‘No one of my predecessors ever consented to use this so profane appellation, for if a single patriarch be styled ‘universal’ the name of ‘patriarch’ is taken from the others...to the consent to the adoption of that wicked appellation is nothing less than to apostatize from faith... I indeed confidently assert that whosoever calls himself or desires to be called ‘universal priest,’ that person in his vain elation is the precursor of the anti-Christ, because through his pride he exalts himself above others,’”( Weaver).

“Gregory the Great, Patriarch(Bishop) of Rome severely rebuked John the Faster for assuming title which neither Peter, John, Andrew or Paul had the presumption to assume, but later Gregory the Great declared himself the Universal Bishop, and took the title ‘Papa’ or ‘Father’ and later, was modified to ‘Pope,’”( Cox, McDaniel, Thomas).

Van Dyke continued, “A few years later there was a peculiar turn in events and this turn is rather ironical, because in 606 A. D., it was the Roman Bishop that was declared to be the universal head of the church and since that time, they have made this presumptuous claim. The details of the incident are interesting and enlightening. Remember now how that the Roman Bishop Pelagius II and Gregory the Great had spoken out against the idea that any bishop should ever wear the title Universal Bishop, yet in just a few years there was a ‘POLITICAL DEAL’ and a ‘TRADE OUT’ by which the Bishop in Rome gained the title and honor, if indeed it is an honor, of being the universal ruler or head of the church.

That came about this way: Over in Constantinople old Emperor Phocas had come to the throne through treachery, murder, and usurpation. He had killed Mauricius, his predecessor, and his family in order that he might gain the throne. This was about 606

A. D. ALL THESE TEMPORAL RULERS LOVED TO HAVE THE APPROVAL OF THE BISHOPS, but the Bishop of Constantinople would not place his approval upon Phocas as the rightful ruler. He would not approve such murderous action on the part of Phocas. Old Phocas knew there was rivalry between the bishop of Rome and the bishop of Constantinople, so in vindictiveness and revenge he turned to the Bishop of Rome, who was at this time Boniface III, and offered to crown him as the universal head of the church in turn for recognition and approval of Phocas as the rightful emperor of Constantinople. The deal was made and in the year 606 A. D., Boniface III was crowned as the first Universal head of the church in the line of what Catholics have considered until this day as successor of Peter. That was the CLIMAX, to it all; hence, the ECCLESIASTICISM was full blown and full grown, but it did not come until approximately 573 years after the establishment of the Lord's church- the Church of Christ. Rome did not gain that ascendancy and so called superiority and authority until after a long hard fought struggle. And only then did she come into that place and position of power and superiority by unrighteous, political sell- out," ( Weaver, emph. mine DAJ).

The same year 606 A. D. after Emperor Phocas crowned Boniface III as Universal Bishop of the Church, the church leaders thought and realized that the word CATHOLIC was a more appropriate term than Universal . The two words are the same in meaning which is "worldwide, global or international," (Cassel Pocket Dictionary), the Roman Universal Church was changed to Roman Catholic Church. Because Boniface III was then crowned by Emperor Phocas as the Universal Bishop of the Church, he became the First crowned "Papa" or "Father" or "Pope" of this renamed church, and the name of the members of this church since then was called Catholic until now, NOT Christians. That's the short history of the gradual and full development of the Papacy and the gradual and full development of the Roman Catholic Church into a very powerful religious organization.

The Pope became so very powerful, that she was responsible in the crowning of Emperors, kings, queens, princes and princesses of Europe. "The Pope totally and strictly prohibited the populace of the Holy Roman Empire to read the Holy Scriptures. He ordered all copies of this Holy Book to be burned. All people who didn't recognize the Roman Catholic Church were called Heretics, and he ordered his armies to seize them and be burned in the stake,"( John Cox, Church History, John Penner, History of the Church of God).

## **II. HOW THE PAPACY BECAME A TEMPORAL POWER**

— Van Dyke said, " I must trace briefly with you how the Papacy came to be a temporal power; and how the Pope of Rome came to have power over temporal or civil government; how the papacy came to possess land. Even though Ecclesiasticism was fully developed in the year 606 A. D., the papacy did not come to possess temporal power until a long time after that. In fact the first record of the Pope coming to reign over territory with temporal power is in the year 751 A. D.

It came about this way. The Pope at this time was having difficulties. His name was Zachary or sometimes spelled 'Zacharias.' The Lombards were pushing down from Central Europe into Italy. Hence, Rome was being threatened and the Pope was afraid; he needed some help; he needed some protection against the invaders, so he turned to

Pepin the Short, the King of France. Pepin the Short, too, had come to be King of France by unrighteous acts. Now Pepin was looking for approval as the rightful ruler of France as Pope Zachary was looking for protection from the invading Lombards, so the Pope simply turned to Pepin the Short and said, ‘ If you will provide protection for us against the Lombards, I will put my stamp of approval upon you as the rightful king in France.’

We cannot appreciate what those proposals meant until we have a grasp and understanding of how powerful the Pope was becoming by this time and how the kings of earth looked up to him for approval, so it meant a lot for Pepin the Short to have approval of the Pope, and meant a lot to the Pope to get protection from the Lombards; hence, the deal was made.

Two years later 753 A. D., Stephen II, who was the successor of Zachary, was still troubled by the invading Lombards, so he rushed up into France and said to old Pepin the Short, ‘I want protection against the Lombards; if you will send an army into Italy and fight against them, I will crown you again as the ruler of France.’ So he recrowned Pepin, thus acknowledging and approving that which Zachary had done before him. As a result, Pepin the Short sent an army into Italy, fought against the Lombards, took away some territory they had gained in and around Ravenna, Italy, took over a portion of the central part of Italy, including a part of Rome, and simply put it into the lap of the Pope and said, ‘Here, it is all yours as a part of the deal.’ That’s the way the Pope of Rome came to possess land and the Papacy came to be a Temporal Power. From that time on the Pope wielded and exercised a greater power than any civil ruler throughout the middle ages. In the year 800 A.D., what is known as the ‘Holy Roman Empire’ had its beginning,”(Weaver).

### **III. THE POWER AND INFLUENCE BY THE POPE OVER CIVIL RULERS**

— Van Dyke said, “ The first ruler or emperor of that ‘Holy Roman Empire’ was crowned by the Pope, and through the centuries after that, there was inter-play between pope and emperor that continued throughout the middle ages and reached a climax of power and influence by the pope over civil rulers on into the eleventh and twelfth centuries under the rulership of Pope Gregory VII or called Hildebrand and Innocent III.

The issue of investiture was up, and that was the question of who would crown the bishops or invest them their ecclesiastical power. The civil authorities had been doing that, and Hildebrand said, ‘I think I will put a stop to it.’ Henry IV, the Emperor up on Germany, said, ‘ No, I think we do not want to give up that right.’”( Weaver).

“Henry IV called together the bishops of the Holy Roman Empire and compelled them to depose Gregory VII. Then Gregory VII or Hildebrand retaliated simply by releasing his subjects from all allegiance to Henry IV. He said, ‘I absolve you of all allegiance, responsibility, and submission to the Emperor.’ Thus, Henry was left without a kingdom. In order to be forgiven by the Pope, and reinstated as emperor, Henry IV was forced to lay aside his royal garments to make a journey over the Alps in the dead winter and to approach the Pope in his palace at Canossa, Italy,”( Weaver, Cox , Church History, p.43).

“ Then came Innocent III later on, who had enough power in his inaugural address, he said, ‘The bishop of Rome, the successor of Peter, is below God, above man, is judge of all and is judged by none,’”( Weaver).

“He believed that he was the ‘ Vicegrent of God on earth. He claimed that he was the successor of the Apostle Peter and that he possessed authority, not only over the church, but also over the whole world,” ( Cox).

“ He had enough power that he made old Philip of France take back his divorced wife. Then he had enough power to take away the crown of King John up in England for opposing the papal authority, and said in Effect, ‘Now, John, you put that crown into the hands of the Roman primate there, and you may have it back when you agree to be a good boy and will take it back with the understanding and acknowledgment that you are subject to the Pope,’” ( Cox, Weaver).

“ In 1170 A.D., Pope Innocent III ordered the King of Hungary to invade Bosnia, the center of the Albingenses or Church of Cathari. He ordered him to suppress the Albingenses. Pope Innocent III gave the land (Bosnia) to the king of Hungary, as his reward in suppressing them. During this time, the Inquisition was established in 1291 A. D. (Secret court to inflict terrors & persecutions). The Dominicans and Franciscans monastic orders of the Roman Catholic Church, competed in applying terrors to the devoted Albingenses,” ( Cox, John Penner, History of the Church of God, p. 8).

Van Dyke said, “Those are just a few of the many instances which show the power and influence by the Papacy throughout the middle ages until its decline, but not completely lost until the year 1870 A. D. when the Italian Armies marched into Rome and took away the temporal possessions of the Papacy,” (Weaver).

#### **IV. WHY WORLD LEADERS RECOGNIZED THE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH?**

Van Dyke said, “In the year 1929, there was a special treaty made between the Roman Catholic Church and the Italian Government. A great amount of money was paid to the Catholic Church and what is now known as the Vatican State was formed. That is a plot of land in the City of Rome consisting of about 109 square miles (1, 744 sq. km), over which the Pope is supreme ruler both civil and spiritual. It is with that territory with the Pope as head, which in effect is both political and a religious state, that our government in recent years has sought to have relations such as they thought would demand a formal, official appointment of an ambassador. That was the issue, that was raised a few months ago (1951) when the president proposed to the senate that he appoint and they approve an ambassador. Those who defended that move had a defense that at first might seem plausible. They said they were not saying necessarily that any church had a right to be of temporal power, but were merely recognizing what did exist – that the Roman Catholic Church owns territory known as Vatican State; she rules over it; it is a temporal power, and we have the right to deal with it as such. That was the argument, and it seems plausible to many people, but in effect, it falls down upon critical analysis. Though the Vatican is a temporal power, the head and ruler of that territory is the Pope of Rome, the head of the Catholic Church. To deal with that temporal power is with an effect dealing with spiritual power and to recognize it with the appointment of an ambassador, is simply to recognize a church and to have an official representative with

and before a religious body. If one religious body has that right then why not others? That is why so much opposition was aroused and protests flooded Washington and until this time, it seems that such a step has been prohibited, or at least forestalled and delayed, and we hope the delay will be permanent.

That's why the Catholic Church claims absolute power both spiritual and temporal, and claims the inherent right to control, not only involving the spiritual and civil affairs of our life. Thus, the UNION of church and state is one of the fundamental and cardinal doctrines of the Catholic Church," (Weaver, emph. mine DAJ).

That's why the President of the United States recognized the power of the Pope, as he is also a temporal power, as well as an ecclesiastical power, so they appoint ambassador to this tiny – State. Not only the United States but also nearly all nations in the world, not excluding the Philippines. The ruler of this tiny-state of Vatican, the Pope, is so very powerful that he can make great leaders of the world, not excluding the President of the Philippines, to bow to him, to kiss his hands, to kneel and to kiss his feet, which the Apostle Peter never did to man. Catholics claim that the Pope is the successor of Peter, but Acts 10: 25- 26 refutes what the Pope is doing to men. "And when it came to pass that Peter entered, Cornelius met him, and fell down at his feet, and worshipped him. But Peter raised him up, saying, 'Stand up, I myself also am a man.'" But here the so-called successor of Peter, the Pope, loves and enjoys being worshipped! Is he the "Son of perdition, sitting in the temple of God, as God? Read II Thessalonians 2: 3, 4., and you will realize the Truth.

Furthermore, the Vatican is sending Papal Nuncio to the Philippines likewise the Philippines is also sending ambassador to this tiny- Vatican State, and so the Filipino people are spending for the salary of that ambassador. Therefore, it is not amazing why the Roman Catholic Church is so much involved in Philippine politics because it possesses, BOTH ecclesiastical power and civil power!

#### **V. MORE FALLACIOUS DOCTRINES OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH**

— These are: "The authority of the Pope, The Doctrine of Purgatory, hereditary sin, transubstantiation, instrumental music, sprinkling for baptism, the selling of indulgences and practice of extreme unction or special service for the dying," (McDaniel).

These major doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church are all foreign in the Holy Scriptures, that is why I said "fallacious doctrines." "These caused the DIVISION of the Roman Catholic Church in 1054 A. D., because the Catholics in the Eastern part of the Roman Empire- Greece, did not uphold these teachings for they realized that they were not backed up by the Holy Scriptures. Thus, the original ONE body of the Catholics became TWO bodies-- Roman Catholic Church and Greek Catholic Church" (Ibid, Cox).

"In 1517 A. D., Martin Luther, a priest (monk) of the Roman Catholic Church realized the ERRORS of the Catholic Church, so he nailed his famous NINETY FIVE THESIS to the door of the church at Wittenburg, Germany in proclaiming the errors of this church. That was the beginning of Protestantism when Luther protested the Edict issued against him by the Diet of Spire in 1529, and he was called 'Protestant,'" (Cox). Many more bold and courageous men had the courage to expose the ERRORS of the Roman Catholic Church, but these are enough to show and enlighten the readers that

this church - Roman Catholic Church IS NOT THE TRUE CHURCH OF THE LORD, although they claim that the Catholic Church is indeed the Church of Christ!

**CONCLUSION:**

Dear readers, fellow Christians and non-members of the Church of Christ- the New Testament Church, I am hopeful and prayerful that this article fully enlightened you about the DEVELOPMENT of the Roman Catholic Church and its doctrines. You are NOW the judges of what you have read about this CHURCH! Now, friends in the Catholic Church after you are through reading the details of its ASCENDANCY as a SUPER religious entity, and you realize that this church is a FARCE religion and its doctrines are also FALSE, don't tarry, LEAVE IT, before it is too late for you to be saved.

The Apostle Paul said, "Wherefore, Come ye out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord," ( I Cor. 6: 17 ).

The Lord Jesus said, "Come forth, my people, out of her, that ye have no fellowship with her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues; for her sins have reached even unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities," ( Rev. 18: 4, 5; Isaiah 1: 18; Matt. 11: 28- 30). The Lord Jesus is so much concerned for your salvation, so He commanded us, you, each one! "**HE THAT BELIEVETH AND IS BAPTIZED SHALL BE SAVED; BUT HE THAT BELIEVETH NOT SHALL BE DAMNED,**" (Mark 16: 15, 16; Acts 2: 38; Acts 8: 35- 38; Acts 10: 47, 48; Acts 22: 16; I Peter 3: 20, 21; Heb. 10: 35- 39; Rev. 2: 10; Rev. 21: 7).

**END**

**Cordon Church of Christ  
Sagat, Cordon, Isabela, 3312,  
Philippines**